



**On the Foundations
and
Concerning Questions
of**

STALINISM

On the Foundations and Concerning Questions of Stalinism

Written by Wolfgang Eggers

December 2008 – July 2009

Published by the Executive Committee of the Comintern/ML
(renamed Comintern/SH in 2009)
translated by the Section USA of the Comintern (SH) in 2020

Introduction and Chapter 1

"Marxism is the science of the laws governing the development of nature and society, the science of the revolution of the oppressed and exploited masses, the science of the victory of socialism in all countries, the science of building communist society." (Stalin)

"Leninism is Marxism of the era of imperialism and the proletarian revolution. To be more exact, Leninism is the theory and tactics of the proletarian revolution in general, the theory and tactics of the dictatorship of the proletariat in particular." (Stalin)

Stalinism is Marxism-Leninism for the transition from the First Period of "socialism in one country" to the Second Period of socialism on a world scale, in general.

Stalinism is Marxism-Leninism for the transition from socialism "in one country" to "communism in one country", in particular. (Comintern/ML)

Hoxhaism is the doctrine of popular revolution against fascism and its transition to socialist revolution, the teachings of the theory and tactics of the anti-revisionist and anti-social-imperialist struggle in the period of revisionism in power in general and is especially the theory and tactics of the dictatorship of the proletariat under the conditions of capitalist-revisionist encirclement. (Comintern/ML)

Preface

This article was written in connection with our original article about

[the events in Georgia in August 2008.](#)

To better understand these events, we wrote a short biographical article about

[Stalin's first creative period in the Caucasus.](#)

This historical image is now rounded off with this **third, final (and once again far too long, unfortunately!) part**, as the traces of his struggle before his death take us back to the Caucasus.

The text should actually end with the chapter about the **Mingrelian Conspiracy**, but ...

...with this last chapter the traces for finding the truth about Stalin inevitably led back to Moscow, tempting the author not to conclude the voyage of discovery with the subject of **Georgia**, but to continue it with the subject of so-called "**de-Stalinization**". Something quite different has now emerged from this:

"On the Foundations and Concerning Questions of Stalinism".

The reader may decide for himself whether he wants to end his study of the Georgia text with the chapter on the **Mingrelian Conspiracy** thematically (Chapter III) or whether he is curious enough and wants to continue to bite his way through the whole text and deepen his study of the foundations and concerning questions of Stalinism.

The central link between the two themes is Berianism. Beria played a criminal role against Stalin not only in Georgia. His crimes even go far beyond the borders of the USSR, which is why we have critically exposed the defenders of Beria, the Berianists, the spread of their Berianism. This reactionary current within the Marxist-Leninist World Movement has caused ideological confusion and has caused not little damage to our movement. And therefore we must expose Berianism and destroy its influence in the Marxist-Leninist World Movement. The following article is dedicated to this task, which should therefore be understood as a self-contained, independent text. In the process, **some** world political foundations and questions of Stalinism with a current outlook have "quite incidentally" come to light.

But enough of the preface!

Why should communism fail? Because of the betrayal within the own communist ranks!

How do we achieve communism? By fighting against its traitors!

Why did Stalin's work fail? Because of the betrayal of Stalin!

How do we complete the work of Stalin? In the fight against his traitors!

We communists will always be victims of fraud and self-deception as long as we do not learn to look for the interests of the exploiting and oppressing classes behind Stalinist phrases!

There is much talk of Stalinism, but what is Stalinism, what are the foundations of Stalinism?

"...if we have full knowledge of Stalin's activity after the Second World War then we will see his titanic Marxist-Leninist greatness more clearly." (Enver Hoxha, 'Reading an Article about the Proletarian Cultural Revolution in China' in: 'Reflections of China', Volume I; Tirana; 1979; p.327; English Edition).

This particular sentence of Enver Hoxha's, the 5th Classic of Marxism-Leninism, is, so to say, our *starting point*.

We believe that it is absolutely necessary to continue working on this "full overview", and that is why we wanted to make a small contribution to this.

How are the foundations of Stalinism being worked out?

Always by exposing and demarcating opportunists who have defended Stalinism in words but betrayed it in deeds.

Whoever wants to defend Stalinism against opportunism today must also defend it against the opportunists who wanted to sell us the anti-Stalinists Beria and Malenkov as "Marxist-Leninists".

The Khrushchevites are burnt out, but the Berianists are still digging! Therefore, we decided to develop the foundations of Stalinism in the struggle against the anti-Stalinism of Berianism.

Chapter I

On the Ideological Foundations of Stalinism

We Stalinists will emerge victorious against anti-Stalinism!

Down with Berianism!

The fact that **we Stalinists**, between the 55th anniversary of Stalin's death and the 130th birthday (!), have only now begun the struggle against **Berianism**, even though we have been fighting for Stalinism **for 40 years**, proves the precariousness of the Berianists who operate in secret. We have been giving these people a bad example this whole time and we are honestly ashamed of it. We had suspected them from the beginning, but we did not know how to explain this suspicion. We lacked sound information and quite simply the revolutionary consciousness to substantiate and prove our suspicions. We thought more about not risking our good reputation as Stalinists. We were afraid that by accusing Beria, we would be moving away from Marxism-Leninism. **We were not thinking of the fight for the truth about Stalin.**

Before, we were not 100% sure, we kept silent. In retrospect, with the destructive evidence we uncovered, one might not want to believe that we had been so **blind and silent** about all the betrayal, but it is still true and this fact remains a shameful but all the more instructive fact for us. What does it show us? It shows us that we can only correct our own subjectivism by examining the facts only on the basis of reality, that we never have a "ready-made Marxism-Leninism" and that we must not fill our gaps in knowledge with idealism, that we always have to struggle with doubts, that things are often not as we explain and imagine them, that we are constantly dealing with our ignorance, have to struggle with our shortcomings, that we approach the truth only relatively close to the truth in a permanent, self-critical process of self-conquest, that we Communists must always first free ourselves a little bit from errors in our own past, from our mistakes, before we are able and entitled to illuminate another, small piece of the way to the liberation of the working class. We have realized that we must correct, expand and consolidate our views of Marxism-Leninism not only on the basis of the misconceptions of others, but above all on the basis of the misconceptions in our own thinking and acting, that we can only strive so tirelessly to become, to be, and to remain, honest, self-critical disciples of Marx, Engels, Lenin, Stalin and Hoxha.

What has changed in our attitude towards Comrade Bill Bland? Not a little, as it turns out.

Our apology should be that we had a principled ideological struggle against, for example, the **ISML ("Alliance" Marxist-Leninist, Hari Kumar)** and their "friends" around the world, and we are continuing this struggle. Hari Kumar visited us in Hamburg in 1998, and at first we had a positive, promising impression of him regarding the improvement of the situation on the theoretical front within the Marxist-Leninist World Movement. Through Hari Kumar we also came into contact with

Bill Bland. Later, the differences between us and Hari Kumar became so great that he even wanted to ban us from speaking and finally excluded us from his Yahoo group and thus from contact with other Marxist-Leninists who had logged on there. We had documented this outrageous process on our Comintern/ML homepage. Hari Kumar was afraid that his anti-Marxist-Leninist internet forum would turn into a Marxist-Leninist forum through our comrades so he pulled the emergency brake and threw us out.

It was also Bill Bland's writings that contributed to the spread of Berianism, so that we finally had to subject them to a long overdue criticism. We realized that unfortunately not only we alone, but other Marxist-Leninist organizations throughout the world had also been infected by the virus of Berianism. The positive attitude of the Albanians towards Bill Bland was an orienting basis for our trust in him. The friendship that the Albanians had with Bill Bland gave us a positive attitude towards him. And indeed, we got to know Comrade Bill Bland as an upright comrade and this attitude did not change after his death. We are very glad that in London, in his own house, the important **communiqué between the Communist League and the KPD/ML came into being in 1999**, the contents of which we published on the homepage of the Comintern/ML and which is still published on the homepage of the "**Communist League**", probably not without the explicit will of Comrade Bill Bland. Apparently Hari Kumar did not succeed in convincing the "Communist League" to delete this communiqué from their homepage. **It is significant that neither Hari Kumar, nor the ISML nor any other Marxist-Leninist organization mentions this document with a single word**, although Hari Kumar claims to defend Bill Bland!! **What is one to think of such a "defense", if he does not mention our common communiqué with a single syllable?** There must have been differences of opinion between Hari Kumar and Bill Bland, which Hari Kumar vehemently denied, in order to allude to differences of opinion between us and Bill Bland, which we, at least at that time, did not see any more than Bill Bland did. From Bill Bland's side, nothing was known about this either. **The communiqué of 1999 is the bond with which we are connected to Bill Bland until today and will remain connected forever. It is and remains a valuable document with which the foundation of the Comintern/ML began. That's why Bill Bland's significance, which he had for us at that time, cannot be erased.**

It was fundamentally correct that we defended Comrade Bill Bland against the ISML and its Trotskyite haze around the world, stretching as far as India, against its neo-revisionist, neo-Trotskyite course. Even during our visit to London we were uncomfortably struck by the condescension of intellectual there with Comrade Bill Bland. When we shared our impressions with Bill Bland, he agreed with us, and he lowered his head depressingly. We had been struggling with such people in Germany for years, but at that time they had since been long gone. What is certain is that these arrogant intellectuals had exerted a corrosive influence in London that we would not have tolerated in Germany. Admirably, however, Bill Bland quickly showed his humorous side and made us understand that we had to get through this situation and patiently continue working with this garbage. Okay. That was his business, not ours. And indeed, he had survived a whole series of attacks by his opponents in his life, including his exclusion from the "Stalin Society", which in our eyes was an opportunistic society. What fascinated us about Bill Bland was that he was not to be fooled by anybody, but used his own head and decided for himself what was right and wrong. This fundamentally critical attitude contributed greatly to his criticism of modern revisionism. In our hearts we feel deeply connected with the character of Bill Bland. However, we have seriously studied his writings and have come to the conclusion that he made a number of serious mistakes, which are more from his sources themselves than from studying them. Bill Bland, after all, had taken the standpoint of objectively examining contradictory points of view without prejudice, whether they were right or wrong.

It is sometimes much harder to convince a revolutionary heart of an error than a revolutionary mind. This also applies to our attitude towards Comrade Bill Bland. We had come to know Comrade Bill

Bland in person as a lovable, warm, modest and upright internationalist comrade, who to our astonishment had met our aims and wishes to the greatest extent possible. And this attitude has not changed and will not change until today. Bill Bland seemed to us to be able to literally "read our Marxist-Leninist attitude from our faces", which we were very happy about at the time and, frankly, it amazed us. We told him at that time that we would sincerely regret that we had made friends so late. **In the jointly written [communiqué of 1999](#), this document of the Marxist-Leninist World Movement, as it could be called at that time a groundbreaking ray of hope, there is neither something Trotskyite nor revisionist to be found, for it stands on the firm ground of Marxism-Leninism. It is a principled document of historical importance for the Marxist-Leninist World Movement, which we defend and which continues to serve as the basis and guidance for our revolutionary action.**

At that time, there were only comradely expressed differences of opinion about the assessment of the KLA in Kosova, which consisted in the fact that Comrade Bill Bland unreservedly supported it, while the KPD/ML took a sympathetic, but rather critically distanced position towards certain nationalist and Maoist circles within the KLA. That was the only position where a compromise was sought and found. There was complete agreement on all other points which were of fundamental importance to us - such as **our wish to push ahead with the building of the Comintern/ML** and to express this unconditionally in the communiqué. Bill Bland was in favor of building the Comintern/ML. We measured the good relationship with Bill Bland not least by the fact that this communiqué came into being, but at that time we did not know his writings in detail. He gave us some to read and some others were published on the homepage of the Communist League and the ISML, in English of course. It was only with the Bill Bland texts translated into German by G. v. Scheven, which we published, that we became suspicious without seriously and critically dealing with them and seeing them in contradiction to the joint communiqué of 1999. We thus interpreted the attacks on us by Hari Kumar and the ISML as attacks against Comrade Bill Bland and defended him. Only later did we realize the contradiction that we could not defend Bill Bland without criticizing some of his theoretical theses and conclusions as errors. **Basically, we were not allowed to defend Bill Bland's mistakes against the correct views of Bill Bland.** We had to kneel ourselves into the matter, into the material that Bill Bland was dealing with. It was not that easy and it took a lot of time and effort. But we think it was worth it for all of us, because the deeper we penetrated into the matter, the more clearly Bill Bland's weaknesses became apparent, the more we began to distance ourselves from his wrong positions, the more necessary it seemed to us to work out our own independent position against them. So we had to torment ourselves to distance ourselves from Bill Band's positions.

Whether Marx and Engels, Lenin, Stalin or Enver Hoxha, they all had a justified critical relationship to the Anglo-American physiognomy of Marxism. Its strength was the purely objective approach, a sober and effective working style. But it's had theoretical weaknesses. There was a lack of a clear line, a consistent demarcation from bourgeois influences. Anglo-American Marxism was never consistent, never penetrated enough into the depths. It was not able to recognize the dialectical connection of things. Above all, the Bolshevik character of partiality was weak. It was unsuitable to be a guide to action for the entire Marxist World Movement, and unfortunately nothing has changed in this respect until today, if one takes a closer look at the Anglo-American "Marxist-Leninists".

Stalin emphasized American efficiency as a special feature of Lenin's working style:

"American efficiency, on the other hand, is an anti-dote to 'revolutionary' Manilovism and fantastic scheme concocting. American efficiency is that indomitable force which neither knows nor recognises obstacles; which with its business-like perseverance brushes aside all obstacles; which continues at a task once started until it is finished, even if it is a minor task;

and without which serious constructive work is inconceivable.

"But American efficiency has every chance of degenerating into narrow and unprincipled practicalism if it is not combined with Russian revolutionary sweep

"(...) The combination of Russian revolutionary sweep with American efficiency is the essence of Leninism in Party and state work." (Stalin: 'The Foundations of Leninism' in: 'Works', Volume 6; Moscow; 1953; p.195-196; English Edition).

It was Stalin who, after Lenin, masterfully applied Lenin's working style. There is no doubt that Stalin's working style is one of the foundations of Stalinism, we will learn from his working style, we will strive to acquire it, to master it. Today, we revolutionaries find global conditions to acquire a globalized, Stalinist style of work, a new World Bolshevik style of work, the world revolutionary style of work, which puts into practice the internationalist worldview of the proletariat, where not only Russian and American, but the most useful working styles of all countries of the whole world are united into a globalized style of work.

Drawing consistent demarcation lines and remaining elastic enough despite a principled attitude towards opportunism has always been a problem for the Anglo-American Marxist movement. There is a broad spectrum of right opportunism on the one hand and plenty of sectarianism on the other hand, **but this broad opportunistic spectrum was always opposed by a far too weak independent position of Marxism-Leninism.** The Anglo-American comrades have never really succeeded in completely freeing themselves from bourgeois influence and in Bolshevizing themselves. In England and America, Marxism-Leninism, with laudable exceptions, has never really been emancipated. This can be documented historically - above all on the basis of the teachings of the classics of Marxism-Leninism. It should turn out that we too had our problems with the Anglo-American literature on Marxism-Leninism and now only after nearly 10 years are trying to create clarity by dealing with the writings of Bill Bland more closely and unfortunately, not with all of them yet. The initial euphoria and hope was followed by disillusionment and distance. While studying his writings, we went through a period when we began to doubt Bill Bland, but we finally convinced ourselves that we could not let Bill Bland fall into the trap, that he could not be criticized without defending his positive aspects. Although we think he had made mistakes, we do not want to deny him his merits. But despite his merits, there were finally such serious mistakes that are not at all compatible with Marxism-Leninism and therefore had to be rejected by us absolutely. In our opinion it was a mistake of Bill Bland to get involved with people like Hari Kumar at all. Hari Kumar is a skillful neo-Trotskyite who has been able to subordinate disguised Trotskyism, that is, Trotskyism wrapped up in "Marxism-Leninism" to some Marxist-Leninists. He undoubtedly made use of Bill Bland's mistake. When we talk about Berianism here, it has been fostered in no small part by Bill Bland's misconception of the role of Beria, Malenkov, etc., but exploiting this misconception in the interest of the class enemy is something that others have done. In any case, we cannot find any underhanded intention behind Bill Bland's misjudgment of Beria, as serious as it is for keeping the foundations of Stalinism clean and defending them, and we do not want to accuse him of a deliberate deception or the fulfillment of an intelligence mission. But mistakes are to be criticized as mistakes, whether they were made intentionally or unintentionally. With the defense of the Berianists, the picture with which Bill Bland tried to draw the defense of Stalin has a devastating effect on us. We cannot and do not want to make friends with the picture that Bill Bland drew of Stalin. **Let us summarize our position on Bill Bland as follows.**

Bill Bland's criticism of revisionism is, in our view, altogether flawed and therefore must be critically judged.

What are we as Stalinists to think of a "critique of revisionism" that starts from the

outrageous thesis that *"revisionist rule already existed in 1934"*? In our eyes this is not a criticism of revisionism, but a retreat from revisionism, a simple capitulatory attitude towards revisionism!

On the other hand, there is general agreement among us Stalinists that the dictatorship of the Soviet proletariat existed at least until the murder of Stalin, that is, until 1953, and not the "dictatorship of the bourgeoisie", because what else can such a "rule of the revisionists" be than "Stalinism" under the dictatorship of the bourgeoisie? We only recognize Stalinism under the dictatorship of the proletariat.

Whoever questions the axioms of Bolshevism, whoever slanders Stalinism, whoever falsifies the history of the Soviet Union over a period of two decades dismantles the real merits of Comrade Stalin in the struggle against revisionism and above all, underestimates the power of Stalinism against revisionism. However, revisionism cannot be seriously defeated with such a self-disarmament. In general: confusing the dictatorship of the proletariat with the dictatorship of the bourgeoisie has, in our opinion, nothing to do with scientific analysis. Such a mistake is more than just a small trifle, it is not a trifling matter. And that is why it is our duty as Stalinists to contradict these "scientific" analyses of Bill Bland clearly, since they are a staple for the Trotskyites to smuggle their old garbage under a new mask into the Marxist-Leninist World Movement, which we have labelled "Berianism".

Any attempt to transform the crimes of Beria into "Marxist-Leninist" deeds by quoting Stalin is grist for the mills of the Berianists, leads into the swamp of Berianism and inevitably meets with the resistance of us Stalinists.

But we would be making a mistake to condemn the writings of Bill Bland in bulk. Bill Bland's writings certainly contain certain merits, useful source material, collections of quotations, useful hints, etc., which have helped us in our own criticism of revisionism. Bill Bland's writings were and are instructive because not only did they help us to better distance ourselves from his false conclusions, but they also allowed us to consolidate our own point of view and develop new ideas. In this respect, and only in this respect, we recommend the study of his writings available to us, they are an enrichment for the further development of the anti-revisionist struggle of the Marxist-Leninist World Movement.

We point out that one must not limit oneself, as Bill Bland did, to the gathering of source material, not even to factual material, but that a Marxist-Leninist must take care to analyze the gathered material theoretically and generalize it scientifically in order to prove the objective regularities of social development in the period of Stalinism and to draw conclusions from it in the service of the current world revolutionary liberation struggle of the proletariat. This is precisely the weak point of Bill Bland.

This is the conclusion reached by the Comintern/ML with its investigations, which we have presented in detail, although not yet exhaustively, in the following. We must continue to study the writings of Bill Bland, we cannot draw a definitive conclusion here, his material is far too extensive for that. **Our assessment is also incorrect due to our own inadequate information.** But remaining silent only for that reason cannot bring the Marxist-Leninist World Movement forward. We must finally speak our mind, even if we are aware of our weaknesses.

It is only now, not least on the basis of the writings of Bill Bland, that we ourselves are able to uncover the ideology of Berianism. So far we had only noticed tendencies like **neo-Trotskyism** and **neo-revisionism**, which is the truth. As far as we know, we are the first and so far the only ones in the world to have named the ideology and with it the concept of "Berianism" as such. We

therefore not only deal with what we think is wrong with Berianism, but also point out its class origin and social function in order to make it understand what Berianism really means in practice.

After all, we founded our **Comintern/ML** in the year **2000** in **demarcation** from the Canadian "Alliance ML" and the **ISML**. **We raised Comrade Enver Hoxha to the rank of a 5th Classic of Marxism-Leninism** in order to better defend Marxism-Leninism, to better defend Stalinism.

And in the past years we have tried to contribute to the defense of Marxism-Leninism, to its further development towards **world revolution**. Despite our tiny existence, we were endeavored to make our modest ideological contribution to strengthen the Marxist-Leninist World Movement, to show it the way out of the crisis as best as we could. We have distinguished ourselves from ISML more and more sharply in the struggle, have seen our own way more and more clearly in front of our eyes, have worked out an **independent world revolutionary, Marxist-Leninist position**, although we had no idea about the existence of Berianism until now. Our theory has now become strong enough to attack and expose the ISML and its ideological haze as an **anti-Marxist-Leninist current in the Marxist-Leninist World Movement**. We'll settle up with these people here now. We may have missed the mark at one time or another in the exposure of Berianism, but we certainly hit this hostile ideology hard. One cannot refute Marxism-Leninism, not even on the "ground of Marxism-Leninism". We have already extracted this tooth for the modern revisionists. What is decisive here now is the **detection of Berianism**. The focus on the **character** of Beria unfortunately makes an overestimation of his historical role inevitable, for which we ask for understanding, because only with increased attention to his criminal deeds we will be able to recognize and smash the ideological danger of Berianism, we will overcome such mistakes of the first period of socialism and draw correct conclusions from the experiences of that time.

We say it openly and we will never take it back: **Beria did not act from his own conviction, but was directed against Stalin by a foreign hand, by bourgeois ideology and its paid adepts. Beria has been "convicted" of all sorts of bourgeois positions, whether from the positions of Khrushchev or other bourgeois positions (including, not least, the bourgeois position of today's Berianists themselves, namely that Beria was allegedly a "Marxist-Leninist"). There are also revisionist voices that criticize Beria as much as Khrushchev, in order to put themselves in an anti-revisionist light** (see the "red channel" English-language article: "The Careerist-Revisionist Beria"). **All of this has led us on the wrong track. There is only one Marxist-Leninist standpoint to lift the veil which the Berianists try to hide behind after Beria's death - this is the Marxist-Leninist standpoint of the 5 classics Marx, Engels, Lenin, Stalin and Enver Hoxha. Only now have we begun to realize what a dangerous opponent Stalin must have faced in his immediate vicinity. With our criticism of Beria we have recognized Stalin's titanic Marxist-Leninist greatness even better.**

Accusing Beria of his crimes is not difficult. Others before us have done the same. That is not what we are concerned with alone, we are concerned with Berianism, with its *ideological* roots. If Berianism is not destroyed, then the misbelief about this alleged "Marxist-Leninist" will continue to haunt unhindered. Indeed, by constantly fueling this misbelief, only more comrades will be "moved" to instinctively protect him from his Khrushchevite accusations. The fact that we are protecting Stalin from the Khrushchevites, that Khrushchev had Beria shot and that we would therefore involuntarily also protect Beria (namely *without* putting Beria under the magnifying glass!!), is exactly what the Berianists are speculating on, namely that they know about us very well: The Stalinists are defending Stalin against the dirty slingshots of bourgeois propaganda. And so the Berianists then set themselves the task of making the "Marxist-Leninist" Beria a cuckoo's egg in the nest of us Stalinists. The Berianists are pursuing the goal that the enemy, hidden in a Marxist-Leninist eggshell, will throw us out of our own nest as soon as we have fed and strengthened him enough. Berianism is therefore a

parasitic ideology, which one has tried to implant in Stalinism in order to destroy its further development from within. To overcome Berianism as an ideology is therefore much more difficult, much more complicated, but all the more necessary and effective than to content oneself with criticism of the character of Beria. If we fail to plough the ground of the Berianist ideology deeply and thoroughly, new Berianists will always grow out of the earth, who will be nurtured and cared for by us Marxist-Leninists "in good faith", but as a result, the growth of Marxism-Leninism, which is close to our hearts, will no longer get a chance. We still have only ourselves to blame if we suddenly find ourselves in the hands of the class enemy. We didn't do that favor for Mao either with his slogan, "Let a thousand flowers bloom!" We are tearing the roots out of Berianism, which has surrounded itself with its "aura of closeness to Stalin", to throw it onto the dustbin of history.

Concealing the truth and distracting from it by covering up traces, by setting up false tracks was the method of the secret service chief Beria, which the Berianists copied from him. But you cannot outwit Marxism-Leninism, you cannot manipulate it arbitrarily or even treat it as a secret. Stalin also got to the bottom of Beria, but by then it was already too late. Marxism-Leninism is not there to cover the traces of our opponents, but to uncover them! One can try to brainwash the Marxist-Leninists, but one cannot brainwash Marxism-Leninism itself. And with that the whole "glory" of Berianism ends, which makes the Berianists all the more angry. One cannot put Marxism-Leninism behind social-fascist bars and draw confessions from it, nor can one undertake a purge against Marxism-Leninism. The truth cannot be forbidden, cannot be purged away, it is indestructible, immortal. Marxism-Leninism is always directed against those who have to abuse it in order to fight against world communism and for the liberation of the world proletariat. We of the Comintern/ML have the courage to openly appear as accusers and to take full responsibility for such an accusation against Beria and Berianism in front of the whole Marxist-Leninist World Movement, in front of the whole world proletariat! This is in every respect a serious step for us, but the only principled, revolutionary way. But lies about Beria are cheap; loss of principles cost nothing. Let the Berianists with their unprincipled attitude go quietly under. But we do not allow anyone to hide behind Stalin's back with his lies and to attack us from there with the mask of "Stalin"!

We try to learn from our mistakes with criticism and self-criticism. It is never too late to learn from your mistakes. However, the criticism is completely justified why it took us so long to do so, especially since we see ourselves as loyal Stalinists. We hope to overcome our criminally neglected Marxist-Leninist vigilance with this long overdue step. We sincerely hope that all other comrades may learn from our mistakes, becoming fully aware of the **deadly difference between true loyalty and hypocritical "loyalty" to Stalin, to expose this difference and to condemn the masterminds behind the cover-up of this difference.** And, dear comrades, this applies not only to Stalin but to all our beloved leaders of the communist world movement, this applies to the entire worldview of the world proletariat and this also applies to Comrade Enver Hoxha. There are countless examples of Berianism. **Hypocritical "loyalty" is one thing, open betrayal and open treason is another thing.** Both go hand in hand, but one is much more difficult to see through than the other. We owe it to Stalin to clarify this, and we are honestly glad and relieved that we were finally able to free ourselves from the clutches of these ideologues, that we were able to free Stalin a little bit from the betrayal of Berianism and thus drew a little closer to him. With the fight against Berianism, after 40 years of fighting for Stalinism, we have honestly earned our proud name as Stalinists.

Without Beria the Khrushchevites would probably have "not so easily" come to power. Beria has opened the way for them. Until his death, Beria was the greatest and most brutal anti-Stalinist of the USSR. The Berianism of today has followed in his anti-Stalinist footsteps. Defending Stalin, therefore, means for us: not to stop with the fight against the

Khrushchevites, but to continue our fight against Berianism. The fight against modern revisionism does not exclude the fight against the pioneering role of Berianism, but presupposes it. How else can one really fight revisionism if one turns one's attention only to the one hand which Beria was shot by the Khrushchevites with and does not notice what the other hand of the Khrushchevites was doing, which in fact was protectively covering Berianism which had been left alive. The Khrushchevites could not convince the sly fox Beria to share his plunder. They flayed him alive, for they could camouflage themselves much better with it than with their own lousy skin. The principle behind it was revealed by Lenin at the time. Or rather, Lenin had slapped counter-revolutionary spies on the fingers. They pointed out from their sewing box that it was tactically unwise to completely smash the Marxist organization because it would have to be re-invented in order to rebuild it. It is more advantageous to maintain a Marxist organization, because this way you can continue to control and direct it from within without anyone's suspicion. This is how the Berianists worked in our ranks.

Why does Berianism try to keep its hypocritical "loyalty" to Stalin alive beyond his death as "honest" loyalty? In order to make them sublime to the faithful Marxist-Leninists, in order to repeat to us the vile example set for Stalin. Whoever, like the Berianists, makes the murderer of Stalin a "Marxist-Leninist loyal to Stalin" makes himself an enemy of Stalin, makes himself an anti-Stalinist accomplice of revisionism, is a pathetic lackey of world imperialism. Whoever defends Beria, stands against Stalin. Whoever defends Beria stands against Stalinism. Whoever stands against Stalinism has no place in the Marxist-Leninist World Movement and belongs on the other side of the barricade, stands in the enemy camp which we are destroying.

The Berianists have quite cleverly taken advantage of our Marxist-Leninist hatred of Khrushchevites, they have sailed under our flag, not so that we would clean the halo of their Beria, but so that we would help them to replace Marxism-Leninism with Berianism, naturally in the name of "Marxism-Leninism". We did not do the Berianism this favor, we put them in the pillory of the Marxist-Leninist World Movement, the only place where they belong.

Comrade Enver Hoxha rehabilitated the Marxist-Leninist World Movement in the struggle against the Titoites, against the Khrushchevites, against the Maoists, against the Euro"communists", against modern revisionism and has lifted it to a higher level.

The Comintern/ML will rehabilitate the Marxist-Leninist World Movement in the struggle against the Berianists, against the neo-Trotskyites, against neo-revisionism and will raise it to a higher level in the spirit of Enver Hoxha!

The struggle to rehabilitate the Marxist-Leninist World Movement will continue permanently!

The Marxist-Leninist World Movement is stronger than all its enemies combined!

"We regard the ideological struggle against modern revisionism as an inseparable component part of the struggle for the construction and defence of socialism in Albania, for the triumph of the freedom of the peoples and the revolution everywhere in the world." (Hoxha: 'Report to the 6th Congress of the PLA' in: 'Selected Works'; Tirana; 1982; p.746; English Edition).

With the shooting of Beria, the Khrushchevites could conveniently bury all of their own crimes against the proletariat in his grave. But eliminating of Beria does not mean that his ideology, the spirit of Berianism is eliminated! Berianism, however, has remained for the

modern revisionists as a sure signpost for the restoration of capitalism, as a reserve invisibility cloak in the struggle against Marxism-Leninism. With the help of the Khrushchevites, Berianism was able to live on to disorientate us Stalinists, even 17 years after the final withdrawal from the Soviet Union! This is a really dangerous sham maneuver of the Soviet revisionists and everything else but a "diminution" of the crimes of the Khrushchevites against Stalin and the communist world movement. The "arguments" of Khrushchev against Stalin are without doubt of the same nature as the "arguments" of the Berianists against us Marxist-Leninists, only that some keep their "arguments" hidden behind the fig leaf of "Leninism" and others their "arguments" behind the fig leaf of "Stalinism" ! Khrushchev was able to cut Beria's head off, but Berianism cannot be defeated by the modern revisionists themselves, but only by us Marxist-Leninists! Revisionism can never be defeated by revisionists, no matter how much they claim their "anti-revisionism" and try to defame us as "sectarians" and "dogmatists"! The real sectarians and dogmatists are the Berianists themselves! Their only mistake is that they conclude from themselves to others.

Khrushchev was only one of the heads of the "Hydra" of Beria! If one rejects his revisionist ideology, new heads will grow back for the Hydra. In this respect, the head of Beria cut off by Khrushchev did not really mean the death of the Hydra, but on the contrary, the Hydra created for itself the best camouflage that could exist to continue its revisionist evil unrecognized and unharmed until today! "Let the Marxist-Leninists calmly believe that the Hydra is finished, let them cut off the head of Khrushchevism, modern revisionism will survive thanks to Berianism". The Berianists certainly believed that, until we met them!

Do you remember, comrades? Stalin's "Short Course" ended with a metaphor from Greek mythology, that the Bolsheviks are invincible if they remain connected to the masses, like Antaeus to Mother Earth. What did Beria do? He ambushed Stalin. And in a weak moment he murdered him. With this he made the Soviet country, the Party, the state, the army, the dictatorship of the proletariat, the world proletariat leaderless and opened the way for the subjugation of socialism to capitalism. Beria reached for the key of invincibility of the Bolshevik leadership and the Hydra shouted: *"I did him in! I have saved all of you!"* (Beria, May 1st, 1953).

We are referring to Stalin's daughter Svetlana, whom aptly called Beria the **Hydra**, and with this metaphor we want to follow Stalin's journey into Greek mythology with how Hercules killed the Hydra:

Hercules shot burning arrows into their cave to lure her out. Angrily hissing, she shot at him, but he grabbed her and clasped her with an iron grip below her nine-fold throat. She wrapped her huge body around him, but Hercules did not give in. He then took the sickle he had in his belt and cut off her head one by one, but two heads always grew back for every head. With a torch, Heracles [his Greek name] burned out stump after stump before another head could shoot out. With one fist he held the beast. In the end, only the ninth head remained, the middle one, which he also cut off, but it lived on and jumped at him again and again. But he grabbed it and buried it in a deep hole in the ground, which he rolled a heavy rock over. Underneath it now rumbled the head, but the stone was too heavy. He cut the body of the snake into pieces and dipped his arrows into her poisonous blood. The puncture wounds were incurable. What does that tell us Stalinists?

The world proletariat must, like Hercules, shoot the burning arrows of anti-Berianism into the caves of the Berianists to draw out the snake of treason. In doing so, it must not be afraid to shoot through all the **masks** of "Marx, Engels, Lenin, Stalin and Enver Hoxha" behind which they hide all their heads for our deterrence and for their protection. The world proletariat must neither hesitate nor tremble like a hare in front of the snake! The world proletariat must take all traitors in the whole world by the throat and must not let any of them go. The sickle symbolizes the poor peasants with

whose help the workers must cut off the ideological head of the traitors. The torch symbolizes Marxism-Leninism. Thus, the ideology of betrayal must be burned out with stump and torch before it can grow back. The laboring masses, the peoples of the world, the world proletariat is merging into one huge rock which the ninth head, the centrist head of the Hydra is buried under. But the world proletariat uses the poisonous blood of the traitors to incurably poison the counter-revolution itself.

Within the destruction of the global betrayal of communism lies the key of the invincibility of World Bolshevism. The traitors to communism are the paid agents of world imperialism! And among its ideological scribblers and lackeys are the Berianists!

"De-Stalinization" begins with the prevention of disclosure, with the concealment of the complete documents and writings of Stalin. We ask you, comrades: Who had access to them? Who was responsible for the Soviet archives? Who supervised them? Who could manipulate or destroy them? Who could falsify or make Stalin's documents disappear? Who could make the crimes against Stalin, against the Russian people, against the people of the Soviet Union disappear? Who could cover his own tracks? Who supervised the amnesties and rehabilitations after Stalin's death? Only a minister who was in charge of the Ministry of Internal Affairs and all the secret services could do that, only Beria could do that! And not only could he do it, but he did it and exactly on the same day when Stalin was dying! And the "Beria File" itself? Even up to Gorbachev the "Beria File" remained allegedly "untraceable" (!). The secret of the Berianists is still carefully guarded by the former KGB. By whom? By still active Berianists! The mysterious spirit of Beria is still omnipresent in today's Russian state. Even bourgeois historians complain about the incomplete and sparse publication of documents from the archives. Who decides what may be published and what may not? Explosive historical facts are still kept strictly under lock and key. Historical documents were exposed to the sea of flames in Moscow! Who are the arsonists? What have they got to hide?

Why is the speech of Stalin's secretary Poskrebyshev at the XIX Party Conference nowhere to be found?! It is said to have spoken about vigilance and the role of the USA in the fight against Bolshevism. It was probably written by Stalin, or at least under his guidance. Was it suppressed by the revisionists?

It is time, comrades, that the world learns the entire truth about Beria's worldwide counter-revolutionary network! The truth about Beria is one of the many keys to the truth about Stalin! The world proletariat wants to know the truth, nothing but the full, the pure, the whole truth! Has there ever been a Berianist who would have fought for the dissemination of the works of Stalin, for the disclosure of the documents of Stalin? No, there is not and there will never be. They are content to "reprocess" Stalin on the basis of the material disclosed (not by them, but by bourgeois historians), in order to fish in the mud! We Stalinists, through painstaking labor, distributed the works of Stalin after the betrayal of the modern revisionists and they do have their good reasons to hate us!

Comrades, millions of "documents" from the archives of the Soviet Union have now supposedly been "revealed". Millions of bourgeois judgements and comments have been written about them. A mess of disinformation. The world proletariat and we communists have only one tiny question: If so much has been revealed, why are there no documents from Stalin? Why are the missing writings of Stalin, still under lock and key or "lost", 55 years (!!!) after his death? Why is it necessary to fight an unyielding, tough battle for every single document of Stalin's? Who is interested in not finally releasing the works of Stalin completely to the whole world? If that is not censorship, then what is? Is the public not allowed to form its own opinion about Stalin's writings? Does the public need the "help" of historical "experts" to understand what Stalin said, wrote and meant? Or are we afraid that

all the myths of anti-Stalinism would collapse like a house of cards if we let Stalin speak for himself? These are all legitimate questions, right? Is there a greater scandal in bourgeois historical "science", a scandal of the world domination of capital, than the secrecy of the complete writings of Stalin? This secrecy alone is damaging to our communist cause in the eyes of the proletariat. Without the complete publication of all the works of Stalin, we cannot fully defend Stalin, he cannot fully defend himself!

The first demand that we Stalinists must make and fulfill is the complete release of all documents not only "about" Stalin, but first and foremost the release of every utterance **that come from his own mouth and from his own hand. By his own statements, by his own writings, one should be able to measure and judge Stalin. As long as this demand is not completely fulfilled, a huge stigma will remain on bourgeois "science", which they themselves have stuck the label of unbelief and insincerity on all their "scientific" works about Stalin with. They carry out the lackey services of their clients and they remain in the background. And the "scientific" lackeys of capital will never be able to wash away this shame, this scandal.**

The other thing is that here before and after Stalin's death we can only, and incorrectly, write an important reason why Stalin is censored in gaps. In any case, the lack of Stalin's documents means that a lot of further corrections and revisions of our own views are inevitable. All the more disconcerting is the fact that within the camp of Marxist-Leninists there are only a few in the world, apart from us from the Comintern/ML and the KPD/ML of Comrade Ernst Aust, who have made this fundamental demand of releasing the documents at all. For 40 years our comrades have made a sincere effort to publish the works of Stalin (we have already published volumes 1-17 in German!!) and today we are doing everything possible to collect and publish missing documents.

Let us take the legendary **Plenum of the CC of the CPSU** after the **19th Party Congress in October 1952**, where Stalin spent many hours passionately announcing an important political statement (probably his most important ever!!). It dealt with the fateful questions of the future of the USSR and communism. He expressed his opinion about the future of communism after his death in it. Stalin did not mince his words in his **indiscriminate criticism of all members of the Presidium**. His criticism in front of the ears of the audience was so devastating for them that they froze and fell silent. They could not prevent Stalin's criticism of the restoration of capitalism at the 19th Party Congress, because he had surprised them with it only the day before so they prevented the announcement of his campaign against the restoration of capitalism in the USSR in order to hush up its world-historical significance for communism. What insolence! Let us remember how the entire anti-Bolshevik world pointed its dirty finger at Stalin with **Lenin's** alleged "**Testament**"! What a cowardly gang of criminals, who **sank Stalin's farewell political speech into his grave!** Betrayal all along the line, betrayal to the inauguration of the 4th Classic of Marxism-Leninism, and betrayal of him on the day of the announcement of his resignation! Betrayal, betrayal, betrayal! **Give Stalin back his political farewell speech!! Give it back!!! It doesn't belong to you traitors to communism! It belongs to all people in the world, whose liberation Stalin fought for and whose liberation we continue to fight for!!! Fight until Stalin's works are finally and completely published!!!!**

It is easy to understand the fact that during this historical period, before and after Stalin's death, relatively little **genuinely Marxist-Leninist literature** has come into the public domain that can be based on authentic documents of Stalin, especially against the background of **today's events in the Caucasus** in our case... and there has been torrential flood of anti-communist, "scientific", "well-founded" "document research" after 1991. It is also a fact that this Marxist-Leninist literature has not even come to uniform and consistent conclusions, that rather the most diverse, even contradictory standpoints and opinions have come out, enriched with newly documented

"revelations" and some half-truths, and then vigorously mixed with old as well as new anti-Stalinist ideas in order to confuse the Marxist-Leninists with them, just as the Berianists do. The great Sisyphean task remains for us to **separate the wheat from the chaff**. All in all, the world bourgeoisie is stirring up its seething cauldron full of eclectic, tough, masses of revisionist lava, which is pouring over the Marxist-Leninist World Movement in order to concrete in the real communist, our own (!) documents about our history after the cooling process, to make them forever inaccessible for the world proletariat.

The text we present here is proof enough that we are aware that the world proletariat is still far from having completely freed itself from the influence of modern revisionism, Trotskyism and other anti-Stalin influences, as in the case of Berianism, that the struggle against modern revisionism is still an international class struggle to the death, that must be fought and won laboriously and resolutely, and that even then it must continue for decades. **But the dialectics of anti-communist counter-revolution was built on the dormant volcanoes of world revolution, which are erupting all the more violently the more one tries to prevent their eruption.** After decades, the volcano of the October Revolution had just been brought under control by the global counter-revolutionary fire brigade with the help of the revisionist extinguishing agent, at least that is what the counter-revolution hoped for. But with the most sophisticated control of the laws of the counter-revolution, the laws of the revolution cannot be overruled. On the contrary: under a global counter-revolution, the October Revolution must turn into a global world revolution so revolutionary volcanoes will erupt all over the world and the counter-revolution will be buried under its hot lava. **This is the dialectics of world communism!** The counter-revolution has also tried to cover the truth about Stalin with lies, with this result: **the volcano of Stalinism is now erupting globally and it will bury anti-Stalinism under its enormous lava mass!**

Whoever refuses to speak of Stalinism, of Stalinists, should do so. Here you are. It's up to you. But we comrades from the Comintern/ML despise this attitude as capitulatory to the anti-Stalinism of the bourgeoisie. If you don't want to call yourself Stalinist, why do you call yourself Marxist? That is inconsistent. The bourgeoisie "defames" us too, don't they? If you defend Marx, you are a Marxist, and if you defend Stalin, you are not a Stalinist? How can one make such a meaningless "difference" plausible to anyone? It's ridiculous.

Without Marx there would be no anti-Marxism and without Stalin there would be no anti-Stalinism. How can one profess Marxism, but conceal or even deny the commitment to Stalinism? Where might the comrades get their stomach aches from, if they do not dare to publicly confess themselves to be Stalinists? They may calmly and self-critically think about it! We communists call ourselves Stalinists just as we call ourselves Marxists, Leninists or Hoxhaists, because we despise hiding our connection with all the classics of Marxism-Leninism (also see Communist Manifesto of Marx and Engels).

The concept of "Stalinism" was discredited by the bourgeoisie and served the hateful anti-communist and revisionist propaganda, but it did not catch on historically and could not do so either with "Marxism" or "Leninism". Even in Stalin's time, comrades considered themselves Stalinists not only in the Soviet Union but all over the world, the name Stalinist was a name of honor, and it will remain so, also and especially under the pressure of anti-Stalinist agitation.

Especially with the struggle against modern revisionism, a new Marxist-Leninist World Movement emerged, which was mainly based on the teachings of Stalin and understood them as independent teachings of the 4th Classic of Marxism-Leninism. The teachings of the "4 Heads" were finally the teachings from which the Marxist-Leninists ideologically distinguished themselves from all other bourgeois currents within the communist movement. With the 4 Heads, the Marxist-Leninist World Movement led by Comrade Enver Hoxha led the struggle against

modern revisionism. With the defense of Stalin we defended Marxism-Leninism against modern revisionism. Stalin is and remains a touchstone, a demarcation line. One must defend Stalin as the 4th Classic of Marxism-Leninism, otherwise one cannot defend Stalin. Just as we do not have to be ashamed but can be proud to call ourselves Marxist-Leninists, we do not have to be ashamed as Stalinists and we can be rightly proud to bear this name. **But only those who fight for Stalinism in words and deeds may rightfully call themselves Stalinists, only those who fight for Hoxhaim in words and deeds may rightfully call themselves Hoxhaists, and only those who fight for Marxism-Leninism in words and deeds may rightfully call themselves Marxist-Leninists.** All of this is actually self-evident. The concepts of Leninism, Stalinism and Hoxhaim are essentially **identical with the concept of the further development of the teachings of Marxism. One cannot speak of Marxism-Leninism and avoid Stalinism!** These are all concepts which have shaped and will continue to shape the development and further development of the communist worldview, the communist world movement, in the historical course of the class struggle against capitalism (for more information on the topic of "Classics of Marxism-Leninism" see our German-language article: "**Enver Hoxha, the 5th Classic of Marxism-Leninism**").

In irreconcilable demarcation to this, all other concepts like Maoism, Trotskyism, etc., are merely bourgeois ideologies which served and will continue to serve to **adapt** the communist worldview to the bourgeois worldview, the communist world movement to the bourgeois world movement, to **assimilate** it and once it has come into the hands of the class opponent, to direct it **against** the communist worldview, **against** the world proletariat and its revolution.

The head of Mao Zedong was banned from the series of classics of Marxism-Leninism by Enver Hoxha. For this alone, Enver Hoxha would have belonged to the banner of the Marxist-Leninist World Movement as the Fifth Head at that time. Since his death another 15 years had to pass until the Comintern/ML replaced the 4-headed banner of the Hoxhaist World Movement by the 5-headed banner in 2000 and the struggle for the 5 Heads has still not been finally decided upon within the Marxist-Leninist World Movement ten years later, it must be victoriously finished. And as long as "Hoxhaists" walk around with the "4 Heads" banner, this struggle can never be finished. Without the 5-headed banner, the Marxist-Leninist World Movement was quite "headless" after the death of Comrade Enver Hoxha, but under the 4-headed banner, many revisionists were able to save themselves, who, with the collapse of the revisionist Soviet Union, were looking for a "new home" where they could go into hiding. Since the foundation of the Comintern/ML in 2000, "Hoxhaists" who have reconciled with neo-revisionists have no place in the Marxist-Leninist Movement (**anti-revisionism in words only is revisionism in deeds**).

Just as Beria cut off the 4th Head in 1953, the Berianists today refuse to recognize the 5th head, putting themselves on the same level with the opportunists in the Marxist-Leninist World Movement who do not want to part with their 4-headed banner. Today all opportunists in the Hoxhaist World Movement and the opportunists who continue to do their mischief with the 3-headed banner are united in not recognizing Enver Hoxha as the 5th Classic of Marxism-Leninism. The Hoxhaist World Movement will be united only from the moment it recognizes Enver Hoxha as the 5th Classic of Marxism-Leninism in word and deed, when it defends and carries the 5-headed banner of the Comintern/ML and gives a proper rebuff to the sham organizations which are sprouting everywhere like mushrooms and which try to take the 5-headed banner of the Comintern/ML and to fight against the Comintern/ML. The 5-headed banner was raised by the Comintern/ML in 2000 and nobody will be able to snatch it from its hands, to doubt or to undo this historical act! We were the first to raise the 5-headed banner in the year 2000 and nobody else.

Comrades, we did not leave the concept of "Marxism" to anti-communism, why should we change the concept of "Stalinism"? Why should we do that? Just as we are not afraid to show the flag in

front of the workers as communists, we do it as Stalinists. How are we to explain the teachings of Stalin to the workers if, on the one hand, we allow the concept of "Marxism" but, on the other hand, we distance ourselves from the concept of "Stalinism"? The worker would have this justified suspicion: "The communists think that everything is alright with Marxism, but with Stalinism they seem to have certain doubts and reservations so Stalinism cannot be right, Stalinism is not to be trusted, one must be careful with it.

Just as a true Marxist cannot distance himself from Leninism, he cannot possibly distance himself from Stalinism or Hoxhaim. **The teachings of the classics build on each other, form a dialectical unity and must not be divided, set against each other or equated. Only together their teachings guarantee the victory of the world proletariat over capitalism, one can speak of the teachings of Marxism-Leninism at all.**

Defending Marxism-Leninism cannot mean copying it from its original stage of development at the time of Marx and Lenin to the present conditions. Marxism would have died long ago if it had not been further developed by Lenin, Stalin and Enver Hoxha. So what does it mean to **defend its further development with Marxism-Leninism**? It means defending Stalinism. Whoever refuses to defend Stalinism, denies the further development of Leninism. Whoever refuses to defend the further development of Leninism, refuses to defend the further development of Marxism and thus denies Leninism. Whoever denies the further development of Marxism through the teachings of Lenin, Stalin and Enver Hoxha, denies Marxism at all. We Stalinists consider Stalinism to be a **further development** of Leninism, not just Leninism and its application by Stalin. The only point is that we can only develop it ourselves, and we have neglected this for the benefit of the bourgeoisie.

Anti-Stalinism inevitably follows its inner logic and does so in a lawful way:

The weaker Stalinism develops, the weaker the position of Stalinism and the stronger the position of anti-Stalinism. The further back the Stalin Era is, the more comfortably the bourgeoisie can let it "historically rot", in its own words, to calm it down. But in the measure that it gets new nourishment with its further development, it is revived, and thus becomes a tangible, current, subjective factor for the revolution of the world proletariat, anti-Stalinism reaches the point where the further development of Stalinism becomes **more dangerous** for it than even Stalinism in its original state of development. At this point, anti-Stalinism shifts its **main task** to the **struggle against the development of Stalinism**, tries to **confront** it with the original Stalinism in order to separate and divide its unity and to brand the development as "illegitimate". Above all, the bourgeoisie then tries to pick up the old banner of Stalinism in order to kill its further development. The bourgeoisie wants to erect a victor's monument to itself as a "champion for the liberation of Stalinism" from the weeds of the "theories of legitimacy" that overgrown it. The better the bourgeoisie is able to "defend" everything about Stalinism that hurts it the least, the greater the chance of misleading and deceiving its class opponent. **This task is currently being taken over by the "anti-revisionist" revisionists.**

And just as this anti-communist law is applied to Stalin, it has been applied to Marxism, to Leninism before and will be applied to Hoxhaim. We must be clear about what it means that Stalin had already **finished** working on the foundations and questions of Leninism shortly after Lenin's death, while today, 56 years after Stalin's death, we are still **in the beginning** with the foundations and questions of Stalinism. What we are trying to say is that the anti-Stalinist struggle - and we are only talking about the **theoretical-ideological** struggle here, is far from over, let alone won, which we can never repeat often enough.

We Stalinists, for example, are directed against those who turn Stalinism from an international proletarian doctrine into a product of specifically Russian conditions.

As Leninism defined Bolshevism as "a model of tactics for ALL", Stalinism built on that tactic. But it did not stop at the level of development of Bolshevism "in one country". At the first level, that is, the Leninist level of development, Bolshevism was based on a single Bolshevik party in power, the Party of Lenin and Stalin, while all other Communist parties of the Third International not in power were based on the same tactic. Stalinism transformed Bolshevism into a higher quality by equipping it with a base of a world socialist camp as a tactic, thus creating a much greater international development of Bolshevism as "a model of tactics for all". This new base of the Bolshevik World Camp enabled a number of communist parties to use this tactic like the Bolshevism in power. This is, of course, an enormous advance over the Comintern Era and thus a decisive step towards world Bolshevism in power. Between the tactics of Bolshevism in general and the tactics of Bolshevism in power in particular, there is a dialectical relationship which Stalin was able to apply masterfully, and it is in this relationship that the whole essence of Stalinism is reflected. World Bolshevism in power is the form of Bolshevism in which "tactics for all" reaches its highest quality. It is only at this stage of development that Bolshevism has achieved its greatest effectiveness as a *world proletarian* tactic, which Stalin fought for and which he had striven for all his life.

Stalinism is the generalization of the experiences of the revolutionary movement of all countries under the conditions of the first world socialist camp.

You can twist and turn as you like. There is no way around the recognition of Stalinism as a further development of the *international proletarian doctrine* of Leninism.

And what did Comrade Bill Bland do? Of all things, he wrote an article about the negative concept of "Stalinism", but not to wrest the concept of Stalinism from the bourgeoisie, but to leave it to the bourgeoisie. Which side did he take in this? We did not come here to write an article about the negative concept of "Marxism" in order to leave this concept to the bourgeoisie. Where, please, is there a difference? The concept of "Marxism", just like the concept of "Stalinism", belongs to the world proletariat. There can be no doubt about this among us Stalinists. And whoever wants to spread the world proletariat's worldview, cannot even defend the concept of "Marxism", if he rejects the concept of "Stalinism" and at the same time, if he rejects "Stalinism" as a concept for one of the further developments of Marx's doctrine!

Since when is Marxism essentially a completed worldview ? Marx did not create Marxism to take it to his grave? They'd like that, wouldn't they?! If Marxism was not developable in its essence, it would have died long ago, and this is also true for Stalinism. If Stalinism is not developed further, it dies and all that would remain of it would be the anti-Stalinist aftertaste of the bourgeois smear campaigns. And you would like that too, you anti-Stalinists! We cannot and do not want to set Bill Bland at this yardstick of the further development of Stalin's teachings, but by rejecting the term "Stalinism" he has certainly not covered himself with glory as a co-founder of the English Stalin Society. Marxism "*as such*" is not that strong, but in its *further development* is its real strength, because only this further development of Marxism can change the situation of the world proletariat fundamentally and therefore revolutionary. Stalinism is not that strong, but its further development is what constitutes its real strength. Every comrade has understood this and our class enemies know this very well. The world proletariat needs the further developed Stalinism NOW and TODAY to liberate itself. But it cannot dress him in his old, tight uniform for the present liberation struggle. The uniform of Stalinism has to be adapted to the size of the developed world proletariat and not vice versa with the size of the world proletariat to Stalinism (as it had still fitted perfectly in the Stalin Era).

We understand if comrades at some point express their resentment at having to constantly deal with the picking apart of Marxism-Leninism, that they are fed up with the quotation battles and prefer to take refuge in practical work. They form a certain image of Stalinism, which they have acquired over the years, and now think that this is a sufficient basis "which must not be shaken any more". This is a sort of defiant behavior that is often observed among children, a sort of resistance not wanting to have at least the final shirt removed. Stalinism as the "final shirt" of the Stalinists? Well, let's keep in mind that sooner or later something like that must be faced: An involuntary retreat into dogmatic and sectarian fragments of Stalinism has dire consequences. Stalinism, as we know, is misused by the bourgeoisie as a retreat strategy to maintain its power, as we know it from the restoration of capitalism, from the revisionists. But Stalinism is the worldview of a class that ultimately wants to abolish class society and build communism and for that you cannot treat it like your "final shirt". With such a defeatist attitude, how can one be able to develop Stalinism in the struggle against the revisionists? How did Stalin develop Leninism? Would he have been able to develop Leninism a single millimeter further without his fierce struggle against the Right and Trotskyite Bloc, *without* fighting quotation battles? Study the works of Stalin to convince yourself of the exact opposite. **Quotation battles and "quotation battles" are thus far from being the same thing.** It essentially depends on whether they are fought by Stalinists or by their opponents, what political intention is pursued, which class they serve and which class they harm, etc. Admittedly, most of all the quotation battles fought were certainly avoidable, each serious "detail work" is a hundred times more valuable, but it is, firstly, undoubtedly inevitable to get along without quotation battles at all and secondly, extremely stupid or anarchistic without wanting to get by and thirdly, it is incredibly dangerous to justify their absolute renunciation with "Marxist" phrases. This too, by the way, is a **tenet of Stalinism in its struggle to defend Leninism.**

Let us see how Bill Bland behaves in this regard. It is noticeable that in his writings one quotation after the other (whereby the predominance of *bourgeois and revisionist quotations* alone should give the unbiased reader something to think about) **and his own conclusions and comments, on the other hand, are amazingly thin, and sometimes even exhaust themselves in a single sentence. That is not the point, however. The point is that the position expressed in this final sentence causes our substantive displeasure, our ideological rejection indeed. Bill Bland avoids imposing his own opinion and lets the reader decide. At first glance, this looks engaging and sympathetic. The reader has the impression of being informed by the presentation of different points of view and is grateful to the author for informative thought-provoking impulses to help him or her form his or her own opinion. But to be able to form one's own opinion more easily or to sweeten a wrong opinion with "objectivity", to have the author do the thinking for you, in order to easily take over this uncritically and unconsciously is a serious difference for us. In fact, a reader without Marxist-Leninist background knowledge is all too inclined to take this trustworthy "factual-scientific" presentation at face value and to buy it all too lightly, not to question it critically or not critically enough. But once the reader has struggled to critically work through what is presented and to think his way deeper and deeper into the uninterrupted series of quotations, especially to look at the authors of the sources under the magnifying glass, more and more questions remain open, it is very difficult to find out for oneself what is actually right and what is wrong. It is all too easy to interpret things "one way or the other". Making something interpretable one way or another is the tool of the opportunists, not the Stalinists. Stalin, as a Classic of Marxism-Leninism, is characterized by unsurpassed clarity and logic with which he disarmed all "so and so" opportunists.**

There seems to be a "line" with Bill Bland, like a tunnel that you walk through by focusing on the light at the end of the tunnel, which only seems to get brighter and brighter. But you have to overcome this tunnel vision for things that come out of the dark when you're not blinded.

This means that one must examine all the previously hidden, newly revealed information within the prism of Marxism-Leninism, one must set to work to correctly evaluate and judge the "news". This can and must be expected from a serious Marxist-Leninist, because only after critical examination can one say with certainty what illuminates the truth and what darkens it in the "new, glaring light". Some readers may be satisfied with Bill Bland's collection of quotes, but are these really reliable sources he used? From whom does his information come? What does the author want to prove or disprove with this information? Studying the vast number of sources listed by Bill Bland and to critically question the people from whom these sources originate is indispensable for a Marxist-Leninist, but not for a lazy reader who is used to having everything chewed over. He is satisfied as it is. He is either too comfortable to use his own head or he has simply not learned otherwise. Comrades, this undoubtedly cannot be an attentive Marxist-Leninist reader. In the newspaper "Komsomolskaya Pravda" No. 12 of January 15th, 1939, Yaroslavsky writes why Stalin "directly treats with contempt those comrades who are too lazy to deal with theory, who are afraid to think theoretically boldly and to raise new questions that show cowardice in thinking. If you dedicate your life to the struggle of the workers for their liberation, you must struggle all your life for the domination of Marxism-Leninism, you must make it accessible to the working class, as Stalin did, but not parrot everything uncritically."

And indeed, the whole movement seems to be infected by the disease of reluctance to deal with something that has been "chewed through a hundred times". This has led to a vulgarization of Marxism-Leninism. And let us calmly remain with the reproach of "chewed through" Marxism-Leninism: The vulgarization of Marxism-Leninism starts where one stops chewing. And where one stops chewing, one only begins to swallow down until one can only choke down single, bite-sized pieces and finally goes over to letting oneself be presented with pre-chewed porridge, because only porridge can be swallowed without chewing. This pre-chewed porridge is exactly the disease of today's Marxist-Leninist World Movement, one can even speak of a chronic suffering. Let us listen to the great words which Karl Marx described the **timeless struggle for scientificity** with:

"There is no royal road to learning, and the only people with any chance of scaling its sunlit peaks are those who have no fear of weariness when ascending the precipitous paths that lead up to them." (Marx: 'Capital' in: 'Collected Works', Volume 35; London; 1996; p.23; English Edition).

Instead, the movement today prefers to let itself be dragged along by the events of the day rather than to seriously tackle the theoretical work, **without which there can be no world revolutionary movement**. Is it any wonder that the movement suffers from its spontaneism, that it detaches the "communism debate" or the "socialism" questions as "special" questions from the entire activity of the communists, makes them independent, alienates them and dismisses them as annoying **"fundamental debates - burdens"** and puts them far away from the class struggle into a drawer, which one opens and closes at one or the other opportunity (when it is once again too late!)

The essence of **(living)** Marxism-Leninism (and dead Marxism-Leninism is dogmatism) is never to regard it as a dogma for eternal times, to regard it as a finished and completed doctrine, to take it as a pre-chewed mush. The revolutionary spirit of Marxism-Leninism precisely consists in the fact that it is capable of development to meet the changed conditions, the present conditions of globalization. The classics can no longer provide the right answers to this, we Marxist-Leninists must do this ourselves today. We must literally "bite through" ourselves. Hoxhaism is the highest stage in the development of Marxism so far, but it is far from being its final stage. This is what our opponents would like. It is a characteristic feature of Marxism that a final stage, a closure and finality of its development is foreign to it. Under the conditions of globalization, Hoxhaism alone will not get us very far either. We Marxist-Leninists are called upon to develop Marxism-Leninism independently

on the basis of the teachings of the 5 Classics and to defend our own development against our opponents. Let us recall Enver Hoxha's thesis, which he put forward at the 7th Congress of the PLA, that **"the question of the revolution and people's liberation is not just an aspiration but a problem presented for solution!"** We believe that it is completely in line with Hoxhaism to deal with the foundations of Stalinism, as it is an indispensable compass for the practical solution of world socialism. But with the fundamentals of Stalinism, alone and on its own, we will not be able to completely solve the problems of globalized socialism, we must develop Marxism-Leninism **itself** for this new task. This was no different with Marxism than Lenin and Stalin had to solve the problem of socialism "in one country". Without the further development of Marxism, without Leninism, without Stalinism, this problem, which at that time had to be solved, would never have been mastered.

When Trotsky began to use the insult word "Stalinism," he was only slapping himself in the face with it, he was only differentiating himself from Marxism-Leninism. We are not Trotskyites and therefore have no reason to separate ourselves from Stalinism. Conversely, we distinguish ourselves from the opponents of Marxism-Leninism by separating them from Stalinism. **One cannot fight against Marxism with anything, but only with Marxism. You can fight anti-Leninism only with Leninism. You can't fight anti-Stalinism with Marx, Engels and Lenin alone. You must fight it with the teachings of Stalin. This all sounds like a play on words, but in reality this is a very principled and fundamental question which we Stalinists have to answer carefully here and which every comrade must make absolutely and absolutely clear. Not to reduce or even reject our proletarian cause just because our opponent has heaped dirt buckets on it, but to remove the dirt buckets and clean and develop our proletarian cause. That is the only correct, revolutionary attitude. Everything else is retreating from the class enemy, is a capitulatory attitude towards Stalinism, towards Marxism-Leninism, is the way into the opportunist swamp.**

We have nothing against some comrades clashing with the concept of Stalinism, but defending the teachings of Stalin. In contrast, we have something against such "comrades" who get upset about the concept of Stalinism only because they do not want to admit that they basically distance themselves from the content of Stalinism or question its independent existence as an inseparable part of Marxism-Leninism. The fact that Stalin was the best Leninist of all times is one thing, but reducing the meaning of Stalin to that, reducing the meaning of Stalinism, is another thing, is revisionist. Yes, it is not even enough to be satisfied with the mere abstract statement that Stalin (somehow) "developed" Leninism further. Much more important is this question: What does this further development actually consist of, what do we have to imagine concretely, what are the foundations of Stalinism? If one asks the comrades about the foundations of Stalinism, many of them embarrass themselves, because they always find out that they never get beyond the teachings of Leninism in all their answers. Everything they attribute to Stalin has in fact already been developed by Lenin (for example: socialism "in one country"). So, with Leninism alone you really cannot scientifically explain Stalinism. A little more already belongs to this.

So what is a Marxist-Leninist, even a Stalinist worth, if they swear loudly to the teachings of the classics of Marxism-Leninism, but are not able to defend the teachings of Stalin against those who have *reduced* the teachings of Stalin to the teachings of Lenin in a revisionist way? Who reduces Stalinism to revisionism is on no other way than fighting Stalinism with Leninism à la Khrushchev. It is impossible to fight either the Berianists or the Khrushchevites, against modern revisionism without the foundations of Stalinism. This is a yardstick by which Enver Hoxha measured the seriousness of anti-revisionists, below which the Maoists promptly fell. If Enver Hoxha had not based himself on the foundations of Stalinism, there would not have been a Socialist Albania, there would not have been a

Hoxhaist World Movement. Only on the foundations of Stalinism the Hoxhaist World Movement could develop and will develop further. In essence, Hoxhaism is as Stalinist as Stalinism is Leninist and as Leninism is Marxist. But to only put between Leninism and Stalinism a line of equality, to recognize the identity of both, but to deny both characteristics, how they differ from each other at all, is just as inadmissible as it is to reduce Leninism to Marxism. We also dissociate ourselves from all comrades who want to reduce Hoxhaism to the Marxist-Leninist teachings of the four preceding classics (we mean all 4-headed "Marxist-Leninists"!). Like Stalinism, Hoxhaism = (same) Marxism-Leninism, but their characteristics are the successive *development* of Marxism-Leninism. Just as Leninism is the further development of Marxism and Stalinism is the further development of Leninism, Hoxhaism is the further development of Stalinism. Whoever does not understand this, has no idea of the meaning of the 5 Classics of Marxism-Leninism and cannot lead the world proletariat to the victorious socialist revolution.

Just as Stalin worked out the foundations of *Leninism*, we have to complete the work of Enver Hoxha and work out the foundations of Stalinism. You cannot defend Comrade Stalin if you do not defend his teachings, if you do not defend Stalinism. But to do so, one must first know what Stalinism is. The decisive thing is to understand, recognize and put into practice the essence of what constitutes this Leninist development towards Stalinism. One must be able to scientifically justify the further development of Leninism, must not only prove that the path of Stalin was Leninist, but must also prove what actually distinguishes Stalinism as a further development of Leninism. Stalin was not content to describe Leninism as Marxist, but first of all he emphasized the special features of Leninism in comparison to Marxism and secondly he threw the outdated formulas of Marxism overboard. This is also the fate of Stalinism. As it happened to Marxism and Leninism, it happens to Stalinism and Hoxhaism. Principles of these teachings that are still valid are applied and other, outdated principles are thrown overboard or modified or recycled.

In the words of Stalin when he gave his lecture at Sverdlovsk University on the foundations of Leninism:

Expounding the foundations of Stalinism still does not mean expounding the basis of Stalin's worldview. Stalin's worldview and the foundations of Stalinism are not identical in scope. Stalin was a Leninist, and Leninism is, of course, the basis of his worldview. But from this it does not at all follow that an exposition of Stalinism ought to begin with an exposition of the foundations of Leninism. To expound Leninism means to expound the distinctive and new in the works of Stalin that Stalin contributed to the general treasury of Marxism-Leninism and that is naturally connected with his name. Only in this sense will the Comintern/ML speak in my lectures of the foundations of Stalinism. (Incidentally, what is said here must apply in the same way to Hoxhaism as soon as we publish our next text "[On the Foundations of Hoxhaism](#)").

We Stalinists must never allow our opponents to declare with impunity that the answers to the questions of Stalinism are superfluous in order to present Stalinism as an unscientific doctrine with the flimsy reason: "Stalinism does not really exist, it is only a symbol of the inflammatory propaganda of anti-communism." Their anti-Stalinism is the result of the struggle against our teachings of Stalinism, not the other way round!

The concept of Stalinism is therefore for us Marxist-Leninists, and we make no apology for constantly repeating ourselves, an important, indispensable scientific concept for the further development of Leninism of the time when Stalin lived and worked. This is anything but a question of taste or interpretation, it is not a subjective question (which only the *character* of Stalin is tied to), but Stalinism is the scientific expression of a certain stage of social

development of the ruling proletariat in the era of imperialism and proletarian revolution. If the teaching of Stalinism is missing, Marxism is incomplete, it is truncated, it cannot fulfill its task, it is worthless for the revolutionary liberation of the world proletariat. Whoever is not a Stalinist, cannot be a Marxist, is an anti-Marxist. Leninism is the instrument of Marxism which Stalin drew the demarcation line against the revisionist restorers of capitalism in the transition to socialism with. Therefore, the ruthless fight against the danger of the restoration of capitalism under the conditions of *constructed* socialism and the *transition to "communism in one country"*, under the conditions of the enormously growing socialist world camp, under the conditions of the *capitalist world camp* threatened with extinction, had to be one of the most important tasks of Stalinism.

Marx did not call himself a "Marxist", but his closest friend and comrade-in-arms Friedrich Engels did, the followers of Marx and Engels did, the Marxist movement in the capitalist countries did, who were guided in the class struggle by the teachings of Marx and Engels and joined and united around them. Marx and Engels were not only those who created the worldview of the proletariat, but also the leaders in the proletarian class struggle in the pre-imperialist phase of the development of capitalism. Many of the tenets of Marxism are still valid today, even beyond the lifetime of Marx and Engels. Other doctrines were only valid in their time and lost their meaning with the capitalist development towards imperialism. Some doctrines had to be dropped, others modified, adapted to the changing conditions of the class struggle.

Lenin himself did not call himself a "Leninist", but the comrades who gathered around him, his followers understood themselves as Leninists, above all was Lenin's student Stalin:

"Marx and Engels pursued their activities in the pre-revolutionary period (we have the proletarian revolution in mind), when developed imperialism did not yet exist, in the period of the proletarians' preparation for revolution, in the period when the proletarian revolution was not yet an immediate practical inevitability. But Lenin, the disciple of Marx and Engels, pursued his activities in the period of developed imperialism, in the period of the unfolding proletarian revolution, when the proletarian revolution had already triumphed in one country, had smashed bourgeois democracy and had ushered in the era of proletarian democracy, the era of the Soviets.

"That is why Leninism is the further development of Marxism." (Stalin: 'The Foundations of Leninism' in: 'Works', Volume 6; Moscow; 1953; p.73; English Edition).

In the struggle against the Mensheviks, in the struggle against the opportunist betrayal of Marxism by the Second International, in the struggle against the bourgeois revision of Marxism, the independent Leninist movement emerged.

"Leninism grew up and took shape under the conditions of imperialism, when the contradictions of capitalism had reached an extreme point, when the proletarian revolution had become an immediate practical question, when the old period of preparation of the working class for revolution had come up and passed over to a new period, that of direct assault on capitalism." (ibid. p.74).

Stalin did not call himself a "Stalinist," but the Bolsheviks who followed him in his struggle against the Trotskyites, Bukharinites, and later against the anti-Party bureaucratic elements and leaders of the apparatchiks called themselves Stalinists. The Stalinist world movement was born at a time when the strengthening of socialism grew to an existential threat to world capitalism, when the question "Who will win, the capitalist or the socialist **world camp**?" was a task that needed a practical solution.

Enver Hoxha did not give himself the name "Hoxhaist". But the Marxist-Leninists, who regarded him as the leader of the struggle against modern revisionism in power, who followed him in the struggle against the revisionist world movement, called themselves Hoxhaists, especially since the struggle against Chinese revisionism, against Maoism, which is led by Enver Hoxha. The Hoxhaists are Marxists who built socialism in spite of the conditions of revisionism in power, who formed a Marxist world front against the imperialist-revisionist encirclement, who fought against the two superpowers, against the cooperation of the imperialists and social-imperialists, against world imperialism which is regaining strength, who understood the question of world revolution as a task to be solved practically, who raised the Stalinist world movement to the height of its time and made the support of the proletarian revolution in the revisionist countries the daily task of living proletarian internationalism in order to reconquer the dictatorship of the proletariat in the former socialist countries. Hoxhaists today are the Marxists who fight for the restoration of the dictatorship of the proletariat, for the world dictatorship of the proletariat, for socialism on a world scale.

As Marxist-Leninists call themselves comrades, who fight for the world proletarian revolution to end the epoch of world imperialism forever and to lead the world proletariat on the way to the transition to world socialism. Only the Marxist-Leninists can be called communists, because they are the only ones who can rely on the science of communism and develop it further.

Stalin was the most advanced to put this world-historical task of the Marxist-Leninists into practice. Therefore, world proletariat today must continue its work and must finish its work.

As Stalinists, we must take a self-critical look at ourselves against this world-historical background to see how far we have lived up to our responsibility to liberate Stalin's life and work honorably from the anti-Stalinist deluge of our global class enemy. Without the spread of Stalinism in the proletarian world movement, without the study of Stalin's teachings, without a large-scale propagandistic counter-offensive, without the unification and globalization of all our forces, without the formation of new Stalinist cadres, without the creation of a worldwide network of new Stalinist organizations, without a world Stalinist party, without the support of the most progressive proletarians, there is no way to imagine a victory in the biggest propaganda battle in the history of the class struggle against anti-Stalinism.

We must never unite with opportunists who openly try to introduce anti-Stalinism into our ranks and smuggle it in secret. We must never give away one millimeter to this danger of disguised, "Stalinist" opportunism, which continues to grow under the pressure of anti-Stalinism! We counter the pressure of anti-Stalinism on us Stalinists by not letting the opportunists into our fortresses (which we have so far built up completely insufficiently!). As an example, we'll mention the Maoist Ludo Martens (WP of Belgium), who pretends to "defend" Stalin, only to actually, in a Maoist manner, attribute to him "acts and sins of omission" that he never committed. There are defenders and so-called "defenders" of Stalin who are hostile to each other. We from the Comintern/ML had compiled a critical article about Mao and his so-called "Stalin question" in 2003. Here is the hyperlink (in German):

[How Comrade Enver Hoxha Defended Comrade Stalin against Mao Zedong and Chinese Revisionism](#)

What Ludo Martens wrote about Stalin is written from the perspective of an anti-Stalinist who pretends to be "on the ground of Stalinism". We strongly condemn this neo-revisionist work. Ludo Martens and his international "friends" and "followers" are arch-revisionists who have no place in the camp of the Marxist-Leninist World Movement.

And if there are opportunists who have nevertheless managed to penetrate, then we strengthen the unity of our Stalinist ranks by mercilessly purging the opportunists out of our organizations and thus deepening our understanding of Stalinism. We were always weakened and threatened in our existence only when we had distanced ourselves from the teachings of Marxism-Leninism, from Stalin, either by neglecting our vigilance and determination or had overstepped the mark by "throwing the baby out with the bathwater" and thus had not understood and not understood the interaction between right-wing and "left-wing" opportunism, reconciliation and centrism. The confidence of the world proletariat can only be regained if we do not abandon it in the principled defense of Stalin, if it can rely on our loyalty to principles combined with elasticity and maneuverability, that is, on our World Bolshevik line. Our task for the struggle is therefore clearly defined: **Stalin was one of the greatest revolutionary leaders of the world proletariat. With his teachings, the wavering rule of the world bourgeoisie must be attacked, Stalinism must be transformed into a global victory. Stalinism means the victory of communism. Anti-Stalinism means the victory of capitalism. This is the way things are.**

Without Bolshevik criticism and self-criticism, however, the struggle for Stalin cannot be won. But with Bolshevik criticism and self-criticism we are able to correct our faulty attempts to assess Stalin's work before and after his death from the point of view of Marxism-Leninism all the better. **Only we Marxist-Leninists are able to bring the truth about Stalin to the public and expose the bourgeois lies about Stalin. No one else in the world.** If we have defeated the hardest chunk, the anti-Stalinism, we will also defeat the anti-communism entirely. **The struggle against anti-Stalinism is the main chain link of our revolutionary struggle against anti-communism.** Therefore, the Comintern/ML has the principle: **The cleaner the anti-revisionist conclusion of the history of the First Period of socialism, the cleaner we can tackle the following chapter, the anti-revisionist history of world socialism. This can mean nothing other than to understand the entire period of Lenin and Stalin's activity as a great and significant historical period of the heroic anti-revisionist struggle, as the only secure basis for the transition from capitalism to communism. The anti-revisionist struggle of the world proletariat is the most important basis for the world revolutionary transition of world capitalism to global socialism, which only leads to victory on the ruins of the bourgeois-revisionist world, on the ruins of the restoration of capitalism, on the shattered new revisionist currents.**

The deeper we look into the revisionist abyss, the more new revelations are revealed about the anti-Hoxhaist, anti-Stalinist, anti-Leninist and anti-Marxist crimes of the modern revisionists, **who are never detached from the entire anti-communist policy of world capitalism**, but must be regarded as a component of it, the easier it will be for us to get to the roots of modern revisionism in order to tackle and uproot the anti-Stalinism that has been sprouted in the herb, and to use it as fertilizer for the better growth of the future world socialism.

The more complete and profound our revelations about the crimes of the modern revisionists are, the more clearly the truth about Stalin comes to light. But with the truth about the **crimes of the modern revisionists** taken alone, no one is automatically convinced of Stalin's merits as the 4th Classic of Marxism-Leninism, of the real, historical, lasting significance of the first socialist state for world communism. Only we World Bolsheviks can rework this on a Marxist-Leninist basis. **Nobody but us can and will raise and advance the Stalinist banner of the world socialist revolution.** It has been shown that the whole edifice of lies about Stalin did not automatically crumble to dust with the collapse of the power of the modern Soviet revisionists. On the contrary, the world bourgeoisie has ensured that the construct of lies, which the modern revisionists had once built up in cooperation with world imperialism in order to come to power, has nevertheless continued to exist and it knows best why. But the construct of lies about Stalin was not only painted

even blacker, but (!) its back doors were painted with even brighter red camouflage colors, in order to lure Stalinists themselves into it more easily so that they could get lost in it, die in it or better still: come out again as camouflaged, turned "Stalinists", as agents of counter-revolution against the Stalinists. **No anti-Stalinist is more valuable to the bourgeoisie in the struggle against Stalinism than a traitor within our Stalinist ranks "turned upside down" by the bourgeoisie.** Only with the help of such insidious tricks of sending agents into our own ranks does **anti-Stalinism have the possibility to penetrate into the Stalinist camp in order to turn it into a bourgeois camp from within, and otherwise to liquidate it.** All this is being done because Stalinism had once inflicted its most sensitive defeat on capitalism, and this despite thousands of counter-revolutionary conspiracies, murders, diversions and acts of espionage, despite military mass destruction, political, economic and ideological attempts to destroy Stalinist society, communism. Capitalism has tried for decades in vain to defeat communism by all means. And, when it finally succeeded with the help of the modern revisionists, it needed another **entire historical period** to transform socialism back into capitalism. So capitalism knows from its own painful experience: **there is no more serious danger for it than the successor generations of the Stalinists.** The world bourgeoisie is still very much afraid of us Stalinists and that is why it cannot afford to ever let up in the class struggle against Stalin. We Stalinists are the only ones who can take away the fear of Stalin from the world bourgeoisie, by helping the world proletariat to liberate itself from anti-Stalinism, from the rule of the world bourgeoisie and to establish the rule of the world proletariat which is crowned with the banner of Stalin.

After 1991, when history had sealed its judgement on the criminal truth of modern revisionism (socialism in words - capitalism in deeds), only a tiny minority in the public recognized Stalin and us Stalinists, the Marxist-Leninist World Movement and above all the world proletariat and last but not least the Soviet peoples as real victims of the revisionists' fairy tales. In other words, the year 1991 did not automatically lead to the rehabilitation of Stalin, to the rebirth of socialism on Soviet soil. On the contrary. The poison of anti-Stalinism is being administered further into the world proletariat in order to keep it from the path of its historical mission, to weaken its revolutionary forces. But just as counter-revolution cannot liquidate the world proletariat, it cannot eliminate Stalinism. **Without Stalin's teachings it is impossible to rebuild socialism today.**

Modern revisionism has consequently paved the way for this anti-Stalinist brainwashing, thus alienating all the more people of the former USSR from their true historical identity, but at a higher dialectical level the Soviet peoples will return to Stalin and identify with him again. The bourgeoisie and its lackeys must fear that, with the collapse of world capitalism, all their constructs of lies will inevitably collapse, including the construct of anti-Stalinism, and that they will eventually drown miserably in the anti-Stalinist maelstrom they themselves have created. **The more gigantic anti-Stalinism is built up, the deeper it falls into the abyss and the more thoroughly the world proletariat will be healed from it in the end, even if painfully.**

Those who had for decades placed themselves in the anti-Stalinist service of bourgeois ideology, in the service of modern revisionists, are now retraining themselves to continue their anti-Stalinism in the guise of "Stalinism" and thus to follow the tactic of "defeating" Stalinism with its own weapons. The anti-Stalinist revisionists, whom we have thrashed for more than 50 years, give themselves up in vain to the hope that they could be safe from our blows if they put themselves under our Stalin banner. Nothing there! Whoever dares to stand under our Stalin banner in the mad hope of driving us away from the Stalin banner will be struck down with our Stalin banner. Neither have we, nor will we let the Stalin banner be taken from our hands - never and by nobody! Just as we have learned from the deceptive maneuvers of the modern revisionists to distinguish Marxist-Leninists from "Marxist-Leninists", we also know how the revisionist "Stalinists" differ from us Stalinists, we will not fall into their trap but into ours, they will die miserably in it.

We will train the world proletariat what the so-called "Stalin question" is about, why and against whom the capitalists are so eager to clean up Stalin's "specter". In the class struggle itself, the world proletariat will gather its own experiences in order to better understand its enemies, who only try to pass themselves off as its "friends" because they want to keep the proletarians from their revolutionary liberation struggle against capitalism. In order to prevent the proletarians from appropriating the Stalinist doctrine of liberation from capitalism, the proletarians are supposed to appropriate the pseudo-"teachings" of Stalin which have been falsified, distorted and mutilated by the capitalists, doctored by them and distributed among the proletarians by their agents, which **sound "communist" and "genuinely Stalinist"** but which are supposed to prove **ineffective and harmless** in the struggle against the capitalists. Something is being sold to the workers as "Stalinism", which in reality is the exact opposite of Stalinism. The capitalists are paying a whole army of agents who are only concerned with how the capitalists can use the teachings of Stalin in a way that deceives and misleads the proletarians. **Those agents are especially well paid by the capitalists who manage to brand the Stalinists as dangerous "agents of capitalism" in the eyes of the proletarians and who can make themselves fondly known to the proletarians as "Stalinists"**. And the highest wages are paid by the capitalists to those agents who succeed in the trick of inciting the proletarians to stand up against the Stalinists "in the name of Stalin". But even if this trick cannot always be performed, the capitalists are already satisfied when they are represented within the Stalinist ranks with their agents, provide information about it, here and there secretly throw a spanner in the works, and secretly cause all kinds of pest work among the Stalinists and confusion in the interpretation of Stalin's teachings. **In a situation as precarious for world capitalism as in 1953, the capitalists were even able to get the entire presidency of the CPSU into their hands with the murder of Stalin in order to switch all socialist levers of power to capitalism, first in disguise, then openly.**

No matter what mask the revisionists try to disguise themselves with, we rip it off their faces. They have no choice but to gather regressive elements under their own "Stalinist" roofs in order to lead them as the 5th Column against us in the counter-revolutionary struggle. We will expose their true intentions and strike them on the head as soon as they dare to stick their "Stalinist" head out of their rat holes. Modern revisionism is far from being dead, it is waiting for its salvation, waiting for us to separate its head from its trunk. In the meantime, it is a real danger for us because it has the ability to shed itself, at least as long as capitalism gives it the strength to do so. Modern revisionism has not changed its nature, but the form in which it presents itself recently is just in contrast to earlier ones = "Stalinist" without giving up its old forms like "Leninist but anti-Stalinist" or "Marxist but not Leninist", "socialist but not Marxist"; "Stalinist but not Hoxhaist"; "5 Classics of Marxism-Leninism in words - anti-Marxism-Leninism in deeds"; etc.

The work and character of Stalin has outlasted 50 years of modern revisionism and will also outlast the next 50 years, will shine forever. The "cult of personality" accusation was not intended to alienate Stalin himself, but the revolutionary consciousness of the peoples, to shake and poison Stalinism. But more about this later.

Stalin placed his whole life unconditionally and consistently in the service of the cause of the proletariat. Never has the powerful red banner of the victorious socialist working class been carried so far across the globe as under Stalin. Never had the proletariat possessed greater power than under Stalin. Never has the proletariat led its class struggle against world capitalism more sharply and relentlessly than under Stalin. Never has world imperialism looked more miserable than under the blows of Stalin. Never has socialism reached such a high bloom, never has humanity been closer to communism than under Stalin. No wonder that it shook the capitalist world to the core and made Stalin the greatest and most terrible "enemy" in the history of mankind. Through Stalin, it was no longer the specter of communism that haunted Europe, but the actual reality of communism on one-sixth of the

world. Thanks to Stalin, the whole world was at the feet of the proletariat for the first time, there was really not much left and capitalism would have been wiped off the face of the earth.

This world historical reality created by Stalin left the bourgeoisie with the most severe trauma in its class history. To this day, therefore, with its chronic illness of anti-communism, it allergically reacts to everything that reminds it even remotely of communism, of Stalin. And although modern revisionism did not allow the bourgeoisie to maintain its power, to prolong the epoch of capitalism, to win the victory over communism without great sacrifices, the bourgeoisie still finds it difficult to continue to trust modern revisionism, especially since it now only has the possibility to hide behind the mask of "Stalinism". The bourgeoisie does not voluntarily agree to accept "Stalin" as a mask, because it risks contributing to the rebirth of Stalinism itself, but the bourgeoisie has no other choice. Beggars can't be choosers! The bourgeoisie will therefore have to beware, in the interest of self-preservation, of abandoning its tactics of beating communism with its own weapons. It has grown old and weak and needs its garment of "communism" all the more today because if it cannot ward off the return of communism this time, its fate is sealed forever. **In the face of a socialist country, the world bourgeoisie had one more chance to survive, it knows that world communism means its final downfall.** The struggle for Stalin will therefore have to be brought to an end today in the Second Period of socialism. The defeat must be turned into a victory. Modern revisionism has proved to be a lie and deceit in the eyes of the workers who trusted it. The bourgeoisie is therefore forced to replace its old double tactic against Stalinism with a new one. And it is precisely this **renewed, even more mendacious** bourgeois counter-revolutionary double tactic of anti-Stalinism must be crushed in the revolutionary struggle for Stalin by a **World Bolshevik tactic of the world proletariat.**

Let's take the alleged "crimes" that Stalin is said to have committed, which have been reissued again and again. If crimes have been committed, and bad crimes (against the **communists!!**) have been committed, they are not on the account of Stalin and communism, but on the account of the bourgeoisie and capitalism, who try to blame their own crimes on Stalin. If there were crimes "in the name of socialism", then they were the insidious crimes of the enemies against socialism. These are the crimes of the capitalists and their lackeys: "Stalinist crimes against socialism in words, but capitalist crimes against Stalinist socialism in deeds!" **This is the definition of the nature of the crimes of the modern revisionists, the lackeys of world imperialism against Stalin.**

The world rulers possess the material power and therefore possess the spiritual weapons against the world proletariat, they possess the global power of anti-communism, the global power of anti-Stalinism, the global power of what is and what is not a "Stalinist" crime, or what is or is not to be considered a "Stalinist crime". **Only in the eyes of exploiters and oppressors is the liberation from exploitation and oppression, is communism a "crime". And vice versa: in the eyes of the exploited and oppressed, the capitalist and his exploiting system is criminal. In this respect, it is not Stalin who is a criminal, but his political opponents are.** The "crime" is not a class concept in itself, only the different classes give it their correspondingly opposite meaning. **Before one can even speak of "crime", one must clarify its class-specific meaning, because in a class society there are no crimes that are committed "above" the classes, not even in the socialist class society, not even in the Stalin Era.** They are not "personal crimes" of Stalin, but crimes against capitalism, which are justified as long as they have been committed in the interest of the proletariat liberating itself from capitalism. Communist morality does not consider crimes against the bourgeoisie to be immoral and unethical, but for liberation from capitalism, for liberation from all class rule, as inevitable and therefore necessary, as morally justified. Crimes are always defined on the basis of the morality and legality of the respective class society, which are inevitable in the antagonistic class struggle, which are imposed on the classes in order to enforce and defend their interests. The very essence of antagonistic class struggle is that it is irreconcilable, that is, the death of one class means the death of the other class. **It is clear why the bourgeoisie *must* criminalize**

the class struggle of the proletariat, because the proletariat is the gravedigger of the bourgeoisie. But this does not quite get to the heart of the matter. Bourgeois crimes differ from the proletarian "crimes" in one crucial point: **The world proletariat is not only the only class that eliminates the crimes of the exploiting and oppressing classes, but the entire class society itself and therefore every crime that is committed by people against people.** However, if the revolutionary struggle against the crimes of counter-revolution is condemned as a "crime", then we Stalinists will be accused of these "crimes" until the world proletariat has ended the crimes of ruling world capitalism with the victorious world socialist revolution. It is exactly this way that the world proletariat creates the basis for the realization of its final goal: to eradicate from the face of the earth forever the crimes of class to class, the crimes by people against people.

Where Marxism-Leninism reigns, revisionism is powerless, the crimes against the working class, against the laboring masses will be eliminated!

The Berianists and the Khrushchevites had to admit that "they were powerless" as long as Stalin was alive and this is a historical fact which we Marxist-Leninists all start from. When the enemy admits his powerlessness in the face of the power of Stalinism, it becomes clear why so much effort is needed to protect itself from Stalinism and especially from its revival, from newly emerging Stalinists, from the renaissance of the Stalin Era. The biggest obstacle on the way to revisionist power was the character and role of Stalin under the dictatorship of the proletariat. Only after they had assassinated Stalin did they succeed in their coup and the revisionist Soviet leaders were able to occupy and expand position by position. The further they dared to distance themselves from Marxism-Leninism, the more obvious their betrayal became and also their crime, whose unmasking we owe above all to the 5th Classic of Marxism-Leninism, Comrade Enver Hoxha. His revelations were finally confirmed with the end of revisionist rule and the dissolution of the Soviet Union. The more openly the revisionists progressed on their capitalist path, the less it could be concealed that the truth about their crimes leaked to the light of day through documents and contemporary witnesses. Some admitted their crimes themselves, some took them to their graves, and others admitted the crimes of their predecessors, especially the crimes of the key revisionist Khrushchev. He played the leading role in the struggle of modern revisionism against Marxism-Leninism. We have already written in our German-language article ["50 Years of Struggle against Modern Revisionism"](#) in great detail and on a large scale about what the text published here follows without any gaps:

In short, Khrushchev's modern revisionism and the revisionism of today's neo-revisionists differ in that the former was forced to beat Stalinism with "Leninism", while the latter now had to slip into various garments of "Stalinism" (garments from "left" [Trotskyites, Berianists etc.] to right [National Bolsheviks]), because we tore the "Leninist" mask off his face and he can no longer hide behind it. This article is therefore primarily directed against the skinned modern revisionism, against neo-revisionism, against globalized revisionism, against revisionism with a Stalinist mask, and also against Berianism.

Modern revisionism in the Soviet Union served the new Soviet bourgeoisie as the ideological basis of the transition period from socialism back to capitalism. But the lessons of our defeat in the struggle against modern revisionism will serve the transition to world socialism (negation of the negation of anti-revisionism). Capitalism is a reality in Russia today and all revisionist talk of socialism has burst like a soap bubble because of this historical fact. We Stalinists were right when we tore the mask off the modern revisionists. Revisionism leads to capitalism. With the opening of the party archives our Marxist-Leninist predictions can be proved and confirmed entirely.

For us Stalinists, the documentation of the struggle against the revisionists' putschist seizure of

power had been blocked for decades by their **cover-up and falsification tactics**, but this had not prevented our faith in Stalin, but only strengthened it even more. **The more and the more cleverly the cover-up is carried out, the more and the more cleverly it is cleared up. Do the revisionists want to doubt that?** This strengthened our efforts to lift the revisionist veil of Stalin's final period, to give ourselves an ever more objective and concrete picture of the events of that time and to draw the right conclusions: It turned out that the parasitic, revisionist worm had eaten its way much deeper into socialist society than we could have imagined, and that, in retrospect, we have to assess Stalin's final purging, although it ended in defeat, all the more highly and significantly politically. But we do not go as far as Bill Bland, who put forward the "thesis that the revisionists were in power since 1934". We have learned a lot from Stalin, but we can learn most from his struggle just before his death. Here he proved his greatest strength, his greatest experience, his greatest mastery. **Neo-revisionism here means concretely nothing else but to acknowledge in words the anti-revisionist struggle of Stalin in its final stage, in order to hide behind it the real continuation of revisionism. Neo-revisionism is the continuation of revisionism with new means, with the means of a feigned "anti-revisionist" struggle.**

Modern revisionism was the gravedigger of the First Period of socialism. Capitalism knows that it will not have enough coffin nails to prevent the resurrection of Stalin in the Second Period of socialism. Therefore, the lackeys of world capitalism are intensively engaged in creating a new bourgeois "image" of Stalinism in order to continue the camouflaged struggle against the resurgence of Stalinism, **to fight Stalin and the Stalinists with the weapons of "Stalin" and the "Stalinists". It was precisely for this purpose that Berianism was forced to make use of Beria's invisibility cloak, which had proved to be useful, because the "Leninist" cloak of invisibility of the Khrushchevites had been torn down by us. In this respect one can also speak of a Berianist skinning of Khrushchevite revisionism.**

But it was not Beria, but Stalin who was the **greatest master of the illegal Bolshevik struggle. He himself was the greatest master of covering up traces against the class enemy, naturally in the interest of the revolution (in Beria's case, it was in the interest of counter-revolution)**, and Stalin thereby rendered an invaluable service to the cause of the world proletariat, to communism. Stalin's method was as follows: **"Revelation" is best method to cover up secrets" and Beria copied this from him and used it against Stalin. And that's how it was.** To this day the world bourgeoisie had no other choice than to fish in the mud and suck any horror stories about Stalin out of their fingers. And the more the world bourgeoisie gets entangled in its own lies, the more unbelievable it becomes in the eyes of the world proletariat, the sooner it will go under with its agitation against Stalin, the more the truth will come to light. It is the enlightened, revolutionary masses who help the truth in history, the truth about Stalin, to break through and create historical facts.

What we can now contribute to historical illumination remains relatively limited. We still lack the last word. But we have come a little bit closer to the truth again, and this is a small victory that can no longer be taken away from us. Ultimately, it will only be possible to uncover everything completely when the working class in Russia is back in power and has sole possession of the historical documents, at least of all those documents that have not yet been destroyed. And it is precisely in order to prevent this from happening that the truth about Stalin, the truth about the crimes of the revisionists, will of course be further obscured, distorted and falsified by the Russian bourgeoisie now in power, though only in a different way, to prevent the inevitable period of re-Stalinization that is about to begin. But it is this, in turn, that helps us to fight even more intensively for a clearer and deeper understanding of the teachings of Stalin, the teachings of Marxism-Leninism (parallel to the politics of the StaSi archive).

In essence, nothing has changed of anti-Stalinism in Russia to this day, only the methods have been

adapted to the changing circumstances to successfully avert the danger of a new October Revolution, a new Soviet Union in the spirit of Lenin and Stalin, which has **learned from its mistakes**. Nevertheless, we Marxist-Leninists can, to a limited extent and with limited means, look over the shoulders of the bourgeoisie when they have reopened the files closed by the modern revisionists. Above all, however, we must examine ourselves on the basis of the documents that have been disclosed, we must check whether these documents are genuine or forged, whether our previous assessment was correct, whether and what we can learn from it, whether we need to rework and revise our previous views, etc., all exclusively from the perspective of Marxism-Leninism, of course. We must not judge according to our subjective wishes and ideas, we must not gloss over anything or cover up anything. **A new body of evidence is always a touchstone for every true historian, who must also be prepared to admit to earlier misinterpretations if hitherto inaccessible files prove to be irrefutable contemporary documents.** However, it is not as simple as all that, we are not fooling ourselves: To date, there will be enough documents that have already been forged again, and there are certainly plenty of documents that remain under lock and key, which could be dangerous to the Russian bourgeoisie of today. Many documents remain "missing" or are incomplete. Above all, we must address the following circumstances, the conditions dictated by the class struggle at that time: **During the Stalin Era, there was no small number of undocumented orders which were under the highest level of secrecy, "exclusively oral" orders.** And in some secret actions no traces whatsoever were allowed to be left behind to protect against the access of the class enemy. Under the conditions of the intensified class struggle in his own country, it was inevitable for Stalin to work with sham documents in order to cover up traces before the enemy even in his own ranks. **Our deliberate disinformation in documents is a means of unsettling and misleading the enemy, so that they do things for us which they are supposed to believe are in their "own" interest, that is, directed against us. With the disinformation we launch, the counter-revolution does what we want it to do, we make it our tool.** It was precisely the war successes against Hitlerite fascism that Churchill admired in Stalin. It was particularly clever to mix disinformation with coherent facts in order to increase the credibility of disinformation. **Disinformation is not only an effective attack, but also an extremely effective defensive weapon of the proletariat. Stalin masterfully used this weapon, especially in the Great Patriotic War.**

The question of the form and content of documents that appear today must be examined by the Party, in the interests of the working class. The class question must not be left out. The secret services themselves were under secret surveillance. Even the surveillance of the surveillance had to be monitored in order to be able to take the struggle against the restoration of capitalism to the deepest depths. Most comrades still have to learn to use these Stalinist methods against the class enemy.

We must continue to expect that today's revisionists have of course "helped" the bourgeoisie in sifting, selecting and evaluating documents and will continue to do so, especially on the question of Berianism, which we have put on the agenda. After August 1991 a real "**run**" on the documents began, the looting of the archives was a "booming" business.

Whoever has material power, even over historical documents, will use, falsify, manipulate or make them disappear in the interest of maintaining material power. In the class struggle, which is carried out with and through "historical" documents, one uses perfected methods of cover-up and manipulation, **globalized methods of disinformation class struggle as they are used today in the world imperialist war of plunder.** The results in, and how could it be otherwise, all kinds of things, but not to a rehabilitation of Stalin but on the contrary, the image of "Stalin's reign of terror" was painted as being even more "documentary", "more realistic", more "convincing". To come across newly discovered "historical" documents today means **entering a minefield where every misstep, every misinterpretation, can mean the most serious injuries and even political death.**

We therefore commit ourselves not to make hasty statements and draw false conclusions under any circumstances. We remain true to the principle of criticism and self-criticism in the evaluation and assessment of newly emerging document, for they could be a trap. We must not fall for the bourgeois sensationalist media with their secretly controlled "revelation mania", we must not let ourselves be led up the garden path, we must rely on our own Marxist-Leninist power of judgement, we must delve further into the study of Stalin's teachings and life, we must better analyze the actual conditions in socialist society before and after Stalin's death. That is why this text is intended to help stimulate discussion. But caution does not mean retreating into the snail's shell, for fear of getting caught in the nettles of one's enemies with misinterpretations or embarrassing oneself in front of friends. When we have learned to deal, we must also learn to take! We have to stand up for our mistakes ourselves. We cannot cheat others out of them, as Beria's political life was.

If new insights emerge from history, we are obliged to evaluate them, even at the risk of making mistakes and following the wrong tracks. Only those who revolutionize historiography can develop it further and thus make it useful for the world revolution. The defense of Stalin is still an indispensable and responsible task of all Marxist-Leninists. This requires great prudence and care, but also partiality and firmness of principle (not to be confused with sectarianism, dogmatism and personality cult, for these are **bourgeois** notions of partiality and firmness of principle). Most of the work is still ahead of us. At the moment we are not able to deal with the revisionist takeover of power and anti-Stalinism (**including any form of anti-Stalinism, which tries to mask itself with alleged "Stalinism"!!!**) of the modern revisionists by studying the newly published documents to the necessary extent. This task can be accomplished only with highly qualified, well-organized Marxist-Leninist forces. And they must be trained. There is one thing we must always pay attention to:

Any assessment of the documents on the events just before and after Stalin's death, which is not done from the point of view of class struggle, is false, anti-Marxist, seriously damages the cause of socialism, benefits the enemies of socialism and is directed against the interests of the working class and socialism. That is what Comrade Enver Hoxha taught us.

The history of modern revisionism in the Soviet Union is the history of covering up the crimes of the revisionist leaders, who are nothing else but criminals against the Soviet Union of Lenin and Stalin. The history of revisionist cover-up of the truth about Stalin is the history of one of the greatest crimes against communism. We therefore call upon all true Stalinists from all over the world to participate in the educational work independently and on their own responsibility and to inform us about the results of their work so that we can collect, publish and discuss them. We must help each other to uncover the truth about Stalin more and more, in order to build a dam against the disinformation flood of the rulers of this world. Comrades, do you realize that anti-Stalinism is still the biggest obstacle for us communists to win the world proletariat for communism? The complete and truthful exposure of the historical cover-ups and falsifications of the revisionists is a struggle for our Comrade Stalin! We would be bad Stalinists if we do not finish our struggle against anti-Stalinism with all our energy, for we owe it to Comrade Stalin and the cause he served in an exemplary way!

We must put an end to opportunism against Stalinism. Let us not be infected by the disease called fearing the truth about Stalin. There is only one line, the world revolutionary line of the Bolsheviks, the line of Stalin. All other lines are in fact anti-Communist lines.

Our struggle for the truth about Stalin is a struggle for the winning, organizing and mobilization of the world revolutionary proletariat, is a struggle for its ideological armament with Marxism-Leninism, in whose further development Stalin had a great share. Stalin

belongs to the world proletariat. Without having completely re-conquered Stalin, without tearing out the deeply ingrained anti-Stalinism of world reaction from the heads of the workers, the world proletariat will not be able to liberate itself from world capitalism, there will be no victorious world proletarian revolution for the world proletariat, there will be no new world proletarian Soviet Union of Lenin and Stalin, which has learned from the crimes of modern revisionism and has completely overcome it.

Stalinism can neither be "de-Stalinized", "Stalinized", nor "re-Stalinized"!

We have extensively dealt with Stalin's **first creative period** in the Caucasus and now we want to move on to his last period of struggle immediately before his death, without losing sight of the **current subject of Georgia**.

This Georgian period, which runs from 1912 to 1913, was chosen, it should be noted, only because we are concerned here with Stalin's homeland, with his first historical place of activity in connection with current events in the Transcaucasus, in Georgia. And this is also where the trail of Berianism [Beria was Mingrelian] begins, which must be followed until 1953 and beyond. However, this division of time must not be misinterpreted politically. **If we say that in this period one must learn from Stalin's fight against opportunism in order to win, then the wrong conclusion must not be drawn from this that one could "confidently do without" Stalin's experiences and lessons in the fight against his opportunistic enemies after the years 1912-1913. With the character of Beria we can follow the whole Stalinist struggle against opportunism. The years in the Caucasus were Stalin's apprenticeship years of the fight against opportunism. Stalin became a master in the fight against opportunism only afterwards, in Russia. Beria's apprenticeship years also began in the Caucasus. He only became a master in the fight against Stalin in Russia. And the fight against Stalin also brought him back to the Caucasus. These two lines of development of Stalin and Beria do not overlap purely by chance, but have remained linked to Georgia to the death.**

If one wants to master the fight against opportunism, one cannot avoid studying not only the years of Stalin's apprenticeship, but above all his mastery years. The Stalinists must always learn from the entire period of Stalin's creative work, must study the historical blows that Stalin dealt to the opportunists in context, in their history of development. This is especially true of his very last blow, which he dealt to the revisionist party enemies, especially Beria. The literature on this period on the part of the Marxist-Leninists has, as already mentioned in the preface, remained quite thin, which is not least due to the sustainability of the revisionist influence in the Marxist-Leninist World Movement. It makes sense to compare and relate Stalin's first blows with his last battle, in order to better understand both the significance of Stalin's first battles in Georgia and his final battles against his enemies, which also lead back to the Caucasus (Beria's Mingrelian Affair). Stalin's purge period against the Berianist enemies of the Party in Georgia in 1950/51 must not be ignored at all if one wants to understand how the bourgeoisie came to power in the Soviet Union. In the struggle against its own revisionist degeneration, the CPSU (B) under Stalin's leadership in 1950-1952 drew important lessons, especially from his Caucasus period, in the struggle against the subversive activities of the Mensheviks. Few comrades are likely to know that Stalin had fought intensively against the Mensheviks until his death, especially against the Mensheviks who, as Georgian emigrants,

organized their nationalist subversive work in the CP of Georgia in order to take action from Georgia against Lenin's and Stalin's Soviet Union, and against Stalin himself. **There were covert anti-Soviet activities by Georgian emigrants financed by Western governments and business enterprises, and under Beria's leadership of the Moscow conspirators of 1953. In Georgia, shortly before his death, Stalin defended the internationalism of the Bolsheviks against anti-Soviet nationalism, against the Menshevik spirit of the Second International, which the Anglo-American imperialists had harnessed to their carts. For Stalin, this struggle formed a dialectical unity against Western cosmopolitanism and Soviet great power chauvinism, both of which inevitably caused the rise of nationalism in the border regions. If anti-Soviet nationalism in the Caucasus was dismantled, the instruments of cosmopolitanism and Russian great power chauvinism against the USSR and especially against its revolutionary center in Moscow were also destroyed.** For Stalin, these were two sides of the same coin, to turn the Cold War that had begun, which was waged from within and without against the Soviet Union of Lenin and Stalin, and which was directed against the socialist revolution and communism throughout the world, into a victory for communism.

The images of Stalin before and after the seizure of power by the Bolsheviks and Stalin before the seizure of power by the modern revisionists are the images of Stalin that is to be presented here in this article in connection with the events in Georgia, in the early 1950s and today. The criticism of Beria plays a central role in this. **The story of Stalin is the glorious story of his lifelong struggle against his internal enemies, against the opportunists who first tried to thwart the conquest of the Bolsheviks' power and then, when they were defeated, began to overthrow the Bolsheviks' power with the support of the external enemies, and who finally achieved their goal of transforming the Soviet Union into a bourgeois state, despite the bitter resistance that Stalin had put up against them. In particular, he called upon his "Old Bolshevik Guard", whom Enver Hoxha aptly called "corpses of Bolshevism", Molotov, Kaganovich, Voroshilov, etc., to go to work just like old times and to fight against skinned Menshevism, modern revisionism, without compromise and with the feared hardness and iron discipline of the Old Bolsheviks, and to face this struggle to the death. But they capitulated under the pressure of the enemies from within and without, adopting a conciliatory and centrist stance and moving further and further away from Bolshevism. His so-called "comrades-in-arms" had now used the "cult of personality" tactic against him with a retinue of their apparatchiks in the ministries and in the Party. The loudest "Stalin" shouted and above all those who most insidiously flattered Stalin were his worst and most dangerous enemies, his conspirators and murderers. With the death of the Fourth Classic of Marxism-Leninism, the revisionist conspirators and rulers also brought about the death of the Soviet Union, the first socialist country in the world.**

Many lessons of this struggle of the CPSU against opportunism were already written down by Stalin in 1938 in the "History of the CPSU (B) - Short Course". And even this "Short Course" was Stalin's product of a sharp struggle against the Trotskyite distortions and falsifications of the role of Lenin and the Bolshevik Party (Stalin's criticism of Slutsky, Yaroslavsky, etc.). **At all party congresses, especially the most recent 19th Party Congress, calls were made for the struggle against the danger of the restoration of capitalism in the USSR, binding party resolutions were passed on this, which had to be implemented in a disciplined manner. But all this was ignored, especially after Stalin's death, and was thrown overboard, twisted and distorted, as the anti-party groups within the CPSU needed it to take over revisionist power and transform proletarian into bourgeois socialism in the name of "Leninism".**

The **direct frontal assault** on Stalin and his teachings was not dared by the Khrushchevite revisionists until three years after his death, until the 20th Congress in 1956. After 70 years it was still the **standard work** for the Comintern (ML), **but it still has to be completed until Stalin's death**, because the history of the CPSU [B] as a Marxist-Leninist party does not end in 1938, but

only with the year 1953). In the Party history of the revisionists, Stalin did not appear by name until the October Revolution. His role in the Civil War and his appointment as secretary general in 1922 as well as the speech at Lenin's grave were ignored. All of Stalin's writings, which had been exuberantly praised by the revisionists at the previous 19th Party Congress, including the "Economic Problems of Socialism in the U.S.S.R." (which Stalin had directed **against them!**), could no longer be mentioned from then on and fell victim to censorship. Stalin's writings were banned not only in the Soviet Union but also in the revisionist countries of the Eastern Bloc. The reissue and distribution of his Collected Works by the KPD/ML was at that time a slap in the face of the revisionists!

The former Bloc of the Right and Trotskyites in the fight against Stalin and its revival and continuation by the common front of neo-Trotskyites and neo-revisionists in the fight against Marxist-Leninists.

We want to prevent misunderstandings and point out the danger that a division of Stalin's life and work entails. Thus the method of historical division is a popular hobbyhorse of Trotskyism and modern revisionism to play one period off against another and use it as a justification for Stalin's condemnation. Our brief description of the period of Stalin's struggle, which we had re-drawn, the time at Lenin's side is played down by the anti-Stalinists more or less as a barely "acceptable prehistory of the dictator". The time shortly before and shortly after Lenin's death, however, is "self-critically" interpreted by the anti-Stalinists as the "underestimation of the danger of Stalin's abuse of power that was recognized too late", after Lenin is supposed to have warned of Stalin's "sole rule" in an alleged "letter". **All** anti-Stalinists, including Khrushchev, later referred to this. This point in time is dated as the "turning point". The fight against Trotskyism, the "leftist" opportunism of the 1920s is already considered a "personal transgression of power" and from 1929, "autocratic power". But at the latest with the purges in the mid 1930s, "where Stalin had decidedly gone too far", the actual "period of Stalin's reign of terror" begins for the anti-Stalinists. It should therefore come as no surprise that the opponents of Stalin within the ranks of the party were not particularly interested in publishing Stalin's works after 1934. With Volume 13, the flagpole was reached for them. In reality, however, they thought they had an easier time with this clumsy trick, only to pour buckets of manure over Stalin after his death. But Stalin proved Bolshevik irreconcilability towards the enemies of socialism until his death. He smashed the Bukharinite-Trotskyite gang of spies, parasites and murderers who were in the service of the spy organs of capitalist states and thwarted their plans to transform the Soviet Union into a colony of world imperialism and restore capitalist slavery. It is clear that the opponents of Stalin were foaming with rage and made him the target of their slander.

It was easiest for the people who wanted to bury the "historical fossil" without comment: "Whoever Stalin may have been, he was in any case a personality of his time and only useful as a deterrent example for today. It is therefore not worthwhile to deal with his views. He had abused Marxism far too much and Stalinism is therefore not worth dealing with it at all. The Stalinists of today are incorrigible, poor lunatics who are so blind that they no longer recognize the signs of the times, that they are incorrigibly pigheaded in their ideology and cannot admit to themselves that they have long since lost their game and are now drowning in loneliness. Stalinism is useless today, least of all Marxism."

Well, not all anti-Stalinists are so crude. More dangerous are those who cleverly hide their anti-Stalinism behind "sympathies towards Stalin" but don't want to know anything about Stalinism. **They try to separate the figure of Stalin from Stalinism in order to graft his figure onto their own political ideas.** They fill the figure of Stalin with characteristics attributed to him, supposedly to prove that he was everything **but a Marxist-Leninist**. Conversely, there are those who supposedly defend him as a Marxist-Leninist, but who attribute to him qualities that are incompatible with Marxism-Leninism, that is, in reality, directed against Marxism-Leninism. **All**

these different trends of people are cooking their own anti-Stalinist soup with the name "Stalin". There is a huge spectrum of disguised anti-Stalinists, which we cannot present here in all details. **They all share the illusory common goal - the de--Stalinization of Stalin**. Let us select an anti-Stalinist group that deserves our greatest "praise" for disguising itself with Stalin in order to remain unrecognized:

There are those who accuse Stalin in his last phase of struggle of not having recognized the danger of modern revisionism "clearly enough", of having not fought it "sufficiently", of "not" having the consistent break with the modern revisionists made and not chasing them out "in time", of having proved to be "too weak" and of having "not consistently let himself be guided by Marxism-Leninism" etc., capitulated in the struggle against the restoration of capitalism, retreated into isolation and was a prisoner of his own country, etc. The fact is that the modern revisionists conquered power by murdering him. But drawing the conclusion that Stalin of all people helped them from this is crazy speculation, which of course nobody can prove with facts. The "critics" of Stalin do not even dare to express this "criticism" openly, for this is what they hide behind their "Stalinist" phrases. They have learned from the modern revisionists that Stalin can only be beaten with the weapons of Stalin and they must be extremely careful to not be exposed!

They dare to indirectly deny or disparage Stalin's merits in the struggle against modern revisionism, only to put themselves on the pedestal of the most "determined" fighters "against" modern revisionism. They want to overtake Stalin and "teach" us Marxist-Leninists about the struggle against revisionism, want to keep us from the allegedly too weak anti-revisionist General Line of Stalin, in reality they want a **type of "anti-revisionism" which heals the wounds of revisionism**. Don't they know or don't they want to know that quite a number of modern revisionists had already been **liquidated** by Stalin, that **further death sentences** of Stalin had already been listed (among them members of the Presidium of the CPSU!), that he had already started to execute the death sentences and that the modern revisionists in the Presidium knew about their death sentence, so they knew what was going to happen to them? **That Stalin was the Bolshevik world leader in the fight against modern revisionism until the end** can be proved by these very deeds (not only against Tito but also within his own ranks!) and not only by Stalin's last writings, which by far not all have been published, whereby these "friends" of Stalin can of course continue to fish in the mud!! **We Stalinists will not buy goods from the anti-Stalinist smugglers! We will not allow them to falsify the life work of Stalin against the restoration of capitalism, the history of Stalin, the history of the Bolshevik Party in the "interest" of Stalin, in the "interest" of the history of the Bolshevik Party! Whoever directs water to the mills of the falsifiers of Stalin's history will not be given any room in our ranks for such "discussions"**.

Stalin **began** the fight against **Menshevism** in the **Caucasus** and continued it there permanently. It would therefore be wrong to assume that the fight against Beria had brought him back to the Caucasus only shortly before his death. In the course of the years Stalin came across a changed Menshevism, a **skinned Menshevism**. **This was a much more complicated struggle against the already defeated Menshevism, as it was still ruling Georgia in its early days, because now it was secretly "in the midst of us"**. It had become a Menshevism that sucked its parasitic power out of flourishing socialist Georgia to grow into a menacing danger for the whole Soviet Union. The Mensheviks were no longer allowed to be seen in public in Georgia during the Stalin Era and had therefore had to put on a "Stalinist" coat, which they now burst out from. They had now become powerful and influential "Stalinist" Mensheviks, and Mensheviks like Beria used them to regain the power lost to the Bolsheviks and finally drive Bolshevism out of Georgia. Menshevism in Georgia was the "socialist tribute" to its social-democratic forebears in the West. Beria wanted to sell the socialist prosperity of the Georgian people, built up in the struggle against Menshevism, off to the West. Beria was the main enemy of the socialist Georgian people, and was in the service of the world imperialist enslavement of Georgia, as

we will see in the chapter on the Mingrelian Conspiracy.

Other people created the legend of the first "good" (the revolutionary Stalin) and then "evil" Stalin (the dictator Stalin). This is a typical pattern of division which the bourgeoisie imposes on all communist leaders. Revolutionaries who were persecuted by the ruling bourgeoisie are admired as resistance fighters. The same revolutionaries, however, once they had conquered power and now in turn persecuted the bourgeoisie, are painted on the wall of the reign of terror.

Even Gorbachev admitted that without the proletarian Soviet Union of Lenin and Stalin there would not have been such a later bourgeois-socialist Soviet Union, that the newly emerging bourgeoisie could never have begun its triumphal march without the proletariat and its dictatorship, without the defense of the Soviet Union in the Great Patriotic War, without Stalin. But Stalin is not the forefather of a Soviet imperialist superpower as Beria needed him, he is not the founder of the bourgeois dictatorship in the Soviet Union, the father of the social-imperialist superpower. Stalin belongs to the world proletariat and not to the new Russian bourgeoisie! And Lenin-Stalinist Bolshevism is not the original source which the radicalized petty-bourgeois national Bolsheviks draw from, but capitalism. **Lenin and Stalin based their teachings on Marxism, on the internationalism of the world proletariat and nothing else!** We do not allow any discussion on whether Lenin's Bolshevism was Marxist or not. Nor do we allow any discussion on whether Stalinist Bolshevism was Leninist or not. We do not discuss at the expense of the very interests of World Bolshevism, which are rooted in Leninist Bolshevism, which are rooted in Marxism-Leninism.

Today, Russia and Albania are the only two capitalist states in the world which have emerged from a socialist state and of course all the other capitalist states in the world have not forgotten this and they will not forget it, especially not the USA which is still the anti-communist center of world reaction.

However, since the military incorporation of the Soviet Union in the Second World War failed at that time and instead a further spread, consolidation and development of socialism followed, every bucket of dung that was poured over Stalin meant a further consolidation of the connection of the party of Lenin and Stalin with the people of Soviet society, a consolidation of the connection between the world proletariat and the oppressed peoples with the newly emerging socialist camp. **Anti-Stalinism polarizes the forces of Stalinism.** The enemies of Stalin, who were identical with the enemies of the Soviet Union and communism, had no other choice but to **try to beat Stalin "in the name of Stalin"**, among other things with the help of the "cult of personality" which was spread especially by the group of Khrushchev, Beria, etc. The path of the restoration of capitalism therefore had to be forced into the guise of the character and teachings of Stalin, which Stalin saw through. And as long as Stalin was alive, the attempt of the saboteurs also failed. Just think of the Stalin's work "Economic Problems of Socialism in the U.S.S.R.". This was a targeted blow against the restoration of capitalism! At the 19th Party Congress, from October 5th to 14th 1952, he made his last speech in front of his revisionist enemies who were in the Presidency. Shortly after the Party Congress, he settled accounts with the restorers of capitalism and put them in their place, including Khrushchev. Khrushchev was reprimanded at the 19th Party Congress, for his propagation of "agrocities" as an example. Already in the spring of 1951 he was reprimanded for this in the "Pravda". If one takes a look at Malenkov's report on the accounts, the amendments to the statute of the CPSU (B) by Khrushchev, the contribution to the discussion by Bulganin, the report by Saburov on the Five-Year Plan, etc., at the 19th Party Congress, it makes you vomit, because their demonstrative "loyalty to and unity with Stalin" at the 19th Party Congress was a single lie, a single hypocrisy, as they themselves publicly admitted after his death and finally proved it in criminal acts. You have to look closely to see that the modern revisionists were **already heading for their treacherous course in the presence of Stalin!** But it was **not even a week after Stalin's death** when they began to

crawl out of their hypocritical and double-tongued holes, where, as leaders of modern revisionism, they openly embarked on the path of restoration, with the consequences known today. They separated economy from politics, strengthened the economy while compromising the political goals of socialism, etc. We will have to go into this in more detail. In short:

The revisionists hid behind the cardboard façade of the "personality cult" they had erected themselves at the 19th Congress, which they officially dropped at the following 20th Congress to hide behind their new "Leninist" cardboard sign. A "de-Stalinization" by means of an open, abrupt and immediate break with Marxism-Leninism was at that time almost impossible, so that the revisionists finally had to use Lenin to "punish" their "scapegoat" Stalin. The revisionists of the USSR made Khrushchev their leader in the so-called "de-Stalinization".

Khrushchevism, that is the bourgeois revisionism of Stalinism using the counter-revolutionary slogan: "With Lenin against Stalin". The Soviet revisionists in power thus took a decisive step towards the bourgeois revision of Marxism-Leninism with "de-Stalinization". Soviet revisionism means bourgeois misappropriation of Marxism-Leninism for the exploitation and oppression of the restored exploited classes of workers and peasants in capitalism, means wage slavery and capitalist bondage under the banner of "Marxism-Leninism". (National Bolshevism in turn uses the banner of "Lenin and Stalin" in its counter-revolutionary struggle against Marxism, against world socialism, against the proletarian internationalism of Lenin and Stalin's USSR).

These were already more highly developed forms of class struggle, which had to be developed from lower forms, which at some point were no longer applicable, and eventually replaced them. It was not only important that the class struggle in socialism had to be waged against people who openly or covertly tried to abolish it or against people who wanted to abuse or misuse it, but that its forms and contents were further developed at a higher level, that is, against the "socialists" who either consciously and covertly inhibited the development of socialism or deliberately anticipated it, both are harmful forms which the class struggle had to be waged against at a higher level. And it is easier to fight against capitalism and its remnants with an open visor than against lagging or advancing "comrades" who were not willing or able to adapt their ideas and actions to the laws of the development of socialism and Marxism-Leninism and who, with their "Stalinist" invisibility cloak, caused much more damage to the further development of socialist society than capitalism could ever have done.

There were comrades who were once outstanding class fighters under capitalism, were Stalin's best and most loyal comrades-in-arms, but in the class struggle of socialist society they failed the moment the capitalist remnants were *already eliminated* under socialism. They failed in the class struggle of socialist society at the moment when Stalin had to fight against the bureaucratization of the socialist classes, against the formation of a new privileged layer, against the emergence of a new "socialist" bourgeoisie, against the degeneration of socialism from within, no longer only against the danger, but against the actually advancing restoration of capitalism itself.

There were also comrades who carried out a heroic anti-fascist struggle at Stalin's side and defeated the most savage and murderous hordes of fascist great powers in the Great Patriotic War, but they failed in the following *Cold War*, where it was about the continuation of the world revolutionary struggle with all means against the entire "civilized", "liberated from fascism", "democratic" world imperialism, with the USA at the head. They failed in the struggle for the victory of the socialist world camp over the capitalist world camp.

And there were comrades again, who were the greatest heroes and pioneers in the construction phase of socialism, builders of a strong Soviet Union, but when the Soviet Union was again strengthened after the war, these comrades did not understand that the conditions for the achievement of communism had matured now and that one had to advance to new shores of communism much further and make new sacrifices. These comrades had either become tired or self-sufficient, or they wanted to be satisfied with what they had achieved, with their "career", their luxuries, etc., and not to advance to the next sacrificial stage of communism. The most difficult task for Comrade Stalin was to give these comrades, whose internationalist élan was in danger of fading, whose revolutionary spirit was gradually exhausted, whose consciousness as the vanguard of the more developed working class left more and more to be desired, to talk into the conscience of these comrades, to demote them if necessary and to make a new cadre selection for the energetic implementation of his General Line. He was directly occupied with mastering even this most difficult task even at the age of 73 when his "closest comrades in arms" conspired against him and secretly murdered him. Such extremely intensified forms of class struggle only emerge with the higher forms of development of socialism and even today, the mysterious circumstances of the murder of Stalin and many communist leaders in the Soviet Union and in the people's democracies, even the murder of Enver Hoxha in socialist Albania, have not been cleared up, the criminal murder gangs of the modern revisionists have succeeded in letting their bloody trail disappear behind a wall of fog until today. Well, medical reports have appeared which at least support our suspicion that Stalin could not have died a natural death, that his injuries only caused a violent death. We are firmly convinced that the names of the murderers came from the closest, "most familiar" leadership circle around Stalin, the names of the leading members of the Presidium of the Central Committee of the CPSU, and who else had easier access to Stalin, knew Stalin's habits better, than Beria! But more about that later.

With the elimination of the exploiting classes, the class struggle was far from over; on the contrary, it was being fought as fiercely as never before. Marx and Engels were not yet aware of the dimension their words would take on when they said:

"Just abolish the class struggle, and the bourgeoisie and 'all independent persons' will 'not hesitate to go hand in hand with the proletarians'! In which case the ones to be hoodwinked would be those self-same proletarians." (Marx, Engels: 'Circular Letter to August Bebel, Wilhelm Liebknecht, Wilhelm Bracke, and Others' in: 'Collected Works', Volume 24; London; 1989; p.265; English Edition).

And it is also a bourgeois, or rather, retrograde attitude to "abolish" the class struggle in the transition to communism and leave everything to its own devices. The two-front struggle that we fought for the liberation from capitalism must continue if we want to overcome the first stage of socialism. In order to advance towards communism, we must strip off old socialist shells which are becoming an obstacle, which were still right and necessary against the remnants of the capitalist class, but which are no longer needed in the transition to communism, and turn into an obstacle. **The transition from the phase of socialism to communism is not without fierce class struggle.** Between the socialist and the communist phase there is no "peaceful coexistence" with elements hostile to the Party - the old shells do not fall on their own nor do they fall automatically. That is spontaneism, an anarchist path to communism that destroys everything again. Socialist society must now free itself from **its own** old shells. To understand the class struggle in this sense requires a high socialist consciousness, because the enemy exists in **our own** backwardness, which we can only overcome **in relation to ourselves**. A consistent struggle must be waged between the opposites of retrograde and progressive ideas, habits, working methods, etc. Socialist society must not be unfaithful to itself and refuse to move towards communism. And if it is no longer prepared to push the revolution forward, if it no longer considers it necessary to revolutionize itself permanently with

the help of Stalin's teachings, then it has already become unfaithful to itself. Trotsky had despised the role of revolutionary theory in the creation and development of the Party. **Trotsky was dead, but Trotskyism lived on under the mask of "Stalinism".**

Stalinism is the ideology of the Bolshevik Party against its revisionist degeneration into a bourgeois party of the restoration of capitalism and thus the key to the successful transition from socialism to communism.

If Stalinism is a further development of Leninism, and this is our starting point, then any "defense" of Leninism against Stalinism leads to the defense of *revisionism*. **"De-Stalinization" is "de-Leninization"**. Stalinism developed at a time when Leninism was already in power. It began with the struggle over the interpretation of Leninism, its distortion and vulgarization. One can speak of Stalinism just as one can speak of Leninism, because both are basically the same in essence (further developments of Marxism). But what one must not do is to speak of Stalinism and (plus) Leninism. Stalinism is not the "teachings of Stalin minus Leninism".

Stalinism is nothing other than Stalin's internationalist doctrine of the Soviet social order as it had actually, objectively, truly developed after Lenin's death.

The *special nature* of Stalinism can be explained for two reasons:

First of all, it emerged not only from socialism "in a" country whose stamp it necessarily had to bear, but also made the transition to communism in the struggle against the restoration of capitalism at home;

Secondly, it strengthened itself beyond its borders in the struggle against the encirclement of imperialism to the outside. It led the newly emerging world camp of communism to storm the fortress of the world camp of capitalism and bring about the victory of world socialism.

The Comintern/ML formulates Stalinism in two sentences:

Stalinism is Marxism-Leninism for the transition from the first period of "socialism in one country" to the Second Period of socialism on a global scale, *in general*.

Stalinism is Marxism-Leninism for the transition from "socialism in one country" to "communism in one country", *in particular*.

What characterized the attitude of Stalin immediately before his death?

Never wavering in the face of the Cold War, not being afraid of the imperialists, not retreating from them, boldly advancing towards communism and not letting the imperialists out of the stranglehold again, but gripping them even tighter, fulfilling his internationalist duty to the end, purging the Party from the revisionists and thwarting their coup!!! **Fight against capitulation!!! Fight against the disparagement of the Bolshevik Party! Fight for Lenin's party! Fight for Bolshevism! Fight to save the Soviet Union from its external and internal enemies!**

Conversely, "de-Stalinization" can be explained for two reasons: Firstly, to transform communism and finally "socialism in one country" into a capitalist country and secondly, to save world imperialism from the global threat of being destroyed by communism. But this does not destroy Stalinism. It will be difficult to rebuild it and it will not be possible to rebuild

it as it was once, but one thing is clear: the "de-Stalinization" will never go so far as to make Stalinism disappear completely. This or that part, this or that remnant of Stalinism cannot be eliminated. The difficulties will only help Stalinism regain power.

What drove the revisionists to "de-Stalinization"? Capitulation and capitulation again!!! To save their skin, to retreat, to doubt the necessity and correctness of the militant struggle against world imperialism, to shake the confidence in Stalinism, to reduce the Bolshevik Party, to put itself on the defensive, to detach from the world revolution, to give up the class struggle, to retreat, to betray Marxism-Leninism, to defect to the enemy!!!!

The center of the struggle against Stalinism had meanwhile been moved from Germany to America and England. For the counter-revolution within the USSR this meant moving the center of its support from Germany to America and England. Accordingly, Stalin also moved his fight against the new enemy center including his agency within the USSR. The central goal of the enemy was directed at the liquidation of the Soviet center of power, was aimed at Stalin. The elimination of Stalin was thus carried out by the externally supported agency of the imperialists in the USSR, by the conspirators of the Presidium of the CC of the CPSU. Stalin therefore concentrated on the elimination of his conspirators before his assassination. The history of the CPSU ended with the struggle against its conspirators, ended with the victory of the conspirators over the Bolshevik Party of Lenin and Stalin. While the conspiracy of the "Right and Trotskyite" Bloc, who were above all an agency of the fascists in Germany and Japan, had been crushed by Stalin, the conspirators of 1953, as agents of Anglo-American imperialism, achieved victory that time.

Bourgeois historians are not entirely wrong when they describe the history of the USSR as a history of Stalinization. And we Marxist-Leninists are not wrong either when we call the history of anti-Stalinism a history of futile attempts at "de--Stalinization", which are of course ultimately and all doomed to failure. Just as the world bourgeoisie a hundred years ago, with its agitation against Bolshevism, ignited the hearts of the workers of the whole world for Bolshevism because of its hatred of capitalism, the anti-Stalinist propaganda of the world bourgeoisie will one day bounce off the workers who have had enough of capitalism. The workers will rediscover Stalinism for themselves as the doctrine with which they liberate themselves from the bondage of world imperialism.

Now the bourgeoisie is making the bold claim that the real "de-Stalinization" of 1989 did not really happen. Well, well. we can guess what is meant by this. But here, too, we must agree with the bourgeoisie in some respects, because no one in the world will ever succeed in "de-Stalinizing" the world, because the roots of Stalinism cannot be eradicated, and especially not in Russia.

Stalinism cannot be "de-Stalinized"!

The bourgeoisie "defines" Stalinism as a "theory and practice of the terrorist, Soviet system of rule". Let's assume for a moment that this is true: But what should we define world imperialism as? As the theory and practice of the anti-terrorist, civilized, democratic worldview, as the liberator of humanity from the Soviet system of rule? In other words, something like the way world imperialism likes to present itself?

Die "Linke" (German social-fascist party – Translator's note) defines Stalinism as an "inhuman stake in the flesh of communism". And how do we Stalinists define the revisionist Die "Linke"? Die "Linke" is the inhuman flesh of rotten capitalism, but Stalinism is the world revolutionary stake in the heart of capitalism.

Gorbachev said: "Stalinism is a term invented by the opponents of communism and widely used to slander the Soviet Union and socialism as a whole." For once, our dear Mr. Gorbachev is speaking the truth here regarding the slander of the Soviet Union and socialism. But unfortunately it is only *half* the truth, because Stalinism is a term which we Marxist-Leninists had used and will continue to use not only extensively to defend the Soviet Union of Lenin and Stalin and socialism as a whole against anti-Stalinism, but to carry his victory across the globe. The term "Marxism", the term "Leninism-Stalinism", the term "Stalinism" is as little an invention of the bourgeoisie as the term "Marxism-Leninism" or "Hoxhaism". By this we communists refer to the teachings of the classics, which together founded and developed the worldview of the proletariat. We have already mentioned this repeatedly. For us communists, these are quite legitimate terms, while for the bourgeoisie they are only terms for "legitimizing" their anti-communism, with the words of the anti-Marxist intellectual Mr. Oskar Negt.

It was precisely this Oskar Negt, this "left-wing light" of bourgeois ideology, who raved about the so-called "science of legitimacy", about Stalinism as an alleged "sham" of Marxism. Oskar Negt wanted to talk the progressive elements of the '68 movement out of "the aberration of Stalinism". With his "criticism of legitimacy", Negt meant that Soviet society "could not withstand" the criticism of bourgeois society, that Soviet society did not fulfill what it had written on its revolutionary banner, that it had not alienated itself from Marxism or turned away from it, but that its "totalitarian system of rule" had from the beginning been covered with red paint and had misused Marx only as an alibi. Stalin had nothing in common with either Marx nor with Lenin. On the contrary, Stalin had misused the revolutionary theory of Marx and Lenin only as a "tool of legitimization" and transformed it into a pseudo-science, had put on the Marxist mask of socialism only to hide his "despotism" behind it. **"My arguments are directed against Stalinism, not against Lenin"** (Oskar Negt, 'Reply to Josef Schleifstein', A Contribution to a Discussion in 1970 on the Occasion of Lenin's 100th Birthday, Frankfurt;1970; p.127-132). In doing so, he effectively took the side of the modern revisionists. But he rejected this far from himself. After the revisionists had already been in power for 15 years, the "Marxists" of the new, Western Left talked about the so-called "legitimization of de-Stalinization". By this they understood it (translated into simple English) as: **"De-Stalinization in words, continuation of Stalinism in deeds."** It was basically as if the "leftist" intelligentsia, on the 100th anniversary of Lenin's death, made itself the mouthpiece of American imperialism, which of course they also "condemned" in words! Condemning the Vietnam War of the Americans as well as Stalinism, that was the position of the "New Left". As petty-bourgeois, they found it modern and "leftist" to "rebel" against both the rule of the bourgeoisie and the rule of the proletariat. The oh-so-progressive intellectualist "critics of the science of legitimacy" turned out to be legitimizers of the Cold War, legitimizers of bourgeois science which they submitted to with every step they took to try to deter the intellectuals opposed to capitalism from the Soviet ideology of Lenin and Stalin! Such people are **rightfully called stooges and lackeys of capital!**

They wanted to make the progressive forces believe that bourgeois Khrushchev, Ulbricht and other arch-revisionists would vainly claim that they had renounced Stalinism, but that this "deception" had been seen through: "In reality", they had secretly never discarded their "Stalinism", but continued it; in short: **"Re-Stalinization behind the mask of "de-Stalinization". Revisionism had "emerged from Stalinism"**, was a continuation of the legitimization of "Stalinist despotism, only WITHOUT Stalin. The restoration of capitalism is thus an "immanent law" of Stalinism (Stalinism = bourgeois revision of Marxism-Leninism).

The modern revisionists fight Stalin with their disguised "Leninism". The bourgeoisie of the West fights against Stalinism by falsifying the disguised "Leninism" of the modern

revisionists as disguised "Stalinism". Until today, anti-Stalinism in its entirety is based on the collaboration of this same disguised "Leninism" of the modern revisionists and its falsification as disguised "Stalinism" by the Western bourgeoisie. And so anti-Stalinism must be exposed and defeated in a two-front struggle against this collaboration by us Stalinists all over the world.

These are basically old Trotskyite parrot slogans, taken from the Titoites' bag of tricks, which were also used by the Apologists of the '68 Movement! **The fact that they unintentionally brought new forces to Stalinism with their anti-Stalinist agitation is the positive phenomenon of the '68 Movement. That was the time when the author of this book spread the writings of Stalin on his book table, where almost 40 years ago, without his efforts, the publication and spreading of the new Works of Stalin would not have been possible.**

Keeping the worker away from Stalinism by frightening him with the grimace of the social-fascists is typically petty-bourgeois and anti-Stalinism builds on this to a large extent. This is precisely the old trick of the bourgeoisie to simply make the terms revisionism and Stalinism interchangeable, to put the deterrent stamp of "Stalinism" on revisionism and let Stalinism rot as dogmatism in the backyard of the history of philosophy. To present Stalinism as deterrent to the worker as possible, in such a way that the worker should come to only one conclusion: **"Stalinism? No thanks, I'd rather live under capitalism with all its boils!"** That's what these scribblers of the bourgeoisie are paid for, and not badly, as you can see with Oskar Negt. When these petty-bourgeois write about "institutionalized Marxism," they mean Marxism in power, they mean the workers in power. The petty-bourgeoisie are happy to warm their hearts to the struggle of the workers against their exploitation and oppression while they are not yet in power. But workers in power are as much a horror for the petty-bourgeoisie as the bourgeoisie in power. Yes, they prefer the bourgeoisie in power to the workers in power, because they have already come to terms with the bourgeoisie at their side for over a hundred years. At the time of Stalinism in power, these petty-bourgeoisie had the need, from their class nature, to "de-institutionalize" Marxism, which means nothing other than "liberating" the "working class from the rule of Marxism". It was in this sense that the petty-bourgeoisie pursued its "de-Stalinization" efforts after Stalin's death. Since then, the petty-bourgeoisie's "revolutionary" task has been to "save" the working class from "re-Stalinization."

Oskar Negt and Co. were more concerned with dissociating themselves from the "Frankfurt School", following in the footsteps of Trotsky, Tito, Deborin and Bukharin, etc., in order to expose the '68 Movement as a petty-bourgeois movement which, in its broad leftist spectrum, had "descended to Stalinism", had tried to "legitimize" itself only by doing so. For this realization that the petty-bourgeois movement adorns itself with the labor movement in order to make itself bigger than it is, one did not need Oskar Negt, the Marxists already criticized this 100 years ago. Not even Oskar Negt could save the '68 Movement from its contact with Stalinism. As a result, he could not prevent, indeed, he involuntarily contributed to the emergence of such intellectuals in the Movement of '68 who seriously took up Stalin's revolutionary standpoint, who seriously joined the revolutionary workers' movement and gradually overcame their own petty-bourgeois standpoint, and who did not fall for Oskar Negts but fought them head-on as anti-communists. He, however, preached "true" Marxism", the criticism of the idealization of "pure" Marxist science. He in particular, like the entire intellectualist "Left" opposition as a whole, always regarded himself as a "revolutionary vanguard" for the "de-Stalinization" of science.

The anti-Stalinist Oskar Negt, who can at best "make friends" with Marxism when it is not in power, as was the case with Soviet Marxism under Lenin and Stalin, is a true "champion" for the liberation of science from its class corset. We Stalinists ultimately agree with Oskar Negt and the whole intellectualist "armada of the 'left' opposition" to liberate science from its class rule, from its class-ideological paternalism (and so he is and they are, of course, "much, much

more rrrrevolutionary" than we Stalinists). **There is only one "small" difference between us and them: for them this goal is already achievable in bourgeois society, whereas we will only have achieved this goal with classless society. For them, Stalinism is an unjustified, illegitimate "obstacle" to classless science, but for us it is an indispensable prerequisite for it. Wanting to already "liberate" Stalinism from its class character under capitalism can only lead to one result, to its adaptation to and subordination to bourgeois ideology, to the liquidation of the proletarian character of Stalinism and to the consolidation of capitalist class society. And this is also the definition of the term "de-Stalinization", whether we look at de-Stalinization in the East or in the West, in the bourgeois essence, both types of de-Stalinization agree and have always worked together against communism and have complemented each other. The strength of Stalinism is still evident today in the fact that the bourgeoisie, after all its futile efforts, is forced to capitulate to the teachings of Stalin. Even if the bourgeoisie never admits it, it has been forced to believe that Stalinism cannot be "de-Stalinized" at all, that simply "no weed has grown" against this ideology, that every bourgeois weed withers as soon as it comes into contact with Stalinism, that capitalism has had to suffer defeat wherever it dared to engage in a confrontation with Stalinism.**

Now we come to the two-front struggle:

Stalinism teaches us to see the class struggle, the *two-front struggle*, the struggle between the privileged classes of all kinds who did not want to develop further and the masses of the laborers, the socialist workers who are at the head of all laborers in order to revolutionize the social development continuously, under the surface of ingrained old habits, political intrigues, cleverly thought-out theories and political currents in socialism. Stalin threw all outdated forms of socialism overboard, helped all outdated Bolsheviks who could not separate themselves from these forms in solidarity and demoted those who refused to give up the outdated forms of their thinking and acting. In the same way, he stood in the way of the newly developed ideas that deviated from Marxism-Leninism in order to eventually replace it. On the one hand, he helped those inexperienced young Bolsheviks who were not yet properly guided by Marxism-Leninism, and on the other hand, he demoted those who refused to part with their deviating "renewing" views, which were nothing more than throwing Marxism-Leninism overboard as something "outdated".

"The training of Party leaders is a very difficult matter, it takes years, 5 to 10 years, more than 10. (...) Leaders cannot be trained by means of books. Books help to make progress, but they do not create leaders. Leading workers mature only in the course of the work itself." (Stalin: 'The Twelfth Congress of the R.C.P.(B.)' in: 'Works', Volume 5; Moscow; 1953; p.223; English Edition).

And if one wants to advance towards communism, they not only need new ideas, a rejuvenating communist theory that illuminates this new stage of struggle, but also a communist cadre, which one must equip with this theory, but, as Stalin taught, only the cadre of sacrificial work, the cadre that actually **grows** into a **communist** cadre during the years of struggle for the further construction of socialism towards communism.

"Have not the youth and the old guard always marched in a united front against internal and external enemies? Is not the unity between the 'old ones' and the 'young ones' the basic strength of our revolution? What was the object of this attempt to discredit the old guard and demagogically to flatter the youth if not to cause and widen a fissure between these principal detachments of our Party? Who needs all this, if one has the interests of the Party in view, its unity and solidarity, and not an attempt to shake this unity for the benefit of the opposition?"

(Stalin: 'The Discussion' in: 'Works', Volume 5; Moscow; 1953; p.396-397; English Edition).

Stalin fought not only against the swamp of revisionists but also against those who turned to the swamp.

This is not simply a matter of interpreting Stalinism. Stalinism accepts nothing in good faith. Stalinism does not exclude critical application and development, but presupposes them. Stalinism must not be obscured by formalism and dogmatism. Thus there were people who, under the guise of Stalinism, took leave of his revolutionary spirit and sent him to exile, not to Siberia, but worse still, to the study. If the disciples of Stalin were guilty of this, one cannot hold Stalin accountable or even justify "de-Stalinization". **Stalinists do not reject criticism of themselves, but only criticism from opponents of Stalinism.** The Stalinists wanted to remain consistent Marxist-Leninists by developing the basic theses of Marxism-Leninism in accordance with the changing conditions of socialism and with the given characteristics of the post-war period and by expanding the theory of dialectical materialism and the economic doctrine of Marxism-Leninism. The opponents used Stalinism to smuggle in their anti-Marxist-Leninist ideas in all areas of social life. The revisionists used eclecticism for their "de-Stalinization". This eclecticism was then celebrated by the revisionists as a "great contribution to the further development of Stalinism". **History has proven that after the emergence of Stalinism, every other ideological current that appeared with socialist slogans had to degenerate into a *reactionary* current, into anti-Stalinism, in the course of the class struggle. One could not build communism without relying on Stalinism, without consolidating and developing Stalinism in the struggle against its enemies.**

Lenin said that: "Every opportunist is distinguished for his adaptability..." (Lenin as quoted by Stalin: 'The Discussion' in: 'Works', Volume 5; Moscow; 1953; p.395; English Edition). **Isn't that what we Stalinists do? Undoubtedly we Stalinists do it too, the question is only the adaptability to what? The difference between the adaptability of the opportunists and that of the Stalinists is quite simply that the opportunists are characterized by the ability to adapt communism to capitalism, while for the communists the ability of adaptation is to adapt the teachings of communism to the changing conditions of the proletarian class struggle in the best possible way.**

And the opportunists of the Stalin Era? They distinguished themselves by adapting Stalinism to the needs of the restoration of capitalism.

The opportunism in the face of the two-front struggle was that the opportunists began to adapt to the two-front struggle of the Bolsheviks, and not only to master this adaptation to perfection in high Stalinism, but to bring themselves into possession of this instrument to beat the Stalinists with their own weapon. It was Khrushchev who was able to make perfect use of this instrument to conquer the power of revisionism.

When we examine the class struggle in the late Stalinist Era in concrete terms, we must logically examine how the Bolshevik method of conducting the class struggle was used at that time and how that struggle was conducted. The Bolshevik method of class struggle consists, as we all know, above all in leading the *ideological two-front struggle*, and **this two-front struggle cannot be limited to the ideological class struggle alone, but that it was fought on all the battlefields of class struggle without exception.**

"Now we cannot *first of all* defeat the Right danger with the help of the 'Lefts,' as was the case in the history of our Party, and *then* the 'Left' danger with the help of the Rights. Now we have to wage a fight on both fronts *simultaneously*, striving to defeat both dangers..." (Stalin: 'Fourth Conference' in: 'Works', Volume 5; Moscow; 1953; p.324; English Edition).

"Among Communists we are neither Lefts nor Rights, we are simply Leninists. Lenin knew what he was doing when he fought on two fronts, against both the Left and the Right deviations in the communist movement." (Stalin: 'Questions and Answers' in: 'Works', Volume 7; Moscow; 1954; p.192; English Edition).

"...when Lenin fought the Russian 'ultra-Lefts' and utterly routed them, in our midst, too, there were people who accused Lenin of Rightism, of having swung to the Right. But all the world now knows that Lenin's position at that time was correct, that his standpoint was the only revolutionary one, and that the Russian 'ultra-Lefts,' who were then making a show of 'revolutionary' phrases [and clothe him in revolutionary 'Stalinist' phrases – Author's note], were in reality opportunists." (Stalin: 'The Fight against Right and 'Ultra-Left' Deviations' in: 'Works', Volume 8; Moscow; 1954; p.8-9; English Edition).

We Stalinists have become aware that this two-front struggle in the late Stalinist Era was fiercer than ever before in the entire history of the Bolshevik Party, and that today, after more than 50 years, there are still "hidden" enemies who have so far gotten away scot-free with the slogan. "Stop thief!"

If Stalin had still been able to do it, his "Short Course" of 1938-53 would have been supplemented and completed. Stalin left us Stalinists the legacy of making up for this, and we have not yet managed to complete this work successfully. Yes, until 1953, with this date, with Stalin died and so did the Bolshevik Party of Lenin and Stalin, **and with 1953 the glorious history of the CPSU (B) ended.** As long as we have not completed the "Short Course" **of 1938-1953**, this means that we have not yet turned our defeat against modern revisionism on this battlefield into a victory. But there are a number of outstanding comrades who have already made good contributions to this, and we are sure that we will soon have put the tedious puzzle together to complete **Stalin's history of the CPSU (B) by 1953 after all.** This work is still ahead of us in Albania, where the **history of the PLA also ended with the death of Comrade Enver Hoxha.** However, it was written under the leadership of Enver Hoxha only until 1980. Since Enver Hoxha died in 1985, there are still 5 years of party history missing, which has to be written by us Hoxhaists. It will also take great efforts to unravel the course of the two-front struggle until the restoration of capitalism. The fact that we have not yet mastered all this says a lot about the true state of the present Marxist-Leninist World Movement, says a lot about the actual influence of modern revisionism, says a lot about how bitter this struggle still has to be fought.

Let us stick with the two-front struggle. When the opportunists of the USSR were still able to appear openly, it was still relatively "easy" to determine, see through and expose their positions. Conversely, in those days it was also relatively "easy" for the opportunists to see through the Bolshevik tactics of the two-front struggle, to adapt to them and to subvert them. But when they were so weakened that they could no longer afford to appear openly, when they were completely forced into illegality, the opportunists were no longer allowed to openly attack Stalin's General Line, but were condemned to use it as their shield, and this meant that they had been forced to build communism if they wanted to remain unrecognized, which considerably limited their counter-revolutionary work. With time however, the counter-revolutionaries mastered the changed claviature of the two-front struggle better and better, so that they conquered position after position, with great sacrifice of course because Stalin had to fight against the counter-revolutionary activities not only with the greatest skill but also with the greatest severity. Many actually shied away from continuing their counter-revolutionary subversion activities, but there were enough who continued them, not least under pressure from the outside, from the imperialist West.

The two-front struggle against Stalin was **conducted underground** in the late Stalinist Era. **Only**

after it appeared here and there on the surface did things come to light, it was exposed and fought against, only to go underground again and reappear elsewhere. The cat and mouse game of the counter-revolutionaries makes it so difficult for us today to historically locate and continuously follow the underground front line. **This work is made more difficult by the fact that some historically active comrades made mistakes in correctly distinguishing between "friend" and foe.** There, revisionists were identified as "Marxist-Leninists" and vice versa, Marxist-Leninists were branded as "revisionists". We ourselves do not exclude ourselves from these mistakes. Sooner or later such a thing takes revenge. Thus, our opponents do not only pursue our lack of principled standpoint in the anti-revisionist struggle with malicious joy, but they exploit our weaknesses against us. The basic rule is:

"(...) the Right deviation in communism signifies (...) a tendency of a section of the Communists to depart from the revolutionary line of Marxism.

"(...) Consequently, a victory of the Right deviation in the Communist Parties of the capitalist countries would lead to a development of the conditions necessary for the preservation of capitalism." (Stalin: 'The Right Danger in the C.P.S.U.(B.)' in: 'Works', Volume 11; Moscow; 1954; p.233-234; English Edition).

"The Rights always raise their head in a period of growing crisis. That is a general law of revolutionary crises. The Rights raise their head because they are afraid of a revolutionary crisis and are therefore ready to do everything in their power to drag the Party back and not allow the growing crisis to develop." (Stalin: 'Speech in the French Commission' in: 'Works', Volume 8; Moscow; 1954; p.108; English Edition). That also applied to the period of the growing Cold War of the Anglo-American imperialists.

"Expulsion is not the decisive weapon in the struggle against the Rights. The main thing is to give the Right groups a drubbing, ideologically and morally, in the course of a struggle based on principle and to draw the mass of the Party membership into this struggle. That is one of the chief and most important means of educating the Party in the spirit of Bolshevism. Expulsion must come, if it is really necessary, as a natural result of the ideological rout of the enemy." (Stalin: 'The Communist Party of Czechoslovakia' in: 'Works', Volume 7; Moscow; 1954; p.66; English Edition).

"The capitalist elements are fighting not only in the economic sphere; they are trying to carry the fight into the sphere of proletarian ideology, trying to infect the least stable detachments of the Party with lack of confidence in the possibility of building socialism, with scepticism concerning the socialist prospects of our work of construction, and it cannot be said that their efforts have been entirely fruitless." (Stalin: 'Questions and Answers' in: 'Works', Volume 7; Moscow; 1954; p.166-167; English Edition).

"(...) a group of 'ultra-Lefts' which keeps repeating the old slogans in a schoolboy fashion and is unable or unwilling to adapt itself to the new conditions of the struggle, which demand new methods of work. Hence we have the 'ultra-Lefts,' who by their policy are hindering the Party from adapting itself to the new conditions of the struggle and from finding its way to the broad masses of the (...) proletariat. Either the (...) Communist Party breaks the resistance of the 'ultra-Lefts,' and then it will be on the high road to winning over the majority of the working class; or it does not, and then it will make the present crisis chronic and disastrous for the Party." (Stalin: 'The Fight against Right and 'Ultra-Left' Deviations' in: 'Works', Volume 8; Moscow; 1954; p.2; English Edition).

"Can we tolerate putrid diplomacy, the slurring over of errors, in questions of the ideological struggle in the Party and the political education of the masses? No, we cannot. We should be deceiving the workers if we did. (...) There is only one solution, and that is to expose the errors of the 'ultra-Left' leaders, and in this way help honest revolutionary workers to take the right road." (ibid; p.8).

"Yes, these are practical revolutionaries, for they place the essence of the matter above the form." (Stalin: 'Thirteenth Congress of the R.C.P.(B.)' in: 'Works', Volume 6; Moscow; 1953; p.30; English Edition).

People who are actually convinced that they are **further** developing Marxism-Leninism would never tolerate the (in)freedom to let the old views exist and maintain them even further **alongside** the new ones. In this way old views can never be overcome. There were a lot of people in late Stalinism who were, **"(...) continuing to work in the old, limited, metaphysical way with methods that were obtained dialectically."** (Engels: 'Anti-Dühring' in: 'Collected Works', Volume 25; London; 1987; p.113; English Edition).

Marxist-Leninists develop Marxism-Leninism further by adapting it to the real, changing conditions of the struggle. What does it mean to adapt? Does the Marxist-Leninist adapt Marxism-Leninism evolutionarily by always quantitatively **INSERTING** new things to the old? No, Marxism-Leninism is not an eclectic teaching. Marxism-Leninism is a revolutionary doctrine which rejuvenates itself only to the extent that it overcomes its obsolescence in the struggle of opposites, in how much courage it mustered to free itself from old doctrines. **In 1958, this was criticized by the revisionists as "one-sidedness". Wanting to "prove" the "Stalinist one-sidedness" of Marxism-Leninism in this way means nothing else but to replace Marxism-Leninism by eclecticism.** The revisionists made use of the method of "peaceful coexistence" between dialectical materialism and idealism, which Shdanov had exposed in Alexandrov's "Textbook of the History of Philosophy". There, the philosophers in history were praised to the skies, with only a few critical remarks at the end, taken from Marxism-Leninism. Until 1958 the revisionists "only" denied the names Stalin and Zhdanov, but formally "recognized" their CC resolutions of 1946-1948.

The Bolshevik method of replacing the old with the new is called criticism and self-criticism. The opportunists limited themselves to interpreting the path from socialism to communism, propagating the evolutionary self-course of socialist development. Stalinism, on the other hand, illuminated this revolutionary path. The Stalinists went the illuminated path, understood it as a qualitative change (not to be confused with the "qualitative leap", which is not the only form of transformation from quantity to quality, but we will go into this later).

The further development of Marxism-Leninism, that is, to raise it to the level of the actual changes in the development of society in a revolutionary way - that is Stalinism is, or in Stalin's words: To understand the Marxist-Leninist theory, it means being able to develop it and move it forward. New understandings must **LIBERATE themselves from the old understandings through criticism and self-criticism in struggle. Here, a struggle between the old and new views takes place. Here, a **CLASSICAL STRUGGLE** against bourgeois remnants in the consciousness of advanced socialist society takes place, which the workers are not only involved in, but take the leading position. Simply excluding the working class and the masses from the philosophical discussion, from the elaboration and development of Bolshevik theory or to let them "only marginally sniff it" requires a consistent class struggle so that revolutionary theory is not separated from the revolutionary class. Here the **TWO-FRONT STRUGGLE** between regression and progress in the socialist society itself takes place! And it is precisely this struggle that Stalin led in the period of building communism after the Great**

Patriotic War until his death in March 1953. From this point of view and only from it, one can see who was really a Stalinist at that time, what was Stalinist and who merely hid behind the mask of "Stalinism" to help bring victory to the restoration of capitalism.

Marx said this about Hegel's dialectics: "It must be turned right side up again, if you would discover the rational kernel within the mystical shell." (Marx: 'Capital' in: 'Collected Works', Volume 35; London; 1996; p.19; English Edition).

And what did the modern revisionists make of it? They turned Marx upside down, trying to return to bourgeois ideology unrecognized. **They restored the dialectics of Hegel by turning back the Marxist dialectics to hide the core of their revisionist degeneration in a Marxist-Leninist shell! In the revisionist "theory", the real relationship of Marxism-Leninism is turned upside down, the mirror image is taken for its most original form and therefore needs a restorative, reactive reversal (this is a reference to Marx and Engels' "On Dialectics"). Just as modern revisionism relates to Marxism-Leninism, Hegelian dialectics relates to Marxist dialectics.**

Marxism-Leninism can never be adapted to the changed reality, communist existence can never DETERMINE communist consciousness, if this consciousness refuses to throw outdated ways of thinking, outdated formulas overboard, if it does not ruthlessly separate itself from habits that were once dear to it. In short: if the old consciousness is not completely **replaced** by the new consciousness, the Stalinist consciousness. There is no other way to bring communist being and communist consciousness into harmonious agreement. The better we succeed in achieving this goal of harmonization, the stronger communism is in the struggle against its enemies. And so, even in the two-front struggle, the struggle against the Right and "Left" is brought into harmony, without forgetting that there is a main front and a secondary front, that their dialectical reversal is recognized at the right moment and handled accordingly.

Now, the question of Stalin has been clearly answered that the harmonization of the revolutionary forces and revolutionary conditions is not a final, rigid process, but that it is a permanent dialectical process, that both the revolutionary forces and revolutionary conditions of a historical transformation of their role as an obstacle and driving force, are subject to their interaction, that in harmonization the identity and the struggle of opposites plays an important role, that harmonization is an objective process, which we approach through knowledge and adaptation to its laws, but only relatively, no more and no less.

"When one reads and rereads the works of our leaders, their writings and speeches, then this or that chapter, this or that hint or sentence, this or that thesis always gains new meaning in the light of our practice. Just as the geologist cannot exhaust all the treasures that lie in the bosom of our country, we too are constantly finding new ideas in the works of our great teachers." (Zhdanov: "Illustrative Material of the History of the C.P.S.U.(B.) - Short Course"; Berlin; 1954; p.101; Translated from German).

What did the ideological two-front struggle of Bolshevism look like under late Stalinism?

First of all, we must realize that everything we have said above about the development of Marxism-Leninism in general also applies to the ideological two-front struggle against the enemies of the Soviet Union, against the anti-Stalinists. With the progress of the socialist society, with the transition to communism, there was also a change in the two-front struggle, it adapted to this development, adopted new forms of struggle and discarded outdated forms without giving up its essential character, its aim to ideologically beat the enemies of the Soviet Union. If Beria's aim was to make this two-front struggle superfluous and to undermine it through pure elimination, through state administration, then Stalin's aim was to put the two-front struggle on a higher level in order to

avert the new dangers that had appeared in the Soviet Union since the end of the war in a Bolshevik manner. The fact that Comrade Stalin's personal intervention was necessary to combat the dying of Marxism-Leninism and the emergence of idealistic, reactionary phenomena shows what a theoretically critical state the USSR was in after the war. The sad results of the theoretical journal "Under the Banner of Marxism" are known to everyone (fight against the incorrect line of Deborin).

The dangers loomed from two ideological directions:

Firstly, it was the persistence of old formulas, clinging onto them, the fear of throwing them overboard and letting them go, which brings the dogmatists on the scene. For it is they who make a virtue of this error, of this weakness, by justifying their insistence on dogmas under the guise of "defending the principles of Stalinism".

"Marxism does not recognize invariable conclusions and formulas, obligatory for all epochs and periods. Marxism is the enemy of all dogmatism." (Stalin: 'Marxism and Problems of Linguistics'; Peking; 1972; p.53; English Edition).

The dogmatists occupied influential posts in many institutions and formed around their intellectual "leaders" an **Arakcheyev regime** (dogmatists at "house power"), which Stalin brought to light and smashed it to smithereens [Count Arakcheyev established a regime that characterized an entire era of unbridled police despotism and military arbitrariness in the first quarter of the 19th century. **And there was no one in the USSR who revived the Arakcheyev regime like the aristocratic secret service agent Beria**]:

"It has brought out, in the first place, that in linguistic bodies both in the centre and in the republics a regime has prevailed which is alien to science and men of science. The slightest criticism of the state of affairs in Soviet linguistics, even the most timid attempt to criticize the so-called 'new doctrine' in linguistics, was persecuted and suppressed by the leading linguistic circles. Valuable workers and researchers in linguistics were dismissed from their posts or demoted for being critical of N. Y. Marr's heritage or expressing the slightest disapproval of his teachings.

"It is generally recognized that no science can develop and flourish without a battle of opinions, without freedom of criticism. But this generally recognized rule was ignored and flouted in the most unceremonious fashion. There arose a close group of infallible leaders, who, having secured themselves against any possible criticism, became a law unto themselves and did whatever they pleased." (ibid; p.29-30).

These scholastic "elite schools" claimed to have leased Marxism-Leninism. They alone felt authorized to interpret and construe Marxism-Leninism correctly. Stalin castigated them as book scholars and Talmudists. **With it they consciously organized and prevented new Stalinist ideas from breaking through so that they could turn into a guidance for revolutionary action. Dogmatists, in the time of late Stalinism they were criminal, selfish and privileged saboteurs against the revolutionization of Stalinism, and were restorers of bourgeois sciences.** Their crime was preserving Stalinism. And by trying to decide what and how something is and is not allowed to be used, they tried to snatch Stalinism from the hands of the revolutionary masses and their revolutionary vanguard party, thus condemning it to die, liquidating it, **depriving the dictatorship of its intellectual power. Marr was rehabilitated by the revisionists in 1957 [sic!!]** and Stalin was firstly accused of "dogmatism" and secondly of "interfering" with the discussion and "interrupted it with his cult of personality". The separation of the philosophical work from the practical activity of the CPSU (B), the blatant withdrawal from life were completely revealed as the basis of the errors on the philosophical front during the **philosophical discussion of 1947**. Stalin

reminded the philosophers anew of the radical error in their work, which they were not able to overcome despite the instructions given to them earlier. This was particularly true of the journal "Under the Banner of Marxism", which the CPSU (B) had worked hard to produce, especially in 1931, but failed completely during the war and even died in 1944.

It is fundamentally wrong to believe that "in war there are more important things than philosophy". Of course, in a military situation, philosophy moves back into the military ranks and there were quite a few Soviet philosophers who exchanged their philosophical weapons with military weapons, but philosophy is indispensable as the intellectual weapon of military warfare and, as on all war fronts, has its task to fulfill on the "philosophical front". There is no situation of class struggle in which the philosophy of Marxism may simply disappear from the scene. That is philosophical capitulation. This is completely contrary to the Marxist worldview, and the reasons are probably well known and do not need to be named here. **Even Stalinism itself finally had to develop under the conditions of the struggle against the encirclement by bourgeois ideology, there was also a "Stalingrad on the philosophical front"**. In other words, the Great Patriotic War was of course also an ideological war, just as the subsequent Cold War was a war against Stalinism on the ideological-philosophical front. We Stalinists today are fighting against the entire philosophy of the bourgeoisie, which has a much longer tradition than the Marxist one. We are in the midst of a war against bourgeois philosophy, which cannot be destroyed with light weapons, but with heavy artillery. We need only look at the "front line" of anti-Stalinism on our philosophical battlefield to see what kind of enemy we Stalinists are dealing with. The question "Which one?" Stalinism or anti-Stalinism? is far from being decided. On this front, we still have great battles ahead of us until we defeat anti-Stalinism, not to mention the victory over all bourgeois philosophy.

Stalinism was, so to speak, the basis and the lever of the theory of world revolution, a guide to action, a guide to the liberation of the world proletariat from the bourgeois consciousness, and through its further development it still is today, of course. The defense of Stalinism was, so to speak, also a foreign ideological-philosophical war of the USSR against the imperialist aggressors, a struggle to defend the ideological interests of the world proletariat.

Every retention of outdated Marxist-Leninist formulas and schools exposes every new Marxist-Leninist initiative, every new Marxist-Leninist thinker after the Second World War to a **perishable rotting process**, a jungle where the only way to clear the way was with a machete. Many revolutionary forces were swallowed up by the jungle of dignitary schools in late Stalinism so that they could not develop their social power and had to wear a muzzle. Standing up against the established academic schools was tantamount to heresy and high treason and could mean the loss of one's own existence, could cost one their head. The bureaucratic views of Marxism-Leninism were a typical expression of this rotting process of Marxism-Leninism at that time, an expression of its increasing ossification and institutionalized independence, **its separation from the masses. The ideological disarmament of the masses was the greatest danger for the existence of the USSR after the Great Patriotic War.** This was a weakness of the Party that Stalin was the first to recognize. And it was precisely this weakness that was useful in preparing the seizure of power by the modern revisionists to carry out the restoration of capitalism **without revolting masses. Stalinism loses more and more of its importance the more it is withdrawn from the masses, the more it is moved from the streets and factories to lecture halls and study rooms.**

And it was Stalin who blew away the dust that had settled on Marxism-Leninism to form a dangerously thick layer during the period of late Stalinism. **Stalin placed himself protectively before all innovators, before all revolutionary forces in all areas of social life, who were hunted down like heretical criminals by the scholastic academies, by the professional communists and by the Inquisition in the state scientific institutes.** But this is only one front which Stalin fought on. What is the second front?

The second one, the other front, which was directed against Stalin and the CPSU (B), was the replacement of the dialectical materialist way of thinking by the metaphysical way of thinking of the bourgeoisie in the revision of Marxism-Leninism necessary for the adaptation to the realization of the construction of communism. This means in simple words that the retrograde elements of the Soviet society had to sell the adaptation to its reactionary ideology as "the further development of Marxism-Leninism". These backward revisionist ideas were praised as "the further development of Marxism-Leninism" by the backward elements of the Soviet society. These backward revisionist ideas were praised in a conformist way as a contribution of "newness", as "creative ideas" for the construction of communism. If these reactionary elements wanted to pursue the restoration of capitalism, they needed a second front to cultivate their revisionist views behind Stalin's back, to replace his communist General Line step by step with their backward, bourgeois ideology. Stalin led a struggle on the second front against **the adaptation of Leninism to revisionism, against the restoration of bourgeois ideology. In the struggle against formalism, the formalists threw the principles of Marxism-Leninism overboard.** Stalin thus rejected Marr's accusations of "formalism" against Marxist linguistics, which the revisionist Marr wanted to elevate his "new doctrine" to a "Marxist" linguistics with. In all fields Stalin led a determined fight against all the deviations that violated the principled loyalty to Marxism-Leninism and borrowed from the old revisionist chiefs. **He led the fight against all those who regarded Stalinism as something "outdated", who felt "persecuted, constricted, patronized and abandoned by Stalinism", who longed for their liberation from Stalinism through bourgeois ideology, who hated Stalinism and wanted to finally get rid of it. Stalin turned against bourgeois "modernism", which was not accidentally spread by the West.** This is where the two-front struggles against cosmopolitanism, Zionism etc., can be classified, which we will discuss later.

It would be a little too simplistic and schematic if **the older Soviet generation** were to focus more on the danger of formalism, the ossification of Marxism-Leninism, the rusting of their old revolutionary fighting spirit, their tiredness in the class struggle, their persistence in well-worn tracks, while the danger among **the younger generation** was expressed rather in the inexperience of Marxism-Leninism, its not yet sufficiently developed firmness of principles, its lack of discipline, its flirting with the West, its "peaceful coexistence" and the temptations of the restoration of capitalism. But the famous "spark of truth" in such generational influences will certainly not be denied. In any case, it has not remained unknown to us Marxist-Leninists that it was the Trotskyites who demagogically exploited the permanent artificial fomentation of the generation conflict to weaken the unity between leaders, Party and masses. We assume that this was no different in late Stalinism. In any case, it cannot be denied that the **two-front struggle** also had something to do with averting the attempted division of the **common front of the generations** (competition between the cadres of the "old guard" and the cadres of the young guard). Certainly, the generational difference was one of the many other manifestations of late Stalinism, but the argument that this was the real cause of the restoration of capitalism is not at all plausible.

"The question of generations is a secondary one." said Stalin in the argument with Trotsky. He opposed Trotsky's view as follows:

"Only those who regard our cadres as a closed entity, as a privileged caste which does not admit new members to its ranks; only those who regard our cadres as a sort of officer corps of the old regime which looks down on all other Party members as 'beneath its dignity,' only those who want to drive a wedge between the cadres and the younger Party members—only they can make the question of generations in the Party the pivotal question of democracy. The essence of democracy lies not in the question of generations, but in the question of independent activity, of members of the Party taking an active part in its leadership." (Stalin: 'Thirteenth Congress of the R.C.P.(B.)' in: 'Works', Volume 6; Moscow; 1953; p.237-238; English

Edition).

The **ideological two-front struggle** was directed against **objectivism** on the one hand and against **subjectivism** on the other. Stalinism takes the view that the objective and subjective should not be metaphysically opposed, but that both form a unity, whereby (objective) being determines (subjective) consciousness (harmonization of the objective and subjective factors in the construction of "communism in one country"). Objectivism and subjectivism are the two sides of a bourgeois coin, which falsified and distorted the teachings of Stalin, the teachings of Marxism-Leninism, especially in the late Stalinist Era: the objectivists underestimated the subjective factor and overestimated the objective factor in the teachings of Stalin. The subjectivists overestimated the subjective factor and underestimated the objective factor in the teachings of Stalin.

First, there's objectivism: Objectivism denies communist partiality. In the late Stalinist Era, the **objectivists** held the view that in the phase of building communism, in the phase of dying classes, the ideology of Marxism-Leninism was transformed into an ideology "above the classes" and dissolved. The objectivists made the mistake of ignoring the special conditions in the construction of "communism in one country", that the class struggle would continue as long as there were classes in the encircling capitalist countries that were fighting a class struggle against the Soviet Union. Only on the world scale of communism does Marxism-Leninism cease to be the ideology of the working class, when there is no longer a working class. Objectivism, this specific feature of bourgeois ideology, was present at the time of the replacement of feudalism, when bourgeois ideology presented itself as an ideology "above the classes" which reflected the entire "people's interest". To this day the bourgeoisie denies the class character of capitalist society precisely with the help of objectivism. Behind objectivism in the USSR was the "justification" that the ideology of the working class had become "worthless" and "superfluous", since in "communism in one country" there was supposedly no class struggle at all. Objectivism denies the intensified struggle between dialectical materialism and idealism, as it continues to exist until the end of the Communist era. Zhdanov condemned objectivism of the late Stalinist Era as the main danger, as a reduction in the importance of the partiality of Marxist science.

Secondly, there's subjectivism. Subjectivism denies the importance of the objective maturation of communism. Subjectivism is the opposite of Stalin's doctrine of the unity of objective possibilities and active purposeful activity of the Soviet people as a decisive factor in transforming the possibility of communism into the reality of communism. The subjectivists doubted Stalin's teaching that the activity of the Soviet people not only transforms possibility into reality, but also prepares possibility as such. The subjectivists spread what they wanted to understand or thought they understood under Stalinism, especially what they thought the masses should understand by it, namely a subjectivist teaching that was incapable of conveying objective truth to the Soviet people, if only because an objective reality supposedly did not exist. Their lack of confidence in the transition to communism was based on their lack of confidence in socialism. They arbitrarily underestimated or overestimated Stalinism in order to distort the reflection of the really existing Stalin Era. Communism corresponds to the objective truth, which we are relatively close to. Stalin turned communism "in itself" into communism "for us". Subjectivism denies the objective truth of Stalinism and that we are approaching communism. In the late Stalinist Era, Soviet society had a great interest in the scientific determination of the objective social processes and regularities of communist construction, which Stalin was able to satisfy excellently in writing and in action. The Party led the ideological struggle against subjectivism and brought it to light in order to destroy it. One cannot separate Stalinism from Stalin who developed his doctrine in the real class struggle and one cannot idealize Stalinism. Stalin was the leading subjective factor of the real

revolutionary, social changes in the USSR that he had founded. The source of Stalinism must not be sought in Stalinism itself, but in the conditions of the communist life of Soviet society, in its real existence, of which Stalinism is a reflection.

An example of the subjectivism of that time was the term "material incentive" used by revisionist economists as the "driving force" of socialist productivity. Behind this subjectivism were all kinds of capitalist forms of narrow-minded selfishness and a limited, vulgar consumer ideology. Another example: Subjectivism, the exaggeration of the subjective factor of the personality of the Bolshevik leader, is also hidden behind the personality cult. The ideas of the subjectivists were the wishful thinking of elitist groups, which did not correspond to the real situation of late Stalinism at all. However, they presented their ideas, opinions and views as "in agreement" with Stalinism, although they were far from the revolutionary masses. The subjectivists tried to impose their views on Soviet society and to falsify and deny Stalinism.

Stalin's ideological-philosophical two-front struggle was an attack against the remnants of capitalism in the consciousness of the Soviet people. He waged an offensive war against the remnants of lazy bourgeois ideology not only in the consciousness of the masses but also in the consciousness of the Party, the state and the army. He also waged this offensive struggle externally against obscurantism and reaction abroad, in all its manifestations.

Stalin accurately identified the main danger in the late Stalinist Era: The main danger that led to the threatening growth of the revisionist forces was the reduction of revolutionary theory, the reduction of the role of the party as the revolutionary vanguard in the building of communism, the reduction of the role of the revolutionary cadres who decide everything when the theoretical road to communism is illuminated, the program of building communism, the five-year plan is worked out and established. Political activity was monopolized in the hands of small leadership groups, while the Party as a whole was not called upon to carry out leading political work. Therefore, the Bolshevik character of the Party was violated. The underestimation of the development of Stalinism could only lead to the reduction of the role of the Bolshevik Party, just as, conversely, the reduction of the Bolshevik Party also led to the underestimation of the development of Stalinism. It was Stalin who opposed this threatening development.

Stalin taught that the "left" and the right opportunists worked hand in hand, that both appeared together and had to be fought together accordingly. While the "left" opportunists hid their right-wing ideas behind the teachings of Stalin, the right opportunists openly represented their bourgeois thinking. They did not dare to openly attack the works of the classics of Marxism-Leninism, which is why they began to develop their ideas undisturbed on the shallow "front" of the borders, where they were no more conspicuous than "provincial philosophers". But when the revisionist trial balloon was launched in a city as big as **Leningrad**, the pain threshold was crossed and the revisionist onslaught on the center had to be stopped **as well as** the attack of the revisionists **within the center** on the Stalinists. Only in this way can the so-called "Leningrad Affair" be judged ideologically correct. What took place in Leningrad on the front of political economy, on the cultural front, took place almost parallel, at least immediately afterwards, to the Mingrelian Conspiracy. There is an ideological-political connection there that cannot be overlooked.

In the **two-front struggle against great power chauvinism and local nationalism**, the main danger was great power chauvinism, so to speak, while local nationalism was only really brought about and counter-cultivated by the spreading of great power chauvinism. In the **two-front struggle against the bureaucratic centralism of the USSR and the bureaucratic decentralism of Leningrad**, the revisionist **main danger** emanated from the Moscow center **itself**, provoked and even challenged it from there. If one wants to judge the "Leningrad affair" correctly, then one must

not make the mistake of confusing the main and secondary danger, one must not **divert** from the main danger (**Beria and Malenkov were behind it, which one must not protect!**) Without the escalation of the power of bureaucratic centralism in the center of the USSR, there would also not have been a "Leningrad Affair", at least not in its historically materialized dimension.

The **dogmatization of Stalinism** is the disguised variant of "de-Stalinization", its first phase, still during the lifetime of Stalin, the "de-Stalinization" under the conditions of Stalinism in power. At the same time, the struggle against Stalinism was also connected with a disguised "criticism" of dogmatism, the struggle against dogmatism in words, in order to hide behind them in reality for its further practice.

The half-open "de-Stalinization" was something that the enemies of the Soviet Union tried to stimulate during their lifetime. With the de-ideologization under the slogan "freedom of science", they thus tried to decouple the dictatorship of the proletariat, to condemn it as repressive, as disturbing political interference in the "further development of science". This was a variant which the reactionary elements of the intelligentsia tried to restore the old privileges of the intelligentsia with, that is, to transform the non-antagonistic contradictions of workers and peasants into antagonistic class contradictions. It was an attack on the dictatorship of the proletariat under the leadership of the reactionary elements of the intelligentsia. Their aim was to restore capitalism...

In short, the ideological two-front struggle of Stalinism was directed against narrow-mindedness, ossification and entrenched tracks and against the revisionist degeneration of Stalinism through reconciliation with and flirtation with bourgeois ideology, which was pinched by these two sides and thus threatened to be strangled. What is important here is to understand that this two-front struggle was paralyzed by the different revisionist factions in their own particular way: The two-front struggle is conducted in words from the respective positions of the revisionist factions, so to say, from all positions they tried to beat the Bolshevik two-front struggle with its own weapons. This was a rather complicated process, which is difficult to understand today. The whole thing is like a puzzle. The law of the two-front struggle states that the struggle against it is not only intensifying, not only differentiating and branching out, but is also being fought with ever more hidden cards, to the same extent as the two-front struggle of Stalinism is intensifying, differentiating and branching out, and also disguising itself in order to expose the masquerade of the revisionists, in order to overrun the revisionists of their disguised crimes and strike them on the head. Stalinism teaches that the Bolshevik two-front struggle does not gradually decrease until it finally dies out completely, but that it must inevitably increase in intensity and complexity, that it must be fought under the conditions of the dictatorship of the proletariat with ever more bitterness, determination and consistency, even by illegal means, so that it can die out at all, in accordance to the general teachings and laws of class struggle under socialism.

Let us take Stalin's vigilance campaigns, which are already mentioned in the 13th Volume of his works. These campaigns were also an expression of the two-front struggle. The Right did not have much to do with this. They were not allowed to feel addressed themselves. They only participated in the campaigns half-heartedly: In words, they were "vigilant" but in deeds, they let them fizzle out and covered up for the counter-revolutionary elements, or adopted a conciliatory, neutral attitude towards them. The "Left" shouted "treason! Betrayal" They went overboard in their alleged work of "unmasking" and terrified the Soviet people, spreading distrust among them. Behind their denunciation was not only their typical burgeoning careerism of the time, but they also cleverly distracted attention from their own crimes and delivered innocent victims to the knife. There was no trace of the unmasking of true enemies of the people. The reactionary elements of the "left" and "right" aligned themselves and used the vigilance campaigns together against the Marxist-Leninists, against the revolutionary forces of the Soviet peoples, against the laborers and the

Bolshevik Party. The Stalinist CC had to lead a principled and determined two-front struggle against the counter-revolutionary phenomena that appeared in the vigilance campaigns. This can be documented by numerous CC resolutions.

We have studied the struggle of Stalin, as it is written in the 13 Volumes, for decades, but have failed to apply this two-front struggle to the late Stalin Era, especially to the time shortly before his death. There the two-front struggle disappears in the fog of conspiracy. The fact that documents on this were kept in secret at the time or were later destroyed should not be used as an excuse for our omissions. We Marxist-Leninists have to exercise self-criticism here and make up for what we have failed to do.

This two-front struggle between the Stalinist General Line and the revisionist line, which was developing behind it in secret, raged back and forth before it finally won over Stalin, over Stalinism. The aged theoretical dignitaries formed a terrorist front against the restorers of Marxism-Leninism, whom the further advancing Soviet society had produced a huge number of excellent cadres from below. The old had "grown stuck" in their chairs and the new ones could not remove them. Here, too, is the two-front struggle: Separating the wheat from the chaff in the "old" and separating the wheat from the chaff in the "new" in order to forge a united revolutionary front of the new and the old against the counter-revolutionary front of the old and new reactionary elements. The counter-revolutionary forces, the backward elements from the layers of the intelligentsia, which weakened Marxism-Leninism in every way, were the ideological stick holders of modern revisionism, the bourgeois ideology of the new ruling bourgeoisie of the Soviet Union after Stalin's death.

Stalin was aware of the fact that after the practical reconstruction of the war damage, a nation cannot do without theoretical thinking if the Soviet Union wants to regain the level of science. Raising the level of Marxism-Leninism was a task that the Bolshevik Party itself had to work out for itself, a task that a Bolshevik Party must never, frozen in its own passivity, delegate to any state institute because the Party must not only guard revolutionary theory like the apple of its own eye, but must also develop it further with the help of democratic centralism, with the help of the Bolshevik principle of criticism and self-criticism, naturally making use of both the support from outside, from the masses, and carrying revolutionary theory into the revolutionary movement with the help of its Bolshevik agitation and propaganda, in order to draw again from the newly gained experience of the masses in applying the revolutionary innovations of theory. The Party is the leader of this dialectical process of developing revolutionary theory and this role must not be diminished. The party is the guardian of the Marxist-Leninist theory:

"The power of the Marxist-Leninist theory lies in the fact that it enables the Party to find the right orientation in any situation, to understand the inner connection of current events, to foresee their course and to perceive not only how and in what direction they are developing in the present, but how and in what direction they are bound to develop in the future.

"Only a party which has mastered the Marxist-Leninist theory can confidently advance and lead the working class forward.

"On the other hand, a party which has not mastered the Marxist-Leninist theory is compelled to grope its way, loses confidence in its actions and is unable to lead the working class forward.

"It may seem that all that is required for mastering the Marxist-Leninist theory is diligently to learn by heart isolated conclusions and propositions from the works of Marx, Engels and Lenin, learn to quote them at opportune times and rest at that, in the hope that the

conclusions and propositions thus memorized will suit each and every situation and occasion. But such an approach to the Marxist-Leninist theory is altogether wrong. The Marxist-Leninist theory must not be regarded as a collection of dogmas, as a catechism, as a symbol of faith, and the Marxists themselves as pedants and dogmatists.

"(...) Mastering the Marxist-Leninist theory means being able to enrich this theory with the new experience of the revolutionary movement, with new propositions and conclusions, it means being able to *develop it and advance it* without hesitating to replace — in accordance with the substance of the theory — such of its propositions and conclusions as have become antiquated by new ones corresponding to the new historical situation." (Stalin: 'History of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union – Short Course'; Tbilisi; 2017; p.495-497; English Edition).

"It is essential to realize the incontestable truth that a Marxist must take cognizance of real life, of the concrete realities, and must not continue to cling to a theory of yesterday..." (ibid; p.501).

What would have become of the Party of Lenin and Stalin, of Leninism, if Stalin had shied away from touching the letter of Leninism, if he had lacked the theoretical courage to drop one of the old conclusions about the possibility of the victory of "*socialism in one country*" and replace it with new conclusions, corresponding to the new historical situation, about the possibility of the victory of "*communism in one country*"?

What would become of Stalinism if it had not been developed further by us, if the Comintern/ML had shied away from touching the letter of Stalinism, if it had lacked the theoretical courage to drop one of the old conclusions about the possibility of the victory of "*communism in one country*" and replace it with the new conclusion about the possibility of the victory of world communism, corresponding to the globalized revolutionary situation of the world proletariat? Can we close our eyes to the collapsing world capitalism in the face of the current world capitalist crisis? In the face of the new world revolutionary situation arising from this, can we still call ourselves Stalinists if we are afraid of realistically considering the possibility of the victory of world communism?

It was clear that Stalin's communist initiative stirred up and brought to the surface everything that had gradually been deposited on the theoretical ground of socialism in the USSR, a mud and morass that made revolutionary, scientific thinking breathless and threatened to suffocate it. The Central Committee had to take several decisions and take tough action to build a new cultural front. This cultural front opened the class struggle against the restoration of idealism. The late Stalinist Era was an era of cultural revolution, a struggle to create a communist superstructure, to which many Bolshevik leaders such as comrade Zhdanov fell victim. The assassination of Zhdanov by Beria expresses the sharpness which the counter-revolution responded to the Cultural Revolution with.

It was the beginning of a **historical period** when, **firstly**, Marxism-Leninism was already battered but strong enough not yet to be defeated and, **secondly**, modern revisionism was on the advance but still too weak to replace Marxism-Leninism. **This coexistence of two opposing ideologies, this transition from one aggregate state to the other, was anything but peaceful coexistence, it was a fight to the death, the moment of the leap to world socialism or the plunge into the darkness of the sole dominance of world reaction. It was a turning point over the decision to let Stalin's General Line of letting Marxism-Leninism win over the globe, to continue consistently or to stop halfway, to capitulate and turn back to capitalism.** The unity of Marxism-Leninism, its ability to survive, consists in its internationalism. Dividing and breaking this unity consisted in the conversion to nationalism, to great power chauvinism, to the nationalization of Marxism-Leninism

in order to prevent its progressive internationalization. **It is the Marxist-Leninist World Movement, the world proletarian force released by it, which decides the future of socialism. Its circumcision to the Soviet Union had to lead to its downfall.** When Stalin and Zhdanov directed against the ideological invasion of the imperialist West and built the bulwark of Soviet patriotism on the ideological front, the nationalists found a new source of inspiration to **restrict** Marxism-Leninism to its national importance for the Soviet Union, to adapt it to nationalism and to break its internationalist spirit. They tunneled under the Stalinist protective wall against foreign bourgeois ideology in order to enhance the domestic Russian bourgeois ideology, make it presentable and allow it to flow in, and **as a side effect to throw overboard everything progressive from abroad, much to the detriment of the Soviet Union. Here it becomes clear how the counter-revolution adapted to the Bolshevik two-front struggle, both internally and externally, in order to turn it against itself. It was a struggle of the forces of internationalization of Stalinism and the forces of nationalist, bourgeois isolation of the Soviet Union.**

The globalization of world imperialism won over the globalization of socialism. The defeat of the globalization of socialism sealed the defeat of "socialism in one country". The forces of world socialism historically proved to still be too weak to triumph over the forces of world imperialism in the first battle. The end of the Stalin Era thus became the new beginning of the era of world socialism, which is still going through a difficult and protracted birth and still has to go through painful processes. The current world crisis of capitalism is currently acting as a midwife. World socialism will see the light of day in the not too distant future and Stalinism will turn its defeat into a victory.

"De-Stalinization" took place in two stages.

However, it had gone to Beria, all in one go. He arbitrarily overrode party decisions to build a Stalin museum in Volynsko and transformed it into a children's home. What is more important now, a children's home or a museum? Beria was clever and calculating, because in reality he was not interested in a children's home or a museum, but in combining things in such a way that he could take advantage of them and erase the memory of Stalin within the Soviet peoples. He always justified the arbitrary disregard of party decisions by actions "which there was no objection against", because the revisionists basically wanted to get away from Stalin's cult of personality. Beria was never a Marxist in his nature, but he understood how to make use of Marxism. From his bureaucratic and pragmatic point of view, if he would like to clip the wings of the two-front struggle by state order, he saw it as a millstone around his neck to enforce his interests. The Khrushchevites were quite different. They could not and would not do without the two-front struggle against Stalinism. Beria waged his own "two-front struggle", the **Berianist two-front struggle**, namely to base himself on the front that had the greater power at the given moment, regardless of whether it was revolutionary or counter-revolutionary. The main thing was that it would help him advance on his career ladder. **He was an unprincipled man through and through, but he was an unprincipled man of a very special kind, someone who made unprincipledness his calculating principle. He was unprincipled, not because he was convinced of the lack of principles, but because he camouflaged himself with the respective "steadfastness of principle" of the ruling power in order to conquer it with his own principles. In English: He had the "gift" of being able to bet on the "right horse" with ice-cold calculation every time he saw the right moment to change to another horse.** The time of Menshevism in power had come, but Beria had not yet brought it about, so that with his lack of principles, with his Menshevism, he dug his own grave far too early. His anti-Stalinism was too far ahead of its time. **Therefore, Beria's Menshevism survived the Menshevik Beria.**

At first the modern revisionists were naturally aware that the colossal life's work of Comrade Stalin

could not be banished from the hearts and minds of the Soviet people overnight. This was completely illusory and objectively impossible. They had nothing at all to oppose it and had to limit themselves to disposing of the cult of personality they had practiced, step by step, behind closed doors. Only after the 20th Party Congress could they finally drop their shells and begin the formal "de-Stalinization". Shortly after Stalin's death, the new Kremlin Tsars adorned themselves with the laurels of Stalin's achievements, they credited themselves for his merits.

Molotov, in his report on "The International Situation and Foreign Policy of the Government of the U.S.S.R.", presented at the meeting of the Supreme Soviet of the USSR on **February 8th, 1955** had actually managed **not to mention a single word about Stalin's foreign policy**, let alone even mention the name of Stalin from his mouth, as if he had never existed, Bulganin did mention the name of Stalin **once** in his speech as Chairman of the Council of Ministers on **February 9th, 1955**, but he fully supported Molotov and Khrushchev. On the other hand, **Khrushchev, of all people**, was the one who, in his speech at the Plenum of the Central Committee of the CPSU on **January 25th, 1955 (sic!)**, "New Successes in the Development of the National Economy of the USSR", continued to make use of the cult of personality, such as, for example: "Instructions of the brilliant Lenin and Stalin, the faithful continuation of his work"; "Stalin, who developed Lenin's instructions further" (and Khrushchev even **quoted** Stalin's "Instructions" in his speech!) Or let us take, for example, this passage in Khrushchev's lecture: **"The correct line, (...) which the great Lenin had mapped out, the party under Stalin's leadership unwaveringly put into practice. It continues to follow this line consistently today and will continue to do so in the future."** (From a pamphlet published by KPD; Düsseldorf; Unknown Year; p.42-43; Translated from German). The same Khrushchev **ended** the "future of this correct line" just as "unwaveringly" one year later with the 20th Party Congress, at which he officially bid farewell to Stalin in a despicable manner not only in deeds but also in words. **The revisionists of today do not continue this anti-Stalinist line so openly: Today, quite a few revisionists try to dip into the anti-Marxist cloak that the nationalists, fascists, chauvinists etc. have put on Comrade Stalin's coat in red.**

Just as these revisionist parasites had already enjoyed the paradise of the USSR during Stalin's lifetime, which the laboring Soviet people had built up in the sweat of their brow, after his death they continued to swim on the "Stalin wave" for a while and they had only carefully stripped off their personality cult, for they no longer needed it.

If we divide "de-Stalinization" into two parts, substantively and formal, it is not because we have succumbed to a mechanistic method. "De-Stalinization" is a dialectical process, just as a "re-Stalinization" on a higher level emerges from it again and becomes Stalinization on a world scale (negation of negation). And this process will also not begin with the renaming of Stalingrad and Leningrad, but with the global anchoring of Marxism-Leninism as the ruling world ideology, as the ideology of the liberated world proletariat.

First, the revolutionary spirit rots. As is well known, the fish begins to stink at the head, then the internal organs rot and then the outer shell decays or is used to fill bourgeois contents. Beria had put "de-Stalinization" into words and action, not only openly condemning Stalin, but also eliminating those who continued the path of Stalin. He did not, however, introduce himself in front of people to shout "Down with Stalin!", but he did, for example, present himself in front of a Politburo of the CP of Hungary to condemn Stalin and his politics there and to impose his "course of de-Stalinization" on the brother parties with bureaucratic violence and blackmail. Even at the 20th Party Congress, the covers had not quite fallen off yet, it was after all still a "secret speech" of Khrushchev. Both the substantive and the formal process of "de-Stalinization" could only take place in stages.

With the 20th Party Congress the modern revisionists went over to overcoming Stalin publicly, "substantively-politically, ideologically-educatively" by seeking refuge in "Leninism" for

ideological "de-Stalinization". Every second term that fell was "cult of personality". Later, when Leninism could no longer be used because the restoration of capitalism had already progressed too far for that, they gradually dropped their mask of "Leninism" in order to openly establish bourgeois ideology, while still "remembering" Lenin in solemn moments and putting the hypocritical label of the "creative development of Leninism" on their capitalism.

We call this second stage of "de-Stalinization" the **legalized, perfectly formed "de-Stalinization"**, which can be characterized by the **removal of the name of Stalin** from the public life of the USSR, from the public life of its sphere of influence in other countries. There were no more images of Stalin, no more monuments of Stalin, no more historical sights about Stalin, no more streets and places named after Stalin, no more publications in which he was mentioned, not even the works of Stalin themselves. Companies, institutions in state, party and army, in schools, in literature and art, everything was renamed. **The name of Stalin was to be systematically and with bureaucratic thoroughness banished from the memory of the Soviet people.** Of course, after the 20 Party Congress the renaming continued. **Stalinabad** was renamed in 1962; **Stalingrad** in 1961. With the Soviet Union the things named after Lenin disappeared. Leningrad was called St. Petersburg again. We Marxist-Leninists are firmly convinced that this renaming will not help the modern revisionists, because we will emerge victorious from the struggle against modern revisionism. Once we have established socialism throughout the world, the old Lenin and Stalin names will not only be restored in Russia and Albania, not only in the former Soviet republics, in the former people's democracies, but these renaming will of course be carried out by the victorious world proletariat throughout the world. The "de-Stalinization" of the modern revisionists will be replaced by our re-Stalinization on the whole globe! How else can a Marxist-Leninist understand the "dialectics of de-Stalinization" as its replacement by the global Stalinization. **Global Stalinization is the program of the Comintern/ML.**

The Hitlerite fascists had burned anti-fascist books on public pyres for propaganda purposes. Imitating this with the works of Stalin was, of course, impossible for the modern revisionists at that time, because millions of people still flocked to Stalin's coffin to mourn. The brainwashing of the modern revisionists took place as an agonizing and humiliating self-denial of the Soviet peoples. This wound in the soul of the Soviet people could not heal until today. It can only heal when the former Soviet peoples have regained their confidence in Stalinism. **Only to the extent that they understand the betrayal of the modern revisionists will they find their way back to Stalin. It is not enough that we *Marxist-Leninists* have understood this. It is our duty to help the Soviet peoples to return to the path of Stalinism, the advanced path of Stalinism on a higher ladder, in the step from their own October Revolution to their integration into the revolution of the world proletariat! No longer integrating the revolution of other countries into the October Revolution, but the other way round, integrating the overthrow of the Russian bourgeoisie into the overthrow of the world bourgeoisie! This is the Lenin-Stalinist way of the future, and to hammer it in again and again: The way ahead of us is globalized re-Stalinization.**

We must remember here that, for example, **as early as January 1951**, there were more Stalinist works among the masses than there were Leninist works. In order to get an idea of the dimension of the total number of editions, here are some impressive figures about the works of Lenin and Stalin published up to **1951**:

First Edition of Lenin's Works (1920-1926) = 2,670,000

Second and Third Editions of Lenin's Works (1925 - 1932) = 20,743,000

Fourth Edition of Lenin's Works (1941-1951) = 21,791,000

Stalin's Works (12 volumes had been published since 1946) = 10,367,000

Stalin's "Concerning Questions of Leninism" = 17,334,000

"History of the C.P.S.U.(B.) - Short Course" = 38,756,000

Stalin's "On Lenin" = 8,921,000

Total Number of Published Works of Lenin = 204,300,000 (!!!!)

Total Published Works of Stalin = 570,200,000 (!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!)

The modern revisionists could not eliminate 570 200 000 works of Stalin "overnight"! They were spread and anchored in the people! (In contrast, the Stalin works published by us Marxist-Leninists after Stalin's death seem rather small. But we promise that in the not too distant future this will soon be different again. The interest in the Stalin works is growing at the same pace as the struggle against world imperialism. The works of the classics of Marxism-Leninism will be spread a billion times under globalized socialism when Marxism-Leninism has become the ruling ideology in the world!

As long as Stalin was alive, that is, as long as power was in the hands of the Marxist-Leninists, the Trotskyites attacked Stalinism from "the left" (following the example of the Bloc of the Right and the Trotskyites). For example, Tito attached to Stalinism the predicate of "modern revisionism", "bureaucratic state capitalism", "imperialism" and "fascism", etc. We, as the Marxist-Leninist World Movement, which had developed against the 20th Congress of the CPSU, attacked the modern revisionists **as modern revisionists** only at a time when they had already come into power, while the modern revisionists attacked Stalinism already at a time when Stalin was still in power as "modern revisionists". After eliminating Stalin, after revisionism was in power, the opportunists turned 180 degrees to denounce Stalinism as "sectarianism", "leftist" opportunism and "dogmatism" etc., from right positions. In the 1960s, the Soviet revisionists regarded Stalinism as "leftist" opportunism, a current that was considered the main danger to be fought. **At this historical turning point, modern revisionism changed its fronts in the two-front struggle, the main front became the secondary front and the secondary front became the main front against Stalinism.**

Today the Berianists continue the "de-Stalinization" of Beria as follows: They try to stop the re-Stalinization by labeling us Marxist-Leninists as "dogmatists" and "sectarians" with the help of their counter-revolutionary slogan: **"Fight Stalinism and the Stalinists, with Stalin"**.

"De-Stalinization" was achieved through the interaction of the forces of collapse and the forces of deformation. Beria and Malenkov operated the wrecking ball (which was still hidden behind conspiracies, intrigues and intrigues in Stalin's time) and the deformation machinery set Khrushchev in motion. And the Berianists today? They beat us Stalinists in order to spread their bourgeois revision of Stalinism everywhere, and vice versa, they deform Stalinism in order to incite against us Stalinists. The struggle between Stalinism and Berianism will be intensified and carried out! Beria could murder Stalin, but against Stalinism the Berianists are powerless.

Consequently, the task of today's Stalinists is to ensure the cooperation of the reconstructive forces and the new formation forces of Stalinism. Everything that has proven to be good and right about Stalinism must be restored, purged from anti-Stalinism (including Berianism) and cultivated in a Marxist-Leninist manner. The application of Stalinism to our present time, this has to be ensured by

our Marxist-Leninist reformation of Stalinism. To the old, still usable building blocks only new ones have to be added, and our new, even more stable Stalinist building can be built and occupied again.

Historically, "de-Stalinization" did *not* (!) *first* begin with Khrushchev, not only with the 20th Party Congress, especially with his so-called "Secret Speech". No, only a few days after Stalin's death, the order was given to drastically reduce the mention of Stalin in the press and radio. Beria ordered a limited mourning period for 3 days. He did not allow the publication of commemorative articles as usual. There is not a single commemorative article, not by any member of the Presidium, not by anyone! The only exception to publish memorial articles of foreign party leaders was allowed to Enver Hoxha and Wilhelm Pieck.

There was even an order to wear only the portraits of Marx, Engels and Lenin at rallies, the future "3 Heads", this anti-Stalinist hallmark of all revisionist parties that followed the Soviet revisionists and still exist today. The orders for de-Stalinization came from what was supposedly Stalin's "most loyal companion", from BERIA!!! The "3 Heads" are the trademark of Beria! The "thaw period" was initiated by Beria. He was the leading head of this immediately implemented anti-Stalinist line, and not Khrushchev.

But be careful: Today's Berianists hide behind the "4 Heads" to save Beria's trademark! Beria, on the other hand, *cut off* Stalin's head to put it on himself, making a newly grafted Stalin head to camouflage the 3 Heads. That is the tactic of today's neo-revisionists, who have split into different currents but are united in their fight against Stalinism. The "thaw period" in the Marxist-Leninist World Movement after the death of Enver Hoxha was also initiated by the Berianists. Many Marxist-Leninist parties infected themselves with the newly circulated Trotskyite virus, only to end up in neo-revisionism. Less and less revolution, but more and more reformism! The majority of our Marxist-Leninist World Movement has thus gone astray and only a small remainder of upright Marxist-Leninist comrades is unfortunately left in many countries. However, it is clearly recognizable that the true Marxist-Leninists all over the world are coming together again and are working on their cooperation and unification in view of the great revolutionary tasks which face the world proletariat today.

The reform course for the restoration of capitalism of Beria was to break the restoration of capitalism in a "coup de grâce" over the knee. **Not the restoration of capitalism itself, but the way to it, made the difference between Beria and Khrushchev.** Khrushchev's "thaw" course was designed for a longer period, sometimes with detours and zigzag turns. The real impetus to turn away from Marxism-Leninism and throw Stalin's teachings, including Marxism-Leninism, into the trash can was provided by Beria with the help of Malenkov. In this respect Beria was Khrushchev's pioneer, the forerunner of modern revisionism in the Soviet Union. **Beria did not sacrifice himself for Stalin, but for modern revisionism.** Beria was even prepared to throw not only Stalinism but also Marxism-Leninism as a whole overboard, while Khrushchev chose to fight Stalinism with "Leninism".

While Beria waved unvarnished social-democratism, nationalism, social-imperialism, etc., Khrushchev initially wore the "left" garment of Marxist ideology. And so that this "left" garment could also gain credibility in the eyes of the masses, **the right-wing enemy of the Party Beria was "unmasked" by the "left"**. Without this tactical move, the so-called formal "demarcation from right opportunism", Khrushchev would not have been able to sell modern revisionism as "Marxism-Leninism" so convincingly, he would not have had a sound ideological platform from which the attack on Stalinism could have been launched, not only in the Soviet Union but also in the Communist World Movement. If Bill Bland postulated that Beria was allegedly a "Stalinist", how does it fit together that Khrushchev had not accused Beria of Stalinist "dogmatism and

sectarianism" but of right-wing opportunism? Who is wrong here, Bill Bland or Khrushchev?

Basically, this was based on Kautskyism, only that here it was not Kautsky against Bernstein, but Khrushchev against Beria, who had taken the field, in order to sell himself as a Marxist and cover up right-wing opportunism with "left-wing" phrases. **Khrushchev's two-front struggle, the "two-front struggle" against modern revisionism in the Soviet Union, was masked as "Marxist-Leninist" after Stalin's death:**

a) Berianism: right-wing, reformist, social-democratic ("revisionism");

b) Stalinism: cult of personality, dogmatic, sectarian, "left-wing opportunist";

c) Khrushchev's course: "Marxist-Leninist".

This revisionist acquisition of the Old Bolshevik two-front struggle played a key role in the development of modern revisionism as an ideological compass for "de-Stalinization", which is why we must not only memorize this scheme firmly, but also derive from it and prove the position of the revisionists before the death of Stalin! We assume that the revisionists knew and used this scheme already during Stalin's lifetime, only in a veiled and disguised form. By the way, this scheme still serves the revisionists today. Who is surprised? Here is how the Berianists present the fight against us Stalinists:

a) modern revisionists (Khrushchev, Mao, Tito, etc.);

b) dogmatists, sectarians, "leftist" opportunists (us):

c) Beria, Malenkov (Marxist-Leninists).

We must not forget, then, that both the Khrushchevites and the Berianists carried out the "de-Stalinization" under the banner of the struggle against dogmatism and sectarianism, only that one openly condemned Stalin, while the other maintained him as a cover.

Was there a two-front struggle against "de-Stalinization" ?

We are very much of this opinion, because it is a class struggle against the liquidation of Stalinism, which inevitably had to be waged against both the Right and the "Left". But where is the second front against "de-Stalinization"? Can this second front have been the front against "Stalinization"? Yes, that sounds paradoxical but dialectically, it is perfectly logical.

Let's take the example of Bolshevization for comparison. Let's remember the 7th, World Congress of the Comintern, where Dimitrov had praised his revisionist course of the popular front tactic as an expression of "Bolshevization", of all things. However, the Bolshevik course of the Comintern's popular front tactic had already been determined long ago by the resolutions of the previous World Congresses. A *change of course* brought about by the label of "Bolshevization" could therefore be nothing other than a turning away from the old Bolshevik Comintern of Lenin and Stalin. Here the term "Bolshevization" was misused to neutralize the Bolshevization as it was previously carried and anchored into the Comintern by Lenin and Stalin, to abolish it, to replace it in reality by revisionism. But one was not allowed to say such a thing openly at that time, but had to wrap it up in a phrase, had to give the new Comintern course a new name and call it "Bolshevization", in order to pass off this revisionist turnaround of the Comintern as something that was supposed to look something like a "further development of Bolshevism". "Bolshevization" of Bolshevization is therefore not to

be understood in a double sense, but as a form of abolition of Bolshevization. So what Dimitrov really wanted to achieve with this was the "de-Bolshevization" of the Comintern.

In our case, of course, this cannot be any different with "de-Stalinization". What does it mean to "Stalinize" Stalinism? Multiplying a minus with another minus gives you a PLUS. Stalinism times Stalinism = abolition of Stalinism. Ideologically, this calculation results in Stalinism multiplied by itself, which produces the opposite, revisionism. Just as one cannot "de-Stalinize" Stalinism, one cannot "Stalinize" it. But what one can and must do is the further development of Stalinism (exclusively) on the basis of Stalinism. To develop further means to raise it to such a level so that it becomes applicable again under the given global conditions and can fulfill its purpose. So we are not doing anything wrong when we strive for the globalization of Stalinism. Not "Stalinizing", but globalizing Stalinism. This, and only this, helps us further with the slogan: "To learn from Stalin is to learn to win! This slogan doesn't help at all if you learn old Stalinist doctrines by heart. As a Stalinist, you have to use your own head, but for us Stalinists, it cannot be used properly.

What had changed in the two-front struggle after Stalin's death?

If we assume that the "de-Stalinization course" of the revisionists after Stalin's death had been carried out unilaterally, without the help of a second front, then this would have been extremely risky, because Stalinism had been defeated, but was still far from being eliminated. The Stalinists offered resistance. As long as one had to reckon with Stalinism showing off and being beaten back, it was inevitable for the revisionists to keep the cardboard sign of "Stalinism" ready as a counterpart for a while. This cardboard sign was given to the so-called "Anti-Party Group" of Molotov, Kaganovich etc., in order to control the Stalinists in this "Anti-Party Group" in the function of a catch-all. This Bolshevik corpse thus formed the second front of the so-called "Stalinists". When the Khrushchevites began to weaken, the Bolshevik corpses did not set out to overthrow Stalinism, but basically they rushed to the aid of the Khrushchevites to save revisionism. Thus the first front of "de-Stalinization" and the second front of "Stalinization" complemented each other to form a common front of modern revisionism, the second front worked into the hands of the first front. We are sure that the Stalinists must have seen through this interplay and that in some way they led a Stalinist two-front struggle against both anti-Stalinist fronts. It is therefore extremely important for us today to find out who led this two-front struggle against the "de-Stalinizers" and "Stalinizers" and how it was actually waged. These are the documents which we Stalinists are interested in. But the anti-Stalinists in the West and in the East are of course in complete agreement about abstaining from them, for reasons we know. They have no interest in the truth about the real Stalinists who fought against modern revisionism after Stalin's death.

The restoration of capitalism begins with the restoration of the Party.

"De-Stalinization" did not begin only after Stalin's death, but was already prepared and carried out during his lifetime, indeed it started before Stalin even became General Secretary of the party, already during Lenin's lifetime.

The degeneration process of the Party, its attempts to restore it to a bourgeois party are things we must take a closer look at in the last phase of Stalinism. The CPSU had not degenerated until the death of Stalin, but it was already on its way there. Too many leaders took the liberty of acting with impunity and dancing on the nose of the Stalinist party. One only needs to look at Khrushchev's report on "Amendments and Additions to the Statute" at the 19th Party Congress to be

amazed that 80% of the entire report had to deal with degenerative crimes committed by party members, which would have been an impossibility in any other Bolshevik party in the world. Let us just briefly pick out two examples: In the glorious party of Lenin and Stalin, Paragraph 1 of Khrushchev's statute states that only those who "do not exploit other people's labor" can be members of the Party. This was discussed less than 40 years ago in the debate with Martov on the first paragraph. Has there ever been a Communist Party in the world that included exploiters in its party? But it is not really so far-fetched from a historical point of view, because half of its members should have been expelled from the Party at the time of Stalin, because they were already familiar with methods of exploitation and oppression, the mass dissemination of which Khrushchev himself had to admit in his report. **And indeed, already in Stalin's time there existed a parasitic stratum in Soviet society that could justifiably be called "exploiters"**. After Stalin's death, the whole system of the Soviet Union was then **transformed into a capitalist system of exploitation of foreign labor**, it was the Party itself that had completely restored capitalism and indeed disciplined itself to the decision of the 19th Party Congress, namely to dissolve itself. Another "thing of impossibility, and just as characteristic of the degenerating party, was the role attributed to Marxism-Leninism. Here Marxism-Leninism really appears only at the end of "On the Specifications of the Tasks of the Local Party Organizations" [sic!!], namely that the ideological work is underestimated and its propagation is still unsatisfactorily organized. But this is only the case with the **local** party organizations, from the local party organizations upwards, apparently not up to the top of the party hierarchy.

The highest level of the fight against dangerously increased degeneration had been reached. The decisive question at that moment was already on the agenda under item 1: Life or death of the party? Victory or defeat for Stalin. Stalin refused to capitulate until the end, he remained loyal to the Bolshevik Party, he broke all the chains of the revisionists that they tried to tie him, he tried to carry out the greatest purge in the history of the Party against the reluctance of the degenerating elements in the party leadership.

And indeed, the existence of the party was massively threatened by liquidators, the Stalinists in the period of late Stalinism still represented the dominant, the ruling faction in the CPSU, but just one faction among others, a faction which had been made more and more difficult to assert and to assert itself. **Shortly before Stalin's death, the CPSU consisted of different groupings, whose power struggles Stalin was just about able to keep under control. Basically, Stalin, in his old age, had to make a titanic effort to keep the Party clean and united. In our opinion, this was his greatest merit of his entire life. Without Stalin, the Party would have gone down the drain long ago. There was "unity", but it was a deceptive unity, a unity outwardly cemented together by Stalin, under the surface of which the struggle for decomposition among the factions was seething. For Stalin, party unity was always there for the working class, not for the Party as an end in itself. And he knew exactly that: If the unity of the Party ceases to serve the working class, it is not worth a cent for the working class, if the unity of the proletarian party turns into a unity of its degeneration, the revisionist leaders will take the unity for themselves in order to turn it against the working class.**

What is the unity in a Marxist-Leninist party worth, if it does not serve the unity of the Marxist-Leninist World Movement? What is the use of unity in a Marxist-Leninist World Movement, if it does not serve the unity of the Communist International? What is the use of the unity of the Communist World Party, if it does not serve the world proletariat, not the unity of its class? Nothing at all!

The revisionists used the unity as long as they did not believe themselves strong enough to do without it, while Stalin needed the unity in order to rein in the revisionists, to take them under his wings and to control them. Thus the unity of the Party was put to the hardest test in its

history. Each grouping wanted to use the instrument of unity to serve its own interests. The groupings did not want to "smash" it, but "only" take possession of it in order to use it as a powerful cover for the coup. If there were such a thing as a "unity" that buries a party, instead of strengthening it, under its burden, then we would be inclined not to rule this out for the last moment in the history of the CPSU (B) of Lenin and Stalin. It was as if Stalin carried this burden on his own shoulders even with his final breath:

"Do not forget that every disaccord at the top finds an echo in the country that is harmful to us, not to speak of the effect it has abroad." (Stalin: 'The Fourteenth Congress of the C.P.S.U.(B.)' in: 'Works', Volume 7; Moscow; 1954; p.402; English Edition). (This was addressed to the opposition - author's note).

In the end, what Stalin was unable to do was to smash those anti-party factions, this bustle of cliquism within the party, and restore the old Bolshevik unity on the ruins of factionalism. The only thing that prevented him from doing so was his violent death. The stronger Stalin's position became, the more the pressure of the anti-party cliques increased, and the more the question of power in the Party intensified. This was particularly evident at the 19th Party Congress, which demonstrated unity on the outside, but was already pitted on the inside. The Party was on the verge of either degenerating into revisionism or getting rid of the dangerously accumulated revisionist rust and freeing the party from its revisionist infestation.

Comrades, here is where the whole physiognomy of the Trotskyite unprincipled nature of its basic views of factionalism is revealed. Trotskyism rejects Stalinism's "claim to sole representation," but not a "Stalinist" faction when it moves within the Trotskyite rules of the game, the rules of ideological pluralism in the party, the rules of the groupings in the party. The Trotskyites thus represented an unprincipled unity in contrast to the Bolshevik unity, which is based exclusively on the foundations of Marxism-Leninism and is therefore a principled unity. But Stalin's conspirators of 1953 had definitively renounced the principled unity of the Bolshevik Party in order to destroy it. For them, Stalinism was only an empty shell behind which they carried on their counter-revolutionary activities. By its very nature, the Leninist-Stalinist Party is characterized by its monolithic unity, which **excludes** the existence of groups and factions within its ranks. Like Trotsky, the conspirators of Stalin opposed this monolithic unity of the party. They were factionists and liquidated the Party by turning it into a bourgeois party, but used its old shell to conceal their crime. They were worse than liquidators because they did not openly reveal their liquidationist intentions, but deceived the Party and the Soviet people behind their backs to make their exposure as impossible as possible.

Trotsky pretended to be a supporter of Lenin as if there were only differences of opinion with Stalin. The Berianists pass Beria off as Stalinist, as if there were only differences of opinion with Khrushchev. This is the same Trotskyite method of hiding the counter-revolutionary face.

Take Lenin's characterization of Trotsky in December 1911 and compare it to **Beria**:

"It is impossible to argue with Trotsky on the merits of the issue, because Trotsky holds no views whatever. We can and should argue with confirmed liquidators and otzovists; but it is no use arguing with a man whose game is to hide the errors of both these trends; in his case the thing to do is to expose him as a diplomat of the smallest calibre." (Lenin: 'Trotsky's Diplomacy and a Certain Party Platform' in: 'Collected Works', Volume 17; Moscow; 1974; p.362; English Edition). And Beria was just a secret diplomat of the lowest calibre.

Trotsky was for shaking up the Leninist cadre. He called for the method of coercion, where the method of persuasion (union question) was to be given priority. The 1953 Trotskyite conspirators

began the shaking (liquidation) of Stalin's cadres **from above** and then continued it **from below**.

The RSDLP's Prague Party Conference in January 1912, which Stalin also participated in, had taught that there can never again be unity between Bolsheviks and Mensheviks in one party. However, in late Stalinism, the Mensheviks built up one position after another within the Party, strengthening their factionalism in the fight against the Stalinists until they were finally able to take over the Party through a coup. They no longer needed to crush it, but it just fell into their laps with the annihilation of Stalin. Now all they needed to do was to turn or clean out the remaining Stalinists, because they already held the central power needed for this in their hands.

It was no wonder that the 19th Party Congress decided to abandon the designation "**vanguard of the proletariat**" and from now on to give itself the elitist and sectarian title: "**League of Like-Minded Communists**". The CPSU has been reduced to the level of a league (English: **Communist League**), whose meaning and purpose has nothing to do with a Bolshevik party anymore and reminds of the old times of the struggle against the founding opportunism, against the league conception of the anti-Leninists. What was hidden behind the adjective "**like-minded**" can be quickly recognized if one studies Khrushchev's report on the 19th Party Congress of the CPSU (B):

In it, Khrushchev justified the renaming of "**CPSU (B)**" to just "**CPSU**" [the criminal omission of the **(B) = Bolshevik**].

First, it had become a national party that stood above Bolsheviks and Mensheviks. This was by no means a formal act, but of political-ideological significance. By this he meant that the class struggle of the Bolsheviks against the Mensheviks must now be buried forever and that Bolshevism and Menshevism in the USSR would no longer exist for "reasons of state": "It cannot be what is not supposed to be. This was the state-imposed disarmament of the Bolshevik character of the Party, which in fact was already underway and well advanced. This was the statutory armament of Menshevism in the Party. The fact is that the fight against Menshevism, that is, the fight against the representatives of capitalism in the Party, had to be stopped, because they had conquered the majority in the Party anyway.

Secondly, with the 19th Party Congress, one was a "communist", **whether** one was a member of Bolshevism or Menshevism. Thus, the historic resolutions of the Prague Party Conference of 1912, which the Bolsheviks had formed as an **independent party** at, were tacitly repealed. Menshevism had not only become respectable, but strong enough to place itself "above the Party" and to be able to generously renounce its individuality and separation from Bolshevism by name. **It was not only Khrushchev, but in the opinion of all conspirators against Stalin, that the CPSU (B) should stop being a Bolshevik party, a party of the class struggle, forever with the 19th Party Congress. The swan song to Stalinism resounded loudly as a "hymn of praise" to Stalin. The stormy applause was no longer directed at him, the "God", but had rather become an expression of satisfaction at having "liberated" himself from Stalin, from Stalinism. And Stalin could no longer meet this provocation with the silence which he had hitherto disciplined unity with. With the 19th Party Congress, he pulled out all the stops at his disposal to oppose the liquidation of the party, so that the whole conspiratorial heap came apart and collapsed like a house of cards. Stalin had been able to strengthen his position again after the 19th Party Congress.**

If the Bolsheviks and Stalin had expelled the Menshevik pactists, the traitors to communism, from the Party, if the liquidation of the Bolshevik Party, if its transformation into a revisionist party in 1953 had not taken place at all, if the masses had asserted the dictatorship of the proletariat and continued to build communism in the USSR, world imperialism would have

been in a hopeless situation.

What should have been done after Stalin's death? We have already pointed out that after the 19th Party Congress, Stalin had prepared the Plenum of the CC, so that this question need not even be asked. Stalin had made it clear to everyone what had to be done. Well, we do not know what Stalin had instilled in the party leadership at that time.

We can only speculate. However, speculations such as "had, would, could, should," etc., etc., etc., don't get you very far.

What "would" we have done in Stalin's place?

In the years after 1953, the Stalinist forces reorganized themselves independently in order to turn the defeat by the modern revisionists into a revolutionary victory. In a party that was conquered by the revisionists, the Stalinist forces tried to exert influence. The Stalinists continue the General Line of Stalin and form a united front of resistance against the "de-Stalinization" campaign of the revisionists. Where there is "de-Stalinization", resistance must be offered, and if necessary, as an illegal organization. Stalinists call the masses to revolutionary uprising, prepare the reorganization of the socialist revolution to re-conquer the dictatorship of the proletariat. If it is no longer possible to reconquer the revisionist degenerated party, the Stalinists commit themselves to building a new Stalinist party and, if necessary, go into illegality. In any case, the Stalinists lead the class struggle against modern revisionism in their own country. They seek contact with the Marxist-Leninist World Movement abroad and cooperate with Enver Hoxha's Albania. Just as the Bolsheviks had won in the October Revolution, they completely smash the political power of the modern revisionists in a Second October Revolution and restore the power of Stalinism without Stalin.

The coup of the conspirators could have been avoided if the Party had stood united behind Stalin and given him better support in purging the conspirators, if it had not lost its Old Bolshevik party spirit. Modern revisionism is so dangerous because it conceals its liquidatory nature and does not openly oppose Stalinism, but takes it by surprise from behind.

Khrushchevite revisionism hid behind its "Marxist-Leninist critique" of Yugoslav revisionism, just like Chinese revisionism with its "Marxist-Leninist critique" of Soviet revisionism, and Berianism also hides behind its "Marxist-Leninist critique" of us Marxist-Leninists in order to split and *liquidate* the Marxist-Leninist World Movement in the name of world imperialism and replace it by a social-democratic-revisionist world movement with an "anti-revisionist face".

Khrushchev's modern revisionism was particularly dangerous because it **embodied** exactly what it pretended to "unmask" and "fight": **The mask of revisionism**, which hid behind the criticism of sectarianism, dogmatism, "left" opportunism in order to discredit Marxism-Leninism. So it says in the revisionist "History of Philosophy":

"The resurgence and spread of revisionism in the second half of the 1950s was linked to attempts by the international bourgeoisie to use the criticism of Stalin's cult of personality and the overcoming of its consequences to discredit and undermine the communist movement" ('History of Philosophy', Volume VI; Berlin; 1967; p.330; Translated from German).

It was the other way around: The "criticism of the cult of personality" was carried out in cooperation between imperialists and revisionists and "overcoming its consequences" served the common imperialist and revisionist interests to put a stop to the restoration of socialism.

the reconquest of the dictatorship of the proletariat, the return to Stalinism, the closure of modern revisionism.

The "cult of personality" and "de-Stalinization", the idolization and demonization of Stalin are two sides of the same coin. Their end justifies the means: The "elevation" to bourgeois state doctrine and its dismantling up to the opportunistic and finally, the complete abandonment of Marxism-Leninism.

End of Chapter

Chapter 2

Questions of Stalin's Personality

The "Cult of Personality" and its "Criticism" - Two Sides of the same anti-Stalinist Coin

You can think what you like about **Stefan Heym**, but on **December 21st, 1953**, he told the truth about Stalin's alleged "cult of personality", and he certainly hit the "**nail on the head**":

"And then there were those who couldn't do enough with nice adjectives. As if he needed that! The man was of such stature as a human being, as a party leader, as a scientist, historian, general and statesman that neither the dirt nor the artificial laurels that were thrown in his path even reached the soles of his shoes."

Very few comrades are aware that **Beria** had built up his own cult of personality around himself, especially in Georgia. We will come back to this when we discuss the "**Mingrelian Conspiracy**". **Beria**, Stalin's "**faithful companion**", was the greatest sycophant, hypocrite and loving servant within the Soviet Union, the "**most subservient servant**" of Stalin, the most perverse figure of the "**cult of personality**" around Stalin, one of the most skillful in using the cult of personality and the most brutal in putting anti-Stalinism into practice. He was the one who invested the most in it and profited the most from it and finally became a victim of his "**de-Stalinization**" himself. The cult of personality was **Beria's** most dangerous weapon to enforce the "**de-Stalinization**", which he immediately initiated openly and directly after the murder of Stalin. The cult of personality was the hatchet that Beria forged to slaughter Stalin and us Stalinists in order to destroy Stalinism! Beria did everything to appropriate Stalin privately, to appropriate Stalinism privately, for the purpose of world capitalist exploitation. That was the privatization of the Stalinist social order for the purpose of its exploitation and oppression. The cult of personality was the most perfidious method of "de-Stalinization". "De-Stalinization" means the elimination of Marxism-Leninism under the guise of eliminating the so-called "cult of personality".

The cult (Latin: worship of the gods) is as old as mankind itself. It was practiced even before it was divided into classes. The cult of personality (translated as: the worship of a person like a god) is thus older than the socialist society in which it was practiced around Stalin. It is even older than the class society. With cults of personality, for example, the retrograde elements of the millennia-old society have repeatedly tried to put progressive people, especially their leaders, in such a glaring light that society, in normal light, no longer sees them as their progressive people, as their progressive leaders, and even no longer recognizes itself as a progressive society. Whoever blinds the masses can blind them with it, darken their lives, disarm the masses with it, break their beliefs in the bright beam of light, and even break them. The weapons of blindness and delusion can very well be transformed into deadly weapons of class struggle. They are the same weapons of whitewashing and rose-tinted glasses, only much more sharply, as in the course of the intensifying class struggle in the Soviet Union and finally in the

whole world. What began with whitewashing and rose-colored glasses around the figure of Stalin was soon no longer enough, and increased to the instigation of an excessive, criminal cult of personality, which was spread all over the world and ended with the so-called "criticism of the so-called cult of personality" as a death sentence not only for Stalinism in particular, but also against communism in general.

What is said here about the cult of personality in particular applies of course quite generally to the cult that is practiced around peoples, masses and classes, like for example the "Proletkult" in relation to the working class. A cult is a cult. After all, it can be practiced with anything and everything, even a cult for the liberation from injustice and slavery, even a cult for the liberation from war and fascism, even a cult for the class struggle itself.

Thus class struggle is neither a demonized "specter" nor a "cult which the communists sacrifice themselves to", but the real revolutionary process of upheavals of all formations of class society. In the social formation of communism, the cult of personality, like any other cult, can forever only be read as a chapter in history lessons. The only thing communism and the cult have in common is the first letter of each term. They can no more be marked with signs of equality than the terms Proletkult and proletarian culture. Both are mutually exclusive.

One only needs to place form over substance in order to replace the old substance with a new substance unnoticed, which then gets rid of the old shell all the more demonstratively in order to take on its new form. The cult of personality around Stalin was replaced by the cult of personality around Khrushchev, after the cult of personality around Beria or Malenkov could not be enforced. The cult of personality separates and alienates the appearance of the communist world leader from his human condition, ascribing to him divine attributes which, as is well known, Marxism rejects to worship. In this way, those who have cultivated the cult of personality then provide themselves with an alibi to appear against the revolutionary leader and replace him with a fake. This is done in order to deceive socialist society, in order to lead it imperceptibly back to a capitalist society, leaving it in the belief that it is still on the "socialist path". In other words, to lead it, so to speak, "on the wrong path".

Experience teaches us enough to be very careful not to over-emphasize people, especially ourselves. Marxism-Leninism, therefore, does not turn a blind eye when the cult of personality remains "within the framework", but absolutely and strictly rejects the cult of personality. Marxism-Leninism opposes the cult of personality because it is harmful to the cause of the proletariat.

Marx and Engels already stood up against the emphasis on their own figures. Engels wrote in a letter to the Singers' Association of the Communist Workers' Education Society, Tottenham Street on November 28th, 1891:

"Both Marx and I have always been against all public demonstrations that are tied to individual figures unless a great purpose can be served by them; and most of all against those demonstrations that in our lifetime would revolve around our own figures" (Engels: 'Letter to the Singers' Association of the Communist Workers' Education Society' in: 'Marx-Engels Werke', Volume 22; p.234; Translated from German).

"(...) we (...) feel almost criminally averse to becoming popular personalities." (Engels: 'Engels to Jenny Marx' in: 'Collected Works', Volume 40; London; 1983; p.555; English Edition).

Marx and Engels vehemently opposed the cult of personality around Lassalle, the "Lassalle Cult." Marx and Engels had initiated this struggle with the result that German revolutionary social-

democracy, the German working class, separated itself from Lassallianism.

"Neither of us cares a straw for popularity. Let me cite one proof of this: such was my aversion to the personality cult that at the time of the International, when plagued by numerous moves—originating from various countries—to accord me public honour, I never allowed one of these to enter the domain of publicity, nor did I ever reply to them, save with an occasional snub. When Engels and I first joined the secret communist society, we did so only on condition that anything conducive to a superstitious belief in authority be eliminated from the Rules. (Lassalle subsequently operated in the reverse direction.)" (Marx: 'Marx to Wilhelm Blos' in: 'Collected Works', Volume 45; London; 1991; p.288; English Edition).

We do not want to conceal at this point that Engels wrote to Eduard Bernstein in 1881, two years before the death of his friend and comrade-in-arms Karl Marx:

"But there's no denying the fact and, what is more, Marx's genius, his almost excessive scientific scrupulousness and his incredible erudition place him so far above all the rest of us that anyone who ventures to criticise his discoveries is more likely to burn his fingers than anything else." (Engels: 'Engels to Bernstein' in: 'Collected Works', Volume 46; London; 1992; p.146; English Edition).

But Engels did not portray Marx as an idol to be worshiped here, but only emphasized Marx's outstanding characteristics, which is not only legitimate, but completely true. Marx is a rare type of person whom one can really give proof of genius to. **As the founder of communism, Marx is and remains the most outstanding and significant of the 5 Classics of Marxism-Leninism, followed by Lenin, without wanting to diminish the importance of all the other Classics.**

Engels expressed his great modesty, honesty and frankness with the following words, which we all know well:

"What I contributed—at any rate with the exception of my work in a few special fields—Marx could very well have done without me. What Marx accomplished I would not have achieved. Marx stood higher, saw further, and took a wider and quicker view than all the rest of us. Marx was a genius; we others were at best talented. Without him the theory would not be by far what it is today. It therefore rightly bears his name." (Engels: 'Ludwig Feuerbach and the End of Classical German Philosophy' in: 'Collected Works', Volume 26; London; 1990; p.382; English Edition).

Engels honored Marx's merits, especially in his eulogy of March 17th, 1883:

"Although the 'Manifesto' was our joint work, I feel obliged to state that the basic concept at its core belongs to Marx". (Engels; Translated from German).

Engels later expressed the idea of having "only played second violin" alongside Marx in his letter to Johann Philipp Becker of October 15th, 1884.

And Lenin commented on this:

"Engels always-and, on the whole, justly so-placed himself behind Marx. 'With Marx,' he wrote to an old friend, 'I always played second fiddle.' His love for Marx when the latter was alive, and his reverence for Marx's memory after the latter's death, were infinite. This stern fighter and strict thinker possessed a deeply loving soul." (Lenin: Frederick Engels' in: 'On Engels'; Moscow; 1935; p.14; English Edition).

As the word "cult of personality" already says, it is a special form of **cult (reactionary, cultism)**. The cult is again a term we know from **religion**. **Fideism** is a doctrine that puts faith in the place of knowledge. The fideism of the revisionists aimed at putting the belief in Stalin in the place of the belief in Marxism-Leninism. It was the intention of the revisionists to enclose Marxism-Leninism as a relic to be admired and worshiped by the masses in a shrine which the "Holy Father" Stalin was to keep watch over. Then they tried to place Stalin himself as a relic.

With the cult of personality, the revisionists put Marxism-Leninism under religious fetters.

After the defeat of the Revolution of 1905, the **Otzovists** had already tried in vain to smuggle religion into the Party in order to mourn the decline of the revolutionary movement in their theorizing prayer rooms and to draw strength from the worship of socialism. We recall Lenin's struggle against the **image of God**, his writing: "Materialism and Empirio-Criticism":

"This is typical philosophical revisionism, for it was only the revisionists who gained a sad notoriety for themselves by their departure from the fundamental views of Marxism and by their fear, or inability, to 'settle accounts' openly, explicitly, resolutely and clearly with the views they had abandoned." (Lenin: 'Materialism and Empirio-Criticism' in: 'Collected Works', Volume 14; Moscow; 1968; p.21; English Edition). (Lunacharsky called the "Anti-Dühring" a "religious economy", which caused disgust with Lenin) The Otzovists wanted to turn the Leninist party into a religious sect.)

The **connection between sectarianism and cult of personality** was not only highlighted more than 50 years ago at the 20th Party Congress of the Soviet revisionists. Lenin had already castigated the bourgeois press, which wrote on the 25th anniversary of the death of Karl Marx that Marx had **"(...) founded an anti-scientific utopia and a real 'Church' of his sectarian disciples."** (Lenin: 'An Estimate of Marx by International Liberalism' in: 'Collected Works', Volume 13; Moscow; 1973; p.492-493; English Edition).

Marx and Engels condemned the **Bakuninist "revolutionary catechism" as the "proclamation of a communism more authoritarian than the most primitive communism"**. This replacement of **"(...) the Holy Catholic Apostolic and Roman Church of the Jesuits with its arch-anarchist and pan-destructive 'holy revolutionary cause'."** (Marx; 'Bakunin' in: 'Collected Works', Volume 23; London; 1988; p.545; English Edition).

Marx and Engels quoted the Bakuninist revolutionary catechism in its entirety and then formulated the excellent following sentence: **"To criticise this masterpiece would be to weaken its comic impact."** (ibid; p.548).

"§ 1. The revolutionary is a dedicated man. He has neither personal interests, nor affairs, nor feelings, nor attachments, nor property, nor even a name. Every part of him is absorbed by one sole interest, one sole thought, one sole passion: the revolution.

"§ 2. In the depths of his being, not only in words, but in deeds, he has severed all ties with civil order and with the entire civilised world, with laws, decencies, morality, and the conventions generally accepted in that world. He is its implacable enemy, and if he continues to live in it, it is only to destroy it more surely.

"§ 3. A revolutionary despises all doctrinairism and renounces worldly science, leaving it for future generations. He only knows one science: that of destruction. For that purpose and none other, he studies mechanics [mechanisms of mass-destruction – editor's note], physics [nuclear physics – editor's note], chemistry [toxicology – editor's note], and perhaps medicine [Doctors'

Plot – editor's note]. **With the same goal, he studies living science day and night—men, characters, positions, and all conditions of the existing social order in all possible spheres. The goal remains the same: the destruction, as quickly as possible and as certainly as possible, of this foul (poganyi) order** [socialism – editor's note].

"§ 4. He despises public opinion [he shies away from and manipulates public opinion – editors note].

"(...) § 5. The revolutionary is a dedicated man. He has no mercy for the State in general or for the entire civilised class of society, and he should no more expect mercy for himself. Between him and society there is a struggle, open or concealed, but always incessant, irreconcilable, and to the death. He must accustom himself to withstand torture.

"§ 6. Strict with himself, he must be the same with others. All feelings of affection, all the softening feelings of kinship, friendship, love and gratitude must be stifled in him by a unique and cold passion for the revolutionary cause. For him, there is only one joy, one consolation, one reward and one satisfaction: the success of the revolution. Night and day, he must have only one thought and one goal—implacable destruction. Pursuing this goal coldly and without respite, he must himself be ready to perish and to destroy with his own hands all that which obstructs the achievement of this goal [sic!!!].

"§ 7. The nature of the true revolutionary excludes all romanticism, all sensitivity, all enthusiasm, and all involvement; it even excludes personal hatred and vengeance. Revolutionary passion, having become with him a habit every day and every moment, must be combined with cold calculation. Everywhere and always he must obey not his personal impulses, but whatever is prescribed to him by the general interests of the revolution." (ibid; p.545).

Bakunin drew up hit lists, which he divided into different categories of liquidation. What fits Beria's murder of Stalin and the other leading Bolshevik comrades is what we read in paragraph 18 on the "third category":

"§ 18. The third category covers a large number of highly placed brutes or individuals who are remarkable neither for their minds nor for their energy, but who, by virtue of their position, have wealth, connections, influence, and power. We must exploit them in every way possible, outwit them, confuse them, and, wherever possible, by possessing ourselves of their filthy secrets, make them our slaves. In this way, their power, connections, influence and wealth will become an inexhaustible treasure and an invaluable help in various enterprises." (ibid; p.547).

And there is still the link between **dogmatism and religion**, between the cult of personality and proletarian cult. Karl Marx declared against the **dogmatic Willich-Schapper party**, which opposed the **"Communist League"**:

"Just as the word 'people' has been given an aura of sanctity by the democrats, so you have done the same for the word 'proletariat. Like the democrats you substitute the catchword of revolution for revolutionary development,' etc., etc." (Marx: 'Revelations Concerning the Communist Trial in Cologne' in: 'Collected Works', Volume 11; London; 1979; p.403; English Edition).

And indeed, religion means nothing other than the subjugation of the masses, the subjugation

of the Party to invisible powers, which can be well **hidden behind a personified mask**. Now, in the Era of Late Stalinism, this is not some imaginary "invisible power" from a transcendental heavenly kingdom, but the **counter-revolutionary power of the restoration of capitalism** in the middle of the solid earthly ground of Soviet power! **And the counter-revolutionaries did not have to search long for the idea of the cult of personality, because with the cult of personality which the Nazis had pursued around Hitler, the same people-dumbing goals could be achieved with the social-fascist Stalin Cult.** The idea of the "**omnipotence of der Führer**" is not only based on the racial "theory", on Social Darwinism, but is also based on fascist voluntarism and other reactionary ideologies. Stalin's cult of personality was intended to express his supernatural power, which would exist **beyond** the willful control of the masses. If the Soviet people had done their utmost for the Great Patriotic War, "for Stalin," in view of the millions of victims and the destroyed homeland, they were left with war-traumatic fears for the future, circumstances that were to awaken thoughts of fate and happiness, chance and providence. **Faith in Stalin was to replace the masses' faith in themselves.** "*After Stalin, all is lost!*" In response to this **mass defeatism**, the counter-revolution wanted to make its coup "socially justifiable" in order to "raise the masses up" in their own sense afterwards.

The reactionary **occasionalism** behind the cult of personality calls on the Soviet people to submit to their "fate" and become **passive spectators in the restoration of capitalism - "Ita est, ergo ita sit."** ("It exists, therefore it is so.") Everything accepted and endured as in the time of the Russian Tsar.

From then on the Soviet people should no longer fight for themselves, **but** "for Stalin". The leaders would then **no longer be there for the masses**, but vice versa, the masses would **be there for the leaders**, they would have to **serve the state and not the state for the masses**, etc. **Marxism-Leninism would then no longer be the ideology for the liberation of the masses, but an instrument of domination which the masses have to believe (to obey and submit).** The cult of personality was imposed on the whole socialist society of late Stalinism in order to prepare the transition from socialism to capitalism.

The reactionary American "philosopher" Dewey expressed this as follows:

"In contrast, the adjective 'religious' denotes nothing in the way of a specifiable entity, either institutional or as a system of beliefs." (Dewey: 'Intelligence in the Modern World'; New York; 1939; p.1010).

Dewey made religion attractive for imperialism by demanding: "Religion belongs to **all and not only** to the church (**Globalized opium for the peoples of world revisionism - globalized opium for the world proletariat!**) Thus, religious influence was to be opened up anew even in those social strata which no longer wanted to have anything to do with the church (the restoration of religion). By the way, Dewey was an admirer of Roosevelt and that as a **social-democrat**. Dewey was praised in the highest tones by all social-democrats all over the world because he had allegedly "dealt a severe blow" to the Soviet Union and the advance of communism in the world with his pragmatic "philosophy". He was considered their "savior from communism. "Truth is everything that frees us from the 'red danger', hence the 'cult of personality of Stalin' and his 'criticism' of him is also true. And the more we convince the world of the existence of the 'cult of personality of Stalin', the truer the 'criticism' of it becomes. Only that which the masses are supposed to believe is true, namely the 'cult of personality' to the masses of the USSR and the 'criticism' of it to the masses in the rest of the world. The touchstone, the yardstick or criterion of truth is the **combination of the practical application of the cult of personality and the 'criticism' of it. Everything that we find useful against communism, that unites us against it is true.**"

The cult of personality thus became one of the first effective propaganda weapons of collaboration between revisionists and imperialists.

And Beria and Khrushchev were two anti-Stalinist wire-pullers who cultivated the cooperation concerning the "cult of personality" and its "criticism" with world imperialism until 1953, and then blew the same imperialist horn of anti-Stalinism and publicly denounced Stalin.

The main argument against Stalin's doctrine was that the conspirers did not want to see in it the further development of Leninism, but a **turning away from Leninism**, because it was supposedly **reduced** to the "authority of the figure" of Stalin. For Beria and for all the other conspirers, the Stalinist system is based on a kind of "Olympus" where Zeus arbitrarily and legally proclaims for everyone what is to be considered "truth" or "untruth" throughout the country and the world.

Here is the **materialist** view of the ancient philosopher **Heraclitus**:

"The world, one and the same out of all, none of the gods has made nor man, but it was and is and will be his eternal living fire, igniting according to measure and extinguishing according to measure." (Heraclitus, as quoted by Lenin in: 'From the Philosophical Estate'; p.276; Translated from German).

The initiators of the cult of personality presented Stalin as something like a pope who decides on the interpretation of Catholicism. "Law" and "truth" were reduced to questions of faith, to a system of lies, which Stalin had sanctioned only by his "dictatorial and selfish" authority. Their accusation that Marxism-Leninism had been degraded by Stalin to a kind of "religious doctrine" **was based on their animosity towards Marxism-Leninism.**

Marxism-Leninism teaches that the key of the teaching about socialist society, the key to understanding the Stalin Era, is not to be found in the consciousness of a single person, it cannot be traced back to an individual character, but the key lies solely in the socialist mode of production of material goods, in the class struggle. Not chance, not personality and its will played the decisive role in the Stalin Era, but it was expressed in the special socialist living conditions and was determined by the situation and interests of the workers. The conditions in the Stalin Era were created earlier and Stalin had to start from them as something given and not created by him. Only because Stalin respected the conditions of socialist development and did not violate them in his actions did he reaped his great world successes. The laws which determined the development of the USSR represented an objective reality. They worked inevitably and determined the will and consciousness of Stalin. The Stalin Era is the result of the socialist activity of the Soviet peoples under the leadership of the CPSU(B) and its leader, Comrade Stalin.

"The objective side [of the proletarian movement – editor's note] comprises the processes of development which take place outside of and around the proletariat independently of its will and of the will of its party [and the will of Stalin as its leader – editor's note], processes which, in the final analysis, determine the development of the whole of society." (Stalin: 'The Political Strategy and Tactics of the Russian Communists' in: 'Works', Volume 5; Moscow; 1953; p.63; English Edition).

This has nothing to do with the standpoint of the Objectivists, who simply ignored personality as a tiny quantity (like the "legal Marxist" Struve). Indeed, they even declared that one should run history with "depersonalized events" (Bulgakov). The Objectivists denied and fought against the subjective factor of the revolution in general. Stalin, on the other hand,

attached due importance to the subjective factor and its strengthening. Already in one of his first articles, "A Reply to 'Social-Democrat'", Stalin disseminated Lenin's doctrine of the role of the subjective factor in the revolution in the Caucasus (see Volume 1 of his Works). After the defeat of the 1905 Revolution, the Marxists fought against the philosophizing representatives who, with bourgeois individualism, mysticism and the cult of personality, tried to dissuade the masses from the revolutionary path and discredit the revolutionary party of the proletariat and its philosophy (personalism, divinization, fideism). They deified the "individual spirit" as the "real subject of history". For them, the masses had no historical role at all; indeed, they behaved ignorantly, contemptuously and arrogantly towards the history of the popular masses' liberation struggle.

Even in the view of economists, the influence of personality, people, classes and parties is not given any importance to the spontaneous movement. They are said to be unable to influence the objective economic law. The economists *metaphysically* contrast the objective factor with the subjective factor, the spontaneity of consciousness, the economic forms of struggle with the political ones, instead of aligning the subjective factor with the objective factor. In Rosa Luxemburg's work, too, there are errors that are rooted in the reduction of the subjective factor (theory of spontaneity). When the revolutionary situation *exists*, when the objective factor is fully developed, the actions of the masses, the people, the revolutionary leaders are the subjective factor that *decides* on the victory and defeat of the revolution. There can be no victorious subjective factor without the revolutionary leaders, the party, etc. As world leader of the proletariat and a Classic of Marxism-Leninism, Comrade Stalin was, is and remains one of the most outstanding subjective factors for the victory of the world proletariat.

"The subjective side comprises the processes which take place within the proletariat as the reflection in the consciousness of the proletariat of the objective processes, accelerating or retarding the latter, but not determining them." (ibid). We complement: Not only as the reflection of the objective processes in the consciousness of the proletariat alone, but as a concentrated expression in the consciousness of the party of the proletariat and its proletarian leaders, that is, what was going on within Stalin and what is going on within us Stalinists.

Whoever equates the subjective factor, the role of personality in history, with Stalin's "cult of personality", and thus slows down the objective processes, in reality opposes the necessity of the unfolding of the subjective factor for the acceleration of the world revolution, that the working class was helplessly at the mercy of the restoration of capitalism, that it was impossible to eliminate its inevitability with its own subjective power and above all with the help of Stalinism. And this is precisely what the intention of the modern revisionists with their so-called "cult of personality" after Stalin's death amounted to.

"Stalin's cult of personality" was also a **form of reactionary idealism**, or in simple terms: **Opium of the socialist people**. It is a counter-revolutionary weapon to turn Marxism-Leninism into a pure creed among the masses, like the Mao's "Little Red Book" later on. Faith in Stalin thus degenerated into recognition of his alleged supernatural "genius", a kind of superhuman who "animates" the Soviet people, watches over their destiny "fatherly" and to whom the Soviet people would have to owe obedience, reverence and worship in return. Stalin had banned religion from the minds of the Soviet people, but with the revisionist cult of personality it was smuggled back in and restored. The revisionist cult of personality was an expression of the restoration of religion in the Soviet Union.

Let us return once again to Stalin's "**Short Course**", where he ended by quoting from the **myths of the ancient Greeks**. We reshape the characters a little bit, so that we understand the cult of personality, the murder hatchet of Stalin's conspirers, more clearly:

In their socialist world the Soviet people had a famous hero, Comrade Stalin. He had a special affection for the Russian people. There was no "hero" whom he, this Comrade Stalin, could not defeat. He was considered an invincible hero. What was his strength? It consisted in the fact that every time he came into trouble in a struggle with an opponent, he united firmly with the Soviet people and the Bolshevik Party, who had elected him as their leader and trusted him. From the masses, from the Bolshevik Party, Stalin drew all his strength. But still he had his weak point: that was the danger of being torn away from the Soviet masses, from the Bolshevik Party, by the cult of personality. His conspirers took this weakness into account and ambushed him. And an enemy was found who took advantage of his weakness. It was Beria. But how did he defeat him? Beria created Stalin's image in order to lift it up into the sky, so that Stalin would be torn away from the masses and the Bolshevik Party. Then he killed Stalin and also destroyed the criminal idol. And the lesson of this "story"? The counter-revolutionaries and their dangerous weapon of cult of personality are to be crushed mercilessly and completely, therein lies the key to the invincibility of the Bolshevik leader.

The struggle against the so-called "cult of personality" not only served the seizure of power by the modern revisionists, but also the division of the communist world movement, whose leader was Stalin, with the **"de-Stalinization" of the communist world movement**. This was a useful gift from Beria to the Trotskyites who had been released from prison by himself. Beria made sure that after their rehabilitation they could regenerate and spread internationally, especially in the "de-Stalinization", to actively help spread the "criticism" of the "cult of personality". It cannot be regarded as a coincidence that the **renewed appearance of Trotskyism coincided with Beria's murder of Stalin** (and the same revival of Trotskyism with the death of Enver Hoxha was not coincidental either!) During Stalin's lifetime no one should have dared to take this daring step, for he would have been a dead man. Stalin characterized, among other things, Trotskyism as follows:

"Thirdly. Trotskyism is distrust of the leaders of Bolshevism, an attempt to discredit, to defame them." (Stalin: 'Trotskyism or Leninism?' in: 'Works', Volume 6; Moscow; 1953; p.366; English Edition). (... and like Beria to murder him in the end!).

In dialectical *reversal*, Trotskyism means as much as trusting in the leaders of opportunism, it means attempting to rehabilitate them and, as intended by the Berianists, putting them in a new "Marxist-Leninist" light, releasing them from our consciousness that had banished them or bringing them back to life as "martyrs of Stalinism" and giving them a "Marxist-Leninist" halo.

Such comrades who today *do not or no longer* consider the role played by Stalin to be of decisive importance, like the Berianists, have not only made a thorough error, but they are also diverting water to the mills of the Trotskyites, who not only deny the role of Stalin as a Classic of Marxism-Leninism, but attribute to Comrade Stalin the role of the "greatest enemy" of Marxism-Leninism. In the anti-revisionist struggle of Marxist-Leninists, the neo-Trotskyites and neo-revisionists, the Berianists come to the aid of the modern revisionists today, in order to remove their battered image by means of skinning (cosmetic surgery and rejuvenation for the aging "modern" revisionism = neo-revisionism).

Trotskyism and modern revisionism are of the **same nature**, not only with regard to the cult of personality tactic against Marxism-Leninism. Both are mortal enemies of Marxism-Leninism under the guise of "Marxism-Leninism". This was first true of Leninism at that time. Now it applies to Stalinism and not less to Hoxhaim. We must not forget that Trotskyism was forced to continue its counter-revolutionary struggle within the Marxist-Leninist World Movement illegally after Stalin had smashed its open forms of struggle in the ranks of the CPSU(B). And today the modern Trotskyites, the Berianists, continue their illegal struggle against Stalin behind the mask of

"Stalinism" in our world revolutionary ranks. **To this day, Trotskyism and Berianism have not given up its double tactic of continuing its subversive work against Lenin, Stalin and Hoxha under the masks of "Leninism", "Stalinism" and "Hoxhaism"**. It is self-evident that Trotskyism and Berianism, is particularly dangerous under the mask of the "defense of Stalin" and therefore its Marxist-Leninist unmasking and combating will continue to be of particular importance in the future (**Hard to believe, but true: Since it is hard to imagine that some Trotskyite groups, that Trotskyites in general, that the Berianists, the greatest haters of Stalin, of all people, could present themselves as the "most loyal defenders of Stalin" in our ranks in such a devious way, but that is precisely why their "Stalinist" invisibility cloak is so perfect!**). And what do we learn from this? **It is not enough to rip the "Stalinist" invisibility cloak off the faces of the Trotskyites, the Berianists. Rather, we Marxist-Leninists, for our part, must put on a Trotskyite invisibility cloak if we are to penetrate the Trotskyite and Berianist organizations unrecognized, and we must do so if we are really serious about destroying Trotskyism, about destroying Berianism. To do this, however, we must have a precise knowledge of neo-Trotskyism, we must study the Trotskyites, the Berianists, of today, not only their counter-revolutionary "theories" but also their counter-revolutionary practice, especially within our own ranks!** The Marxist-Leninist struggle for Stalin against all his Trotskyite enemies is thus far from complete or even decided. The Comintern (ML) calls on all Marxist-Leninists in the world to continue the struggle in defense of Stalin undiminished and to unite firmly, both against Stalin's open enemies and against his supposed "friends". We must not let the struggle in defense of Stalin be taken out of our hands. **This struggle for the classics of Marxism-Leninism can only be waged and ended victoriously by us Marxist-Leninists ourselves. And this can only succeed on the condition that we keep our Marxist-Leninist ranks pure from Trotskyite and revisionist influences, from Berianist influences, and take to heart the teachings of Stalin.** We must be vigilant, because it is very likely that the enemies of Stalin will choose us Stalinists of the Comintern (ML) to undermine, crack and liquidate this current ideological bulwark in defense of Stalin, all "in the name of Stalin"! The Trotskyites, the Berianists, are defaming us, the Comintern (ML) in order to defame other Marxist-Leninists from there and **replace them with the renewed ("Stalinist") Trotskyism. That is their old, declared goal. The Trotskyites have historically failed to replace *Leninism* with Trotskyism and they will also historically fail to replace *Stalinism* (note: and finally also *Hoxhaism!*) with Trotskyism.** We will see to it that any revival of Trotskyism is buried under the mask of "Marxism-Leninism". If, in so doing, we act boldly and intrepidly in the spirit of Stalin, we need not fear the "r-r-r-r-evolutionary intelligentsia," **for Stalinism was and always will be a guarantor of victory over Trotskyism**, no matter in what garb it will slip into to cover its tracks, as Beria did. The Berianists have always been successful in covering their tracks, but this is exactly what will bring them down.

It is an old trick of all those who deviate from Marxism-Leninism to hide their anti-party ideology behind people who are all too conveniently sacrificed without touching the revisionist ideology these people represented, so that this ideology can continue to "run free" unhindered. Of course, this is especially true of Beria and the Berianists.

If Beria murdered Stalin, then he has by no means been able to silence Stalinism. It is not about the figure of Stalin, but about the circumstances, about the conditions of the Stalin Era. You can remove Stalin, but this does not mean that you can eradicate either the Era of Stalinism or the roots of Marxism-Leninism. The question of individuals is not the first thing that interests us, but the current role of the leaders of Stalinism in our struggle for world communism.

The revisionist danger must not be sharpened on individuals. And so we are not primarily interested in the figure of Beria, although he is as repulsive as could be. First and foremost we are interested in the victory over Berianism, the ideology Beria used to bring the powerful

colossus, the USSR, to its knees from within.

Comrades, the bourgeoisie stereotypically places the figure of Stalin at the center of its inflammatory propaganda. Why? The bourgeoisie wants to make everything that the Soviet people had achieved in the construction of communism and in the struggle against reaction and fascism, in the struggle against world imperialism, fade into the background. This trick must not be used. We as Stalinists must not be content with refuting the accusation of the cult of personality as unfounded. It cannot be our intention to **limit** ourselves to the purification of Stalin's character. We can only restore the honor of Stalin by highlighting the great communist achievements of Soviet society, which Stalin served with all his might, a force on which we rely to achieve the goal of building world socialism. It was above all the Russian people who had taken Stalin to their hearts, who made him what he has become, the greatest leader of communism. The deep affection for the people and by the people, the revolutionary unity between the Bolshevik leader Stalin and the workers of the Soviet Union, is what we Stalinists today put in the center of the analysis of the late Stalinist Era, which the relationship between world proletariat and world Bolshevik leaders is also based on.

As a **Georgian**, Stalin was a comrade who "only" came from a border region of Russia. One can see this in a more positive light, because he came from a country that connects the Eastern and Western worlds and from a world revolutionary point of view, it is therefore an ideal location for the development of a Bolshevik leader. And this positive role of Georgia was also duly emphasized in the events of August 2008. But there were enough enemies of Stalin who hated him for the sole reason that a Georgian "rules the Russians and becomes ruler of the huge Soviet Union". "How can a Georgian, of all people, become the successor of the revolutionary Russian leader Lenin?" Stalin's enemies did not forgive him for exposing and fighting Russian Great Power Chauvinism, nor the local nationalism in Georgia, as a Georgian! He did not unilaterally stand on the Western side, nor did he unilaterally stand on the Eastern side. **Throughout his life, Stalin united the peoples of the West and the peoples of the East in their common, world revolutionary liberation struggle against world imperialism. And it is important to hold on to this honorable and glorious Stalinist tradition consistently today.** To be an "Asian" was considered an insult in Russia, and so Stalin's enemies reviled him as an "crude Asian brute", whose "rudeness" Lenin is said to have "warned" of in his alleged "Testament" ... (We will come back to what this Trotskyite "testament" is about in detail at another point). Yes, one even went so far as to claim that Stalin allegedly "Georgianized" the Soviet Union - but more about this later in the chapter on the Mingrelian Conspiracy, which turned out to be Georgianization by Beria. In English: Berianization of Stalinist Georgia or "de-Stalinization" by a Berianist Georgia.

Svetlana, Stalin's daughter wrote:

"My father loved Russia deeply all his life. I know no other Georgian who had so completely sloughed off his qualities as a Georgian and loved everything Russian the way he did."
(Alliluyeva: 'Twenty Letters to a Friend'; New York; 1967; p.119-120; English Edition).

As for the great importance of Stalin already had in the creation of the Bolshevik Party, after his death it was scaled down to silence by the Soviet revisionists. And when the Comintern (ML) comes to the public today with its brief description of his first creative period in the Caucasus, the dung buckets will not be far away, which will certainly be poured out over us "fossils of the Stalin Cult" in the near future.

The Soviet peoples, the socialist working class, the world proletariat have never accused Stalin of the cult of personality; on the contrary, he was loved and revered by the masses, was their leader, whom they trusted and who never betrayed their trust throughout his life. The accusation of the cult of personality served the traitors to shake this trust of the masses in

Stalin, to make them believe that Stalin had "abused" their trust, that the Soviet Union must "free itself" from him in order to be "saved". In reality, the accusation of the cult of personality was intended to shake and bury the masses' self-confidence in their own revolutionary, creative power, if the cult of personality was to frighten them. This was not the first time in the history of the class struggle that the bourgeoisie tried to deny the masses their destiny, to take their fate into their own hands and to build their own, a better world. Until today, the world bourgeoisie has not stopped trying to persuade the masses that they cannot change their fate as exploited and oppressed, that they are a flock of sheep whose sole purpose is to be eaten by wolves. And on behalf of the world bourgeoisie Beria took Stalin's side to get rid of him.

What was Stalin's position on the cult of personality?

For this purpose we have selected a few quotations from him, some of which are well-known, others less so, and some of which are new.

"The point is (...) a new bourgeoisie has arisen which, being unable to come into the political arena openly, is trying to breach the communist front from within and is looking for champions [!!!] among the leaders of the R.C.P.(B.). Well, this circumstance is giving rise to oppositionist sentiments within the R.C.P.(B.) and is creating the ground for an opportunist deviation," (Stalin: 'The Communist Party of Poland' in: 'Works', Volume 6; Moscow; 1953; p.280; English Edition).

"He [Stalin] believes that it is possible that 'saboteurs' are behind it in order to discredit him." (L. Feuchtwanger: 'Moscow 1937'; London; 1937; p.93; Translated from German).

This first quote from Leon Feuchtwanger probably hits the nail on the head. One of the main saboteurs was Beria.

From a conversation with Colonel Robins on **May 13th, 1933:**

"Robins: I consider it a great honour to have an opportunity of paying you a visit.

"Stalin: There is nothing particular in that. You are exaggerating.

"Robins (smiles): What is most interesting to me is that throughout Russia I have found the names Lenin-Stalin, Lenin-Stalin, Lenin-Stalin, linked together.

"Stalin: That, too, is an exaggeration. How can I be compared to Lenin?" (Stalin: 'Talk with Colonel Robins' in: 'Works', Volume 13; Moscow; 1954; p.268; English Edition).

"Stalin systematically gives credit for all the progress made to Lenin, whereas the credit has been in very large measure his own" (Barbusse: 'Stalin'; London; 1935; p.294; English Edition).

"Only later did I realise that this simplicity and modesty, this striving to remain unobserved, or, at least, not to make himself conspicuous and not to emphasise his high position, this feature was one of Lenin's strongest points as the new leader of the new masses, of the simple and ordinary masses of the "rank and file" of humanity." (Stalin: 'Lenin' in: 'Works', Volume 6; Moscow; 1953; p.56; English Edition).

And in a talk with the German writer Emil Ludwig, Stalin said:

"As for myself, I am just a pupil of Lenin's, and the aim of my life is to be a worthy pupil of his." (Stalin: 'Talk with the German Author Emil Ludwig' in: 'Works', Volume 13; Moscow; 1954; p.107; English Edition).

And indeed, Stalin remained the most worthy and greatest of all of Lenin's students until his death.

Emil Ludwig then stated:

"Marxism denies that the individual plays an outstanding role in history. Do you not see a contradiction between the materialist conception of history and the fact that, after all, you admit the outstanding role played by historical personages?" (ibid).

Stalin replied:

"No, there is no contradiction here. Marxism does not at all deny the role played by outstanding individuals or that history is made by people. In Marx's *The Poverty of Philosophy* and in other works of his you will find it stated that it is people who make history. But, of course, people do not make history according to the promptings of their imagination or as some fancy strikes them. Every new generation encounters definite conditions already existing, ready-made when that generation was born. And great people are worth anything at all only to the extent that they are able correctly to understand these conditions, to understand how to change them. If they fail to understand these conditions and want to alter them according to the promptings of their imagination, they will land themselves in the situation of Don Quixote. Thus it is precisely Marx's view that people must not be counterposed to conditions. It is people who make history, but they do so only to the extent that they correctly understand the conditions that they have found ready-made, and only to the extent that they understand how to change those conditions. That, at least, is how we Russian Bolsheviks understand Marx. And we have been studying Marx for a good many years." (ibid; p.107-108).

Emil Ludwig remained stubborn:

"Some thirty years ago, when I was at the university, many German professors who considered themselves adherents of the materialist conception of history taught us that Marxism denies the role of heroes, the role of heroic personalities in history." (ibid).

And Stalin answers just as persistently:

"They were vulgarisers of Marxism. Marxism has never denied the role of heroes. On the contrary, it admits that they play a considerable role, but with the reservations I have just made." (ibid).

But Emil Ludwig does not give up and keeps asking questions:

"Sixteen chairs are placed around the table at which we are seated. Abroad people know, on the one hand, that the U.S.S.R. is a country in which everything must be decided collectively, but they know, on the other hand, that everything is decided by individual persons. Who really does decide?" (ibid; p.108-109).

Stalin patiently gives the answer:

"No, individual persons cannot decide. Decisions of individuals are always, or nearly always, one-sided decisions. In every collegium, in every collective body, there are people whose opinion must be reckoned with. In every collegium, in every collective body, there are people who may express wrong opinions. From the experience of three revolutions we know that out of every 100 decisions taken by individual persons without being tested and corrected collectively, approximately 90 are one-sided.

"In our leading body, the Central Committee of our Party, which directs all our Soviet and Party organisations, there are about 70 members. (...) Each has an opportunity of contributing his experience. If this were not the case, if decisions were taken by individual persons, there would be very serious mistakes in our work. But since each has an opportunity of correcting the mistakes of individual persons, and since we pay heed to such corrections, we arrive at decisions that are more or less correct." (ibid).

June 1926:

"I must say in all conscience, comrades, that I do not deserve a good half of the flattering things that have been said here about me. I am, it appears, a hero of the October Revolution, the leader of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, the leader of the Communist International, a legendary warrior-knight and all the rest of it. That is absurd, comrades, and quite unnecessary exaggeration. It is the sort of thing that is usually said at the graveside of a departed revolutionary. But I have no intention of dying yet.

"(...) I really was, and still am, one of the pupils of the advanced workers of the Tiflis railway workshops." (Stalin: 'Reply to the Greetings of the Workers of the Chief Railway Workshops in Tiflis' in: 'Works', Volume 8; Moscow; 1954; p.182; English Edition).

November 12th, 1926:

"It has to be admitted, comrades, that it was Lenin, and no one else, who discovered the truth that the victory of socialism in one country is possible. Lenin must not be robbed of what belongs to him by right. One must not fear the truth, one must have the courage to tell the truth, one must have the courage to say frankly that Lenin was the *first* of the Marxists to present the question of the victory of socialism in one country in a new way, and to answer it in the affirmative." (Stalin: 'Reply to the Discussion' in: 'Works', Volume 8; Moscow; 1954; p.318; English Edition).

September 1927:

Stalin was asked: ***Could you briefly tell us what are the main disagreements between yourself and Trotsky?*** (Stalin: 'Interview with the First American Labour Delegation' in: 'Works', Volume 10; Moscow; 1954; p.124; English Edition).

Stalin replied: **"I must say first of all that the disagreements with Trotsky are not personal disagreements. If they were personal disagreements the Party would not bother with them for a single hour, for it does not like individuals to thrust themselves forward."** (ibid).

October 1927:

"And what is Stalin? Stalin is only a minor figure." (Stalin: 'The Trotskyist Opposition Before and Now' in: 'Works', Volume 10; Moscow; 1954; p.177; English Edition).

July 9th, 1929:

"We have hundreds and thousands of young and capable people who are striving with might and main to rise to the surface and contribute their mite to the common treasury of our work of construction. But their efforts are often unavailing, because they are very often kept down by the vanity of the literary 'lights,' by the bureaucracy and callousness of some of our organisations, and, lastly, by the envy (which has not yet evolved into emulation) of men and women of their own generation. One of our tasks is to break down this blank wall and to give scope to the young forces, whose name is legion. My foreword to an inconsiderable pamphlet by an author unknown in the literary world is an attempt to take a step towards-accomplishing this task. I shall in the future, too, provide forewords only to simple and unassuming pamphlets by simple and unknown authors belonging to the younger forces. It is possible that this procedure may not be to the liking of some of the snobs. But what do I care? I have no fondness for snobs any-how. . . ." (Stalin: 'To Comrade Felix Kon' in: 'Works', Volume 12; Moscow; 1954; p.120; English Edition).

"Your congratulations and greetings I place to the credit of the great Party of the working class which bore me and reared me in its own image and likeness. And just because I place them to the credit of our glorious Leninist Party, I make bold to tender you my Bolshevik thanks.

"You need have no doubt, comrades, that I am prepared in the future, too, to devote to the cause of the working class, to the cause of the proletarian revolution and world communism, all my strength, all my ability and, if need be, all my blood, drop by drop." (Stalin: 'To all Organisations and Comrades who sent Greetings on the Occasion of Comrade Stalin's Fiftieth Birthday' in: 'Works', Volume 12; Moscow; 1954; p.146; English Edition).

April 1930:

"There are some who think that the article, 'Dizzy with Success,' was the result of Stalin's personal initiative. That, of course, is non-sense. It is not in order that personal initiative in a matter like this may be taken by anyone, whoever he might be, that we have a Central Committee." (Stalin: 'Reply to Collective-Farm Comrades' in: 'Works', Volume 12; Moscow; 1954; p.218; English Edition).

Take his letter to "Comrade Shatunovsky" from August 1930:

"You speak of your 'devotion' to me. Perhaps it was just a chance phrase. Perhaps. . . . But if the phrase was not accidental I would advise you to discard the 'principle' of devotion to persons. It is not the Bolshevik way. Be devoted to the working class, its Party, its state. That is a fine and useful thing. But do not confuse it with devotion to persons, this vain and use-less bauble of weak-minded intellectuals." (Stalin: 'Letter to Comrade Shatunovsky' in: 'Works', Volume 13; Moscow; 1954; p.20; English Edition).

February 1933:

"I have received your letter ceding me your second Order as a reward for my work.

"I thank you very much for your warm words and comradely present. I know what you are depriving yourself of in my favour and appreciate your sentiments.

"Nevertheless, I cannot accept your second Order. I cannot and must not accept it, not only because it can belong only to you, as you alone have earned it, but also because I have been amply rewarded as it is by the attention and respect of the comrades and, consequently, have no right to rob you.

"Orders were instituted not for those who are well known as it is, but mainly for heroic people who are little known and who need to be made known to all.

"Besides, I must tell you that I already have two Orders. That is more than one needs, I assure you." (Stalin: 'Letter to Comrade I. N. Bazhanov' in: 'Works', Volume 13; Moscow; 1954; p.241; English Edition).

1935:

In 1935 the general plan for the reconstruction of Moscow was published. One of the designs for the Palace of the Soviets envisaged the erection of colossal statues of Lenin and Stalin. Stalin rejected this design with these words:

"We are building the Palace of the Soviets with a monument to their creator - Lenin."

Early December 1937:

In the Kremlin, Stalin found a campaign poster with his picture and an appeal: "Vote for Stalin!" He got angry:

"'That's all I need, too. If this goes on, I'll find my statue in my bed one night...' After that, all electioneering in the Kremlin was strictly forbidden. (...) Only twice in all these years did Stalin speak in the first person, including on the eve of his election on December 11th, 1937. Otherwise he always spoke of his plans and orders in the form: "We Bolsheviks, we Leninists, we supporters of the General Line. For he does not want to be in the foreground as a person, but as the embodiment of the entire Party, the entire country, the entire progressive world" (Achmed Amba, "A Person Sees Stalin"; Rowohlt; 1951; p.141, 166).

February 1938:

"I am absolutely against the publication of 'Stories of the childhood of Stalin.'

"The book abounds with a mass of inexactitudes of fact, of alterations, of exaggerations and of unmerited praise.

"(...) The important thing resides in the fact that the book has a tendency to engrave on the minds of Soviet children (and people in general) the personality cult of leaders, of infallible heroes. This is dangerous and detrimental. The theory of 'heroes' and the 'crowd' is not a Bolshevik, but a Social-Revolutionary theory. The heroes make the people, transform them from a crowd into people, thus say the Social-Revolutionaries. The people make the heroes, thus reply the Bolsheviks to the Social-Revolutionaries. The book carries water to the windmill of the Social-Revolutionaries. No matter which book it is that brings the water to the windmill of the Social-Revolutionaries, this book is going to drown in our common, Bolshevik cause.

"I suggest we burn this book." (Stalin: 'Letter on Publications for Children Directed to the Central Committee of the All-Union Communist Youth' in: 'Works', Volume 14; London; 1978; p.327;

English Edition).

1938:

"Hence the practical activity of the party of the proletariat must not be based on the good wishes of 'outstanding individuals,' not on the dictates of 'reason,' 'universal morals,' etc., but on the laws of development of society and on the study of these laws." (Stalin: 'The History of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union (Bolsheviks) - Short Course'; Tbilisi; 2017; p.159; English Edition).

"(...) not on the good wishes of 'great men', but on the real needs of development of the material life of society." (ibid; p.160).

February 1946:

"The hymns of praise to Stalin also pain the ears, it hurts to read them." Stalin: 'Answer to a letter of 30 January, from Col.-Professor Rasin' in: 'New World'; 1947; p.25; English Edition).

Here are some excerpts from Stalin's correction of the draft of the book "J.V. Stalin - Short Biography" (1947) and Mochalov's notes on Stalin's conversation with the Authors' Collective of 23 December 1946:

"There are mistakes. The tone is not good and is raised in the manner of the social-revolutionaries. All teachings up to and including every teaching about the constant factors of war come from me. It turns out that I have created a teaching about communism as if Lenin, you see, had only written and spoken about socialism and never about communism. Furthermore, it is presented as if the teaching about the industrialization of the country and the collectivization of agriculture came from me, and so on and so forth. In fact, Lenin deserves credit for having raised the problem of the industrialization of our country. This is also true of the question of the collectivization of agriculture, etc. There is much praise and exaggeration of the role of personality in this biography. What should the reader do after reading this biography? Should he fall on his knees and worship me? You do not educate people in the spirit of Marxism. We do not need idol worshipers.

"The matter is then presented in such a way that I have created the teaching on the permanent and temporary factors of war, while in every work of military history it is written about them. It may be that I have emphasized some things more strongly and definitively, but that is all." [By constant and permanent factors of war Stalin understood, for example, the strength of the hinterland, the moral spirit of the army, the number and quality of the divisions, the armament, the organizational abilities of the commanders, while among the secondary or only temporary factors was counted, for example, the moment of surprise of the fascists' attack on the Soviet Union.]

"We have the teaching of Marx and Lenin. We don't need additional teachings. People should not be educated to be slaves, but there are tendencies to do so among you. And if I no longer exist? You do not educate people to love the Party. And if I am no more, what will happen then?' Stalin asked, 'Who is this kind of expenditure intended for?' 'There are hundreds of thousands of libraries in our country. You can get nausea from such an edition.

"As for Baku, they say that there was nothing going on there with the Bolsheviks, and I just had to appear and everything changed immediately. Someone built it all up. You can believe it or not. What was it really like? It was necessary to create cadres. Such Bolshevik cadres were

formed in Baku. I have given the names of these people in appropriate places. This also applies to another period. Such Bolshevik cadres as Dzerzhinsky, Frunze and Kuybyshev also lived and worked, but they are not written about, they are missing.

"As far as the period of the Great Patriotic War is concerned, it was necessary to find capable people, appoint them to the appropriate functions and temper them for their tasks. Such people were gathered around the Supreme Command of the Red Army.

"Nowhere is it clearly stated that I am a student of Lenin. It's not understandable... only somewhere far away something about it is mentioned. I made that clear in my famous conversation with Ludwig. I am a pupil of Lenin, I went to Lenin for teaching and not the other way round. No one can say that I am not a pupil of Lenin. Lenin gave reasons and showed the way, and we have followed that given way."

Stalin's criticism of his son Vasili:

"Do you think you're Stalin? You think I'm Stalin? Stalin, that's him [pointing to a portrait]. We have a duty to stay on the ground and do the tasks our humanity dictates to us." (No citation available).

Stalin's nature, not only in his private sphere, but also in his political work, is in stark contrast to public acclaim. For Stalin himself this was an unbearable ordeal. There was not a trace of any stardom or graces to be discovered in him. Everything was simple and natural. He didn't tolerate obeisance, he loathed the cult of personality and mocked it. He never approved, encouraged or even ordered and commanded this cult of personality. This is confirmed by all those who have spoken about personal encounters with Stalin, including his enemies such as Churchill, for example.

It is clear from all these quotations that it was never his personal standpoint that he held, but always the standpoint of the Leninist Party, the standpoint of the working class, the masses, etc. The arrogance of the deserving man despised Stalin all his life. It was only with the help of the method of cult of personality that the revisionists were able to personify Stalin's standpoints according to the motto: *"You can be completely calm, this is from Stalin himself, this is what Stalin said, this is what Stalin ordered, this is what Stalin commanded, this is what Stalin banned, etc. etc."* **In this way the revisionists began to do and leave what they wanted in the name of Stalin.** With the traitorous word "Stalin" on their lips, they murdered Stalin underhand and deceived the masses' trust in Stalin in order to seize power. With the cult of personality, the axe was to fly down on Marxism-Leninism itself!

In general, one must not allow artificial contrasts between individuals and the collective, society, nor tolerate constructed contradictions between the role of the individual and the people. **The revolutionaries are not loners. They place themselves collectively at the service of the cause of the proletariat, they subordinate themselves to the needs of society, they carry out the tasks assigned to them by the Party of the working class in a disciplined manner. Revolutionaries are both students and teachers of the masses.** The working class does not tolerate any divisive antagonism between its leaders, its class and the masses fomented by the bourgeois, revisionist and Trotskyite demagogues to the detriment of the unity between the revolutionaries and the workers. Bolshevism is the revolutionary unity of socialism and the workers movement. Anti-Bolshevism is the division of this unity. Let's not forget **that both the method of formation and the corresponding method of "condemnation" of the cult of personality afterwards is a creation of the reactionary class in the struggle against the revolutionary class.** It was the vain attempts of the Soviet revisionists, who had built up this cult of personality themselves, in order to bring down Stalin with their accusation of the "cult of personality" later on all the more easily. The cult of

personality is alien to the working class, and it was no less a person than Stalin himself, to whom this cult of personality, which was organized around him with much pomp, was deeply hated and whom he himself fought incessantly from beginning to end against. In contrast to the revisionists, Stalin was capable of open self-criticism. For example, the mistakes that were made when Hitler invaded the Soviet Union:

"Our government made many mistakes."

But Khrushchev said in his criminal secret speech against Stalin:

"Everyone can err, but Stalin considered that he never erred, that he was always right. He never acknowledged to anyone that he made any mistake, large or small, despite the fact that he made more than a few in matters of theory and in his practical activity." (Khrushchev: 'Speech to 20th Congress of the C.P.S.U.'; Moscow; 1956; English Edition).

Stalin was very sensitive to hypocritical, outwardly pompous "ovations" and even reacted to them with extreme anger and rage. Thus, especially in the last part of his life, he lived in seclusion, puritanically, in a room where he worked, ate and slept, but he was always on guard to direct the destinies of the Soviet Union. He was often drawn to the South, and even when he went to Georgia in the early 1950s for convalescence, he sought the seclusion of his own figure there, but he never withdrew from his political work or even from his responsibility to the cause of the revolution, the Party, the working class. As Lenin's most loyal Bolshevik, he fulfilled this responsibility to the last breath.

"My father had unpleasant memories of his journey here because he couldn't stand the sight of a crowd applauding him and shouting 'Hurrah!' His face would twitch with annoyance each time it happened." (Alliluyeva: 'Twenty Letters to a Friend'; New York; 1967; p.201; English Edition).

Stalin abhorred personality cults, flatterers, praisers, screamers, phrasemongers, chatterboxes, blubbers and panic-makers. His logic was of irrefutable power, his mind crystal clear, his will was of steel, his devotion to the Party and the cause of the world proletariat immeasurable, his conviction of world communism unshakeable. He only wanted to be a humble, simple servant of the working class, considering himself a disciple of Lenin and that was honor enough for him.

All revisionists bred and cultivated the cult of personality in order to denigrate, discredit and destroy the prestige of the leaders of Marxism-Leninism (and thus Marxism-Leninism itself!) in the eyes of the international workers' and communist movement in the subsequent so-called "struggle against the cult of personality". This was inevitable if they wanted to transform the dictatorship of the proletariat under the guise of "Marxism-Leninism" into the dictatorship of the new bourgeoisie. The split of the communist world movement was necessary for the elimination of socialism through the restoration of capitalism and for the later transition to social-imperialism and social-fascism, was necessary to give world imperialism a "proof" of trustworthiness. They started with Stalin, then it was Enver Hoxha's and Albania's turn to be publicly discredited and condemned and thereby deepen the division in the bosom of the international communist movement. With the vulgarization of Stalinism, the followers of the cult of personality reduced Marxism-Leninism to almost nothing and thus condemned the world communist movement to passivity, to vegetating. But Comrade Enver Hoxha lifted the Stalinist banner, which the revisionists trampled with their boots. He led the struggle against the personal accusation of the revisionists. Enver Hoxha rightly said about the cult of personality:

"The cult of personality means glorifying individual personalities excessively, attributing to them supernatural qualities and attributes, making them into people who perform miracles and finally get down on their knees before them". (Hoxha; Translated from German).

"However, Khrushchev strengthened his positions and immediately attacked the so-called cult of Stalin. He intended to kill two birds with one stone: internally, to replace the «cult of Stalin» with his own cult, and likewise in the international communist movement, to ensure that he himself and no one else, was top dog, hence not Mao either. Meanwhile, Mao had hopes that after this their roles would change: Khrushchev «would be the pupil of Mao». However, Khrushchev understood the situation and took another course, shifted his rifle from one shoulder to the other." (Hoxha: 'Reflections on China', Volume II; Tirana; 1979; p.252; English Edition).

It was not the Khrushchevites but Tito who started the anti-Stalinist hate propaganda against the so-called "cult of personality".

Tito openly stated that it was not only about the cult of personality, but also about that order which "made the cult of personality possible", and by this he meant the Soviet order. And that was also one of the reasons for Beria's pacing with Tito. The accusation of the "cult of personality" had to be used to justify the slogan of "liberalization" and thus the restoration of capitalism, served as a pretext for the bourgeois revision of Marxism-Leninism, as a pretext for overcoming and liquidating the dictatorship of the proletariat, as a pretext for discrediting the Bolshevik Party. When the modern revisionists speak of Stalin's alleged "crimes", why did they not only cover and welcome them during Stalin's time, but also committed them themselves "in the name of Stalin"? Why did they cover up their crimes and blame them on Stalin? Did Khrushchev, Beria and all the other revisionist leaders ever criticize themselves, for being the main culprits in the cult of personality, for example? Their appraisal of Stalin during his lifetime was disgusting enough in itself, but the true extent of this crime becomes clear with Khrushchev's so-called "Secret Speech" at the 20th Party Congress, which he had not even held by order and decision of the Central Committee. So much for Khrushchev's understanding of the democracy of "collective leadership"? Khrushchev's Secret Speech was the appropriate cover which he could conceal his own crimes as well as those of his co-conspirers behind. The "disclosure" of "treason," "crime," and "secrets" in order to cover up treason, crime, and secrets. That was the dialectic of the double-tonguedness of the modern revisionists, that was the dialectic of the double-tonguedness of the Trotskyites and the Berianists! This is all in contrast to Stalin, who had never in his life placed himself above the Party, and who even offered the Party his resignation, his voluntary renunciation of the leadership of the party three times in his life, who did not seize power as Khrushchev had done in such a shameful way.

It was very convenient for the Khrushchevites, for the Berianists and for all the other enemies of the Soviet Union to portray Stalin as someone who decided everything on his own, "over the heads of the others", because one has to ask oneself the serious question: What were all those "heads"? When one has become aware of how many enemy heads Stalin was surrounded by, which he naturally could not trust, and when one then has to be convinced of how many Marxist-Leninist cadres he allegedly "liquidated", then one can only come to the conclusion that these "heads" carried everything on his shoulders, that these "heads" were often the reason why he had to put their condemned garbage in order. Who else could have done it? So this is not Stalin's personal fault, but first of all it was those who abandoned him and secondly those who betrayed him and stabbed him in the back.

Stalin worked day and night all his life in the service of the cause of the proletariat, as a disciple of Lenin, until his final breath.

We want to close this section of the "Cult of Personality" chapter and take shorthand from an arbitrarily selected typical sequence of a working day for Stalin, September 27th, 1935 which is a day from the time when Stalin was "only" General Secretary. During the war, of course, this looked much more concentrated, where he "incidentally" fought the Great Patriotic War:

"7:50 - Breakfast (18 minutes).

"8:10 - 'Forging Time' (planning of the course of the day with his 'pipe').

"8:17 - Walk to the office accompanied by an officer of the watch.

"8:20 - study the latest TASS news (every 8 hours); skim over the 'Pravda'.

"8:45 h Andreyev, as one of the CC Secretaries, reports on recent party events, personnel and organizational issues of the party organs

"9:25 - After Andreyev leaves, Stalin takes time to think through the complex of questions before tackling the next field of work.

"9:40 - Molotov comes to the briefing and leaves at 9:45 (on the first, third and fifth day of the week meetings of the Council of Ministers are held between 10:00 and 12:00).

"10:15 - Zhdanov arrives. Principles and ideological questions are discussed with subsequent assignments (e.g.: the visit of a cinema delegation to Chaplin).

"11:05 - Zhdanov leaves, but comes back with Andreyev and some district leaders at 11:25 to solve problems of bread deliveries

"12:07 - Stalin goes to lunch with Zhdanov (informal talks at the lunch table).

"12:47 - Stalin is in his private cabinet ("private" receptions of "various people").

"14:00 - Writing errands in his study

"16:16 - 16:48 - Molotov is there with the ministers (for finance, trade and agriculture) and is briefly interrupted in the middle by the Vice-Minister of Foreign Affairs.

"17:00 - 18:05 - The Commissar of Heavy Industry "Sergo" (Ordzhonikidze), with his deputy Pyatakoy, reports about the Stakhanovite movement (at 17:30, Professor Bardin, one of the greatest authorities of the steel industry, joins the group).

"18:08 - 18:22 - Dinner with "Sergo", Stalin's best Georgian friend.

18:25 - 19:45 - Military conference with Commissar of Defense Voroshilov and three marshals (Tukhachevsky, Yegerov, Budyonny), the army's political chief Garmarnik and the NKVD Chief Yagoda, as commander of the internal troops. In the course of which an urgent call of Molotov is postponed.

"20:00 - 20:50 - Monthly meeting of the commission for the elaboration of Stalin's "Constitution" (which is solemnly adopted on December 5th, 1936) Today, the complex of jurisprudence is discussed with Prosecutor Vyshinsky.

"21:15 - 0:50 - Politburo meeting with shorter invitations from 21 ministers and party leaders. Questions of agriculture, the navy, foreign trade, health care, the copper and lime industry, and cleaning (called the "examination of party documents") are discussed, without the interruption of coffee and snacks.

"Until 1:25 - The missing Politburo members are informed by telephone: Zhdanov (already back in Leningrad), Kosior (Ukrainian District Leader), Eiche (Siberian District Leader).

"1:30 - Stalin comes home: Reading time "in the corner" (private corner).

"After 18 hours and 35 minutes the 56 year old goes to bed." (Shortened excerpts from: Amba: 'A Person sees Stalin'; Rowohlt; 1951; p.151-158; Translated from German).

The Stalinist is a special type of Bolshevik revolutionary. How did Stalin characterize the Bolshevik revolutionary, how did he evaluate the advanced type of a communist?

"Comrades, we Communists are people of a special mould. We are made of a special stuff. We are those who form the army of the great proletarian strategist, the army of Comrade Lenin. There is nothing higher than the honour of belonging to this army. There is nothing higher than the title of member of the Party whose founder and leader was Comrade Lenin. It is not given to everyone to be a member of such a party. It is not given to everyone to withstand the stresses and storms that accompany membership in such a party. It is the sons of the working class, the sons of want and struggle, the sons of incredible privation and heroic effort who before all should be members of such a party. That is why the Party of the Leninists, the Party of the Communists, is also called the Party of the working class." (Stalin: 'On the Death of Lenin' in: 'Works', Volume 6; Moscow; 1953; p.48; English Edition).

"Things have come to a sorry pass, comrades, if the only reason why we are called old Bolsheviks is that we are *old*. Old Bolsheviks are respected not because they are *old*, but because they are at the same time eternally fresh, never-aging revolutionaries. If an old Bolshevik swerves from the path of the revolution, or degenerates and fails politically, then, even if he is a hundred years old, he has no right to call himself an old Bolshevik; he has no right to demand that the Party should respect him." (Stalin: 'The Right Deviation in the C. P. S. U. (B.)' in: 'Works', Volume 12; Moscow; 1954; p.2; English Edition).

What does Stalinism teach us about the traits and outstanding characteristics of a communist?

***"We must not become infatuated with the successes achieved, and must not become conceited."* (Stalin: 'Report to the Seventeenth Party Congress' in: 'Works', Volume 13; Moscow; 1954; p.385; English Edition).**

***"We must remain true to the end to the great banner of Marx, Engels, Lenin."* (ibid; p.387).**

***"We must be true to the end to the cause of proletarian internationalism, to the cause of the fraternal alliance of the proletarians of all countries."* (ibid; p.388).**

We are imbued with the same world revolutionary spirit as Stalin. We world revolutionaries want to be as hard, as strong-willed and as disciplined as Stalin. We want to learn from Stalin's creativity and assertiveness. We world revolutionaries follow Stalin's world politics clearly and decisively. We fight just as relentlessly against the oppressors and exploiters of the

world and smash our enemies in our own camp just as resolutely as Stalin did. We guard our unity like the apple of our eye and act in solidarity and helpfulness with one another just as Stalin used to do. Let the barkers quietly yap at us from the side of the road. They will get a kick if they try to stop us. We will not deviate from Stalin's General Line and follow his compass until we reach the socialist shore of the world, even if we have to zigzag our way, which Stalin was not spared. We take the hardest tests, the fight to the death, just as Stalin did. We do not fall into timidity when the world revolution is "delayed" or when we have to accept defeat and retreat. We learn to rein in our world revolutionary impatience and do not panic when the situation above us is threateningly coming to a head. Stalin used to say, "There is no fortress that the Bolsheviks cannot take!" Even the greatest fortress, the world fortress, will be seized by us World Bolsheviks. We'll consider all our decisions carefully and thoroughly, as carefully as Stalin did. We want to be faithful to Marxism-Leninism as Stalin was faithful to Marxism-Leninism. We remain honest to the world proletariat and are its most faithful servants, as Stalin was. As proletarian internationalists, we love all peoples of the world as the great proletarian internationalist Stalin loved them.

What is the expression of the type of the world Bolshevik today? The Comintern / ML has listed 15 characteristics of the type of a contemporary Stalinist:

The world revolutionary is guided only by one worldview, the worldview of the world proletariat. That is Marxism-Leninism, the teachings of Marx, Engels, Lenin, Stalin and Hoxha.

The world revolutionary fights for the victory of the proletarian world outlook over the bourgeois world outlook.

The world revolutionary defends world revolutionary theory, world revolutionary thought and ideals, the science of the world proletarian movement, which gives it the revolutionary direction and the revolutionary aim.

The world revolutionary leads the ideological class struggle in the spirit of proletarian internationalism against the nationalist spirit of the world bourgeoisie and against the ideology of cosmopolitanism.

The world revolutionary subordinates all political interests and aims to the highest political interest and the highest political aim of the world proletariat - the world socialist revolution.

The world revolutionary fights for one single party, for the party of the world proletariat, for the party of all world revolutionaries, the Communist International / ML.

The world revolutionary is a world revolutionary only if they fight against world revisionism and world opportunism in their own ranks of the world proletarian movement and fight for World Bolshevism.

The world revolutionary leads the political class struggle for the overthrow of world imperialism, world fascism and world reaction to the revolutionary liberation of the world proletariat from wage slavery, exploitation and oppression.

The world revolutionary fights only for one single rule, for the political rule of the world proletariat - the world dictatorship of the proletariat.

The world revolutionary leads the military class struggle of the world proletariat to the

destruction of the armed counter-revolution of the world bourgeoisie, to the violent conquest of the political power of the world proletariat.

The world revolutionary exercises iron, military discipline only against one army, the army of the world proletariat - the World Red Army.

The world revolutionary provides the world proletariat with the weapons of the world bourgeoisie to direct them against themselves.

The world revolutionary defends the world revolutionary movement only by defending the world proletariat which leads the world revolutionary movement.

The world revolutionary fights against the destructive, rotting and parasitic world of capitalism, the "*homeless, profit-greedy knave*" and for the world of a renewed socialism, for the new home of the world proletariat - for world socialism.

The world revolutionary is world revolutionary because he permanently advances and changes the proletarian world, the proletarian world him, through ruthless criticism and self-criticism.

The so-called "cult of personality" and the newly emerged Marxist-Leninist World Movement of Enver Hoxha

In 1956 the modern revisionists did not yet use the term "Stalin Cult" from their lips. They were able to withdraw behind the anonymity of the term "cult of personality" and, by means of its generalizing character, tie in with the Marxist criticism of the "role of cult of personality in history". It was quotes from Marx, Engels and Lenin behind which they hid their criticism of Stalin. However, in the register of Lenin's Works, which appeared in 1972, the term "personality and its role in history" is found, but not the term "cult of personality".

Their criticism of the "cult of personality" was therefore so dangerous because they pretended to formulate it from the "ground of Marxism-Leninism". The struggle against the so-called "cult of personality" and against its alleged "criticism of it" was duly exposed, fought and defeated by the Marxist-Leninist World Movement after the death of Stalin and especially after the 20th Party Congress of the CPSU and Khrushchev's dirty speech. It provoked the protest of the Stalinists all over the world - especially the PLA with Comrade Enver Hoxha at the head. Not least as a result of this struggle against the so-called "cult of personality", the new Marxist-Leninist World Movement has emerged and strengthened.

The clarification of the so-called "Stalin Question" only came up when those who questioned Stalin were already in power. At the time of High Stalinism there was no public Stalin Question. Especially with the so-called "Secret Speech" of Khrushchev it became the

ideological demarcation line between the modern revisionists and the Marxist-Leninists all over the world. It triggered a movement of revival of Stalinism aimed at the revolutionary smashing of revisionism in power. This was one of its greatest historical merits. The movement to defend Stalin and to revive Stalinism is the historical merit of the PLA with Comrade Enver Hoxha at the head. Only anti-Stalinists raise the "Stalin Question" and question Stalinism. And so came what had to come: this demarcation line was drawn in the struggle against the Maoists in power, against Chinese revisionism, on a higher level of the international class struggle, namely against that revisionism which in words defended Stalinism against Soviet revisionism, in order to fight Stalinism in Albania as well as in the Marxist-Leninist World Movement.

The formation of a new Marxist-Leninist World Movement basically began with Enver Hoxha's world-historical speech, which he gave at the meeting of the 81 Communist and Workers' Parties on November 16th, 1960. And that was in Moscow, in the center of the most dangerous revisionism of the world! It was a meeting where almost all revisionist leaders of the whole world were represented. Only the Yugoslav revisionists did not take part in it. And the Maoists took a half-hearted position on the so-called "Stalin Question" because they had to hide their own Chinese revisionism. Enver Hoxha said in his speech, and this is roughly equivalent to a definition of the Period of Stalinism:

"It was correct and grateful towards this glorious Marxist against whom, while he was alive, there was no one among us [underlined by the editor] <<brave enough>> to come out and criticize, but when he was dead a great deal of mud was thrown, creating in this way an intolerable situation in which a whole glorious epoch of the Soviet Union when the first socialist State in the world was set up, when the Soviet Union waxed strong, successfully defeated the imperialist plots, crushed the Trotskyites, Bukharinites and the kulaks as a class, when the construction of heavy industry and collectivization triumphed, in a word, when the Soviet Union became a colossal power succeeding in building socialism, when it fought the Second World War with legendary heroism and defeated fascism, liberated our peoples, when a powerful socialist camp was set up, and so on and so forth -- all this glorious epoch of the Soviet Union is left without a helmsman, without a leader.

"The Party of Labor of Albania thinks that it is no right, normal or Marxist, to blot out Stalin's name and great work from all this epoch, as it is actually being done. We should all defend the good and immortal work of Stalin. He who does not defend it is an opportunist and a coward. [underlined by the editor]

"As a person and as the leader of the Bolshevik Communist Party, after Lenin's death Comrade Stalin was, at the same time, the most prominent leader of international communism [underlined by the editor] helping in a very positive way and with great authority in consolidating and promoting the victories of communism throughout the world. All of Comrade Stalin's theoretical works are a fiery testimony of his loyalty to his teacher of genius, to great Lenin and Leninism.

"Stalin fought for the rights of the working class and the working people in the whole world, he fought to the end with great consistency for the freedom of the peoples of our countries of People's Democracy.

"Viewing things from this angle alone, Stalin belongs to the entire communist world [underlined by the editor] and not to the Soviet communists alone, he belongs to all the workers of the world [underlined by the editor] and not to the Soviet workers alone.

"(...) Did Stalin make mistakes? Of course he did. In so long a period filled with heroism, trials, struggle, triumphs, it is inevitable not only for Joseph Stalin personally but also for the leadership as a collective body to make mistakes. Which is the party and who is the leader that can claim to have made no mistakes in their work? When the existing leadership of the Soviet Union is criticized, the comrades of the Soviet leadership advise us to look ahead and let bygones be bygones, they tell us to avoid polemics, but when it comes to Stalin, they not only did not look ahead but they turned right round, completely backward, in order to track down only the weak spots in Stalin's work.

"(...) At Bucharest, turning to the Chinese comrades, Comrade Khrushchev said: <<You are catching on to a dead horse>>, <<Come and get his bones, if you wish!>> These references were to Stalin." (Hoxha: 'Speech delivered at the Meeting of 81 Communist and Workers' Parties in Moscow on November 16, 1960' in: 'Selected Works', Volume III; Tirana; 1980; p.157-159; English Edition).

The Albanian comrades linked the struggle against the so-called "cult of personality" with the struggle against modern revisionism, based on the teachings of Comrade Stalin and showed the deceived working class in the revisionist countries the revolutionary way out to overthrow the revisionist dictatorship of the new bourgeoisie and to reconquer the dictatorship of the proletariat, which had been established under the leadership of Lenin and Stalin. Enver Hoxha taught that the dictatorship of the proletariat is the only form of political power that is able to oppose the revisionist dictatorship of the bourgeoisie, to replace it. The restoration of socialism is today the task of the entire world proletariat, which is nothing else than the creation of world socialism under the present conditions of globalization.

The Albanian comrades have again raised the world revolutionary banner of Comrade Stalin, thus winning the sympathy and support of all loyal supporters of Stalin all over the world. New Marxist-Leninist parties have emerged, based on the Bolshevik principles of Lenin-Stalin's party building of a new type. A strong Stalinist world movement had been rebuilt and so the traitors to Stalin were exposed and attacked on a world scale with the banner of Stalin.

The Albanian comrades courageously took side with Stalin and called upon the world proletariat and the communist world movement to remain faithful to and defend the principles and teachings of Comrade Stalin, not to renounce them, not to replace them with the opportunist ideas of Bernstein, Kautsky, Trotsky, Bukharin, Tito, Khrushchev and the other renegades and to tear the mask off the face of the modern revisionists.

Subjugating, persecuting, and eliminating the enemies of the Soviet Union was not a crime and could not have been as an expression of the dictatorship of the proletariat. Lenin and Stalin taught that there was no let-up in the class struggle against the remnants of the old bourgeoisie and that they were uncompromising in their opposition to any attempts by a new privileged layer to rise above the dictatorship of the proletariat. **The revisionists, however, as is well known, abandoned the class struggle and condemned Stalin because he defended the Leninist doctrine of the inevitability of the intensification of the class struggle under socialism.** After Stalin's death, the revisionists rehabilitated the criminals under socialism. The modern revisionists used the slogan of "struggle against the cult of personality" in order to realize their counter-revolutionary aims to rehabilitate such criminals to socialism as Tito, as "Victims of Stalin" and to eliminate the revolutionary leaders who were loyal to Marxism-Leninism and followed Stalin. If Stalin had lived, Khrushchev and all the other revisionist criminals would have been punished or eliminated. Stalin was in the process of radically purifying the leadership when his murderers beat him to it. When the purge began at the end of 1948, some revisionist leaders had already been sentenced and punished with death. The other revisionists were very afraid that their crimes would be exposed and punished

at any moment. So they had no choice but to flee and seize power when their head was already on the scaffold.

Enver Hoxha said:

"He [Mao – editor's note] says that 'Stalin shot people for the most trifling mistake'. This is a slander. Stalin did not shoot people for making mistakes. On the contrary, he struggled to correct those who made mistakes and there are documents which show this is true . Stalin directed that evil-doers should be put in prison or concentration camps, and that counter-revolutionaries, traitors, spies, and the other enemies of the people should be shot for especially dangerous crimes. If he had not done this, socialism could not have been built in the Soviet Union, and Stalin would not have been on the Leninist road. Mao Tsetung is opposed to this line. He generalizes the issue and treats both those who have committed not very dangerous crimes, who certainly should not be shot, and counter-revolutionaries, in the same way. Who says that we should shoot those who have not committed grave crimes? Nobody. On the contrary, we are for correcting such people, and this is what we have done." (Hoxha: 'Some Thoughts about the Ballist 'Decalogue' Mao Tsetung' in: 'Reflections on China', Volume II; Tirana; 1979; p.383; English Edition).

The Albanian comrades courageously stood up against the modern revisionists, who raved about a period of "reign of terror", of "serious violations of socialist legality", in order to denigrate, falsify and reject the historical experiences of the dictatorship of the proletariat and of socialist and communist construction in the Soviet Union under Stalin's leadership. The Albanian comrades called on the communist world movement to continue the way of Lenin and Stalin and not to follow the way of the modern revisionists.

The Albanian comrades revealed Khrushchev's accusation of the "cult of personality" as a bluff. They were not interested in who defends the cult of personality and who fights it, as the Khrushchevites did, but the Albanian comrades were mainly concerned with the fundamental question: Should we abandon or defend Lenin's principles on the relations between the masses, the class, the Party and the leaders?

For the Albanian comrades it was clear: in order to defend Marxism-Leninism one must defend Stalin, one must attack the modern revisionist Khrushchev and his lackeys in the communist world movement, who with his accusation of the "cult of personality" really wanted to strike Marxism-Leninism.

Because of our loyalty to Stalin, the revisionists, after their defeat, were finally forced to hide again behind the mask of Stalin which they actually thought they would never have to put on again. After the Stalin statues were toppled in Albania and Ramiz Alia revealed his true counter-revolutionary face, the banner of Enver Hoxha was kicked into the dirt, the banner of Stalin's most faithful and best disciple. This was a heavy defeat for the Stalinist world movement. It split and disintegrated into a thousand pieces and the cause was of course the penetration of revisionist influence, since the struggle against revisionism had almost ceased (For example: The neo-revisionist "Declaration of Quito" of 1992).

But basically a salutary process of purging took place, whereby the upright comrades as a minority in the Stalinist world movement regained principled ground under their feet. It was clear to the upright comrades of the Stalinist World Movement after the overthrow of the dictatorship of the proletariat of Albania that one could only raise the banner of Stalin if one raised the banner of Enver Hoxha, which had been trodden in the mud at the same time.

What did this mean for the Stalinists all over the world? The Stalinists could not defend Stalin if they would not defend Enver Hoxha. The so-called "Stalin Question" was therefore inseparably linked to the so-called "Hoxha Question", especially to the fight against the so-called "cult of personality" of Enver Hoxha. Thereupon the Stalinist World Movement was equipped with the 5th Classic of Marxism-Leninism, with Comrade Enver Hoxha. This also meant a strengthening of Stalinism. This task was solved by the Comintern/ML in 2000. From that time on, the old demarcation line in the so-called "Stalin Question" was raised one step higher to distinguish itself from those revisionists who had put on the mask of Stalin in the meantime. This was a historically important step to protect Stalinism from the renewed attacks of revisionism (neo-revisionism). But this was not the end of the task. Now the Stalinists all over the world had to defend themselves against the penetration of hostile elements into the Hoxhaist World Movement. What had to be done? An ideological struggle had to be led against neo-revisionism: Hoxhaism in words, revisionism in deeds. Since its existence, the Comintern/ML fought against many neo-revisionist manifestations in order to clean the Marxist-Leninist World Movement from the garbage of revisionist and sectarian influence. These were groups which we did not all see through at first sight, but whose true nature we recognized step by step.

Today there are different currents and "schools" which try to separate Stalinism from the Marxist-Leninist World Movement and each in its own way influences the world proletariat. These "Stalinist Schools" such as the Alliance/Canada and the ISML, which we consider to be typical sectarian "Berianist Schools", strive to place the Marxist-Leninist World Movement under its high priesthood.

This "Berianist School" set out to have the last word on the events of the late Stalin Era and to distort the role of Stalin in the history of the communist world movement in its favor. The Stalinists could not allow this. They had to deal with it self-critically and lo and behold, this dangerous current within our ranks could not only be recognized, but in the dissociation from Berianism we learned with the renewed study of the works of Comrade Stalin also to recognize the basics of Stalinism much clearer, so that today we can make the "Foundations of Stalinism" available to the Hoxhaist World Movement and enrich it. Basically we owe this to the Berianists. We cannot put ourselves on the level of Stalin's "Foundations of Leninism", which is not our intention, but the beginning has been made and we are sure that the Stalinists all over the world will help each other to further cooperate on the "Foundations of Stalinism" and to perfect them, so that the world proletariat can be helped to a safe weapon to liberate itself from anti-Stalinism and to build its new world with the compass of the Foundations of Stalinism.

What does Stalinism mean today in the struggle against the danger of the cult of personality?

Stalinism today solves the question of cult of personality on a world scale on the basis of the experiences and teachings in the struggle against modern revisionism in the first period of "socialism in one country". The cult of personality is not a danger that is limited to a purely national level. The struggle against the so-called "cult of personality" was carried out between the Revisionist-Trotskyite World Movement and the Marxist-Leninist World Movement. And this struggle is not finished, but is in full swing, which is proved by this struggle against Berianism.

At present there is no 6th Classic of Marxism-Leninism in sight, which the neo-revisionists could accuse of having a cult of personality around. What is the consequence? It follows that the Hoxhaist World Movement is still too weak to form new leaders in the global class struggle of the world proletariat. This task of training new leaders of the Hoxhaist World Movement must be solved now and it will be solved on the one hand by the fact that the world

proletarian revolutionary struggle will develop and grow, whose center new leaders will emerge from and on the other hand by the fact that the new leaders will equip themselves with the latest state of the further developing Marxism-Leninism and arm themselves with the teachings of Marx, Engels, Lenin, Stalin and Hoxha. Without world revolutionary theory, there is no world revolutionary movement, no re-emerging Hoxhaist movement. The Comintern/ML is currently far from playing a practical leading role in the Marxist-Leninist movement, although it itself like many others has emerged from the world revolutionary movement of Comrade Enver Hoxha and is trying to create its most progressive center. But it tries to serve its modest contribution with new theoretical impulses and to raise the banner of proletarian internationalism of Marx, Engels, Lenin, Stalin and Enver Hoxha with all other comrades all over the world. And here in this ideological field, the Comintern/ML has already shown certain leadership qualities in the Marxist-Leninist World Movement which are necessary to throw a last lifeline to the comrades of the Marxist-Leninist World Movement which has been seized by a strong revisionist current and is threatening to drift further and further away from the revolutionary course. Today, the Comintern/ML has already become the force that has raised the bar of Marxism-Leninism the farthest in the struggle against those who try to lower it for the purpose of letting the revisionists jump over to destroy the fortress of the Marxist-Leninist World Movement of Comrade Enver Hoxha from within for good. The Comintern/ML restores the ideological base of the Marxist-Leninist World Movement by firstly, preserving this base in its old revolutionary core and protecting its Marxist-Leninist roots, secondly, by liberating it from outdated doctrines and thirdly, by enriching it with new ideas.

And this also includes correctly leading the struggle against the so-called "cult of personality" of Stalin, including the Berianists.

What does "correct" mean? Two things must be taken into account:

Firstly, when we Marxist-Leninists reject the slanders against Stalin, the so-called "criticism of the cult of personality", it is not with the aim of restoring the cult of personality, but to emphasize the outstanding importance of the figure of Stalin as the 4th Classic of Marxism-Leninism. Reviving and rehabilitating the cult of personality of Stalin today, so to speak as an "anti-revisionist weapon against the slanderers of Stalin", is sectarian and works into the hands of the rehabilitation of the revisionists. One cannot replace an "exaggerated" cult of personality with a "normal" one, one cannot fight the cult of personality with cult of personality, but one must rely on the formulas of Marxism-Leninism to create and consolidate a healthy relationship between leader - class - mass. We are not longing for the old cult of personality, nor do we feel the need to choose a new one, for we are against the cult of personality in general and for the final elimination of its inevitability, for the elimination of class society which created it for the sole purpose of opposing the class struggle which is waged by the workers for the elimination of class society!

The cult of personality must be dismantled, but the figure of Stalin must not be dismantled at the same time. Those who separate loyalty to Stalin from loyalty to communism, those who dismiss the defense of their figure as a cult of personality and their ideas as a cult, preach the betrayal of Stalin, the betrayal of communism. We Stalinists want to treat the figure of Stalin just as Stalin had treated the figure of Lenin and just as Stalin continued Leninism, we Stalinists want to continue Stalinism as Enver Hoxha did. Is that clear enough?

So whoever points out the merits of Stalin as the 4th Classic of Marxism-Leninism is therefore neither an admirer of the figure of Stalin nor a slave of the cult of personality that was practiced around him. Any accusation that the defense of the Marxist-Leninist life and work

of Comrade Stalin is "sectarianism" must be rejected absolutely, because we Marxist-Leninists must never allow the merits and teachings of Stalin to be diminished, falsified or undermined by anyone and in any way. We Stalinists want to change the world and Stalin is our role model, teacher, guide.

Second. If we Marxist-Leninists fight against the so-called "criticism of the cult of personality", we must also fight against the attempts of the neo-revisionists, who use the rejection of the "criticism of the cult of personality" in order to impute to Comrade Stalin a meaning that serves the revival of revisionism, that serves world capitalism and its lackeys in the ranks of the revolutionary world camp. We Marxist-Leninists are opponents of such elements who abuse the role and importance of the figure of Stalin for their great-power chauvinist, imperialist, nationalist and reactionary purposes, for the purpose of splitting and disorganizing the Marxist-Leninist World Movement, for the purpose of strengthening revisionism. We Marxist-Leninists must not allow elements to penetrate our movement who pretend to defend Stalin in order to smuggle all their revisionist filth into our ranks. Revisionists defend Stalin in words to betray him in deeds. Not everyone who defends Stalin against the so-called "cult of personality" is a Marxist-Leninist. One can only lead the fight against the so-called "cult of personality" on the ground of Marxism-Leninism, otherwise one slides into the swamp of opportunism.

Only if one takes action *against both directions equally*, recognizes their interaction and smashes them, does one correctly fight against the accusation of the cult of personality.

The so-called "Stalin Question" is only raised by our opponents because they reject Stalin as a Classic on principle or do not even want to recognize him as a Marxist-Leninist. We therefore want to distance ourselves from the outset from the right opportunists and "left" sectarians who attack our principled position on the irrefutable teachings of Stalinism:

For the Marxist-Leninists of the world, for the future representatives and members of the Comintern/ML, there is fundamental clarity and unity about Stalin as the 4th Classic of Marxism-Leninism. When we defend Marxism-Leninism, we defend Comrade Stalin. This does not mean that we want to defend his mistakes or suppress discussions about mistakes. Mistakes were made by all the classics, that is why they have not lost their significance as classics to this day and will never lose it.

We must make clear to the proletariat the importance of Stalin as the 4th Classic, spread his works, learn and teach them and apply them in the class struggle. We explain why and how we must reject the attacks on Stalin. We educate our members in the spirit of Stalin.

The entry of a comrade into the Marxist-Leninist Party, his activity in the daily class struggle, cannot be made dependent on his complete clarity about the so-called "Stalin Question". One cannot simply exclude him because of ambiguities, just consider that it took us ourselves several years to clarify and refute the question raised by our opponents. One cannot simply exclude a new comrade because of ambiguities in the so-called "Stalin Question", that would be sectarianism and misunderstood principled standpoint.

We must not expose the Marxist-Leninist World Movement to the danger of its division or liquidation because of a conciliatory attitude towards a struggle in the so-called "Stalin Question" led by right-wing opportunists or sectarians against us. This must not happen to us in the demarcation to Berianism either.

Let our opponents raise the so-called "Stalin Question" as much as they want. They will not

achieve their goal for us to question Stalin. The Stalinists always emerge strengthened from this struggle, the opponents are discredited every time.

They always began with the last classic and then tried to "refute" one classic after the other or at least to reduce its importance in order to "refute" and reduce all of Marxism-Leninism. They attacked Stalin and meant Lenin. They attacked Lenin and meant Marx and Engels. They attacked Marx and Engels and meant communism. This is the consistent path of revisionism, starting with sectarianism and ending with openly anti-communist bourgeois ideology, which ends up on the dustbin of history. Last but not least, Enver Hoxha had brilliantly refuted the so-called "Stalin Question". When we are called "Stalinists", we are not affected. Some Trotskyites insult us as openly as they insult Stalin. The other kind of Trotskyites are more subtle. They defend Stalin in words in order to accuse us Stalinists of "sectarianism." Both form the front of the 5th Column in the struggle against Stalinism today, in the struggle against the world socialist revolution, against the world revolutionary proletariat. Our opponents will try to turn the tables, "swear" on Stalin and make us Marxist-Leninists look like charlatans. However, nothing and nobody can deny, refute or stop the teachings of Stalin, not even with rotten tricks. We do not fear physical extermination, we do not fear fascist persecution and torture, we do not fear the social fascists and their lackeys, but also not such opponents who pretend to have suddenly "discovered" their "heart" for Stalin in order to abuse our trust and to storm the fortress from inside with a "Trojan Horse" and put a knife in our back.

We must not be blind in one eye or the other. Whoever stops in the fight against the exaggeration of Stalin's importance and does not fight the same way against the understatement of Stalin's importance, will only be able to halfway defend the figure of Stalin and his importance. If one wants to learn how an exaggeration and the criticism of it was turned into an understatement and belittlement, study Berianism. The ideology of Berianism is the ideology of belittling and disrespecting the figure and work of Stalin "on the grounds of Stalinism", is the revision of Stalinism, is the revisionism of Stalinism. Bill Bland praises Stalin as an "outstanding Marxist-Leninist, who has led a consistent struggle against revisionism throughout his life", to write in the same article that actually it was not Stalinism, but in reality *"revisionism has ruled the Soviet Union since 1934"*. An outstanding Marxist-Leninist, this Stalin, who since 1934, for almost 20 years under the revisionist rule of the USSR "led a consistent fight against revisionism" [sic !!!]. Bill Bland concludes this from the 17th Party Congress, which took place in 1934, at which the revisionists allegedly established their rule over the USSR. The period from 1934-1953 is consequently denigrated as a "revisionist" USSR. During this period, the USSR is said to have been a work of counter-revolution and not the work of Stalin! This is a destructive thesis, which in fact denies the actual development of Stalinism, which could not be based on anything else but the objectively existing socialist development of the Soviet Union from 1934 to 1953. Was there no socialist Soviet Union at all between 1934 and 1953? Without a socialist USSR of the years 1934 - 1953, Stalinism could not have developed into a bloom at all. Bill Bland makes a grave mistake here, because with this thesis he puts himself exactly in line with the thesis of the revisionists by declaring the work of Stalin with the 13 volumes, thus with January 31st, 1934 (sic!) to be "finished". After all we have criticized about Bill Bland, we cannot dismiss this agreement with the revisionists as a coincidence. There is a system behind it. It is precisely this objective existence of socialism in the USSR that is denied. Bill Bland takes the view that "objective conditions led to the fact that this struggle [Bill Bland meant the struggle that Stalin waged against revisionism - editor's note] should ultimately not be crowned with success." (Bill Bland, Conclusions - "Stalin, The Myth and Reality"; a lecture given at the Weekend School of the Communist League; 1977 [not to be confused with the 1999 lecture - translator's note]). Stalin's "defeat" against revisionism is thus based on the false premise of the allegedly "objective

conditions of the rule of revisionism from 1934 - 1953". We Stalinists firmly reject this thesis of Bill Bland as a revisionist and completely untenable thesis. Praising Stalin in words, but denying him in deeds is the bourgeois revisionism of Stalinism.

Unfortunately, what we are dealing with here is not just a particular belittling of the role of Stalin, but a general belittling of *Marxism*. What are the serious consequences for the Marxist-Leninist World Movement? If one regards Stalinism as a dam against the influence of bourgeois ideologies on the Marxist-Leninist World Movement, then the dismantling of this dam must inevitably lead to the Marxist-Leninist World Movement being flooded with bourgeois influences, so that the revolutionary theory is not only diluted and vulgarized, but also runs the risk of drowning in revisionist ideology. From this then arises the dangerous swamp of opportunism, which the future generation of revolutionary workers is lured into. Comrades, the flooding of the Marxist-Leninist World Movement with bourgeois influences is in full swing right now, at this very moment! We must not have any illusions about this. There is only one thing we can do: We have to build the dam higher, where it will be dismantled the most: At Stalinism. What is the task of the Marxist-Leninist World Movement? It is not only to be careful not to belittle Stalinism but also *not to overvalue it*. It is *precisely in this very specific place* that Stalinism must be defended and developed under the changing conditions of the world proletarian liberation struggle.

And now we find ourselves confronted with the very effect of the poison of Berianism, which inevitably had to produce the daring and intolerable thesis of Bill Bland, namely to encourage petty-bourgeois intellectuals, who doubt the existence of socialism, to belittle Stalinism much further than Bill Bland did. If Bill Bland put forward the still quite "harmless" thesis that there had "only" been no socialism in the USSR since 1934, "critics" of the split off grouping of the organization "Red October" in Germany come to the conclusion that Bill Bland cannot speak of 1934 - 1953 as a period of the "restoration of capitalism", because his thesis assumes that there must have been something that capitalism restores - socialism. Thus the "critics" of Bill Bland, who in reality are only his successors, who only openly said what Bill Bland could not have said at that time, because he would have been criticized for it in the Marxist-Leninist World Movement. So what is the "great discovery" of the new generation of "thinkers of dialectical materialism"? "There has never been socialism in the world!" "Without socialism there can be no restoration of capitalism", and so our intellectuals conclude that our slogan for the struggle against the restoration of capitalism is "not" Marxist-Leninist. That's how they want to put the noose around our necks, these resourceful fools! Our formula here against neo-revisionism hits the mark once again: "Anti-revisionism in words, revisionism in deeds! Mind you, a group that split off from the German organization "Red October" in the beginning of 2008 is trying to tell us these monstrous fairy tales, these so-called "Marxist-Leninists", who shortly before had still taken a "Stalinist point of view" (which they had, by the way, only accepted after we had pulled the soft pillow of modern revisionism out from under them!!!). These are uprooted intellectual elements, who go from one organization to another, only to finally crawl into their own snail's shell in disappointment and withdraw from the class struggle. If they would at least leave it at that, we wouldn't mind. But of course petty-bourgeois intellectuals can't sit on their hands and that's why they try to paste up their theoretical fantasies as "honest searches for truth". When we followed the Marxist-Leninist World Movement of Comrade Enver Hoxha with many other new Marxist-Leninist parties at the end of the 1960s and beginning of the 1970s, we also had to struggle with these intellectualist, sectarian debating club appearances. It had cost us no small amount of strength to deal with this intellectual hooliganism and finally to leave them alone. The fact that they are now crawling out of their holes again as a new generation of "revolutionary theorists" shows us that we are right, that the Marxist-Leninist World Movement is on the move again, that it will emerge anew and strengthened from dropping this intellectualist

ballast.

The Trotskyite seed has thus sprouted among the vacillating petty-bourgeois intellectuals and bears its "fruits". We prophesied this to them nine years ago, but they wanted to be smarter than us in their typical arrogance, and now we see that they have gone even further down the Trotskyite path. This "dialectical intelligence" inevitably had to sink into the quagmire of Hegelian idealism because, under the pressure of bourgeois influence, they had strayed too far from the solid ground of materialism, the recognition of historically existing socialism. The poison of Berianism has already had an effect on them, which they thought they had "honestly" and "self-critically" distanced themselves from. These people do not understand that Berianism puts the "criticism of Berianism" in their mouths only in order to further dissuade them from Marxism-Leninism. "Honest self-criticism", which these people write about, is a cover-up for the fact that they have in fact gone even deeper into the swamp with their "criticism of Bill Bland". This disguised "honest self-criticism" of Bill Bland is intended to throw sand in the eyes of our comrades, which of course only makes the whole thing worse. Anyone can "somehow" criticize Berianism, but only Marxist-Leninists can really push back Berianism as a Trotskyite influence within the Marxist-Leninist World Movement.

So we see where Berianism has already led, to the denial of Marxism, to the fight against Marxism, to the fight against the Marxist-Leninist World Movement. Berianism lays out the trap with bait so that our comrades fall into it, and then Berianism washes its hands in innocence in order to rub them behind the back of the comrades afterwards. You can see what it leads to if you do not criticize Bill Bland in time. You can see what it leads to if we Stalinists do not criticize ourselves in time and fail to keep up the defense of Stalin at all times. It is a fatal error to believe that the criticism of the accusation of the "cult of personality" against Stalin is all-encompassingly closed by the Marxist-Leninist World Movement through Enver Hoxha. We have made the mistake of resting on old laurels. We have been punished for this rightly. The Berianists taught us a lesson and we have to learn from it!

The history of the decline of Marxism is an evil chapter in the history of opportunism which continues to be written in ever newer forms.

Although the Berianists affirm in words that they are "correctly" fighting this struggle, it turns out that they did not do so with honest intentions, that they did not scientifically prove the role of Stalin's personality, but only pseudo-scientifically "justified" its belittlement. The Berianists came to the conclusion that the cult of personality which the revisionists had pursued could only spread thanks to a "minority position" of Stalin, from which they drew the conclusion that it could not have been far off with the role of Stalin. Basically, this is not only an outrageous criticism of Stalin, but also an insidious criticism of the Albanians with Enver Hoxha at the head, of the Marxist-Leninist World Movement, of us Stalinists and of all people who do not appreciate Stalin highly enough. Then the sectarianism of the Berianists against us Stalinists, the accusation that we would practice the cult of personality "like the revisionists", comes to light. Yes, while the revisionists proceeded with the cult of personality out of ice-cold calculation, we would be even more dangerous representatives of the cult of personality, because we were honestly convinced of it. The Berianists see their task in disparaging the revolutionary people of the Marxist-Leninist World Movement, in disparaging us Stalinists and in demoralizing inexperienced comrades in the so-called "Stalin Question", in giving them a distorted, disparaging image of Stalin. This is a false game that the Berianists are playing. They want to isolate us Stalinists in the same way that the revisionists tried to isolate Stalin, only that they put themselves on the sidelines.

The Berianists are making a crucial mistake. They put themselves above the love which the

world proletariat and the peoples of the world, especially the Soviet peoples and the whole communist world movement felt for Stalin. They place themselves above the millionfold trust that Stalin enjoyed, because he 100% justified it in words and deeds. The Berianists place themselves above the great achievements of the people of the first socialist state in the world, which would have been unthinkable without Stalin. Stalin was of *decisive* importance for the communist world movement, for progressive people all over the world. Even Stalin's worst enemies respected him and rightly considered his role to be *decisive*. Even Beria's murder of Stalin was done in the knowledge that Stalin's role was *decisive*.

The Berianists inflate themselves up as "scientific" "Marxist-Leninists" who "defend" Stalin in the "two-front struggle" against the alleged "sectarian cult of personality" of us Stalinists, of Enver Hoxha and his Marxist-Leninist World Movement and at the same time against the revisionist cult of personality including its "criticism" of him. The Berianists claim to be the ones who lead the Marxist-Leninist two-front struggle against the cult of personality, and they see themselves as the "true" defenders of Stalin, but of a Stalin of "not decisive importance". So, what should we call such Stalinists who do not attach a decisive importance to Stalin? They are not *decisive* Stalinists. And as non-perceiving Stalinists, they will never achieve decisive importance in the Stalinist World Movement.

They portray Stalin's struggle as the "struggle of a lonely fighter in the desert" who was helplessly at the mercy of the power of the revisionists because of the "objective conditions". The Berianists project the significance of Stalin on his "outstanding fight against the superiority of the revisionists". Although the "objective conditions" dictated the hopelessness of his anti-revisionist struggle to him, Stalin nevertheless fought bravely and attest to Stalin's non-decisive significance of being like that of Don Quixote. Stalinism is all fine and dandy, but not up to revisionism. In other words: The working class fights heroically, but the "objective conditions" of capitalism do not allow it to liberate itself. This is the direction which Berianism wants the world proletariat to go, this is the thought which communism should be infected in order to submit to the "objective conditions" of capitalism with.

We Stalinists reject such tall tales about Stalin by far: It was not revisionism, but Marxism-Leninism, Stalinism that had a decisive importance in the Soviet Union, as the great victories of socialism in its First Period OBJECTIVELY proved. One cannot want to turn this historically proven relationship upside down! Who put the teachings of Marx, Engels and Lenin into practice, Stalin or the "objective conditions" of the revisionists? Who showed the world the right way to communism, not only theoretically but also practically, Stalin or his opponents? Was it the work of the Soviet peoples under the leadership of Comrade Stalin or the work of the revisionists? The fact that Stalin spent his life successfully preventing the restoration of capitalism, thus giving his opponents one defeat after another until his death, that all the enemies of the world trembled before him, that he made communism stronger in the world than any other is why the Berianists do not want to acknowledge all these great achievements. They do not write anything about them, they do not consider them defensible, they do not consider them crucial.

The elimination of the inevitability of the restoration of capitalism on a world scale cannot be reduced to objective conditions. It is a fact that there was nobody in the world who, had created the conditions for the historical victory of world socialism like Stalin. Stalin made communism so strong that it was about to conquer the whole world. The objective conditions were excellent: The weakening of the imperialist world camp and the strengthening of socialism.

Stalinism is the doctrine of the spread of communism throughout the world, as an objective,

historical fact that cannot be discussed away or "scientifically disproved".

The struggle against the so-called "cult of personality" of Stalin is not only to refute the accusations of the modern revisionists, not primarily to bring to the fore his weaknesses (if there were any) and the "strengths" of the revisionists, as the Berianists do, but to bring out and emphasize the true greatness of Stalin on Marxist-Leninist soil, **completely independent of the revisionist barkers and Berianist disillusionists**, to establish his personality as the 4th Classic of Marxism-Leninism and of emphasizing his outstanding importance for today's Hoxhaist world movement. The Bernianists do not say a single word about this. On the contrary!! Read for yourselves what a devastating result the Berianists come to in their evaluation of the role of the personality of Comrade Stalin:

"I must make it clear right from the start that the Communist League does not consider the role played by Stalin to be of decisive importance [!!!!]" (Bland: "STALIN - The Myth and the Reality", A lecture given at the Weekend School of the Communist League; 1977).

Comrades, we honestly ask you: Can there be Stalinists whom the role of Stalin is not decisive for?

If you do not give a decisive importance to Comrade Stalin, what importance do the Berianists give to the other classics of Marxism-Leninism, including a role of non-decisive importance? Do they mean to say that only Marx, Engels and Lenin are classics of Marxism-Leninism, as the Berianists propagated immediately after he killed Stalin?

Neither the murder of Stalin, nor the "scientific proof" that Stalin's role was not decisive and it cannot change the truth that Stalin was and always will be the 4th Classic of Marxism-Leninism.

What conclusion must one draw from this, comrades? One can only draw one conclusion, the only correct one:

The Berianists do not attach any importance to Marxism-Leninism itself. They play with Marxism-Leninism in the Trotskyite manner in order to discredit and falsify it.

Whoever disparages any classic of Marxism-Leninism disparages all other classics.

Whoever makes such intolerable assertions about Stalin cannot possibly be a Stalinist.

Bill Bland was not a Stalinist. A Stalinist would never endorse the kind of view that Bill Bland held. The presumptuous claim of Bill Bland is bad enough in itself. However, we Stalinists cannot and must not accept this claim, but we must resolutely oppose this Trotskyite method which has crept into us, if we want to "scientifically" justify it and smuggle it into the Marxist-Leninist World Movement as a "Marxist-Leninist" standpoint. It was a mistake not to have done so until now. We are self-critical about this:

We declare war on Berianism!

The Berianists are dangerous enemies of Marxism-Leninism and they must be treated as such. Bill Bland has at least contributed (and we do not exclude ourselves from this) to the fact that Berianism found its way into the Marxist-Leninist World Movement.

The defeats have always been blamed on the communists, the workers' leaders, the classics, but never on their traitors, who were rehabilitated by our enemies (Beria)! Personal

inadequacies are equated with the revolutionary cause. The bourgeoisie especially accuses the proletarians themselves of being to blame when they succumb to the "delusion" of the classics. Marx, Engels, Lenin, Stalin and Enver Hoxha are not religious idols to be worshipped. We love and honor our classics and all heroes and leaders of the revolutionary world proletariat, but we Marxist-Leninists are opponents of the cult of personality. We are not mindless followers who blindly follow their idols. We are neither "sectarians", "ultra-leftists", nor "Keepers of the Holy Grail", which our opponents of the Marxist-Leninist World Movement want to make believe.

It was never the revolutionary workers who practiced the cult of personality or the Proletkult, but those were always and only the agencies of the bourgeoisie within the revolutionary workers' movement. The cult of personality is part of the ideological arsenal of the bourgeoisie. The revisionists have only praised the classics and workers' leaders highly and practiced the cult of personality in order to better overthrow them. And the bourgeoisie, as it turned out, has not shied away from reducing and distorting the role of Stalin, the role of Stalinism, behind the struggle against the so-called "criticism of the cult of personality".

We Marxist-Leninists have never measured the seriousness of the professions of loyalty to our classics with mere words, but have always followed their teachings in the fire of daily class struggle.

The Conspiracy against Stalin already began with the Conspiracy against Lenin

"The leaders of the Second International, Bernstein and Kautsky, began their betrayal by rejecting Marx and Engels, the Trotskyites, Bukharinites and Zinovievites began their betrayal by rejecting Lenin, and the Khrushchevites began its betrayal by rejecting Stalin. History repeats itself, but the modern revisionists must not forget that they repeat not only the actions but also their consequences. They will suffer the same fate as all their successors. Their defeat is inevitable, it will happen sooner or later: Marxism-Leninism will triumph over all opponents and traitors" (Zëri i Popullit: 'The so-called Struggle against the 'Cult of Personality' and its Consequences'; Tirana; 1964; p.158; Translated from German).

How was Trotskyism able to save itself, recover and regain strength after its defeat in the 1930s? At first, it could only save itself by "going on a long march through the institutions", by presenting itself as a "communist" faction in order to put itself at the head of the "struggle against Trotskyism!" This was achieved by none other than Beria, who took the place of the traitors Yagoda and Yezhov. And who freed the Trotskyites from the prisons immediately after Stalin's death? Beria! Who rehabilitated them? Khrushchev!

"As a matter of fact Trotskyism was a faction of Menshevism until the Trotskyists entered our Party; it became temporarily a faction of communism after the Trotskyists entered our Party, and it became once more a faction of Menshevism after the Trotskyists were driven out of our Party. 'The dog returned to his vomit.'" (Stalin: 'Reply to Olekhovich and Aristov' in: 'Works',

Volume 13; Moscow; 1954; p.132; English Edition).

Beria had also "returned to his vomit".

What Stalin said at the 15th Congress of the All-Union Communist Party (Bolsheviks) about the conspirers of the Trotskyites and Bukharinites also applies to the conspirer Beria:

"Ruthlessness in the choice of means and lack of principles in politics." (quotation found in: "Trial Report"; Moscow; 1937; p.528; Translated from German).

Beria's understanding of domestic politics, especially of state security and intelligence, was not that of an extended arm of the dictatorship of the proletariat, as an instrument of political class struggle in the hands of the socialist working class, but a completely limited understanding of the tactics of conspiracy, administration, hypocrisy, careerism, intrigue, etc. He undoubtedly had "leadership qualities", but he belonged to the sort of "leaders" who are not used to being called *Bolshevik* leaders. He himself instigated conspiracies in order to "convict" comrades of conspiracies and liquidate them "in complete legality" and with Stalin's signature, or to subordinate them to his interests, to blackmail them. At any time he could have blamed all his crimes on Stalin, but that would have cost him his own head, and thus would have thrown his so laboriously prepared plans overboard in one fell swoop. He transformed worker socialism into a conspiratorial "socialism" which not only separated itself from the working class, but restored the tsarist autocracy, the Okhrana, in its "red" garb. Beria was a social fascist. In order to restore capitalism, the counter-revolutionary policies of the bourgeoisie first had to be restored. Its "red" terror served to deter and subdue the masses. You should not dare to stand up against it! Disguised terror was his teacher, not Stalin!

This is a deeply anti-Marxist-Leninist understanding of politics and challenges our fundamental contradiction. What is our Marxist-Leninist position on this? We Bolsheviks take the view that the class struggle is not conducted by conspirers and their apparatchiks, but by the working class and its revolutionary party, that the political power of the working class cannot be conquered or defended by conspiracy, but by the class struggle, by the struggle of the Soviet peoples, by the application of Marxism-Leninism by the broad masses of the working people themselves. Lenin did not believe in the omnipotence of conspiracies.

He did not believe "(...) **that to reduce political struggle to conspiracy means, on the one hand, immensely restricting its scope, and, on the other hand, choosing the most unsuitable methods of struggle.**" (Lenin: 'The Tasks of the Russian Social-Democrats' in: 'Collected Works', Volume 2; Moscow; 1972; p.340; English Edition).

Lenin believed that politics **should not be reduced** to conspiracy, that the working class should not give up its political struggle and not leave it to a handful of conspirers. And just as one could not overthrow the tsarist government by means of conspiracy circles detached from the working class movement, one could not defend the socialist government by conspiracy, but only by mobilizing the working class, the Soviet peoples, the world proletariat. To Lenin, conspiratorial terror is **powerless terror** because it misses the class goal in its essence, while truly revolutionary terror is exercised by the whole people against its tormentors (also see Lenin's article "The Happening to the King of Portugal" found in his Collected Works, Volume 13, page 472). On the other hand, a terror of the Soviet peoples against the conspirers of the restoration of capitalism would not only have been justified but also necessary and victorious.

As a faithful disciple of Lenin, Stalin has always defended Lenin's view against conspiracy.

"I must declare that Communists never had, do not have, and cannot have, anything in common with the theory and practice of individual terrorism; that Communists never had, do not have, and cannot have, anything in common with the theory of conspiracies against individual persons. The theory and practice of the Comintern consists in organising the mass revolutionary movement against capitalism. That is true. That is the task of the Communists. Only ignoramuses and idiots can confuse plots and individual terrorism with the Comintern's policy in the mass revolutionary movement." (Stalin: 'The Fourteenth Congress of the R.C.P.(B.)' in: 'Works', Volume 7; Moscow; 1954; p.300; English Edition).

Stalin was a strict opponent of all conspiracy theories. But why was and is he still accused of being guided by "conspiracy theories"? Precisely in order to divert attention from his political class struggle, from the leadership of the world revolutionary mass movement, to cover up the fact that he was a Marxist-Leninist who was guided by the teachings of Marxism-Leninism: **"The liberation of the masses can only be the work of the masses!"** Attaching "conspiracy theories" to Stalin, which is one of the inventions of anti-Stalinism, is propagated by anti-Stalinists in order to "substantiate" the "paranoia" of a "dictator", a "despot" etc. **The task of Marxism-Leninism is to unmask the "fantastic", "mysterious", "irrational" nature of the "conspiracy ideology" and to expose its reactionary class character.** It is obscurantism when the purely theoretical pattern of conspiracy is used to separate and isolate revolutionary theory from revolutionary practice, the masses from their leaders. And in theory and practice, Stalin took consistent action against conspirers and their plans for overthrow, of which there have been many in the history of the Bolshevik Party. **The accusation that Stalin was allegedly guided by "conspiracy theories" against the people, against the masses, is only intended to distract from the fact that it was in reality the anti-Stalinists, the counter-revolutionaries, the imperialists and their terrorist organizations who had conspired not only purely theoretically but also quite practically against the revolution, against the working class and its leaders. If there were conspiracies in the USSR under Stalin, they were all plotted against the USSR, against the Soviet peoples, against the working class and its leaders, against Lenin and Stalin.**

Who can believe the fairy tale that the world imperialists, the greatest enemies of communism, are the most peaceful innocent lambs? From the very beginning, the aim of world capitalism was to demonize communism by all means, to discredit it among the masses and to eliminate the leaders in an "elegant" as well as brutal way. The imperialists are not only afraid of communism, but also have a boundless rage in their bowels because the communists dare to sweep their capitalism from the globe. This is an old known fact and to deny this and put up Stalin's alleged "conspiracy theories" instead is part of the bourgeoisie's arsenal, part of the stupefaction of the laboring masses.

"Conspiracy theories" are alien to the working class and its ideology. The bourgeoisie even defames the proletarian worldview as a "conspiracy theory of the powerlessness against capital". And we remember that not only Stalin, but also Lenin, and even the Bolsheviks in general, were accused as "Blanquists", as adherents of "Blanquism", for example by the Struvists, the "legal Marxists". The conspiracy ideology in its entirety deliberately serves to insult the complexity of the actual class struggle and its manifold forms. It leads straight into the swamp, into the labyrinth of suppositions, of fantasies, of constructed personal motives, of falsified history, in order to cover up the exposure of the actual political and social processes. They lead straight into religion, are opium for the people, give themselves a "scientific", sometimes even a Hollywood-style ravishing touch of the agent milieu in order to "explain" the hitherto unexplained, that is: to satisfy the search for truth through speculation, through creeds and spy thrillers among other things.

Today, the conspiracy ideology is once again on the rise. Social supporters are often petty-bourgeois

elements, who thereby try to explain and express their powerlessness and desperation, their capitulation to the capitalist world crisis that has come upon them. Some nationalists, who feel overwhelmed by the supremacy of globalization, are also affected by this. Even in our own communist camp, petty-bourgeois conspiracy ideology is trying to smuggle itself in to fill the gap of impatient waiting, namely that capitalism has still not disappeared and socialism has still not returned. The defeat of socialism, the end of the First Period of Socialism, is a historical fact which cannot be justified by "conspiracy theories". Revolutionary upheavals cannot be artificially fueled by conspiracies. That is anarchist.

The conspiracy ideology is reactionary because it tries to replace the theory of class struggle and denies the active role of the masses in the history of class struggle. The globalization of the bourgeois conspiracy ideology must be countered by the globalization of Marxism-Leninism.

Well, we Stalinists do not fundamentally reject the instrument of conspiracy in the class struggle. Political conspiracies belong to the history of class society like the lid to the pot. We merely believe that political conspiracies (Blanquism) must not replace our class struggle, that they are, **in themselves**, unsuitable. We always keep all forms of struggle open, never committing ourselves to a single form of struggle. We do not exclude the method of conspiracy as **one of many** methods of class struggle, just as our class enemy does not and cannot do without it. The method of conspiracy is part of the class struggle, both on the part of the bourgeoisie and on the part of the working class. In hot, revolutionary situations, this method is not excluded on both sides of the barricade, conspiracies and counter-conspiracies take place. **They are inevitable and indispensable in the antagonistic class struggle between capitalism and socialism.**

"(...) the French word 'conspiration' is the equivalent of the Russian word "zagovar" ('conspiracy') (...) It would be extremely naive indeed, therefore, to fear the charge that we Social-Democrats desire to create a conspiratorial organisation." (Lenin: 'What is to be Done?' in: 'Collected Works', Volume 5; Moscow; 1977; p.475; English Edition).

Conspirers are called conspirers because they do not reveal the truth of their political intentions, not even among themselves. Conspiracy groups have organized themselves not only against Lenin and Stalin, against the Bolshevik leaders, but also against competing and rival conspiracy groups, especially when they work together in an anti-Soviet Bloc. Just as the various anti-Soviet groups joined together to liquidate the Soviet leaders in the 1930s, so did the anti-Soviet conspiracy groups in the late 1940s and early 1950s. It would be naive to think that vain sunshine prevailed among the conspirers of 1953. After Stalin's death they all tried to slaughter each other and get out of each other's way, the conspiracy for the best place at the revisionist feeding trough really started. And it was then that the pig Khrushchev, along with the other pigs, drove out the pig that had pushed the most, Beria.

The **double-tonguing**, "**for the Party in words and against the Party in deeds**", was elevated by the Trotskyite-Zinovievite Center into an anti-Bolshevik tactic against Stalin. **Zinoviev** used this "legal" method to "crawl into the Party on his stomach", as he himself put it, and to gain the trust of the Party, and Stalin in particular. And Zinoviev did not seem to have been the only one who wanted to gain Stalin's trust in this way, only Beria had more flattery and cunning than him to penetrate Stalin's personal environment. Pretending "loyalty" and "devotion" to Stalin in order to create better opportunities for acts of terror against Stalin were the exact counter-revolutionary measures not only used by Beria but also by all other conspirers of 1953. **Stalinists in words, but Stalin's murderers in deeds!**

Stalin's conspirers of the 1950s, with Khrushchev at the head in the end, used the same unscrupulous methods as once used by the Trotskyite-Zinovievite Center and the Right and

Trotskyite Bloc. The traces of the terrorist state conspiracy were obliterated by liquidating all those who knew too much about it. **Consequently, two things always belonged to terrorism: 1. The organization of the terrorist act itself and 2. The liquidation of the perpetrators to cover up the traces.** The conspirers were intent on seizing the leadership of the OGPU/MDV on the one side or the GRU on the other after the seizure of power to cover up the traces of their crimes. They copied methods from the Nazis where participation in the conspiracy was physically destroyed at the hands of the organizers of the conspiracy, as was the case with the destruction of Röhm and his followers. The modern revisionists, like the Trotskyites and fascists, also used this method.

One of Stalin's conspirers in the 1930s was Bukharin. He most submissively pursued the tactic of nesting in the Party and gaining the personal trust of the leadership. For this reason he also allowed himself to be humiliated at the **17th Party Congress**, just to be able to stay in the Party, because nothing could be done from outside after the 1930s. Beria went further, he penetrated to the core of power and from the center he used his powerful socialist host to finally tap into it.

There were conspirers who stood before the court in the 1930s that did not tell the whole truth and those who told the whole truth. There were those who intended to continue their anti-party path, the others had broken with it completely and turned away from that path. With several groups of conspirers, contradictions could easily arise within the terrorist conspiracy front, especially when the **secrets constituted a power of mutual blackmail**. In this way, conspiracy became a commodity that was usually traded bidding in the satisfaction of its political aims. Secrets can be the best investment and life insurance if they are mastered and used properly, as Beria did. But if you are handed over to them, you will perish in them. Beria must have been aware of this, too, if he, as a conspirer, had to carry this mental pressure (not a guilty conscience, but the desire to fly away at some point) with him. Beria had traveled a decade-long path of crime before he became a murderer of Stalin. Even a conspirer like Beria, did not fall from the sky or be born a conspirer.

As a Bolshevik, one must see through the **dialectical laws of conspiracy** and use them **as a weapon against the conspirers themselves**. Stalin understood this like no other, and Beria, who always stayed close to Stalin, learned to use this weapon against Stalin himself. Trotsky never came as close to Stalin as Beria did.

Stalin as the "target" of the conspiracy could of course take advantage of the fact that he could turn different groups of conspirers against each other. It was enough if he could get certain internal information from the conspirers to lure them into his trap. Stalin had informants within the counter-revolutionary organizations, but also informants about hidden enemies in the middle of the Party. In this way, he was able to blow the entire conspiracy at the right moment, confusing the conspiratorial front and striking when the enemy least expected it. In the same way, the conspiracy front and the victim front could face each other for years without any change in the balance of power. One knows about each other, but has each other in an entanglement, controls each other's authority, and Stalin was like a panther constantly on the lookout and ready to leap. Whoever wavers in a conspiracy becomes a security risk for the conspiracy group, which is why the group must liquidate the "risk" if the "risk" does not "voluntarily" liquidate itself.

From the Soviet files most of the failed **attacks on Stalin** are probably known, as well as the names of those who carried out the attacks and above all who planned and ordered them, but certainly not all of them. One of the Trotskyite attacks that Trotsky personally ordered was the shooting of Stalin at the 7th World Congress of the Comintern, which was to trigger an "international mass movement". The plan failed, as did the one to shoot Stalin at the 13th Plenary of the ECCI, at which Stalin was not even present. With the purges further plans were uncovered and thwarted. For decades Stalin had kept the international counter-revolutionary terror of the whole world from destroying the Soviet Union, from eliminating communism. This alone speaks for his anti-

conspiracy leadership qualities. If the conspirers accused Stalin of "paranoia", then Stalin gave them good reason for them to do so!

The question of the **opposition's tactics and the resolution of differences of opinion** was still in the **foreground in the initial phase of the Party** until the 1930s. For years, the Party let itself be fooled to a certain extent by its enemies, because it was of the honest opinion that comrades had to be convinced of the right policy. Before Kirov's murder, there was no death penalty for party members. The Party only realized later that there was an anti-party tactic of liquidation behind it, which had to be stopped, when the opposition had in fact moved to overthrowing the Party and murdering its leaders.

At first, the opposition hid its struggle against Soviet power behind criticism of its shortcomings, weaknesses and difficulties, because it was speculating on the defeat of socialism, on its collapse. However, when socialism gained so much strength that this method seemed hopeless, the opposition began to give up all hope, abandoned the previous path of political-ideological argument about the General Line of the Party, to take the criminal path of conspiracy, terror, sabotage and cooperation with the world reaction against the USSR of Comrades Lenin and Stalin. Counter-revolutionary ideas became counter-revolutionary actions. What was the trigger of the wave of purging in the 1930s? Crimes of party leaders were exposed and this meant a warning against further double-talkers and traitors in the Party, who talked about their remorse and disguised themselves and masked themselves to organize a strike in the back of the Party, the country, the proletarian cause, all the easier. This was also the position taken by the conspirers of 1953. Although the leaders of the Trotskyite-Zinovievite Center were exiled or imprisoned, their center remained capable of action, to carry out the murder of Kirov for example. The center of the conspiracy was directed abroad by Trotsky. The center of the 1953 Conspiracy was within the party leadership itself. Although Stalin was in control of the 1953 conspirers, they remained capable of acting to carry out the assassination of Stalin. Whether the conspiracy was directed by foreign forces we do not know, but at least we assume that conspiracy threads were directly and indirectly directed abroad.

The enemy, once arrested, did not confess his crimes until the facts of the indictment were incontrovertibly established, once the enemy was fully exposed. If we write these lines here, the enemies of Stalin will of course read them with great attention and they will put 2 and 2 together and carefully analyze what has become known of their crimes and what has not yet been revealed. With this knowledge they can then use enough useful information to put us, who continue to follow their tracks, on the wrong track. Be sure, we know more about you than you suspect! We will get you all, if not today, then tomorrow!

The common system of Trotskyites and fascists against the Bolsheviks, especially the plans for the assassination of Stalin came into being in 1933 when the Nazis came to power. Trotsky saw the assassination of Stalin as his main task. The Gestapo let the Trotskyites run free because it was bound by the agreement with them to kill the Soviet leaders through terrorist means, especially Stalin. The fascists therefore relied not only on intervention from outside, but also on terrorist acts from within, which they undertook together with the Trotskyites, but without the support of the Fifth Column. Starting in 1932, terrorist acts were carried out in the USSR by German Nazis on behalf of Himmler, not only as head of the Gestapo, but already with Himmler as chief of staff of the SS.

Not only Trotskyites are **social-fascists**, not only the modern revisionists are **social-fascists**, all other anti-Bolsheviks who act in the guise of "Bolshevism" are social-fascists, and so are the **Berianists**. And whether they like it or not, they all together form a 5th Column of international fascism against world revolution. The hatred for Stalin, the deep animosity towards us Stalinists, is equally strong and of equal essence among the fascists and social-fascists. They only differ

outwardly in that one flag is brown, green, yellow, black etc., but the other one is "red".

In the case of a possible compromise of Trotsky, the acts of terror were to be passed on to the Gestapo and the White Guards, this was also intended with the compromise of Beria, but the murder of Stalin could be successfully covered up and Beria was eliminated just in time. Trotsky placed his hopes especially on the Trotskyites who had not yet been compromised as Trotskyites in the ranks of the CPSU(B). The Trotskyite conspiracy groups were not to be connected with each other, so that when one group went up, the entire conspiracy organization would not be exposed. The premise applied to all conspirers:

The struggle against communism is a struggle against the Communist Party, especially against its leadership. The struggle against the Communist Party is a struggle against Stalin, against the leaders of the Party. Once Stalin was dead, then one came into possession of the party and lead it on the path of capitalism. The stronger the influence of capitalism, the stronger the decline of communism, which finally ends with its decline. That was the line of counter-revolution, which has been consistently implemented since fascism came to power. But under the pressure of the Great Patriotic War, it was Hitler who finally took his own life in a cowardly manner, and not Stalin, whom he pompously tried to kill. It was only after the Second World War, under the pressure of Anglo-American imperialism, that Stalin became the victim of their Cold War, murdered by traitors within his own leadership connected with the West. Everything points to the fact that what happened in the 1930s with the fascists against Stalin also happened with the Anglo-Americans after the Second World War, especially from the end of the 1940s until the date of Stalin's death. The motto of the Americans is "Not only do we spare all those who turn away from Stalinism, but we also handsomely reward them with dollars". The first to hold out his hand was Tito, who was once so "loyal to Stalin", but Beria did not want to take second place to him and held out his hand as well. Every single one of them, from Tito to Gorbachev, was in cooperation with world imperialism and not only held out their hand, but also received their thirty pieces of silver for their betrayal.

Whether it be Trotsky, Beria or Khrushchev, they and all the others realized that there was no possibility of changing the Party's policy, of getting the Party into their hands, until Stalin was forcibly eliminated: In the struggle against Stalin neither one nor the other could stop at the extreme means so Stalin had to be physically destroyed. Only with the conquest of political power could the restoration of capitalism be completed. As for the assassination of the party leaders, Trotsky pursued the tactic "far from Moscow" of ambushing him on the borders with spectacular assassinations such as staged "car accidents", etc. **The conspirers of 1953 were quite different:** They could very "legally" use the access to Stalin's private room to assassinate Stalin without being disturbed by anyone in the process. It is by this development that one can measure how far the enemies and murderers had advanced after Trotsky's death to complete their criminal work. What is more, Trotsky could only blame the White Guards, foreign intelligence services, etc., to wash his hands of the crime. The conspirers of 1953, on the other hand, were all so dirty that they could easily blame any leader of the Party and the Soviet state. They calmly chose their victims. Even criminals could release them arbitrarily and put comrades, who had made mistakes but had overcome them, back in prison if they seemed dangerous to them. This common tactic was used by both the conspirers of 1953 and the Trotskyite conspirers in the 1930s, for both had **gained influence over the Ministry of the Interior and the state security organs and other instruments of the dictatorship of the proletariat.** Trotsky was far from Russia and had no mass influence. Beria made use of the secret service and Khrushchev used all the propaganda means in the Party and state to create his own mass base, his own cult of personality, after he no longer needed the trust of the masses as a "fighting companion" of Stalin at the 20th Party Congress. Trotsky's conspirers and the conspiracy of the modern revisionists had the same goals, the restoration of capitalism in the USSR, except that Trotsky sold himself as an agency of the Nazis, while the modern revisionists sold themselves to the Anglo-Americans: Allowing the development of private capital, dissolving

collective economies, liquidating Soviet economies, transferring Soviet enterprises to foreign hands, accepting loans, making concessions that would not exclude the transfer of territory had all played the same role from the beginning.

Stalin sent a strong signal to foreign governments that the USSR would never capitulate and had nothing to give to imperialism. Stalin consistently pursued his course of confrontation between capitalism and socialism, which meant nothing other than an intensification of the class struggle, which did not stop him from sitting on a bench with the imperialist great powers, forcing them to make tactical concessions in order to protect the USSR from them. After Stalin's death, the USSR signaled to the same foreign governments the desire to end the confrontation, the desire to gradually align socialism with capitalism. **Other than by building links with the West, the modern revisionists could not have asserted their power.** Just as Trotskyism proved to be a weapon in the hands of the fascist arsonists, the modern revisionists had been a weapon in the hands of the Anglo-American arsonists, for they murdered the man who had fought for peace like no other in human history, who had fought against the inevitability of war. And the fight against the inevitability of war meant for Stalin after World War II to turn the spearhead against the USA. **Just as Trotskyism and fascism extended their hand against communism in the days of fascism, the modern revisionists and the victorious Western powers, led by the USA and England, extended their hand against communism.** Traitors to communism have always been and will always be agents of capitalism, under whatever mask these traitors have slipped or will slip.

The tactic of criminal offenders was and still is, to confess only what can be irrefutably proven, as was the case in the 1930s, but by no means any more. With his invented fairy tales, the deceitful criminal speculates on the gullibility of the people and finally on his "heartbreaking remorse that moves you to tears". The "burned" (unmasked) Trotskyite agents in the Party were immediately publicly "branded" by the Trotskyites to protect the currently undisguised Trotskyites in the Party. Thus, Trotskyites still run around in the Communist World Movement as so-called "Marxist-Leninists" like the Berianists, for example. Such a tactic is generally called a "**placeholder tactic**". Berianists, then, are placeholders of Trotskyite subversion within the Marxist-Leninist movement, as what happened with Beria and Malenkov and other traitors who are still celebrated today as "Marxist-Leninists". These placeholders are not only "sleepers", but also activists to disintegrate the Marxist-Leninist organizations from within in the most covert ways. The mistakes of the Marxist-Leninists are praised, for example, and the correct Marxist-Leninist line is criticized as "sectarian", always with "Marxist-Leninist arguments" of course. In the Marxist-Leninist camp there were so-called secret "placeholders". Placeholders are those who move in the Marxist-Leninist camp unrecognized through double-tonguedness, as agencies of the modern revisionists and other anti-Marxist-Leninist forces, who would have no open access to the Marxist-Leninist World Movement, who, if they appeared openly, would sooner or later be thrown out and smashed. **Placeholders within the communist movement and organization create space there for the systematic adaptation of the revolutionary forces to the counter-revolutionary forces from within.** The party enemies within the Marxist-Leninist Front, which have remained undiscovered by the Marxist-Leninists, try to preserve as many (historical) criminals as possible, and this for as long as possible under the guise of "Marxist-Leninists", just to camouflage the crimes and to make room enough for covering further crimes. **Such a placeholder role is also played today by the Berianists:** *"Lead the Marxist-Leninists further astray when they try to get behind them. Only in this way can you continue to pursue your Berianists policy unhindered, the Marxist-Leninists will follow you in the belief that you are fighting modern revisionism."* Well, the Berianists can assume that we Marxist-Leninists also have our placeholders in their camp, in front of and behind the barricades of our class struggle!

Part of this tactic was also to protect accomplices from being discovered and exposed, in order to leave reserves for further crimes, or to finish the crime that had been uncovered. A second,

independently structured, conspiracy **reserve center** is often set up for this purpose. Parallel centers of the restoration of capitalist relations in the USSR were, on the one hand, the centers of the encircling imperialist powers and, on the other hand, the centers of counter-revolutionary elements inside and outside the Party and government of the USSR. For all their tactical autonomy and parallelism, these centers were strategically interlocked and coordinated, all serving the common strategic goal of liquidating the power of socialism and its leaders.

The Trotskyites acted more decisively and energetically than the Zinovievites. **Whoever got the best position before the murder would be all the more powerful after the murder.** Whoever could show the greatest crimes was naturally entitled to the largest piece of the cake. It was no different with the conspirers of 1953. Beria was the greediest. They killed Beria so that there would be enough of the cake left for them. With this competition to get the biggest piece of the cake, the activities of the conspiracy groups against Stalin took on a characteristic momentum of their own, which put the conspirers in situations that they could neither predict nor plan for, but to which they were rather at the mercy of, and which irreversibly brought everything to a head. But once you got to the levers of power, it turned out that they were not as easy to control as they had hoped. Everything now seemed to conspire against the conspirers themselves. The conspirers were under enormous pressure. And this is also expressed in their chaotic political actions immediately after the murder, although they had practiced in cold-bloodedness for decades. This was particularly evident in Beria's adventurist politics, which he carried out at breakneck speed after Stalin's death.

The modern revisionists were representatives of the vanguard of the international counter-revolution, who insidiously seized the vanguard of the proletarian world revolution in order to lead it into a dead end, into the enemy camp. They were more or less aware that they would make a retreat to capitalism, that they would have to give up their power as leaders at the moment when the process of restored capitalism was finished. The counter-revolution eats its children, even Beria. The path was marked out; if a revisionist leadership deviated from it, for whatever reason, it was deposed by another revisionist leadership. The end of this revisionist path that had been taken since the death of Stalin was finally reached with the transition from Gorbachev to Yeltsin. Once caught in the wolf pit of imperialism, the modern revisionists were seized and became its pawn. The modern revisionists had imagined in their megalomania that they would exploit the imperialist forces for themselves, but in reality it turned out that it was the imperialists who had used the modern revisionists as their tool against communism. After all, the modern revisionists had brought the degeneration of the once so proud socialism of Lenin and Stalin to such a state of decay that only a small, run-down pile of misery was left on the doorstep of world imperialism. **But has modern revisionism really collapsed with its rotten work?** To believe this would mean to have learned nothing from the history of modern revisionism. Is it really so hated by the masses that it is buried and cannot rise again? This is what the Trotskyites claimed when they begged for leniency from the Soviet court. But of course we Marxist-Leninists know that this is not true, that Trotskyism is shedding its skin and poses a threat to us as long as the threat of capitalism exists. The Trotskyites committed their murders to overthrow socialism and they were shot for that. And so it is with the modern revisionists who aim their guns at the rebirth of socialism and then try to shoot at us Stalinists "in the name of world revolution".

Rykov organized Kulak uprisings against the Soviet government in the North Caucasus. At that time he was chairman of the Council of People's Commissars and passed material to both the Second International and the Mensheviks so that they could incite the Soviet Union in their newspaper "Sotsialicheski Vestnik" and call on the Kulaks to revolt. On behalf of the fascist espionage services, the conspirers collected cadres for bandit uprisings by preparing them for armed actions in the North Caucasus and elsewhere. For this purpose, the Bloc of the Right and Trotskyites made contact with the Social-Revolutionaries, who had their roots in the Kulak strata of the village and also maintained their foreign Central Committee in Paris among emigrant circles. Bukharin was

already active here from 1926, because he saw the peasant movement in the North Caucasus as one of the most important levers for overthrowing Soviet power. In the North Caucasus, Kulak uprisings were able to break out earlier than elsewhere, and there were also remnants of the White Guard Kulak army on standby from abroad. Therefore, Bukharin concentrated on taking the lead there in time. This would have signal effect for all other uprisings in the whole country. This was Bukharin's "mass tactic" to transform the border regions back into capitalism. **And that was of course directed against Leninism, which affirmed the possibility of the direct transition of former colonial countries to socialism, without having to go through the capitalist stage of development.** Traitors within the bloc were liquidated, including in the North Caucasus. This was intended to put pressure on the bloc's own members to increase their efforts to commit terrorist acts. The conspirers before 1953 did not proceed differently. They even approached Japan and Germany, asking them to hurry up their attack on the Soviet Union so that the conditions for the uprising would not deteriorate any further. But the acts of terror led, quite contrary to their aims, to the consolidation of the masses' vigilance against the internal enemies of the Soviet Union. **The masses did not perceive the terror as an "act of liberation" from the "yoke of socialism", but as an attack on their own interests.** The masses were upset by Kirov's murder and stood even more firmly behind Stalin than ever before. But the question of the seizure of power by an armed insurrection was raised by Bukharin even before 1929, before the bloc with the Trotskyites was formed. From 1934, the defeat of Soviet power was to be prepared from within. That was the preparatory work for the destruction of Soviet power. Wood was stolen in the northern part of the country and illegally sold to the English. England wanted to invade the north of the Soviet Union. An illegal deal was going on between the imperialists and the Bukharinites. This was supposed to be a kind of advance payment so that the right could build capitalism in Russia after the destruction of the USSR, in direct cooperation with the imperialists abroad. In 1935 an agreement was reached between the Trotskyites, the Right and the military group of Tukhachevsky on armed overthrow. In comparison, Beria occupied the Kremlin with his MVD troops and thus had the entire Presidium under his control.

Elements of double-talkers that did their counter-revolutionary work in the Party existed from the beginning, that is, long before the October Revolution, they were already there at the time of the Okhrana, which recruited such elements from the revolutionary movement, organized and paid them. Among the defendants of the trials in the 1930s were many former elements of the Okhrana. When the Okhrana was crushed, many of them then served in the secret services of foreign imperialist states illegally within the Party and government apparatus of the USSR, some of them even in leading positions, including before and after Stalin's death. **This is a straight line of counter-revolution that must be followed here, from the first day of the foundation of the Bolshevik Party until its crushing after Stalin's death.** The more of them were exposed, especially the various legal representatives of the opposition in the Party, the more vigorously the remaining counter-revolutionaries made declarations "against" the counter-revolutionaries, in order to use this double-tongued tactic to dismiss any suspicion of belonging to the counter-revolution, so as not to expose their counter-revolutionary reserves. From 1930, the legality of counter-revolution was over. From then on, it only appeared illegally. The "Right and Trotskyites," who could no longer appear in public, were of course far from being crushed by this, but they continued their subversive work against the Soviet Union all the more intensively illegally, and even took the lead themselves in the "struggle against the Bloc of the Right and Trotskyites" in order to conquer new positions in the Party.

The tactic of openly expressing counter-revolutionary positions within the Party, the formation of an opposition, turned from that moment on into the tactic of concealing and falsifying the revolutionary goals, for example, concealing the main links of the class struggle or replacing the actual main links of the chain with false ones in order to weaken the thrust or to steer it in the wrong direction. This tactic was used more and more elaborately until the death of Stalin, until it was

mastered by the modern revisionists in power to make the actual implementation of the restoration of capitalism appear as a "further development and consolidation of socialism". The roots of this tactic lead back to the tactics of the Bloc of the Right and Trotskyites as it continued its counter-revolution after the purges of the 1930s. **It is therefore imperative that we follow the trail of the Right and Trotskyite Bloc until the death of Stalin in order to understand and interpret the 1953 Conspiracy historically.**

Yagoda's task as deputy chairman of the OGPU of Menzshinsky was to protect the illegal organization of the Right and Trotskyite Bloc before and during the purges of the 1930s from the grip of the dictatorship of the proletariat. Openly the Right had appeared mainly with Tomsy, Rykov and Bukharin (triple alliance), but the organization itself operated illegally. Protection of their own criminal organization was the reason why the Right and Trotskyites accepted innocent victims to divert suspicion from themselves and save their own skins. Innocent victims then later put Beria and Khrushchev on Stalin's account. Beria and Khrushchev thus entered the general tenor of Western anti-Stalinist propaganda.

The so-called "**Ryutin Platform**" from 1932 was the illegal program of counter-revolution, the program of the violent overthrow of Soviet power, designed in Tomsy's country house, where besides **Bukharin, Rykov and Tomsy** other counter-revolutionaries took part. The double tactic of this platform was already expressed in the intention of its authors to officially distance themselves from it by name, in order to address and win over as many opponents of the Soviet system as possible, including those who would not have supported the platform at all if they had known that the authors' real names were Tomsy, Rykov and Bukharin. **After all, they were leading members of the Central Committee of the CPSU(B)!** The content of the platform was the practice of all violent measures against the USSR and the organizational unification of the counter-revolutionary forces. The forces of dissatisfaction with the Party and government were to be united and concentrated on armed uprisings, for example Kulak uprisings. By uniting with this Ryutinist Platform of the Right, Trotsky showed what he was hiding under his leftist uniform, his fascist sentiments! The Right and "Left" ideologically armed each other and proved what they really were - outright scoundrels.

While the Bloc of the Right and Trotskyites opened the door for the fascists to invade the Soviet Union, the conspirers of 1953 opened the door to the Soviet Union for the Cold War of the Anglo-Americans, not to hand over the Soviet Union, but to participate in the power game of world domination, that is, the subjugation of the world to capitalism, which they hoped to gain ample advantages from. But in whose hands would the power actually end up in the end? Only in the hands of world capitalism, of course, which became a historical fact in 1991. The 1953 Conspiracy was thus a division of world imperialism with the Western powers at the top, especially the USA. The fear of being exposed brought them together to cover each other. But once brought together, the common cover turned into a collective pressure, which thus weighed on each of them individually. The strength of the common conspiracy became the ultimate test of their disintegration at the weakest link in the chain.

The Trotskyites had to build up their own illegal military forces for the "palace revolution" independently of their other illegal organizations, while Khrushchev was able to use the leadership of the Red Army to take over his power by party means quite "legally". The center of the Bloc, as well as Yagoda from the Ministry of the Interior and Tukhachevsky from the army, were connected with the military group. Khrushchev, on the other hand, quite "legally" used Beria and Zhukov/Bulganin.

In **1934**, 2/3 of the Central Committee was purged, not by the revisionists, but by Stalin and his followers. Stalin's General Line was developed in ideological two-front struggle into a majority

line, which could only be overthrown over his dead body. **The great importance of Stalin is above all that he was able to push the Marxist-Leninist line through to the end against all revisionist forces** who had allied themselves with the imperialist forces from outside against Stalin, to overthrow Stalin, to assassinate Stalin.

The Trotskyites and the Right were preparing their **overthrow for the 17th Party Congress** in January 1934 (the trials were in 1938, 4 years later, when the criminal gang was really going strong!), even planned to arrest Stalin and the other leading members of the government in the republics and districts (Tomsky). Although they had to refrain from doing so because of the hopelessness of their plan, they had at least tried to win a majority at the Party Congress, but Stalin survived the critical situation caused by the lower number of votes due to the influence that the Trotskyites and Rightists had actually exerted on the delegates. However, the majority of votes weren't against him thanks to his great successes in building socialism, thanks to the masses who stood behind him in a united front, and not least thanks to the crushing exposure of the Bloc of the Right and Trotskyites, the formation of the Leninist Front against all anti-party deviations. In this hard struggle at the 17th Party Congress, he once again remained the victor, while the "stragglers", the double-talkers, suffered defeat and finally made hypocritical praises for Stalin in order to be able to continue their illegal bloc-wooing within the Party.

For the 1953 Conspiracy against Stalin, the entire leadership of the CPSU bears the responsibility, both the comrades of the Old and the New Guard, **without exception!** The role of the leadership circle in the 1930s and 1953 was different in so far as **in 1953 nobody had fought on the side of Stalin, but everyone more or less agreed to eliminate Stalin.** This relative unity to rebel against Stalin was ultimately decisive for the conspirers to step up their attacks on Stalin and this had finally given impetus and dynamism to their criminal deeds. In the counter-revolutionary united front, they reduced their fear of Stalin and this was of great importance for what happened next. The conspiracy groups were united by their different anti-party views, which then led to the need to fight against Stalin. But as they fought against Stalin, it became increasingly clear to them that they had betrayed socialism, the USSR, that they had become accomplices of the capitalist world. They hid this all the more because they were afraid of being exposed and liquidated as traitors. This fear, this bad conscience drove them deeper and deeper into the abyss. If Stalin had lived, the program of the restoration of capitalism would have failed, it would have meant the bankruptcy of the conspirers.

Just like the Right and Trotskyites, who considered "socialism in one country" impossible, the modern revisionists feared world socialism after Stalin's great victories.

Without fascism from outside, there would be no counter-revolutionary groups in the Soviet Union that could have relied on fascism. In the First Period of Socialism, that is, in the period of "socialism in one country", although it was possible, with a great deal of effort and countless sacrifices, to sweep the Bloc of the Right and Trotskyites from the surface, to inflict on it bitter defeats and losses which gave an enormous and decisive impetus to the construction of socialism, to win the Great Patriotic War over fascism and its 5th Column in the Soviet Union, to create better conditions for the transition to the Second Period of Socialism, etc. But the counter-revolution that continued to rumble underground could not be rendered harmless forever; this required the intensification of the class struggle in the Soviet Union. **In the First Period of Socialism, the inevitability of the counter-revolutionary movement of the restoration of capitalism could not be eliminated, but can only be done on a global scale, that is, in the Second Period of Socialism.** This is due to the historical fact that the First Period of Socialism is characterized by the increasing pressure of world imperialist encirclement:

"Capitalist encirclement must not be regarded simply as a geographical concept. Capitalist

encirclement means that the U.S.S.R. is surrounded by hostile class forces, which are ready to support our class enemies within the U.S.S.R. morally, materially, by means of a financial blockade and, if the opportunity offers, by military intervention." (Stalin: 'Political Report of the Central Committee to the Sixteenth Congress of the C.P.S.U.(B.)' in: 'Works', Volume 12; Moscow; 1954; p.311; English Edition).

At the time of fascism, the counter-revolutionary groupings within the USSR could not rely on a closed global counter-revolutionary system of imperialist encirclement, but only on the individual great powers, which were fighting each other and weakening each other, especially Germany, England and Japan. Above all, the counter-revolutionary groups relied on the great power that was most likely to contribute to the overthrow of the USSR and the conquest of counter-revolutionary power - Germany. **Germany was the main enemy before the Second World War and after the war it was the USA and it has remained so until today.** This also corresponds to the essence of the First Period of Socialism. But how do the conditions of the counter-revolutionary groupings in the Soviet Union change, after on the one hand world imperialism was extremely weakened after World War II and on the other hand the Soviet Union with the emerging socialist camp, with the revolutionary development of Asia, etc., was strengthened on an international scale? **The world was faced with the decisive historical situation of the worldwide triumph of socialism and thus the worldwide decline of capitalism. In other words: the socialism of the First Period had already matured so far after the Second World War that the qualitative leap to world socialism was beginning to take place. The conspiracy would not have brought about Stalin's death, would not have brought about the failure of his already made transition to the Second Period of Socialism, if world imperialism had not been forced in this situation to support this conspiracy from outside with all available means.** Beria took the position of non-interference. For him, the Soviet Union was strong enough to deal with everyone in the world, to cooperate with both aggressors and their victims "for the good of the Soviet Union". In reality, Beria's attitude of non-interference favored the aggression of the Allied Western powers, but in reality his attitude did not favor the end of the Cold War, on the contrary, it only increased their warlike aggression.

Without a Roosevelt and a Churchill there would have been no conspirer named Beria. For the modern revisionists, the extermination of Hitlerite fascism was a precondition for the alliance with the other Western powers and not a decisive step towards the entire extermination of the world imperialism, as Stalin planned. **Without the determination and unity of the world imperialist camp to counter the imminent danger of the socialist camp with all its might and all its means, there would have been no national movements in the border areas of the Soviet Union which could have been seduced by Beria to separate themselves from the Russian center.** On the threshold of the Second Period of Socialism, the character of the conspiracy also changed. **It no longer served only to overthrow "socialism in one country", but to prevent the transition to world socialism. Thus, modern revisionism had become a world revisionist current. The conspirers of 1953 transformed the center of world revolution into a center of counter-revolution and this is exactly what saved world imperialism from its downfall.** Thanks to the resulting Marxist-Leninist World Movement, socialism was victoriously defended in Albania. In other words, although the transition to world socialism was prevented, the development of "socialism in one country" was not prevented, but the socialism of the First Period continued to develop, despite revisionism in power. **In this way we Marxist-Leninists proved to the world that we had victoriously defended Stalin's legacy, that Stalin could be assassinated, that socialism could be swept off the face of the earth for a limited period of time, but that Stalin's legacy could not be permanently destroyed. Today, world imperialism is starting to decay globally, so that even the revisionists are deprived of their support by world imperialism, that the victory of the world socialist revolution is inevitably within reach.**

At the 15th, Party Congress, Stalin spoke out against the opposition of Kamenev and Zinoviev:

"Shall we Bolsheviks, who uprooted the nobility, restore them now in our Party?" (Stalin: 'The Fifteenth Congress of the C.P.S.U. (B.)' in: 'Works', Volume 10; Moscow; 1954; p.360; English Edition).

The majority of the Presidium, indeed the entire Presidium should have been expelled in the early 1950s. Stalin did not want any noble "Bolsheviks" in the Party, **neither those of the old nor those of the new nobility.**

Such radical situations as purging the entire leadership had not occurred for the first time with the Bolsheviks. **Like Stalin in 1953, Lenin was all alone in 1903.** From the leading group of six went Plekhanov, Zasulich, Martov, Axelrod and Potresov. As a result, however, the Party with Lenin found itself in the right, on the Bolshevik path. The situation was no different in 1907 and 1908, in the period of withdrawal of the failed 1905 Revolution. Also, as far as the period of the NEP and the subsequent period of building "socialism in one country" was concerned, it required the annihilation of the leaders of the capitalist remnants and the Trotskyite leaders of the opposition. Or take the situation created by the Great Patriotic War. Here too, it was inevitable that leading party heads had to roll, especially within the Red Army. And 1953? The same thing! As a result, the Party with Stalin, with Stalinist members of the Presidium, could have continued the Bolshevik path of Lenin and Stalin victoriously, if such "leaders" as Khrushchev, or those who made him a leader, had been purged from their posts in time. **The purging of the Party, especially the purging of the party leadership, is not an arbitrary act, but is inseparably connected with the historical turns of the class struggle, which every Bolshevik Party has to master, and which, after all, cannot go off without party sacrifices, sacrifices in the party leadership.**

It is a fact that history, including the history of Bolshevism, always makes certain decisive turns in its course. These turns have always led to the replacement of old party leaders by new ones as radical as the turn itself.

Also at the beginning of the 1950s, Bolshevism was at its historical turning-point, the turn to World Bolshevism: The smashing of all world imperialism, the breaking of its orbit with proletarian internationalism in power, the victory of socialism on a world scale, the turn from the "dictatorship of the proletariat in one country" to the world dictatorship of the proletariat, the turn of "communism in one country" to world communism. In short: the practically imminent transition from the First to the Second Period of Socialism, the turn to world socialism.

At the beginning of the 1950s, such presidium members, who got cold feet in the face of this enormous challenge, who had already made themselves all too comfortable in their stately beds furnished by the working class, were an impossibility for Stalin. For this very reason the Party's path led inevitably into degeneration, into decline. **The path of transition to world socialism, the transition of "communism in one country", was betrayed by the turn of the first socialist state in the world into a restored capitalist state, whereby the turn to the Second Period ended with the temporary death of the First Period of Socialism, the transition from "socialism in one country" to "communism in one country".**

We Marxist-Leninists have always spoken of **capitalist encirclement** under the conditions of Lenin's and Stalin's USSR, whereas we had to assume capitalist-revisionist encirclement after the seizure of power by the modern revisionists. This was, of course, completely correct. But have we correctly shed light on the dialectical development process towards capitalist-revisionist encirclement? How did this decisive qualitative change of the encirclement come about, which the Marxist-Leninist World Movement with its leading Albanian world center was now confronted

with?

Stalin tried to solve the question of capitalist encirclement dialectically. The encirclement from outside affects the inner "encirclement". The 1953 Conspiracy aimed at "revisionist encirclement" the leading center of the Bolshevik Party with Stalin at the head by means of direct and indirect support for the capitalist encirclement from outside. The capitalist-revisionist encirclement, as it affected Albania and the Marxist-Leninist World Movement after Stalin's death, had already developed during Stalin's lifetime, only that Stalin could prevent the unification and fusion of the capitalist and revisionist encirclement into a single world front until his death.

The transition to "communism in one country" depended on whether Stalin would succeed in delaying not only the Cold War from the outside, but also the Cold War from within, which could not be waged by the revisionists from outside any other way than under the conditions of the Cold War, which was inevitable, but which he delayed, either until the moment when the Socialist World Camp spreads sufficiently or finally until the moment when the imperialists among themselves *as well as the revisionists among themselves* fall apart because of the spread of the Socialist World Camp on the one hand and the transition to "communism in one country" on the other hand.

Stalin wanted to liberate the Party from those wavering, capitulating and lambing leadership elements, which had hindered the Party's progress in this **direction towards the turnaround**. But the blowing up of the inner perimeter was already no longer an internal affair of the Soviet Union, but was closely linked to the struggle against the Anglo-American imperialists' Cold War, that is, to the struggle against the newly emerging world capitalist camp.

To that, Stalin said:

"Well, if some of the old leaders who are turning into trash intend to fall out of the cart—a good riddance to them!" (Stalin: 'The Fifteenth Congress of the C.P.S.U. (B.)' in: 'Works', Volume 10; Moscow; 1954; p.382; English Edition).

But with his murder, Stalin could not continue his internationalist work, what remained alive in the Party, that which was no longer worth staying alive, and the new, the growing, that had been killed with Stalin, must today be rebuilt from the front with great difficulty. So much for the world-historical consequences of failed purges, so much for the iron principle of a Bolshevik Party: **The Party moves forward by purging itself of rubbish. Conversely, the Party will be purged of its own retrograde elements if it fails to take this iron principle seriously and consistently put it into practice.** We should not be surprised, comrades, that the bourgeoisie is demagogically and precisely denouncing this principle of purging, our principle of purging, as an "undemocratic and uncivilized, barbaric tool of the Communist Party's dictatorship of terror over dissenters and opponents" to the masses. We should also not be surprised that the modern revisionists condemned the purges as **"the devil work of Stalin"** to lick the boots of world imperialism. It is significant that the modern revisionists branded Stalin as a "deviator" from Leninism, when Leninism taught the purge of the Party that Stalin could only implement masterfully.

Up to Stalin's death, the Conspiracy still had a generally defeatist character. The conspirers were tired of constantly having to hide their displeasure and resentment from Stalin, since they had long since broken with Stalin. They felt malicious joy when Stalin had difficulties in enforcing his General Line. They supported him only very half-heartedly and reluctantly, and many of them stabbed him in the back wherever and whenever the opportunity arose. When their dissatisfaction had increased to the point of refusal, a new "thirst for action" matured in them and **passive**

defeatism turned into active defeatism. This, of course, did not remain hidden from Stalin. This tense situation did not remain without consequences for his state of health. He was already 73 years old and this fight cost him a lot of strength. The different conspiracy groups were all sharply criticized and fought by Stalin. Conversely, Stalin was a constant threat to the realization of their criminal intentions. In order to finally get rid of him, they granted each other a mutual amnesty, concluded a "non-aggression pact" among themselves until the conquest of their revisionist power, and then, after Stalin's death, they competed with each other in the struggle for succession, for their own power, for their own heads. However, it would be un-Marxist to push personal motives for power to the fore. **In reality, the new bourgeoisie was only concerned with how to use its political power best in order to implement the restoration of capitalism safely and smoothly.**

The depravity of Khrushchev's morality is expressed in the elimination of Beria, which was already planned by him before the elimination of Stalin. Khrushchev's duplicity towards conspirers who helped him to seize power proved to be a masquerade which allowed him to direct all his fire against Beria in order to assert and consolidate power. Khrushchev accused Beria of "shaking the foundations of the USSR", of being a "Western agent" etc., and exposed this double-talking man with the intention of covering his own tracks of his involvement in the heinous crime against Stalin. Everything that Khrushchev accused Beria of in the blackest colors was partly committed by Khrushchev himself and that is the truth. Khrushchev's sentence against Beria was the sentence against himself. That was how Radek proceeded in the trial of Zinoviev and Kamenev - the same way, with the difference that Radek did not escape his just punishment, while Khrushchev was able to continue his crimes, which we Hoxhaists exposed and fought against. Khrushchev walked over the corpses of his cronies and burrowed his way out of the stinking, bloody sewer in which he had been stuck during Stalin's lifetime. But traitors never escape the judgment of the world proletariat. It will not only nail Khrushchev's crimes to the shameful stake of history, it will not only destroy Khrushchevism, but all of world revisionism.

What about Beria? Beria, who had participated with Khrushchev in the preparation of the "palace revolution" during Stalin's lifetime, cried over the murdered body of Stalin to cover his tracks as well. **Only that in covering his own tracks. And he was a master at it, for in fact nothing bad could be "proved" to him, without running the risk, in uncovering his true crimes, of diverting the traces to the other conspirers, to Khrushchev. Thus Khrushchev had no choice but to pass his death sentence on Beria, for otherwise he could not have saved his own skin if Beria had asserted his will against all the others, and not least against Khrushchev himself.** But Beria was not possessed by a "naked lust for power". That is not true. This was an attempt to deceive public opinion. In order to hide the program of the restoration of capitalism and implement it unrecognized, Khrushchev shoved it on Beria, according to the motto of all criminal offenders: "Stop thief!" **But if one takes both the criminal deeds of Khrushchev and the criminal deeds of Beria in the period between Stalin's and Beria's deaths under the Marxist-Leninist magnifying glass, one cannot deny that both were "in their own way" advocates of the program of the restoration of capitalism and that they differed only in the different amount of blood on their hands.** Those who deny this take the side of the restoration of capitalism, whether or not they claim to be "anti-revisionist, Marxist-Leninist". **A distinction between Beria and Khrushchev is not a distinction between modern revisionism and Marxist-Leninism. Beria had been overthrown not as a Stalinist but as a hasty restorer of capitalism who has rushed ahead too quickly. Beria and Khrushchev were in principle in agreement about "de-Stalinization", but there were irreconcilable differences on the road to capitalism, both in terms of the extent and limits of the restoration of capitalism to be carried out, and in terms of the pace and methods. Whoever calls Beria a so-called "Marxist-Leninist" is making a momentous mistake and must know that he is helping the bourgeoisie to save modern revisionism from its final downfall is moving to the other side of the barricade. We do not**

blame any comrade who has so far misjudged Beria. We ourselves have only now received information about Beria, so for a long time we were unable to form an accurate picture of him. However, those whom we condemn are people with dark intentions, such as those from the "red-channel", who know very well about Beria's crimes.

Since we Marxist-Leninists had seen through and denounced the renegade Khrushchev, his liquidation of Beria had to look as if a "leader of Marxism-Leninism," "a loyal follower of Stalin," had "fallen victim" to the revisionists. **But the truth is that here only a conspirer against Stalin fell victim to a rival conspirer against Stalin.** In this way, these Berianists have tried to save revisionism and to make it us Marxist-Leninists. Every revisionism, every revisionist who is not exposed and who can continue to hide, is a danger for us Marxist-Leninists that we must face. This is exactly what we understand by neo-revisionism : **"Anti-revisionism in words, revisionism in deeds!" The attitude towards Beria is a touchstone in distinguishing Marxism-Leninism from neo-revisionism!** The hostile attitude of "red-channel" towards us is no coincidence and has its reason. The "red-channel" defends the GDR against our reproach of social-fascism, logically they must also protect Beria from us. Whoever supports the social-fascist GDR of Ulbricht and Honecker is an arch-revisionist, whom we Stalinists do not touch with velvet gloves, because the StaSi did not do that with our Marxist-Leninist comrades either. Let them defend their GDR, they will end up on the dung heap of history just like the GDR.

Both Beria and Khrushchev believed that world imperialism, with the U.S. in the lead, would win and strangle everything, and that it was therefore better to come to an understanding with them in time and make some kind of compromise in terms of retreating from socialism to capitalism. **Only Beria did this behind the Party's back through his power in the Interior Ministry, while Khrushchev chose the more appropriate way through the Party and successfully gained decisive influence in the party base and thus among the masses. Beria was so filled with blind hatred of Stalin that he was careless and underestimated Stalin's influence in the Party and the masses, and refused to acknowledge this fact, which Khrushchev understood very well. For as it turned out, the cadres in the Party, state and army felt caught off guard by Beria's breathtaking reform course, they distrusted Beria's passing over the Party, they condemned Beria, which Khrushchev was able to cleverly exploit to get the reins in his own hands by "leaning" on the Party, and thus on the masses.**

If one demands **"proof" against Beria**, what kind of "proof" should be given about such conspirers? It will hardly be possible to find any document in which Beria, with his signature, confessed to being a conspirer against Stalin and to being his murderer? The very essence of his conspiracy was to hide his crimes behind Marxism-Leninism, behind Stalin, in order to make them appear "Marxist-Leninist" and "Stalinist". It is impossible to have the conspiracy certified by a public notary to prove guilt. The question of proof cannot be asked at all, especially not when the KGB still guards the **"Beria file"** like a sanctuary before the eyes of the public, if it still exists at all.

I did him in! I saved you all!

That is what the social-fascist butcher Beria said on the tribune of the Mausoleum on May 1st, 1953.

"I love all – all Humanity! I really do! I set myself before you!"

This was the call of his German student, the social-fascist butcher Mielke, at his 1989 trial.

Like master, like student!

Neither the masters nor students have ever regretted their crimes, but have celebrated themselves as "liberators". Both of them, in the name of Stalinism, not only persecuted, imprisoned, tortured, beat, poisoned and murdered communists, but also did this to all other people when they stood in the way of their anti-Stalinist goals.

Not only is there inflammatory bourgeois propaganda that portrays these two murderers as "Stalinist" butchers, thereby blaming Stalinism for capitalist crimes against humanity. No, that's not all. There are also people who place themselves in the service of this inflammatory bourgeois propaganda, who "scientifically prove" that the murderers of Stalin were in fact "Marxist-Leninists", "loyal followers" of Stalin [sic!!!].

It is clear that we Stalinists could no longer remain silent on this, that we had to expose, brand and condemn this bourgeoisie's sham maneuver, that we not only had to consistently distance ourselves from the Berianists, but also launch a Marxist-Leninist offensive against them, that we had to push back the ideological influence of the Berianists in the Marxist-Leninist World Movement, that we had to drive them out of the Marxist-Leninist World Movement, that the Marxist-Leninist World Movement had to free itself from the harmful influence of Berianism and to strengthen itself through purges.

We have included Mielke here because we, as the KPD/ML, had been declared "Public Enemy #1" by the GDR. This was the order given by Mielke to the StaSi. We are among the Stalinists who were hunted by a student of Beria, and this hunt for us has not ended even after Mielke's death, and the informants of Mielke are still among us unscathed. Here we take position as directly concerned Stalinists on Bill Bland's article: "THE 'DOCTOR'S CASE' AND THE DEATH OF STALIN".

As affected Stalinists, we, unlike Bill Bland, approach the question of Comrade Stalin's death politically and partially, in a biased way, if you will. This is not historically one-sided or unscientific, but quite the opposite, in the spirit of Marxism-Leninism. We cannot, therefore, be comfortable with the collection of quotations from bourgeois historians which Bill Bland stuffed the chronological sequence of events with. Such anti-communist "historians" as Robert Conquest, whom Bill Bland so fondly quoted, are utterly detestable. Robert Conquest also wrote the preface to the anti-Stalinist inflammatory writing of Sudoplatov, who was loyal to Beria: "Special Tasks: The Memoirs of an Unwanted Witness—A Soviet Spymaster", which certainly, though not intended by him, contributed to the revelation of Beria's anti-Stalinism. Sudoplatov once revered Beria as the "deliverer" from Stalinism, as leader of the fight against Stalin's "terror regime", the "criminality of Stalin", the "crimes of Stalinism", etc. It is certainly true that Sudoplatov also strongly criticized Beria, because the goodwill of Western historians depended on it, which Sudoplatov could not appear in the world public without. **What we criticize about Sudoplatov is not that he did not fight for Stalinism. Sudoplatov was not the kind of class enemy that Beria was. Beria was his mentor and Sudoplatov obeyed his orders. As a former convinced Stalinist, he had once earned great merits, and of course, as Stalinists we cannot condemn them. What we must reproach Sudoplatov and many other comrades, however, is that he finally turned away (as he called it) from the "power intrigues of the leadership" in disappointment. He saw himself in the victim role, which had been dictated "from above". He should have remained faithful as a Stalinist and as such at Stalin's side, in order to hunt down the schemers against Stalin in his own ranks, for example Beria and all the other conspirers. Sudoplatov did not deny his former Stalinist actions, but later judged them to be "fatal errors", blamed Stalinism for these "errors" in an inadmissible way, in order to finally be able to celebrate himself as a hero—even at the price of earning applause from the capitalist world. Sudoplatov, like many other Stalinists, lost his bearings on the**

factional struggles going on at crucial moments in the fierce class struggle in the Soviet Union, was no longer able to distinguish friend from foe, finally refused make the distinction, and thus actually became a stooge of power, though not of Stalin's power, but of the power of Stalin's opponents, as Beria was one. He did not lose his militant attitude, but he did lose his proletarian attitude, his revolutionary, Bolshevik spirit, which he was always so proud of. Sudoplatov was one of the many proletarian revolutionaries who became capitalist soldiers through Beria. The tragic thing about him is that until his last breath he surrendered to Beria's "self-deception," that it wasn't he, Sudoplatov, but Stalin who had "lost his revolutionary spirit". Sudoplatov and thousands of other Stalinists were so influenced by the sneaky opponents of Stalin at the head of the Soviet Union that they managed to use them as a tool against Stalin. This was a great crime against the Stalinist cadres, committed not only by Beria but by the modern revisionists as a whole. This is a historical fact that cannot be ignored. To this day, the effect of Beria's poison has been to incite, break and subdue upright comrades at turn them against upright comrades, to compromise the leaders, to burn the cadres and to deceive the masses. Berianism has also benefited, and continues to benefit, informants on a global scale. From this we Stalinists must learn lessons: We must educate our cadres so well that one good day we do not lose them to the class enemy, who will use them against us to destroy us. If we make the cadres the strongest point, we must always take into account that precisely because of this they can become the weakest point, and we must take appropriate precautions against this.

And Sudoplatov's "double tragedy" (which overtook him and many others) consisted in the fact that the modern revisionists violated him until they were tired of him and left him to the lechery of the Western hustle and bustle.

In the preface, Robert Conquest writes about this autobiography of Sudoplatov:

"It is perhaps the most important single contribution to our knowledge since Khrushchev's Secret Speech." (Conquest: 'Foreword' to Sudoplatov's 'Special Tasks'; Canada; 1994; p.viii; English Edition).

"He emerges, in fact, as one of the most valuable of all possible sources for important matters over the period of High Stalinism." (ibid; p.xii).

Well, these are the very "sources" that provided the imperialists' anti-Stalinism with new ammunition that Bill Bland uncritically took over.

Incidentally, in the introduction to Sudoplatov's autobiography, **Sudoplatov's attitude to Beria** is characterized by the following words:

"Sudoplatov reveals the complex character of Lavrenti Beria, his mentor from 1939 to 1953. He was concerned with painting a full portrait of the Beria he knew: a man of vision and managerial brilliance who successfully presided over the creation of the first Soviet atomic bomb [which was about the same as "Hitler building the Autobahn" – editor's note]. Sudoplatov hoped that Beria would take over and turn his ruthlessness and drive to cleaning out the Augean stables of corruption [which he blamed Stalin for – editor's note]. He would raise the Soviet Union's world stature [by murdering Stalin???? - editor's note].

"(...) Beria, argues Sudoplatov, was an innovator [reformist – editor's note] who would have brought about the unification of Germany in the 1950s, avoiding the crises [as a capitulator in the service of the imperialists – editor's note] that led to the construction of the Berlin Wall. In

the few short months between Stalin's death and his arrest by Khrushchev's supporters. Beria had begun emptying the Gulag and urged that political prisoners [only the anti-communist prisoners placed by Stalin, not the Stalinist prisoners placed by Beria – editor's note] be released." (ibid. p.xvi-xvii).

So the "poor, good" Beria has been prevented by the terror of both Stalin and Khrushchev from doing good for the (imperialist) world. And Bill Bland awarded Beria the order of a "Marxist-Leninist" for this. Marxism-Leninism thus defines itself as a teaching against Stalinism on the one hand and modern revisionism on the other. For the Berianists, therefore, their anti-revisionist struggle consists both of the fight against modern revisionists (openly) and (covertly) against Stalinism.

People like Robert Conquest tried to systematically disillusion Stalin's friends in England and America and their sympathies for Soviet communism with their inflammatory writings and were honored at the highest levels. They worked directly as American and English agents of world imperialism, painting a grim picture of Stalin that could not be worse. And this is not only true of the falsifications about the circumstances that brought about Stalin's death. Bill Bland is hiding all this. Bill Bland's reference to the source is only neutral: "CONQUEST, Robert, British-born poet and political analyst specialising in the USSR (1917-); senior research fellow, Hoover Institute (1977-)". Why didn't Bill Bland comment critically and self-critically on his so-called "sources", why didn't he criticize Robert Conquest for who he was, a pen pirate - on behalf of the imperialists?

As an expert on Stalin, Bill Bland knew that the pen pirates never spread more lies about Stalin than they did about his death, and that therefore any speculation must be critically opposed, or at least have a healthy critical attitude of detachment. Is that too much to ask? Whoever reads the works of Stalin attentively will find enough explanations of Stalin to defend himself against forgeries and falsehoods, and it is no coincidence that most of the anti-Stalinist filth has been and continues to be poured out on the world public at the behest of the Anglo-American imperialists, apart from the revisionist runner-downs.

Let's take Volume 10 of the Stalin Works for instance. The last article in this volume is entitled: "Statement to Foreign Press Correspondents Concerning the Counterfeit 'Article by Stalin'"

In it, Comrade Stalin denies a series of alleged "interviews and articles by Stalin" that never existed and were purely invented by the West:

"Their aim is to counteract the effect produced by the U.S.S.R. delegation at Geneva by its declaration on complete disarmament.

"(...) The fact that in their struggle against the peace policy of the U.S.S.R. the agents of capital are compelled to resort to the assistance of all sorts of shady individuals and pen pirates is the best demonstration of the moral strength and soundness of principle of the stand taken on the question of disarmament by the U.S.S.R. delegation at Geneva." (Stalin: 'Statement to Foreign Press Correspondents Concerning the Counterfeit 'Article by Stalin' in: 'Works', Volume 10; Moscow; 1954; p.386; English Edition).

Nothing has changed in these journalistic criminal methods of the lackeys of capital, they have only been further refined. One of these refined methods is to sell the murderers of Stalin to the revolutionary left as "Marxist-Leninists".

We must give political reasons why we refuse to allow Bill Bland to make such remarks in parentheses every time the names of Beria and Malenkov and the names of other traitors to Stalinism are mentioned in his bourgeois quotes as ("*Marxist-Leninists*" - *the author Bill Bland*"). It would have been the duty of Bill Bland to give political reasons for his remarks, but he failed to do so for whatever reason.

In the Marxist-Leninist World Movement, there is not yet a sufficient, uniform and closed evaluation of the events that led to the death of Comrade Stalin, simply because of a lack of evidence. However, there are indications from Comrade Enver Hoxha, who himself regretted not having had enough information about this. It is astonishing that the "Hoxhaist" Bill Bland conceals Enver Hoxha's extremely revealing remarks such as:

"Such elements as Khrushchev, Mikoyan, Beria and their apparatchiki hid the truth from Stalin." (Hoxha: 'The Khrushchevites'; Tirana; 1984; p.19; English Edition).

How can "Hoxhaist" Bill Bland praise a Beria as a "Marxist-Leninist" who, according to Enver Hoxha, deceived and cheated Stalin? How can one pretend to be an honest Hoxhaist, a friend of Albania? One cannot accept Bill Bland's assessment as a uniform assessment of the Marxist-Leninist World Movement, which is committed to Hoxhism. On the contrary, Bill Bland's assessment is to be rejected without *diminishing* the value of the material he has collected from bourgeois historians. However, we believe that Bill Bland made the mistake of overvaluing the bourgeois hacks he quoted. An overvaluation of these materials, as we can see with Bill Bland, is to be criticized because it complicates and hinders the uniform Marxist evaluation of Comrade Stalin's death in the camp of the Marxist-Leninist World Movement rather than actually clarifying it. And this cannot be any different with bourgeois historians. If they did not spread lies, they would not be bourgeois historians.

Finding out the truth about Stalin's death is a process that takes decades, and it lasts just as long as the process of its concealment and falsification. But there can be no doubt among us Marxist-Leninists that Stalin was not the only Stalinist in the Soviet Union or that with his death the Stalinists did not stop being and remaining Stalinists. The struggle of the Stalinists in the period of the seizure of power by the modern revisionists had, in our opinion, *objectively taken place*. This is a fact that must never be concealed or falsified. Here all comrades of the Marxist-Leninist World Movement agree, because it is the very essence of the Stalinists to never give up their struggle in defense of Stalin, but on the contrary to strengthen it.

The anti-Stalinist tactic of concealment has had its day. There is a growing number of bourgeois historians who openly admit that Stalin was assassinated. In its place, the alternative anti-Stalinist tactic of falsely rewriting the revisionists' competition among themselves as "*the struggle of the revisionists against the Marxist-Leninists*" is increasingly evident. We cannot fail to note that Bill Bland's article "THE 'DOCTOR'S CASE' AND THE DEATH OF STALIN" encourages this bourgeois tactic of historical falsification. This, in turn, has led us to find out WHO the then Stalinists really were and HOW they fought against the various revisionist factions, how they were organized, what actions they carried out, what victims were deplored, what crimes the revisionists committed against the real Stalinists, etc. One cannot solve the death of Stalin without solving the deaths of all Stalinists, without solving the struggle to defend the first dictatorship of the proletariat. If we have exposed the tall tales about the alleged "Marxist-Leninists" Beria and his ilk, we have only uncovered half the truth. The question inevitably arises: If the alleged "Marxist-Leninists" have been exposed, who were the true Marxist-Leninists? What was the real struggle in defense of the dictatorship of the proletariat at the time? Where did the Party stand? Where was the working class? Where were the masses? Stalin did not fight against the whole world alone?!

We are firmly convinced that a heroic struggle was waged here by heroes whose existence was swept under the table of history with the intention of pulling the anchor of Stalinism out of the Party, out of the working class, out of the toiling masses with the method of silence.

If we are deliberately kept in the dark on this issue, one thing is clear to us: Without the lasting effectiveness of the Stalinists' anti-revisionist struggle, the modern revisionists would have certainly not needed almost four decades to complete the process of the restoration of capitalism! It is no coincidence that today, far from the Russian metropolises, countless monuments, statues, and busts of Stalin and Lenin still stand upright and have not yet been overthrown. And it is also no coincidence that the Stalinist movement, despite the most severe persecutions, is more and more open with Stalinist demonstrations and pictures of Stalin. It is an overwhelming joy for us Stalinists, who have been fighting for Stalinism for over 50 years, to be able to witness this. The Stalinist movement has historically held its ground and continues to develop. Bravo!!!! Even the most hardened anti-Stalinists can no longer deny this.

We are further aware that the Stalinist movement in the revisionist Soviet Union and in other revisionist states (with the exception of the Stalinist movement in East and West Germany) had been isolated from the actually existing Marxist-Leninist World Movement outside the revisionist states, that there was no contact whatsoever "on either side". This has changed today. There is no longer a revisionist-bourgeois wall between the Stalinist movements of all countries of the world. The Stalinist World Movement today is in the process of uniting globally across all national and political borders and of bringing to an end Comrade Stalin's struggle for world socialism after his death. That is a fact.

Of course, the Stalinist World Movement is aware that the revisionists can continue to fish in the mud as long as we do not bring to light the class struggle veiled in darkness between the Stalinists and the revisionists just before Stalin's death, during the seizure of power by the modern revisionists and immediately thereafter. Here we are especially dependent on the support of the Stalinist comrades of the former Soviet Union, who are better able to assess the situation from within than is possible from without. Leading the struggle against revisionism, which today means not least of all to enlighten and document the whole physiognomy of the Stalinist struggle in the Soviet Union shortly before and after Stalin's murder, to learn from this struggle. Only in this way can we gradually dig up the water from the revisionists, can we chase them out of the trenches in which they took shelter and get them in front of our guns. The struggle of the Stalinists in countries where the revisionists seized power is one of the most important experiences of the international revolutionary workers movement, from whose victories and defeats we draw important lessons to prevent history from repeating itself in such a way.

So when we deal with Stalin's death, we do not do so without the intention of finding historical evidence of the existence and active survival of the Stalinist movement under the conditions of revisionism in power. Much of what Mielke, Beria's student, did against the Stalinist movement throughout Germany will surely have parallels in all other revisionist states. The KPD/ML in Germany has earned the merit of illuminating and bring revolutionary change to this chapter of history.

Now, the so-called "anti-Party Group" around Molotov, Kaganovich, etc. was emerging, but what does this prove? Everything we know about them indicates that they could never have been the leaders of the Stalinist movement after Stalin's death. On the contrary, we agree with Stalin that they deviated from the path of Stalinism, that they stabbed Stalin in the back, and that Stalin's death did not bring them back to Stalinism in remorse. Not only did they

capitulate to the power of the modern revisionists, but they even paved the way to power for them. They had already ceased to be Stalinists during Stalin's lifetime, and nothing changed after Stalin's death. Both Beria and Khrushchev used these corpses of Bolshevism to bury Stalinism.

Presumably this "anti-Party Group" would have been linked to the actual Stalinist movement, but the illegal Stalinists certainly did not follow this group into surrender. They had continued to fulfill their revolutionary duty in the struggle against revisionism in power, in defiance of all the reconciliators and capitulators without sacrifice, without the fear of death, a fact that is still hushed up today. We Stalinists of today will not be dissuaded from this firm conviction and we will provide the proof that we were not wrong. Testimony is, for example, the document: "Programmatic Proclamation of the Soviet Revolutionary Communists (Bolsheviks)", which was illegally distributed in the Soviet Union and which the Albanian comrades published in the late 1960s/early 1970s. This document can be read on the Internet.

Just as one cannot "de-Stalinize" Stalinism, this consequently means that one can neither "de-Stalinize" one Stalinist nor even the entire Stalinist movement. An essential point about the Stalinist movement is that the counter-revolutionary disorganization of the Stalinist movement has only contributed more to the revival and reanimation of the Stalinist movement both nationally and internationally, that the class enemy itself inevitably had to contribute to its expansion and consolidation and continues to do so. And the fact that the Stalinist movement still exists today shows that not only has the Russian bourgeoisie had to create 150 different "Stalinist" sham organizations with the intention of drowning the Stalinist core in them, but it has increasingly become a global phenomenon. It is no coincidence that such sham organizations have also been created in Europe, America and every other continent in the world to drown the core of the Stalinist world movement in the global reservoir of revisionism. But in the dialectical sense, this will inevitably lead to a process of ideological clarification where the wheat is separated from the chaff, where the truly Stalinist world movement has become ever more closely knit and strong enough to create hundreds of "Stalinist" sham organizations "from the throat" in the Stalinist sense. In any case, the Comintern/ML has concentrated all its work since 2000 on this ideological clarification process and we are sure that this effort will one day bear fruit, that the Stalinist World Movement will again become the leading political force in the world after Stalin's death. All our political efforts serve this goal!! This is the legacy that Stalin left us and which we will fulfill with honor! And it also means that we will fight against such views with which the murderers of Stalin can still be "honored" as "Marxist-Leninists" without ever having been called to account for them.

Now Stalin was not just any communist, but the 4th Classic of Marxism-Leninism, the leader of the international working class, the builder of the world's first socialist state, the victor over fascism, the leader of the world socialist camp, the closest fighting companion of Lenin, one of the best and most important world revolutionaries in the history of mankind. You don't read about any of this in Bill Bland's work, not at all.

All the more serious is the world-historical crime of the conspirers who murdered Stalin in 1953. They all have the heaviest debt to the world proletariat. They all agreed to end Stalinism with the murder of the figure of Stalin. All members of the Presidium felt it was their "duty" that "things could not go on like this with Stalin", that the Soviet Union must be "liberated" from Stalin.

Beria and Malenkov were the most active organizers of Stalin's assassination. It was they who, one

day after Stalin's death, were able to take the **highest posts in the new Soviet revisionist leadership**.

Beria had the most optimal conditions for eliminating Stalin. He was the 4th in charge of the Department of the Ministry of Health, and thus had the doctors in his hands. That is why he was able to skillfully maneuver the tactics of the Doctor's Plot.

Immediately before Stalin's death, Beria no longer ranked fourth, but sixth, behind Bulganin, Kaganovich, Molotov, Mikoyan, Voroshilov and Andreyev who had each already fallen from grace. The latter two were also no longer invited to Politburo meetings.

Shortly before his death, Stalin lived a very secluded life in his sparsely furnished dacha of Kuntsevo, or in fact he had already been completely isolated from his conspirers. There he was visited only by Beria, Malenkov, Bulganin, Mikoyan and Khrushchev. The people who had belonged to Stalin's private circle for decades had been removed one by one by Beria and Malenkov. In his very last days, Stalin was treated as if the world no longer existed around him by this scum. The old jokes were tortured out, but politically there was an oppressive silence. It was like the peace of the grave that preceded his murder. A silence of gravediggers, who accompanied Stalin as if he was dying. Stalin must have been aware of this situation.

Beria wanted to appear as a "pure" Marxist-Leninist. But he goes down in history as the murderer of Stalin. It is the story itself that silences all the Beria's praise. With the MVD occupation of Moscow, Beria suddenly had absolute power in the Soviet Union. This coup with the help of security troops is a historical fact, which is proven by the events that immediately followed Stalin's death.

It would have taken the Red Army's military many days and fierce bloody street fighting to thwart Beria's internal military power over the Presidium, which he had locked inside the Kremlin walls and completely shielded from the outside world. No mouse, no Red Army soldier would have been able to get to Moscow at that moment, let alone get into Moscow. Beria's troops had overwhelmed the Kremlin guard. Proskronishev and all the other loyal Stalinists were shot on the spot. Beria's secret service did what it was ordered to do-to help the counter-revolution to victory. Everything went according to plan, but seizing power and maintaining power are two different things, as we know.

Beria was far too weak to rule alone and had far too many enemies. But he was already too strong for a triumvirate of himself, Malenkov and Molotov. He withdrew his troops after the members of the Presidium had to give in. But he had now challenged them to a counterstrike by acting on his own authority. Beria's "coup de grâce" could not end any other way than with a "coup de grâce" against himself. Even the outwitted Red Army had hatred for Beria. It had been harboring pent-up anger toward its own military of the internal apparatus since the October Revolution anyway. So the "punishment" followed on its heels. Beria could not kill the entire Presidium; he had to share power with it. But the presidium did *not want or need* to share power with Beria. So a few months later the Kremlin became a death trap for Beria, who himself had used it shortly before to occupy the entire Presidium - the very Presidium, which was now in the hands of the Khrushchevites. Khrushchev had cleverly arranged this, and all members of the Presidium agreed with his plan.

Beria would have needed support from the West, which he had previously tried hard to obtain through the secret service (see the order to Sudoplatov). But in the West they were still far too suspicious of him at first. They knew what to think of Beria. The Americans thus faithfully stuck to their old strategy: The more the Kremlin factions weaken each other in their power

struggle, the better it would be for the West. "Wait and see" was the motto of the English imperialists. And so time passed for Beria without the expected support from the West; and he now had to go to great lengths to pull something else, which he did. The hesitation of the West cost Beria his head and no one in the world could or would save him.

As mentioned earlier, Stalin had plans for a purge in his pocket, and it included the names of all the members of the Presidium. So this is where the end of the race began: What would it be? Liquidating the entire Presidium to save Stalin's General Line or assassinating Stalin and extend the arms of socialism to capitalism? The assassination was not unexpected, but there was no other choice for the traitors to socialism, it was either: Stalin or them? Here, as a Marxist-Leninist, one must make a choice: either continue the class struggle against the Restoration with the greatest efforts to courageously implement Stalin's General Line and consistently, thus accepting sacrifice, or capitulate and begin the withdrawal of socialism. As badly as the initial situation was historically painted on the part of counter-revolution, we on the revolutionary side could have relied on socialist forces as they were at that time unique in the young history of socialism. We do not see the situation of 1953 in a gloomy light, but in an extraordinarily positive light. With the right group behind him, Stalin would have ensured the victory of the world revolution, and if not him, then his successor would have been able to make this victory perfect. But for that, the worldwide wave of purges against the capitulators would have had to rush ahead. If Stalin had crushed the U.S. imperialists, we would enjoy the socialist, peace-loving and prosperous socialist world today. But that chance was thwarted and we must do the work without Stalin, wrest the rule of the world from the Americans, and raise the Red Flag on the Washington Capitol in America, just as Stalin had done on the Brandenburg Gate in 1945. (Incidentally, the man with the Red Flag on the Brandenburg Gate was a Red Army soldier from Georgia!)

The fact that the 1953 Conspiracy could happen shows that the slightest insincerity toward the Party, the slightest deviation from Stalin's General Line, was enough to land in the camp of counter-revolution. The departure from the positions of Bolshevism ends in political counter-revolutionary banditry. All of the world imperialists' anti-communist propaganda was able to draw on their anti-communism with the takeover of the modern revisionists, always mindful of revealing the secret that modern revisionism springs not from socialist but from bourgeois ideology.

Nothing had happened for 16 hours, no doctors were called, Beria strictly forbade Stalin's personnel to call for medical attention. With this act alone he was guilty of the crime of failure to provide assistance. No one dared to oppose Beria's orders. He had the power of life and death of Comrade Stalin, and Beria used this power to bring about the death of Comrade Stalin. In our eyes, he is the most insidious and cruelest murderer that ever existed in the world.

Rybin, a bodyguard who was an eyewitness, stated that Beria and Malenkov had arrived in a car on March 2nd at 3:00 a.m. Someone wanted to get medical help, but Beria and Malenkov forbade it. They left in their car and Stalin was left alone in his agony for dramatic hours without medical care.

Because of the bruises on his head and hands, manslaughter cannot be ruled out. As the latest documents show, the same bruises were found on other victims of Beria.

Lieutenant General Vlasik, who was responsible for the Kremlin Guard and Stalin's security, was sent to Siberia shortly before as a camp leader and was secretly imprisoned there!!! Malenkov had great power over Stalin's surroundings immediately before his death, for he had emerged strengthened from the elimination of the Leningrad Group. Malenkov stood at the highest level of

his power and speculated on Stalin's succession as the revisionists in the people's democracies would have liked, except for the Albanians, who hoped to count on Molotov as their successor. Vlasik remained in prison until 1955. There was a power struggle between the old and the young generation within Stalin's Kremlin environment.

One of the reasons why the Politburo rushed to take action against Stalin in February 1953 was that they were forced to avert the dangerously close purge at the top of the leadership. The "causing of Stalin's death" was the only solution for Beria, Malenkov and the other conspirers to pull their heads out of Stalin's noose. Beria was directly responsible for Stalin's death, Malenkov his accomplice, and Khrushchev, Bulganin and all the others as participants and beneficiaries.

If, according to Enver Hoxha, Khrushchev and Mikoyan were supposed to have bragged about their murder of Stalin, then it was certainly more for the intimidation of Enver Hoxha. No doubt they were all more or less complicit in Stalin's death. We Marxist-Leninists certainly credit these two revisionist conspirers with this cruel act, but we rather believe that they are adorning themselves with "foreign feathers", because there was another who was no more devious than they were: Beria. We see in him a person who systematically gained access to Stalin by all means, including violence, gained his trust, and behind his back had instigated the fight against Comrade Stalin's Marxist-Leninist General Line. He did the "dirty work" for everyone.

Let's listen to Enver Hoxha's 1979 view of the situation. Incidentally, Beria is not mentioned by name in it, but rather "Khrushchev and his associates" are mentioned:

"All this villainy emerged soon after the death, or to be more precise, after the murder of Stalin. I say after the murder of Stalin, because Mikoyan himself told me and Mehmet Shehu that they, together with Khrushchev and their associates, had decided to carry out a 'pokushenie', i.e., to make an attempt on Stalin's life, but later, as Mikoyan told us, they gave up this plan. It is a known fact that the Khrushchevites could hardly wait for Stalin to die. The circumstances of his death are not clear." (Enver Hoxha: 'With Stalin'; Tirana; 1979; p.31; English Edition).

Consequently, before the actual assassination of Stalin there must have been plans for murder, but their execution failed. When Enver Hoxha states that the circumstances are not clear, it does not mean that they are not clear, but he said this honestly from the state of his information. Enver Hoxha clearly spoke of murder, but was unable to comment on the circumstances due to a lack of information.

As for the "white smocks", Enver Hoxha continued:

"An unsolved enigma in this direction is the question of the 'white smocks', the trial conducted against the Kremlin doctors, who, as long as Stalin was alive were accused of having attempted to kill many leaders of the Soviet Union., After Stalin's death these doctors were rehabilitated and no more was said about this question! But why was this question hushed up?! Was the criminal activity of these doctors proved at the time of the trial, or not? The question of the doctors was hushed up, because had it been investigated later, had it been gone into thoroughly, it would have brought to light a great deal of dirty linen, many crimes and plots that the concealed revisionists, with Khrushchev and Mikoyan at the head, had been perpetrating. This could be the explanation also for the sudden deaths within a very short time, of Gottwald, Bierut, Foster, Dimitrov and some others, all from curable illnesses, about which I have written in my unpublished memoirs, 'The Khrushchevites and Us'. This could

prove to be the true reason for the sudden death of Stalin, too." (ibid; p.31-32).

We will talk about the doctors and the connection with Beria elsewhere.

Beria had Stalin spied on at every turn for years, isolating Stalin both within his family and political circle of friends, as also from other leaders in the state and Party. Beria eliminated everyone who stood in his way.

The Stalin murderer Beria died not by Marxist-Leninist but by revisionist hands!

The conspirers must have been working **for years** on a coup, on division, on taking power, but all attempts failed because of Stalin's concentrated attention. It was precisely the hopelessness of determining politics in the Soviet Union behind Stalin's back and past Stalin that drove them to despair.

If we assume that the top beast that was killed was Beria, then the reason why he was silenced was because Beria was involved in the murder up to both ears. Beria did not give the impression of being intimidated and fearful, but of an aggressive, quarrelsome, exuberant and boisterous working style. Handling power is one thing, which he had skillfully mastered this weapon, the other is the subjugation of power. Because Beria had not mastered that properly, power was forcibly taken from him.

The accomplices directly involved in the murder were physically destroyed. The Stalinists were to be removed from all Party and Soviet posts and replaced by "selected, reliable" people. In order to cover the tracks, one sat down at the head of "the fight against the enemies of the Party" in order to protect the enemies of the Party or, if necessary, to liquidate those who knew too much, for example, better, and to liquidate the best fighters against the enemies of the Party as "enemies of the Party", to imprison them in the camp, etc., or to degrade them. The art of the modern revisionists was to hide their true criminal physiognomy behind the proletarian worldview, behind communism, i.e., to praise the overt crimes as communist achievements and to commit secret crimes against the communists, against the Marxist-Leninists, against the workers and peasants, against the masses, if necessary with the pomp of the public inquisition to deter the masses from resistance. The modern revisionists conspired against the Marxist-Leninists in the name of "Marxism-Leninism" to annihilate them and thereby exploit and oppress the masses "in the name of socialism" unhindered.

It was advantageous for Beria's camouflage that he could blame others for the murder at every dicey opportunity. Khrushchev would have liked to expose Beria the murderer right away, if he could have done so, but exposing the fact that Stalin had been murdered in the first place would cause great indignation and readiness to fight among the masses and thus endanger his own cover, indeed the entire counter-revolutionary program of capitalist restoration. That is why this issue remained a strict taboo until the fall of the Soviet Union. Everyone thus agreed (along with the rest of the world) to keep quiet about Stalin's murder and make his death appear a "natural consequence" of illness and old age. They based the "legitimation" of their power on this.

The idea for the "palace revolution" of the conspirers of 1953 came from the right-wing conspirers of 1933 and thus matured for 20 years, but it was put into practice in a completely different way, because completely different conditions prevailed. Arrests and executions of Stalin's followers were carried out secretly and surgically before Stalin's murder, and a "natural death" was faked, precisely in order not to cause a stir, as if everything was in order and everything continued its usual "socialist" course. This was the new tactic of the "palace revolt" of 1953; Stalin's death meant the end of the Stalin Era, and power was now completely

in the hands of the modern revisionists, so further murders of Stalinists were no longer opportune, no longer inevitable among Stalinists whom the modern revisionists no longer seemed to consider dangerous. A "palace revolution" would have made sense if it had been about arresting the socialist government, but with Stalin's murder the conspirers already had power in their hands if the Presidium did not have to be "arrested", because the Presidium itself now consisted only of conspirers, or capitulators, who had no resistance in them and who submitted to the pressure of the revisionists. To this extent, Beria withdrew his military troops that had occupied Moscow with. With military force he was able to make the Presidium dance to his tune for a certain period of time. If the conspirers had killed Beria before Stalin, this would indicate that Beria was in the way of the conspiracy for some reason. But that was not the case. Rather, the fact that Beria was not shot until after Stalin's death suggests that, while he shared the same strategy of all the conspirers (and was thus needed in the capitalist transformation of the Soviet Union, which began immediately with drastic measures against socialism, that is, in the alliance of all the conspirers until Beria's death! He possessed the power to know about the crimes of the others and thus put them under pressure to follow his straight and rugged line to capitalism. Beria and Malenkov overestimated their own power and underestimated that of the Khrushchevites. That was their mistake, with which they ultimately punished themselves with.

Beria had never shied away from using extreme means to force his opponents to be servants of him. What guile one had to have in order to remain unpunished in the eyes of all, in such a responsible position, which has as its main task the struggle to preserve the life and protection of the socialist state, its citizens, its leaders, in the course of a number of many years, to be implicated daily in the destruction of the state and the murder of Stalin, indeed to hold the top of power in one's hands.

We do not know for certain whether Stalin's death was by poisoning. Beria and Co. were murderers who worked with poisonous substances for decades without being exposed. The poisonings should always be explained as natural death due to illness. Yagoda formulated the following horrible words:

"A person falls ill and everyone gets used to the fact that he is ill. The doctor can promote the recovery of the sick person, but the doctor can also accelerate the death of the sick person. This is the main content of the idea. And everything else is a matter of technology". That was the art of Beria's crime, an art in which he had become "master" in the course of his counter-revolutionary activity. Beria was one of the few powerful people in the USSR who had access to the toxicological institute, access to the poison. Mayronovsky was head of the research group of toxicology [!!!] that was subordinate to the NKVD from 1937. On direct instruction of the People's Commissars and Ministers for State Security Beria, Yezhov and Merkulov executed death sentences in addition to Mayronovsky's research work. Secret liquidations with poison were carried out from 1937 to 1947. Even high-ranking personnel of the NKVD were not allowed to enter the toxicological institute.

In 1951, Mayronovsky was charged with poisoning high-ranking Soviet politicians, including Stalin [!!!!], allegedly under the orders of Abakumov and Eitingon and Jewish doctors. Mayronovsky's confession would reveal the guilt of Beria, Molotov and Khrushchev. He was sentenced in absentia by a secret investigative committee in February 1953, immediately before Stalin's death [sic!!!], to 10 years in prison. Typical of this: People who were needed as witnesses later on were not executed!

The murderer was able to take advantage of his privileged position in relation to the victim. The main organizer of the poison killings, who was in the dock during the 1936-1938 trial, was

the Minister of the Interior, Yagoda. The main person responsible for the poison killings at the end of the 1940s and beginning of the 1950s was Beria. One anti-Stalinist was struck down by Stalin's bullet, the other by a revisionist bullet. On May 1st, 1953, the murderer blabbed the secret of the murder: "I did him in!"

Beria wore a mask for his entire life, pretending to be an irreconcilable Bolshevik, but in fact he was never a Bolshevik in the true sense. Beria did not know how the fight between Stalin and his adversaries would end and created for himself such conditions under which he could best follow his treacherous path one way or another. He wanted to join the side that would win, only pro forma. When Beria finally came to the conclusion that Khrushchev would eventually win as a real force, Beria declared that he was with him, but without failing to mention that he claimed a special position. Beria always went where the power, where the majority was. He was not the type of an autocrat.

All crimes of conspiracy were proven to have connections to capitalist foreign countries in a fundamental and concrete way. This is true of Khrushchev; his deal with the U.S. was to build capitalism unchecked and in return to be allowed to have a say in the circle of the great powers. This is also true of the criminal Beria. Beria presented the murder of Stalin as a "necessary act" that was "in the interest of the Soviet state and peoples". And the other conspirers endorsed this. The murder of Stalin was even under the pressure of the Cold War. The West offered peace to the Soviet Union if Stalin was eliminated, no matter how!

There were only two ways to keep the 1953 coup secret: either through "voluntary" silence through complicity and thus sharing the guilt for the crime, or through violent silence through liquidation. All conspirers chose the first way, and for Beria only the second way remained.

In September 1950, the Ukrainian security minister Drozdov was brought to Moscow by Stalin. This was Special Bureau No.2 "*The Surveillance and Kidnappings of the Enemies of Stalin (including alleged enemies)*". Beria's first official act after Stalin's death: Firing Drozdov because he knew too much about internal struggles against Stalin and Drozdov did not get along with Kobulov (Kobulov was Beria's deputy).

Immediately after Stalin's death, that is, that same evening, Beria was appointed minister of the expanded Ministry of Internal Affairs (MVD), which included both the militia and the security apparatus! It was Beria who ordered the MVD's troops to Moscow!!! Within 24 hours after Stalin's death (!!!) Beria merged the Ministry of State Security and the Ministry of Internal Affairs under his sole leadership.

Stalin's death had an "oppressive" and "paralyzing" effect on some members of the Presidium, a guilty conscience on the part of Molotov, Kaganovich, Voroshilov and Bulganin . On others he had a "liberating" and "invigorating" (unscrupulous) effect, like on Khrushchev, Mikoyan, Beria and Malenkov.

The period, immediately after Stalin's death, was the period of Beria's highest power. This is the period in which he himself showed his true face openly. This is the period when we Marxist-Leninists can actually hold in our hands and show the world many of the decisive touchstones of Beria's crimes. It is no coincidence that it was during this period of all times that the Berianists had to protect the "Marxist-Leninist" Beria from us Stalinists by falsifying the elimination of Beria as an anti-Stalinist act of the Khrushchevites.

On the second day of his appointment as Minister of the Interior, Beria had already exchanged 82 of Stalin's officers and filled the posts with his own people, including

Sudoplatov, who on his behalf established secret contacts with the West, without the knowledge of the Foreign Ministry, without the knowledge of the Party, without the knowledge of the Red Army.

Above all, Beria had pulled his head out of the noose when on March 13th, 1953 (!!) he made all incriminating material against himself, all charges and preparations for the trial, with which Stalin justified his death sentence with, simply **disappear** and declared null and void by virtue of his office as Minister of the Interior, which he had snatched from Stalin's safe in his final hours.

Beria's arrest was the high point of the power struggle after Stalin's death, and Khrushchev was the mastermind behind the plot against Beria. Khrushchev's "best friends" had been Malenkov and Beria. Khrushchev had already exerted influence on Bulganin in the 1930s: Bulganin had the order to bring his armed generals to the Kremlin, where they, including the armed Brezhnev waited for Beria. Yet none of them knew beforehand why they should appear in the Kremlin with weapons. Even Zhukov was inaugurated only a few hours before Beria's arrest. This was an extremely delicate situation and a unique event in the history of the Soviet Union. Even under Stalin it was strictly forbidden to enter the Kremlin with a weapon. Anyone who tried to enter the Kremlin with a weapon would have been shot on the spot by Kremlin guards. Why did Khrushchev expose himself to this risk, why was entering the Kremlin with weapons part of his plan? He must have been very sure that his murder plan would succeed. He had to have connections with the Red Army leadership, he had to have sufficient power. Beria, on the other hand, lacked a sufficient basis of trust among his co-conspirers. He was feared because of his malicious unpredictability and was avoided by all others as much as possible. His initiatives proved that he could not realize his claim to sole rule and that he instead wanted to secure as much illegal decision-making power as possible, both in domestic and foreign policy. He took advantage of his long-standing personal relationship with Malenkov to go at it alone, but in doing so he put Malenkov in an unpleasant isolated position in relation to the other members of the CC Presidium, which Khrushchev knew how to use.

It turned out that Beria's position was entirely dependent on Malenkov's power and support. Beria had angered Malenkov by arranging for Ignatyev's removal in consultation with Khrushchev. Ignatyev was Malenkov's henchman and had supervised the party's security machinery. Malenkov, for his part, had overestimated his popularity; it had escaped his notice that Beria's support was crucial to his position because Beria, Pervukhin, Saburov and Malenkov represented the comparatively younger generation in the ruling Presidium. The Old Guard, Molotov, Voroshilov, Mikoyan, Kaganovich, in whom Stalin had long since withdrawn trust and curtailed their former power, was hostile to this young generation that had come to power after the purges of the 1930s. There was a delicate imbalance between the two generations; the older leaders were held in higher esteem than Malenkov, Khrushchev and Beria, who in the eyes of the public were Stalin's servants rather than their "beloved heroes".

Khrushchev successfully navigated between the two camps; he helped Beria weaken Malenkov when Ignatyev was compromised in the Doctor's Plot. Once again he supported Beria in relieving Malenkov of his powerful position as Secretary of the Central Committee. Today it is clear that Khrushchev took advantage of the dissatisfaction with Beria's new activism to initiate his dismantling. In 1952 the office of secretary general was abolished, making Khrushchev the primus inter pares; to become the supreme leader, he had to get rid of Malenkov as head of government. The best way to do this was to cut off Malenkov's true power base, namely his connection to Beria and control over the security machinery. As a result, Khrushchev's henchmen had to move up to decisive positions in the state security

service.

Beria wanted to occupy leading positions with locals, and in Ukraine as well so the clash with Khrushchev became inevitable. Khrushchev needed his Ukrainian henchmen for Moscow's power, while Beria needed them against Moscow, why else did Beria come closer to Yugoslavia? Revisionist levers from the outside against the Moscow center? Beria lobbied for ethnic minorities, rehabilitated the forces captured and condemned by Stalin, "in order to strengthen national consciousness". On Beria's initiative, ordinary criminals were released. A flood of riffraff poured into the cities. Riots spread throughout the country and street fighting broke out, which Beria had first provoked and then crushed. This diminished Beria's reputation among the Soviet people. This was not clumsy of Beria, but rather a clever tactical move: to have an alibi, to be able to put down political street fights as the "actions of criminals". He released criminals in order to have an excuse to get rid of the Stalinists, whom he criminalized. In our opinion, this was also one of the reasons why Beria had Moscow sealed off by MVD troops the day after Stalin was assassinated to be sure that operations that Stalin might have previously taken against the seizure of power by his enemies of the Party in the event of his death. In any case, Beria was rightly accused of having brought the MVD troops to Moscow to arrest the government. The Berianists are silent about this, or some, like Sudoplatov, claim "stiff and hard" that such a plan of Beria's did not exist.

The murderers write the obituaries. Why did the Party lose Comrade Stalin? The Party lost Comrade Stalin because the modern revisionists murdered him. The murderers, who had seized the post of their victim, wept for their victim, only to then "secretly" (Khrushchev at the XX Party Congress!) present themselves as victims of the victim.

The Izvestia reported that the Russian court once again dealt with the question of the rehabilitation of Beria. On May 30th, 2000 the following verdict was issued: **Refusal of rehabilitation, but shooting was wrong.**

Enver Hoxha and Stalins Daughter Svetlana defended Stalin against Beria

If anyone has analyzed and judged the background and the true extent of the conspirers' hypocritical coups against Stalin from a Marxist-Leninist point of view, it was Comrade Enver Hoxha, the 5th Classic of Marxism-Leninism, on whose standpoint we World Bolsheviks essentially base ourselves and whom we defend in any case. For this we mainly recommended the study of his work "The Khrushchevites".

There is a very significant quotation from another of Enver Hoxha's writings: "**The Titoites**", in which Khrushchev expressed his anti-Stalinist rage against Enver Hoxha, and with which we want to begin before presenting the role and figure of Beria in the light of Enver Hoxha's view. This is because Enver Hoxha saw Beria as a member of Khrushchev's criminal gang, which had a common goal: To eliminate Stalin and to initiate the "de-Stalinization". So what did the horrified

Khrushchev say to Comrade Enver Hoxha?

"Where do you want to lead us, to Stalin's road?!" (Hoxha: 'The Titoites'; London; 1982; p.575; English Edition).

This basically says everything!!!

1. The path of Enver Hoxha was the path of Stalin. The path of Stalin was the continuation of the path of Lenin. And the path of Lenin was the continuation of the path of Marx and Engels. One can neither go forward nor backward halfway through communism, just as one can stop the clock but not the time; whoever says "A" must also say "B". This applies to both sides of the barricades. The path of Stalin leads to communism, the path of "de-Stalinization" led back to world imperialism.

2. Here, Khrushchev said the word "we", by which, of course, he meant the entire Khrushchevite criminal gang in the Presidium (including Beria!), which was engaged in a front against Enver Hoxha with provocative quarrels, curses, threats, blackmail and slander in Moscow in the manner of: "Who do you think you are? If you open your insolent mouth, we will crush you like a little louse." This throws a telling light on how these criminal gangs dealt with Stalin and the Stalinists in the USSR, in the People's Democracies and throughout the whole world, and how they have dealt and will continue to deal with them.

Here again are a selection of quotations from: "The Khrushchevites", from which we learned for the first time which anti-party elements had surrounded Stalin and with which elements he had to deal with.

Immediately, not even (!) one day after Stalin's death, the conspirers quickly distributed the new posts of power, driven by panic, not to be shortchanged or ripped off: Prime Minister Malenkov became Premier, Beria became First Deputy Prime Minister and Interior Minister, and Bulganin, Kaganovich, Mikoyan, and Molotov shared the other posts:

"Major changes were made in all the top organs in the party and the state within that day. The Presidium and the Bureau of the Presidium of the Central Committee of the party were merged into a single organ, new secretaries of the Central Committee of the party were elected, a number of ministries were amalgamated or united, changes were made in the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet, etc." (Enver Hoxha: 'The Khrushchevites'; Tirana; 1980; p.14-15; English Edition).

On March 7th, 1953, in a joint decision of the Plenum of the CC, the Council of Ministers and the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet, the Stalinist organizational structure was abolished, namely the joint leadership of the CC and the Council of Ministers. The office of the Presidium of the CC and the office of the Council of Ministers were dissolved without further ado. The lost power of the "Old Guard", which Stalin had removed power from during its lifetime, was reclaimed as soon as Stalin made his final breath.

Less than a year had passed since the 19th Party Congress, which was still forced to show consideration for Stalin's General Line, when the dismantling of Stalin's General Line was hastily begun, which was expressed in the distribution of authority and in the new organizational structure of the Party that had long since been secretly decided upon. This shows the double-talk which the conspirers had already appeared at the XIX Party Congress with, only a few months before Stalin's assassination. They hypocritically pretended to follow Stalin's General Line at the party congress and, while they were making grand speeches there

about Stalin's "genius", they in reality had already divided all the new posts among themselves - one more reason to denounce the conspiracy against Stalin that had been planned long before and another reason to continue Stalin's General Line as the General Line of the Marxist-Leninist World Movement and lead it to victory.

These masters raided what was left of Stalin's organizational competence, greedily dividing it among themselves like legacy hunters. But not to strengthen the unity of the leading "collective", as one might have assumed, but to enrich their own power competence, that is, as a welcome enrichment of the tools with which they wanted to push through the restoration of capitalism. At the funeral service, they pushed their way in front of each other like at the chicken coop, a disgusting hypocritical spectacle. This was clear for Enver Hoxha "(...) that there was no unity in the Presidium of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union". (ibid; p.29). After the funeral service, the Presidium met in the Kremlin as quickly as possible to continue the "interrupted" distribution of posts. Enver Hoxha saw this as confirmation that the plot had been prepared long before. All previous conspiracies against Stalin were thwarted, except for the one in 1953. This suggests what power it had already united in its hands and how dangerous it really was - the greatest conspiracy in the history of Communism.

"One of the main directions of Khrushchev's strategy and tactics was to seize complete political and ideological power within the Soviet Union and to put the Soviet army and the state security organs in his service." (ibid; p.41).

With Malenkov's post as the First Secretary of the Central Committee, Khrushchev gained power in the Party, firstly by eliminating Beria and occupying its state security organs with Khrushchevites, and then to get his hands on the army (especially the GRU leadership) by eliminating Bulganin and Zhukov. In short: Khrushchev took over the Party still "in the name of Stalin" (at first) with the help of the apparatchiks of the Ministries of Defense and the Interior.

"In other words, in the name of Stalin, and by means of their apparatchiki, they suppressed criticism and tried to turn the Bolshevik Party into a lifeless party, into an organization without will and energy, which would vegetate from day to day, approving everything that the bureaucracy decided, concocted and distorted." (ibid; p.54).

Only in January 1956, on the occasion of a consultation of all socialist countries in Moscow, did Khrushchev openly say bad things about Stalin for the first time in a confidential conversation with Enver Hoxha. At that time Khrushchev had already prepared his secret speech at the 20th Party Congress. In February 1956, the Trotskyite conspirers and counter-revolutionaries, Zinoviev, Kamenev, Rykov and Pyatakov, were rehabilitated. Khrushchev was himself a disguised Trotskyite, posing as a "victim of Stalinist terror". In June 1953, Mikoyan proved himself to be a "victim of the Stalinist terror" in the talks with Enver Hoxha.

"Mikoyan, in particular, was the most negative, the most dubious element and the greatest intriguer among the members of the Presidium of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union. This huckster, who was constantly grinding and clicking his false teeth, was also ruminating on diabolical anti-Marxist, conspiratorial, putschist plans, as was proved later. This individual, with an unpleasant face and a black heart, behaved in a very menacing way, especially towards us Albanians. (...) The friendly, internationalist socialist feelings had been wiped out as far as he was concerned." (ibid; p.62-63).

"It seemed that the Soviet leadership based itself on the "great economic experience" of this

cosmopolitan huckster, who, as history showed, plotted with Nikita Khrushchev against Stalin, whom they had decided to murder. He admitted this with his own mouth to Mehmet and me in February 1960 [!!!]. After the putsch they linked up with American imperialism, and set about the destruction to its foundations of the great work of Lenin and Stalin, socialism in the Soviet Union.

"(...) In relations with us Mikoyan was not only the most miserly but also the most insulting. This anti-Albanian line of his was permanent, even when Stalin was alive." (ibid; p.63-64).

This can also be read in Enver Hoxha's memoirs "With Stalin":

"But will the Albanians themselves work?"

"I understood why he (Stalin) asked me this question. It was the result of the evil-intended information of the Armenian huckster, Mikoyan, who, at a meeting I had with him, not only spoke to me in a language quite unlike that of Stalin, but also used harsh terms in his criticisms about the realization of plans in our country, alleging that our people did not work, etc. His intention was to reduce the rate and amount of aid. This was always Mikoyan's stand. But Stalin accorded us everything we sought." (Hoxha: 'With Stalin'; Tirana; 1979; p.104; English Edition).

Let us now come to the picture that Enver Hoxha drew of Beria.

Who was Beria and what role did he play "at the side" of Stalin? There are not a few in the Marxist-Leninist World Movement who cultivate this "comrade" as the "most loyal Marxist-Leninist on the side of Stalin". Having to read these lines will of course hurt those people, and if they reach for the place where the pain comes from, we will point to their sore spot. Let us wait and see what they will do. We are ready to fight. Their cover is blown now and they have to come up with something. They are so dangerous because they hide their right-wing opportunist ideology behind a "very" "Marxist-Leninist", "anti-revisionist" line and "rely" on Enver Hoxha, among others. We think that the grace period that we have granted them to reconsider their wrong point of view has long expired and we openly say what we think and what we think of them as - traitors! May everyone form his own opinion about our hostile attitude towards the Berianists.

First of all, let us affirm that we defend Comrade Enver Hoxha's criticism of Beria in every way. As proof, we list the following quotations from Enver Hoxha against Beria:

As for the Beria, he is only mentioned in Enver Hoxha's last meeting with Stalin, together with Molotov, Malenkov and Bulganin and no longer with Mikoyan. That was in April 1951. Stalin saw through Tito's great power chauvinism towards Albania because Enver Hoxha had succeeded in advancing directly towards Stalin without Tito (and Beria?) being able to prevent it any further. When Stalin met Enver Hoxha personally, his friendship with Albania grew in the same measure as his animosity towards Tito. Stalin immediately took an interest in the meeting with Enver Hoxha in how Albania was preparing for its defense, for an impending war, which Tito had planned on behalf of the Anglo-American imperialists. Beria was very much present (!!!) when Enver Hoxha reported on the punishment of the anti-party Yugoslav elements in his own country, which Stalin expressly welcomed. Beria knew very well the Albanians' hostile attitude toward Yugoslav revisionism (through all his intelligence sources long before Enver Hoxha's meeting with Stalin!) when he sought reconciliation with Tito after Stalin's death in order to score points with the Anglo-American imperialists. In his

work "The Titoites," Enver Hoxha assessed the attitude to Tito's Yugoslavia as a:

"Touchstone to see who were the new leaders who seized power in the Soviet Union after Stalin's death, who were also the leaders of the other parties who changed course immediately after Khrushchevism came to light" (Enver Hoxha: 'The Titoites'; Tirana; 1983; p.638; Translated from German).

Enver Hoxha measured the figure and role of Beria against this. We World Bolsheviks have nothing to add to this. We were able to prove how good Enver Hoxha's nose was. From the critical attitude Enver Hoxha took toward Beria's treacherous attitude toward Yugoslav revisionism, we must draw conclusions about Beria's fundamentally treacherous attitude toward Stalin. We must take the General Line of Stalin as a touchstone for *Beria*, as Enver Hoxha did to *Tito*. A complete confirmation of Enver Hoxha's correct assessment of Beria will better protect our ranks against hostile influences, will strengthen us immensely in the fight against Beria, and will help wavering and insecure comrades to convince themselves.

Enver Hoxha did not allow himself to be intimidated and deceived by Beria's cunning and unanimously saw through him as an enemy of Albania and condemned him as such, because any reconciliation with Yugoslav revisionism inevitably meant an increase in the threat posed by revisionist Yugoslavia to Marxist-Leninist Albania. Beria knew very well that Tito had worked to eliminate Enver Hoxha, to overthrow the dictatorship of the Albanian proletariat, which did not prevent Beria from being the first (!) after Stalin's death to stop the struggle against modern revisionism in power and begin friendly relations with Yugoslavia (see his letter to Tito). The construction of socialism in Albania was systematically sabotaged by the new revisionist rulers in the Kremlin, a concerted effort by Yugoslav and Soviet revisionism against the only surviving disciple of Stalin. Enver Hoxha writes in the "Khrushchevites" that:

"The disdainful and insulting tone of the new Soviet leadership could not fail to hurt us. We could not fail to ask in astonishment: 'How can those people in Moscow know whether we have presented our problems rightly or wrongly, when it is we who live and work in Albania and not they?!'" (Hoxha: 'The Khrushchevites'; Tirana; 1980; p.74; English Edition).

Today we know that the Soviet revisionists had Albanian informants for this. Mehmet Shehu had, for many years, secret contact with the Soviet secret service without the CPA knowing about it. The Russian informant Major Ivanov most likely "knew" that the putschist Mehmet Shehu was both an Anglo-American and Yugoslavian agent. Ivanov must have been covered up by the GRU leadership, which hid its information from Stalin. If the secret services, whether from the GRU or the NKVD, had reached Stalin in time, Stalin would certainly have "informed" Enver Hoxha about it, and Mehmet Shehu (and not only he, but also Beria!!!!????) would have been exposed and punished sooner, and the murder of Stalin might have been prevented. This proves that the Soviet secret services knew more than Stalin, that they hid the truth from Stalin, that they must have worked against Stalin and for Tito against Albania and thus for the Anglo-Americans. And this also proves why Tito did not let Enver Hoxha get close to Stalin, because then Beria would have also been in danger. Beria was someone who had used his cogs to obtain secret information about the Marxist-Leninist struggle of the Albanians against the first modern revisionism in power and was therefore in the know. Thus Mehmet Shehu, without being covered by Beria, could not have continued any shameful malicious work until the 8th Party Congress of the PLA. Shehu then cowardly committed suicide when he was unmasked, pushed into a corner. Here is what Enver wrote about Shehu:

"The documents that have been discovered and incontestible evidence prove that since before the War he had been working for the American secret service. During the War and after Liberation Mehmet Shehu fought and worked in Albania as a mercenary in the pay of foreigners and under their orders. When he was in the 1st Brigade he was recruited by the Yugoslav secret service (OZNA, today the UDB) and then, by the Soviet KGB , and he served them all zealously. Acting on the orders and instructions of foreign espionage centres, especially the CIA and the UDB, he and the group of plotters linked with him, who are now in the hands of the authorities for full investigation, worked to destroy the Party and the people's state power and to put Albania under foreign rule.

"In order to carry through the subversive, gangster plans worked out by their patrons in Washington, Belgrade and elsewhere, Mehmet Shehu and his associates were prepared to commit grave crimes. Mehmet Shehu had received orders from the Yugoslav UDB to kill the First Secretary of the Central Committee and other leaders of the Party and state, as well as to use terrorist means to crush all those who would rise against this great treachery.

"If they were unable to act to carry out their criminal intentions, this was connected with their great fear of the people and the Party and their steel unity, which does not allow any enemy, however cunning and diabolical, to have his way. Mehmet Shehu was never able to alter or distort the line of the Party, because if he tried to do so he would be immediately unmasked." (Enver Hoxha: 'Work and Vigilance to Make the People's State Power Ever Stronger'; Tirana; 1982; English Edition).

Enver Hoxha gave this speech in 1982, 3 years before his death, when Ramiz Alia was the next to work on the betrayal. This shows how dangerous the enemy was before and after Enver Hoxha's death. Here many parallels can be drawn between the death of Enver Hoxha and Stalin - the murderers were the same - revisionists! It is no coincidence that the end of Albania coincided with the end of the Soviet Union. The threads can be traced back to Washington.

Ivanov was later the revisionist ambassador of the SU in Tirana in 1957. In other words, a Khrushchevite. The poly-agent Mehmet Shehu also worked on behalf of Khrushchev against Albania. Beria's security ministry had obtained his information from Mehmet Shehu's security ministry without the knowledge of the CPA or the CPSU, without the knowledge of Stalin or Enver Hoxha!

This was in fact the "information about the interior of Albania" that Beria had confronted Comrade Enver Hoxha with so brazenly and vilely in Moscow in June 1953. Beria may not have known in all details that from 1948 on, hundreds of diverse and criminal gangs, sent to Albania by Tito and the West together, were all exterminated by Albanian security forces, but as one of the leading security officers of the Soviet government, he must have been fundamentally informed about it, must have known, not least with the help of Mehmet Shehu, what he was doing there, and cannot be rehabilitated blindly as a "Marxist-Leninist" today, only with regard to his hostile attitude towards Albania and his pro-Yugoslavian attitude. We must most probably assume that Beria did not stop at "gathering information" but that he abused it, that he used it against Stalin, against Enver Hoxha and thus against the revolutionary cause of the world proletariat. In "The Titoites" Enver Hoxha wrote:

"After Stalin's death, the group that came to power sentenced the head of the Soviet KGB Beria for numerous violations of the law. We called on Mehmet Shehu to check whether there had not also been mistakes in the organs of our Ministry of the Interior, which he headed. Mehmet Shehu was afraid that his connections with the Soviet KGB or Western agencies would be exposed and that he would suffer the fate of Beria. He went to the Soviet

ambassador Levichkin, to whom he assured his devotion to the newly arrived Khrushchevites, demanding Soviet protection." (Enver Hoxha: 'The Titoites'; Tirana; 1983; p.634; Translated from German).

From 1952 to 1953, that envoy was ambassador to Albania and from 1953 to 1955 he was ambassador to Albania. In 1956, he headed the 5th European Department of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the USSR. Since he was not replaced by Khrushchev, it can be assumed that in 1952 Levichkin could not have been "a rock-solid follower" of Stalin.

It may be interesting to note that there were astonishing parallels between the ministries of the interior in Albania and the Soviet Union. In both cases, conspirers used the highest posts in the ministries of the interior to overthrow the dictatorship of the proletariat and liquidate the party leadership not just once, but many times over a long period of decades! It is as astonishing as it is remarkable that not the Interior Ministries themselves uncovered and smashed all these conspiracies and conspiracies (for which the proletariat had actually set them up and which would have been their most urgent task!!!), but the Bolshevik parties, PLA and the CPSU with Enver Hoxha and Stalin at the head, and not without engaging in a dangerous fight with the moles of the Ministries of the Interior!

Returning to Enver Hoxha's last meeting with Stalin, if one keeps in mind the situation in the Soviet party leadership, Stalin's response to Enver Hoxha's report on the fight against the anti-party elements in the CPA is revealing: "'You did the right thing,' Stalin said to me, 'the enemy will try to smuggle himself into the Party itself, even into its Central Committee. But with great vigilance and a determined attitude, such attempts can be detected and thwarted.'" (ibid; page 187). And this was certainly intended directly for the ears of Beria, who was involved in the Mingrelian Conspiracy at the same time. Moreover, Beria, who had personally attended this meeting between Stalin and Enver Hoxha, deliberately concealed all the intelligence information he had received about the situation within the Albanian party. Beria deceived not only Enver Hoxha, but also Stalin at that meeting. According to Enver Hoxha's statement in 1981-1982, Mehmud Shehu supplied the Soviet secret service with secret information shortly after the liberation of Albania. Both Mehmud Shehu and the Soviet secret service are guilty of this, and there is no doubt that Shehu and Beria worked together.

Stalin addressed Enver Hoxha on the question of economic construction, "that you (...) must also pay more attention to strengthening the working class and training cadres. The Party must pay special attention to the working class" (ibid). From Stalin's desire to strengthen the unity between the Party and the working class it can be seen that this must have been of great importance for his struggle in his own Party and state leadership, especially for the Soviet post-war reconstruction of the economy. Enver Hoxha also reported Stalin's criticism that much in the Soviet Union had been morbidly idealized, and that the slogan "everything is 'in the best of order'" (ibid; page 196). was dangerous. We know today that the modern revisionists liked to operate with this slogan in order to hide behind it the path they were pursuing for the restoration of capitalism. "Everything is in order" was not the way to communism, but "everything is in order" was the way back to capitalism. This was the essence of the revisionists' "order".

Enver Hoxha must have seen Beria for the last time before Stalin's death at the 19th Party Congress in 1952. He only met him again in Moscow in June 1953, a few months after Stalin's death and a few months before Beria's arrest.

In the following we list Enver Hoxha's assessments, page by page, in the "Khrushchevites" here:

"If there were some excesses in the course of this just and titanic struggle, it was not Stalin who committed them, but Khrushchev, Beria and company, who for sinister hidden motives, showed themselves the most zealous for purges at the time when they were not yet so powerful. They acted in this way to gain credit as 'ardent defenders' of the dictatorship of the proletariat, as 'merciless with the enemies', with the aim of climbing the steps in order to usurp power later. The facts show that when Stalin discovered the hostile activity of a Yagoda or a Yezhov, the revolutionary court condemned them without hesitation. Such elements as Khrushchev, Mikoyan, Beria and their apparatchiki hid the truth from Stalin. In one way or another, they misled and deceived Stalin. He did not trust them, therefore he had told them to their faces, '. . . when I am gone you will sell the Soviet Union.' Khrushchev himself admitted this. And it turned out just as Stalin foresaw. As long as he was alive, even these enemies talked about unity, but after his death they encouraged the split." (ibid; p.19).

In June 1953 Enver Hoxha was received in Moscow when Khrushchev had not yet fully seized power, where Malenkov still ranked first and Beria was second:

"Beside him stood Beria, with his eyes glittering behind glasses and his hands never still." (ibid; p.21).

Enver Hoxha had hardly spoken for twenty minutes when:

"when I heard Beria, with his snake's eyes, say to Malenkov, who was sitting listening to me as expressionless as a mummy:

""Can't we say what we have to say and put an end to this?"

"(...) Beria, pleased that I had finished, put his hands in his pockets and tried to work out what impression their replies were making on me." (ibid; p.23-24).

"Malenkov and Beria seemed to be the two 'cocks of the walk'" (ibid; p.24).

"Beria began to speak, the movements of his hands and eyes revealing his embarrassment and irritation, and said that according to their information, we allegedly had unsuitable and dubious elements, not only in the army, but also in the apparatus of the state and in the economy! (...) Bulganin sighed with relief and looked around, not concealing his satisfaction, but Beria cut short his smile. He openly opposed Bulganin's 'advice' about purges and stressed that the 'elements with a bad past, but who have since taken the right road, must not be purged but should be pardoned.'" (ibid; p.26).

And Enver Hoxha responded to Beria's accusations:

""(...) not only do I not accept these accusations but I am telling you that your informers are deceiving you, are concocting slanders." (ibid; p.27). (That was for Beria!!! And it hit home!!!)

"My conclusion from this meeting was unpleasant. I saw that the leadership of the Soviet Union was ill-disposed towards our country. The arrogant way they behaved during the meeting, their refusal to give those few things that we sought, and their slanderous attack on the cadres of our army were not good signs.

"From this meeting I observed also that there was no unity in the Presidium of the

Communist Party of the Soviet Union: Malenkov and Beria were predominant, Molotov hardly spoke, Mikoyan seemed to be on the outer and spouted venom, while what Bulganin said was bullshit.

"It was apparent that the in-fighting had begun among the leaders in the Presidium of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union." (ibid; p.29-30).

"After he kicked out Malenkov, leaving him only the post of prime minister, Khrushchev made himself first secretary of the Central Committee in September 1953. It is evident that Khrushchev and his group of close cronies hatched up the intrigue in the Presidium carefully, by setting their opponents at loggerheads and eliminating Beria and apparently 'taming' the others.

"There are many versions about the arrest and execution of Beria. Amongst others it was said that men from the army, headed by General Moskalenko, arrested Beria right in the meeting of the Presidium of the CC of the party. Apparently Khrushchev and his henchmen charged the army with this "special mission", because they did not trust the state security, since Beria had had it in his hands for years on end. The plan had been hatched up in advance: while the meeting of the Presidium of the CC of the party was being held, Moskalenko and his men got into a nearby room unobserved. At the given moment, Malenkov pressed the bell and within a few seconds Moskalenko entered the office where the meeting was being held and approached Beria to arrest him. It was said that Beria reached out to take the satchel he had nearby, but Khrushchev, who was sitting 'vigilant' by his side, was 'quicker' and seized the satchel first.

"(...) This is what was said, took place and Khrushchev himself admitted it. Later, when a general, who I believe was called Sergatskov, came to Tirana as Soviet military adviser he also told us something about the trial of Beria. He told us that he had been called as a witness to declare in court that Beria had allegedly behaved arrogantly towards him. On this occasion Sergatskov told our comrades in confidence: 'Beria defended himself very strongly in the court, accepted none of the accusations and refuted them all.'" (ibid; p.30-31).

In June 1954 Enver Hoxha was back in Moscow, where he was directly confronted by Khrushchev for the first time, several months after he had become First Secretary of the Central Committee of the CPSU:

"'The party leads, organizes, controls,' he theorized. 'It is the initiator and inspirer. But Beria wanted to liquidate the role of the party,' and after a moment of silence he asked me: 'Have you received the resolution which announced the sentence we passed on Beria?'

"'Yes,' I replied.

"He left his discourse about the party and started to speak about the activity of Beria; he accused him of almost every crime and described him as the cause of many evils. These were the first steps towards the attack on Stalin. For the time being, Khrushchev felt that he could not rise against the figure and work of Stalin, therefore, in order to prepare the terrain he started with Beria. At this meeting, moreover, to our astonishment, Khrushchev told us:

"'When you were here last year, you assisted in the exposure and unmasking of Beria.'

"I stared in amazement, wondering what he was leading up to. Khrushchev's explanation was this:

"You remember the debate which you had last year with Bulganin and Beria over the accusation they made against your army. It was Beria who had given us that information, and the strong opposition which you put up in the presence of the comrades of the Presidium, helped us by supplementing the doubts and the facts which we had about the hostile activity of Beria. A few days after your departure for Albania we condemned him.

"(...) The "Beria" dossier had been closed. Khrushchev had settled accounts with him." (ibid; p.35-36).

"Khrushchev and Mikoyan were the bitterest enemies of Marxism-Leninism and Stalin.

"(...) Khrushchev and Mikoyan worked to a plan and after the death of Stalin found an open field for their activity, also because of the fact that Malenkov, Beria, Bulganin and Voroshilov proved to be not only blind, but also ambitious, and each of them struggled for power.

"(...) In a few words, they applied this tactic: split and divide in the Presidium, organize the forces of the putsch outside, continue to speak well about Stalin in order to have the millions strong masses on their side, and thus bring closer the day of the seizure of power, the liquidation of opponents, and of a whole glorious epoch of the construction of socialism, the victory of the Patriotic War, etc. All this feverish activity (and we sensed this) was aimed to create the popularity of Khrushchev inside the Soviet Union and outside it." (ibid; p.50-51).

"The truth is that in this initial stage of Khrushchev's revisionist assault, Beria was the appropriate card to play to advance the secret plans. As I have written above, Beria was presented by Khrushchev as the cause of many evils: he had allegedly underrated the role of the first secretary, damaged the "collective leadership", and wanted to put the party under the control of the state security apparatus. On the pretext of the struggle against the damage caused by Beria, Khrushchev, on the one hand, established himself in the leadership of the party and state and took control of the Ministry of Internal Affairs, and on the other hand, prepared public opinion for the open attack which he was to undertake later on Joseph Vissarionovich Stalin, and on the real work of the Bolshevik Communist Party of Lenin and Stalin." (ibid; p.52-53).

"I have spoken above about the meeting in June 1953 with Malenkov, Beria, Mikoyan, and others in Moscow. Apart from other things, from the way they behaved towards us and how they handled the economic problems which we raised, I felt that now it was not only the body of the unforgettable Stalin that was missing in the Kremlin, but also his generous humane spirit, his attentive, friendly behaviour and his outstanding Marxist-Leninist thought." (ibid; p.67).

At a meeting with Soviet leaders on June 8th, 1954, Khrushchev's social-imperialist grimace on the Albanian oil question was fully expressed when he boldly declared:

"I know that your oil is not in demand, it contains many impurities, especially bitumen and a high percentage of sulphur, and processing it makes it even less profitable. Let us give you an example of what has occurred to us with our oil at Baku. We have invested billions of rubles there. Beria always sought sums for investment for the development of oil in Baku from Joseph Vissarionovich, since Stalin, having worked in Baku in the past, knew that there was oil there. However, from the discoveries we have made today, other places of our homeland and from the analyses we have made, it turns out that the exploitation of the oil at Baku is not profitable.' [An outrageous lie, especially when one thinks about the First and Second World War and the events of Georgia today!]

"After giving me a good lecture with figures about the 'profitability' and "non-profitability' of the extraction of oil, with the aim that I 'should not make mistakes' like Stalin(!), Khrushchev came round to the point:

"Hence we must make our reckoning economic questions very carefully, both in our country and in yours, and if you have profitable sources of oil, fine, we give you credits. However, reckoning things this way, it turns out that it is more profitable for us to supply you from our oil . . .'" (ibid; p.78-79).

Khrushchev's course was to limit socialist construction in Albania to the "cultivation of citrus fruits". Khrushchev wanted to turn Albania into an orchard of the USSR. And as an example he cited the restriction to fruit growing, which he had already forced on the Georgians immediately after he came to power. By 1954, Khrushchev's Russian social-imperialism had been put into practice as planned, even in the non-Russian Soviet republics.

In 1954, Khrushchev thought it was still too early to openly attack Stalin's Marxist-Leninist line on the Yugoslav Question and used one of his popular sleights of hand instead. He argued that Beria had only pushed Yugoslavia further into the arms of imperialism and that it needed to be embraced rather than forced in order to be better assimilated. Enver Hoxha wrote about this:

"And those who were to blame were found to be Beria among the Soviets, who with his actions had caused 'justifiable dissatisfaction among the Yugoslav leadership', and Djilas among the Yugoslavs (who had been condemned by Tito in the meantime), who 'openly propagated liquidationist views', was 'an active partisan for the orientation of Yugoslavia towards the Western countries', etc.!"

"Thus, according to Khrushchev, the problem turned out to be very simple. The breach with Yugoslavia was based not on real reasons but on fabricated pretexts, so 'we wronged you for nothing and the culprits have been found: Beria on our side, and Djilas on yours. Now we both have condemned these enemies, therefore, all we have to do is to kiss and make up and forget the past.'" (ibid; p.112).

Tito had placed four conditions upon Khrushchev, the fourth of which was as follows:

"Fourth, the causes of the conflict, said Tito, are neither Beria nor Djilas. The causes go deeper, therefore you, the Soviets, and the others united with you, must completely abandon the line of the time of Stalin, abandon your former principles, because in this way the true causes of the conflict are automatically overcome." (ibid; p.118-119).

This indirectly indicates that they did not want to get rid of Beria because he was an obstructive defender of Stalin's line on Yugoslavia from 1948/49. Both Khrushchev and Tito were in agreement against Stalin, but neither side justified Beria's guilt with Stalin's "defense" of him. We address this to the Berianists!

In the summer of 1955, Enver Hoxha arrived in Moscow to meet with the Khrushchevite Suslov, the greatest demagogue, who was a member of the War Council in the Caucasus from 1941-44, head of the partisan associations there, a member of the Presidium of the Central Committee of the CPSU from 1952-1953, and a member of the Foreign Affairs Commission of the Union Council of the Supreme Soviet of the USSR at the time of the meeting with Enver Hoxha:

"In his opening words he told me that we would talk about the Yugoslav problem and stressed in a dictatorial tone:

"(...) 'The main problem is that the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union has examined the Yugoslav question in a realistic light, bearing in mind the traitorous work of Beria, and we made self-criticism about this. Our Central Committee came to the conclusion that the breaking off of relations with Yugoslavia was a mistake, that is, we were hasty.'" (ibid; p.135-136).

"'A number of mistakes have been made, but they must be examined carefully,'" said Suslov, and started to list a series of 'arguments' to convince me that the Yugoslav leaders were allegedly not on a wrong road. Naturally he also tried to lay the blame on Beria and Djilas and the efforts of imperialism 'to attach Yugoslavia to itself'.

"'Molotov, too, has maintained a very sectarian stand on this problem,' continued Suslov. 'He personally made mistakes in state relations with Yugoslavia while insisting that it was the Yugoslav comrades that made the mistakes. However, the Central Committee demanded that Molotov prove where the Yugoslavs had been wrong, and we criticized him severely for his stand. Finally he, too, expressed his solidarity with the Central Committee!'" (ibid; p.137).

In order to force the Albanians to reconcile with the Belgrade revisionists and thus force them to rehabilitate the Yugoslavian anti-party elements they had condemned, Enver Hoxha was woken in the middle of the night by a call from Mikoyan:

"Mikoyan began to deliver a standard monologue about "socialist Yugoslavia", about Tito who was "a fine chap", about Beria's mistakes and the sins they had allegedly committed (the Soviet Union and the Information Bureau), and then he concluded:

"(...) 'You, too, must help ensure that Yugoslavia does not go over to the imperialist camp . . .'" (ibid; p.141).

"Precisely after the death of Stalin we entered into conflict with the new leadership of the Soviet Union - Malenkov, Bulganin, Khrushchev, Mikoyan, and others. Three or four months after Stalin's death they attacked us fiercely and shamelessly...

"We took part in the meetings of the communist and workers' parties in Moscow, but did not go there with the views of Mao Tsetung. We did not speak out against the Soviet Union until the conditions for this were ripe, but within ourselves, we had great worries and doubts about its leadership. It did not show itself resolute, there was confusion there. We sensed the contradictions which existed within it, among the leaders, and especially over the line of Stalin, although we had no real knowledge of them.

"Our opinion is that Mao Tsetung knew about this situation and that he must have been in agreement with the line and actions of Khrushchev against Stalin and the line of the Bolshevik Party...

"(...) After the death of Stalin and regardless of his saying that 'Khrushchev is a great man', Mao (naturally, these are suppositions) put himself above Khrushchev and thought that he ought to have his place after Lenin as "a great philosopher" and the leader of a country with the biggest population in the world." (Enver Hoxha: 'The Chinese Revisionists are Attacking the

Party of Labour of Albania in an Underhand Way' in: 'Reflections on China', Volume II; Tirana; 1979; p.410-411; English Edition).

- End of Enver Hoxha's quotes dealing with Beria -

Now we have taken the trouble to carefully collect all the quotes from Enver in which Beria was mentioned. We think that it is more than clear that Enver recognized in Beria an enemy of Marxism-Leninism. May the reader judge for himself whether he wants to side with us on the side of Enver Hoxha or with the Berianists on the side of Beria. Bear this in mind: The Berianists pretend to base themselves on BOTH the Marxist-Leninist Hoxha AND on the "Marxist-Leninist" Beria? Who is the Marxist-Leninist, Enver or Beria? Whoever takes Beria's side is in our opinion an enemy of Enver Hoxha and Stalin. For us there can be no other conclusion! We of the Comintern/ML are of the opinion that Enver Hoxha is not only a Marxist-Leninist, but the 5th Classic of Marxism-Leninism and his word has all the more weight. His word is for us Marxist-Leninists law: The accusation and condemnation of the anti-Marxist-Leninist Beria, the accusation and condemnation of the Berianists and Berianism! This corresponds to the revolutionary spirit of Enver Hoxha - this is Hoxhaism! Today's struggle against Berianism is the development of Hoxhaism!

The Berianists are Hoxhaists in words and anti-Hoxhaists in deeds! And as such, we establish an irreconcilable demarcation line between them and us: A Marxist-Leninist can never defend Marxism-Leninism if he defends his enemies at the same time.

One need only look at how perfidiously the Berianists deal with the quotations of Enver Hoxha. From this alone we draw our conclusions that we are wary of them, because they accuse Enver Hoxha of exactly the opposite of what he said, as we will see in a moment.

And this is exactly how the Berianists have acted towards the Comintern/ML. They are hiding all of Enver Hoxha's assessments of Beria. The only thing the Berianists found in Enver Hoxha is not even from Enver Hoxha himself (!), but Enver Hoxha was writing there *about* someone who secondhandedly told him about how Beria had defended herself so cunningly in his trial that nothing could be proven against him. We take this quote from Enver Hoxha from the pro-Beria "red channel" on the internet where it can be found:

"When a general, whose name I think was Sehatskov, came to Tirana as a military adviser, he also said something about the trial of Beria. On that occasion, Sergatskov told us confidentially: *'Beria defended himself very well in court. He did not accept any of the accusations and refuted everything!'*" (red channel; Translated from German).

With your hand on your hearts comrades, can you seriously want to prove with this quotation that Enver Hoxha considered Beria to be a Marxist-Leninist?

"To support this," they add the anti-Stalinists Nikolaevsky and Lang. With them, you know that you can't believe anything they say. Even Sudoplatov, Beria's student, logically defended Beria when he spoke about the trial. Surely one must not believe people who are not Marxist-Leninists at all, nor must one conceal what the Marxist-Leninists believe about Beria. Stalin already had the death sentence for Beria in his pocket, the trial against Beria was scheduled for March 1953 by Stalin. Should the comrades then accuse Stalin as an enemy of Marxism-Leninism because he wanted to liquidate the "Marxist-Leninist" Beria?

Furthermore, the Berianists cite a quotation from Svetlana, Stalin's daughter. We have also

collected what Svetlana thought of Beria and then listed it here to prove that the Berianists used the same sleight of hand that they used with the quotations from Enver Hoxha. They made all of Svetlana's devastating judgements about Beria disappear into a drawer (and there's quite a lot!!!) and used only one single quotation (!) of her to "prove" the quotation of Enver Hoxha that they dug up. The quote reads:

"The trial was staged - without any evidence". We have taken Svetlana's quote here again from the Internet, again from "red channel".

The Berianists' intention is transparent. They claim that: If Beria was shot by the Khrushchevites without evidence, ergo Beria must have been a "Marxist-Leninist". Is that Marxist logic? How stupid do the Berianists actually think we are? Beria, as the most powerful man in the state, had enough evidence to have all the other members of the Presidium shot, because they were so dirty. Yes, he was so powerful that he could do whatever he wanted with them even without evidence. He occupied the Kremlin with his own troops and put his pistol to the chests of the entire Presidium, and they had to give in, had to do what he said. They had no other choice if they wanted to live. Yes, that was Beria! These are facts and that was Beria's death sentence. He knew too much and had them all in his hand. The members of the Presidium were blackmailed by him, paraded by him, had to dance to his tune. If they had not eliminated him, all the conspiracy groups would have been blown up and the whole coup against Stalin would have been in danger. If one of them talked, all of them were finished. Even if they had wanted to reveal everything about Beria's crimes at that time, they would only be digging their own grave. It was only with a trick that the Khrushchevites finally succeeded in luring Beria into a trap and letting him snap shut. This mutual putschism had nothing to do with the correct actions of a Bolshevik party. So for the time being they had no choice but to grit their teeth and wait for the 20th Party Congress, where they were well prepared to tell their tall tales about Beria, mixed with half-truths and truths, without burdening themselves with them.

Everything decisive about this was said in Enver Hoxha's "The Khrushchevites". We have examined these events again elsewhere. Just as we did with the Enver Hoxha quotes, we want to let Svetlana speak here in detail so that you can see for yourself. Everything that Svetlana wrote about Beria in Georgia we have listed in the chapter on the Mingrelian Conspiracy of Beria and left out here to avoid repeating ourselves.

Svetlana Defended her Father against Beria:

Svetlana loved her father, nobody in the world disputes that. Why should she lie after his death? Why should she hide anything, why should she wrongly accuse anyone? We Marxist-Leninists do not agree with everything she wrote about her father and socialism in the Soviet Union, but we believe what her honest childhood heart felt about Beria's constant presence, and so we studied her letters about life with her father with great attention and not without compassion for her hatred of Beria. One thing Svetlana said clearly: For her, there is no person in the whole world whom she had hated more in her life than Beria, and whom she, involuntarily, got to know personally better than others. She would have done anything to protect her father from Beria, and it was precisely this powerlessness against Beria, to have to watch her father run further and further into ruin, that had broken her heart. Confidants of Stalin's daughter suspect that Svetlana was only allowed to write her criticism of Beria in the "slave language". The first reason for this is that she had to publish her "Twenty Letters to a Friend" in the West, and thus under the possible influence of certain political circles, in

publishing and editing. The second reason for this is that Khrushchev had given her the order not to disclose anything about the murder of her father, because the official authorities in Russia have kept this secret to this day. But Svetlana's choice of words nevertheless made it quite clear that she could only hate Beria so deeply for one reason: She knew about it just like her brother, who was locked up in prison only because he, too, knew about the truth and unlike Svetlana had dared not to remain silent, but to openly speak out about the murder of his father, which he paid for with his life. What we see here is the social-fascist violence, namely to brutally invade the personal relations not only of the masses but also of the great leader Stalin, to destroy, torture and kill his family life and to exploit it in the interest of their power. Svetlana's wish was to leave forever the country where the murder of her father was officially hushed up. Khrushchev would hardly have let her leave the Soviet Union unhindered if she had not publicly and explicitly confirmed to him that she would keep the truth to herself. It is humanly comprehensible what burned in Svetlana's soul. She had to lighten her soul and revealed as much as she could to the public. Before Beria had entered the life of her family, she felt happily and lovingly cared for in her family, her relationship with her father was unburdened and carefree. Since Beria had appeared, she describes life as hell, for Beria wiped out half of Stalin's family and she had to go through all this at close quarters as a child.

Beria was, and no one disputes this, the person who had the easiest, most open, unhindered and temporally longest access to the most strictly guarded politician in human history. For this fact alone it is impossible to objectively exclude him as a perpetrator. We compile such statements of Svetlana, which seem to us to be revealing about Beria, here from her "20 Letters to a Friend", written in 1963 with the accompanying word: *"I should like the reader of these letters to feel that they were written for him"*.

On March 2, 1953, Svetlana was taken from school to her father's deathbed. She wrote:

"Everyone was tiptoeing around as quiet as a mouse.

"(...) There was only one person who was behaving in a way that was very nearly obscene. That was Beria. He was extremely agitated. His face, repulsive enough at the best of times, now was twisted by his passions - by ambition, cruelty, cunning and a lust for power and more power still. He was trying so hard at this moment of crisis to strike exactly the right balance, to be cunning, yet not too cunning. It was written all over him. He went up to the bed and spent a long time gazing into the dying man's face. From time to time my father opened his eyes but was apparently unconscious or in a state of semiconsciousness. Beria stared fixedly at those clouded eyes, anxious even now to convince my father that he was the most loyal and devoted of them all, as he had always tried with every ounce of his strength to appear to be. Unfortunately, he had succeeded for too long.

"During the final minutes, as the end was approaching, Beria suddenly caught sight of me and ordered: "Take Svetlana away!" Those who were standing nearby stared, but no one moved. Afterward he darted into the hallway ahead of anybody else. The silence of the room where everyone was gathered around the deathbed was shattered by the sound of his loud voice, the ring of triumph unconcealed, as he shouted, "Khrustalyov! My car!" [Editor's note: There were comrades, who had served at that time in direct proximity of Stalin, who were convinced of the fact that courtier of Beria had done the actual dirty work with the procurement and the administration of the poison!]

"He was a magnificent modern specimen of the artful courtier, the embodiment of Oriental perfidy, flattery and hypocrisy who had succeeded in confounding even my father, a man

whom it was ordinarily difficult to deceive. A good deal that this monster did is now a blot on my father's name, and in a good many things they were guilty together. But I haven't the slightest doubt that Beria used his cunning to trick my father into many other things and laughed up his sleeve about it afterwards. All the other leaders knew it.

"Now all the ugliness inside him came into the open - he couldn't hold it back. I was by no means the only one to see it. But they were all terrified of him. They knew that the moment my father died no one in Russia would have greater power in his grasp." (Alliluyeva: 'Twenty Letters to a Friend'; New York; 1967; p.7-8; English Edition).

When Svetlana held the hand of her dying father she noticed in his last conscious moment:

"He suddenly lifted his left hand as though he were pointing to something above and bringing down a curse on us all. The gesture was incomprehensible and full of menace, and no one could say to whom or at what it might be directed. The next moment, after a final effort, the spirit wrenched itself free of the flesh." (ibid; p.10).

In her "Twenty Letters to a Friend", Svetlana reported on the accusations that Stalin heard from his wife because he let Beria rope him in:

"I see no facts! But she just cried out, 'What facts do you need? I just see he's a scoundrel! I won't have him here!' I told her to go to hell. He's my friend. He's a good Chekist. He helped us forestall the Mingrelian uprising in Georgia. I trust him. Facts are what I need!"

"My poor, clever mother. The facts came later." (ibid; p.20).

[Parentheses by the editors: In 1929, Stalin had not yet convinced himself that Beria was the real leader of the Mingrelian uprising in 1924, but Stalin instead trusted Beria as a "Chekist", whom he incorrectly defended against the suspicion of his wife! Please do not confuse the Mingrelian uprising with the later Mingrelian Conspiracy, for the only thing the two had in common was Beria of course! Svetlana writes about the year 1929, when Stalin and his wife had quarreled over Beria, one of the reasons why Beria killed the very relatives of Stalin who had suspected him! The astonishing thing about this quarrel, which Svetlana has described here between her parents, is that Stalin's wife had in 1929 already foreseen the year 1951/52 that the mastermind of the Mingrelian Conspiracy was none other than Beria - after Svetlana's mother had been dead for over 20 years! Stalin had already been warned in 1929, but he had ignored the warning by his wife. There are things in life that one should not refrain from doing until there is "evidence" against them. Beria always had "counter-evidence" on all 10 fingers at hand! Stalin had finally collected enough evidence against Beria in 1951/52, but it was to become clear that it was already too late to condemn Beria on the basis of that evidence!]

Svetlana suddenly ends the sentence (in the German edition – translator's note) without it being completed. We do not find out why, but everyone can imagine: If Stalin had listened to his wife, he would have stayed alive in 1953. In a note of the German edition of her "Twenty Letters" there is a remark of the translator, which we do not want to withhold here. It says:

"The Mingrelian Affair of 1951/52, despite numerous results of investigations, remains unexplained to this day. It "resulted in a purge of the Georgian party and state apparatus whose extent almost eclipsed the bloodbath of the years 1936 to 1938." (note of the German translator).

"Unexplained to this day???" Because the murder of Stalin was concealed, and the exact opposite must have happened in Mingrelia than what was officially announced afterwards. The translator wanted (or had to?) lead the public on a false track in order to distract from what had really happened.

Svetlana further wrote:

"The very next day - it was well before the funeral - Beria had the whole household, servants and bodyguards, called together and told that my father's belongings were to be removed right away - no one had any idea where - and that they were all to quit the premises.

"Nobody argued with Beria. (...) Servants who had worked for my father devotedly for ten or fifteen years were simply thrown out. Every one of them was sent away. (...) Two of them shot themselves. No one knew what was going on or what they were guilty of or why they were being picked on.

"(...) In 1955, when Beria himself and "fallen", they started restoring the dacha. My father's things were brought back. The former servants and commadants were invited back and helped put everything where it belonged and make the house look as it had before. They were preparing to open a museum (...) But then came the Twentieth Party Congress." (ibid; p.23).

In this interesting tripartite division of the period after Stalin's death, Svetlana's statements reflect three positions on Stalin, and these are exactly the three moments that broke over socialism: the overthrow, the pausing moments of horror and emptiness after the loss of Stalin, a brief resurgence of Stalinism only to finally go out, to finally turning away from it.

Svetlana continues:

"My father could not have been cut off from life in those years (before Beria came along – editor's note). That came later, when he was isolated from all the sincere, honest, kindly members of the family who had been on an equal footing with him." (ibid; p.35).

"Beria, who was already in power in Moscow by this time (around 1938 – editor's note), made up various stories about Pavel's death and kept trying to put them over on my father. The most farfetched was that Pavel had been poisoned by his wife.

"(...) But that wasn't enough for Beria. A full decade later, in 1948, he had Pavel's widow accused of spying and poisoning her husband and she was thrown into jail. (...) Neither was set free until 1954." (ibid; p.55-56).

(This only happened after Beria's death. He granted the greatest amnesty immediately after Stalin's death, but why not in this case? Why not?).

"What my father didn't want to realize was that in the cellars of the secret police X, Y and Z could could be made to testify to anything. That was the domain of Beria, Yezhov and the other executioners, whom nature had endowed with a special talent for that sort of thing." (ibid; p.78).

"My father was astonishingly helpless before Beria's machinations. All Beria had to do was bring him the record of the interrogation in which X 'confessed,' or others 'confessed' for him, or worse yet, X refused to 'confess'. (ibid; p.79).

"(...) or whether Beria had simply made up his mind to get rid of those who knew about his crimes and had no trouble talking my father into it." (ibid).

"I speak advisedly of his influence on my father and not the other way around. Beria was more treacherous, more practiced in perfidy and cunning, more insolent and single-minded than my father. In a word, he was a stronger character. My father had his weaker sides. He was capable of self-doubt. He was cruder and more direct than Beria, and not so suspicious. He was simpler and could be led up to the garden path by someone with Beria's craftiness. Beria was aware of my father's weaknesses. He knew the hurt pride and the inner loneliness. He was aware that my father's spirit was, in a sense, broken. And so he poured oil on the flames and fanned them as only he knew how. He flattered my father with a shamelessness that was nothing if not Oriental. He praised him and made up to him in a way that caused old friends, accustomed to looking on my father as an equal, to wince with embarrassment.

"Beria's role was a terrible one for all our family. How my mother feared and hated him! And it was her friends - Alexander Svanidze, his wife Maria, his sister Mariko who was Yanukidze's secretary, to say nothing of Yenukidze himself - who were the first to fall, the moment Beria was able to convince my father that they were hostile to him.

"I have already said that in a good many things Beria and my father were guilty together. I'm not trying to shift the blame from one to the other. At some point, unfortunately, they became spiritually inseparable. The spell cast on my father by this terrifying evil genius was extremely powerful, and it never failed to work." (ibid; p.137).

"The years 1949 to 1952 were terribly trying for me, as they were for everyone. The whole country was gasping for air. Things were unbearable for everyone. The most orthodox Party spirit reigned in the house I lived in, but it had nothing in common with the spirit of my grandfather and my grandmother, my mother, the Svanidzes and all the old Party people I knew. It was all hypocritical, a caricature purely for show." (ibid; p.197-198).

"After the Nineteenth Party Congress in October 1952, he twice informed the Central Committee that he wished to retire. It was probably because he was ill. In any case the fact that he wanted to retire was known to everyone who belonged to the Central Committee at that time." (ibid; p.206).

Svetlana wrote of his 73rd birthday, December 21st, 1952, where she had seen her father for the last time:

"Toward the end the 'usual' people were Beria, Malenkov, Bulganin and Mikoyan. Khrushchev also appeared from time to time. Molotov was out of things after his wife's arrest in 1949. He wasn't even summoned even during my father's last illness. Shortly before my father died even some of his intimates were disgraced: the perennial Vlasik was sent to prison in the winter of 1952 and my father's personal secretary Poskrebyshchev, who had been with him for twenty years, was removed." (ibid; p.208).

And Svetlana wrote about Stalin's son, her brother:

"(...) the death of our father, which shook him badly. He was convince that our father had been 'poisoned' or 'killed.' He saw that the world world without which he was unable to exist was crumbling all around him, and he was terrified.

"Throughout the period before the funeral he was in a dreadful state, and his behavior was

appalling. There was no one he didn't blame. He accused the government, the doctors and everybody in sight of using the wrong treatment on our father and failing to give him a proper funeral." (ibid; p.215).

This is where our quotes from Svetlana end and you should read them again and again to remember her image of Beria.

By the way, Stalin's son Vasily was put into prison by Khrushchev because he accused Khrushchev of being his father's murderer.

And finally, here's a quote from Svetlana's "Only One Year":

"Sometimes my father made fun of Beria, repeating the same old joke while directly addressing the 'Prosecutor,' who would never have taken it from anyone else. The joke was about a Chekist and a professor who lived in the same apartment. One day the professor, irritated by his neighbor's ignorance, exclaimed, 'Oh you! You don't even know who wrote *Yevgeny Onegin!*' The Chekist felt insulted (because he really did not know). Soon afterward he arrested the professor, boasting to his friends: 'I got him to confess it! He was the *author!*'" (Alliluyeva: 'Only One Year'; New York; 1969; p.386; English Edition).

Who was Stalin referring to?

- End of Chapter -