

**THE CONGRESS
OF THE
SOVIET REVISIONISTS
- A CONGRESS
OF SOCIAL IMPERIALIST
DEMAGOGY
AND EXPANSION**

*Editorial of the «Zëri i Popullit»,
organ of the Central Committee
of the Party of Labour
of Albania,
March 12, 1976*

OCTOBER BOOKS
4B TEMPLE COURT
LIVERPOOL 2
A C.P.B.M.L. BOOKSHOP

**THE CONGRESS OF THE SOVIET REVISIONISTS
— A CONGRESS OF SOCIAL IMPERIALIST
DEMAGOGY AND EXPANSION**

*Editorial of the «Zëri i Popullit»,
organ of the Central Committee
of the Party of Labour of Albania,
March 12, 1976*

**THE «8 NËNTORI» PUBLISHING HOUSE
Tirana, 1976**



Some days ago the 25th Congress of the revisionist party of the Soviet Union ended in Moscow. For ten consecutive days, during its proceedings, the bells of the Soviet propaganda rang out with all the power at their command to the glory of the great Czar, Brezhnev, and the glory of the power of the new revisionist Russian empire.

In his speech Brezhnev tried to paint an idyllic picture of the Soviet Union and to present the present policy of its leadership as an internationalist, socialist policy of peace and security. His home lieutenants and foreign admirers also spared no effort to present the period of the Brezhnevian rule in «epochal» colours, to put it down in history as a «brilliant» period, almost as brilliant as that of the October Revolution or the Great Patriotic War.

But reality remains reality. It cannot be disguised with advertisements nor be made brilliant with words, no matter how talented their users or how skilful the apologists.

The 25th Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union was a continuation and a further deepening of the course of the new Khrushchevite leadership towards the intensification of capitalist exploitation within the country and of imperialist expansion abroad. Neither in essence nor in form did this Congress differ from the previous ones

organized by Brezhnev and his clique, the same stale trifling with Leninism, the same refined social demagogy, the same deceptive political phraseology, the same statistical juggling, the same vain boasting and empty promises. Only that this time the general secretary of the Soviet revisionist party had to exploit his entire arsenal of political somersaults and all the tricks of the opportunist propaganda, to present black for white, failures as triumphs, imperialist aggression as pure internationalism, degeneration and revisionist disintegration as the acme of unity and solidarity.

Brezhnev tried to dodge the tender spots and the discussion of the major internal and external political problems.

Thus, for example, he did not mention the «normalization in Czechoslovakia» and he skimmed over the growing divergencies with several revisionist countries by saying that a number of parties had specific viewpoints on a series of questions, but the general tendency was characterized «by the strengthening of the solidarity of the socialist countries». Which are these parties, what are these questions? Outside the Soviet Union, everyone knows about them, but the Soviet people must live with the illusion that «solidarity is being strengthened», that «the community is growing stronger». And when new events occur, like those of Prague and Gdansk, Brezhnev has the slogans ready to say that the tanks were sent «to save the community», to «strengthen the solidarity».

In the same manner, Brezhnev avoided any explanation in regard to the conflicts in which the Soviet Union has been involved, especially in recent

years, for example, the deterioration of relations with Egypt, the complications in Portugal, etc.

But despite this, in the problems of foreign policy dealt with at the Congress, the hegemonistic and expansionist course of the Soviet superpower, its efforts to dominate the peoples and nations, its aims to go even further in its preparations for war, were manifested in all their monstrous proportions.

«There is no corner in the world», Brezhnev said, boasting like a former British monarch, «no state of affairs, which we have not taken into consideration in the formulation of our foreign policy». Translated into normal language, this means there is no question anywhere in which Soviet social imperialism is not trying to intervene, no area in which it is not interested, no zone where it is not fishing in troubled waters, or no international conflict from which it is not trying to profit.

Brezhnev again openly announced his plan of advancing towards the complete liquidation of the national sovereignty of the revisionist countries and placing them under the direct control of the Soviet state organs, and of unconditional subjugation to the directives and orientations from Moscow.

In addressing the foreign countries, he spoke not only as the representative of the bloc, but also as its patron.

It was only for demagogical purposes that he did not fail to say that, «There is a flourishing of the socialist nations and a strengthening of their sovereignty», but he hastened to add that, «Now that the reciprocal ties among the socialist nations are becoming closer, more and more common political, economic and social elements are emerging». With

this, he was repeating the ultrachauvinist thesis which is long being peddled in the Soviet Union and which expresses the course of denationalization followed by the Kremlin, to the effect that national sovereignty in the socialist countries is dying out, while a new type of sovereignty, «internationalist», «supra-national» sovereignty is arising. And from the tribune of the Congress, with the arrogance of an absolute monarch he orders the «leading parties to struggle against tendencies of withdrawal into themselves and of emphasizing their national peculiarities, to bear in mind their common internationalist duties», with the aim of advancing this process which, he alleges, is a «law».

The particularly large place, in the reports of Brezhnev and Kosygin and in the contributions of the speakers at the Congress, devoted to the plans of economic, military and ideological integration of the Comecon countries, the efforts which were made to put these plans on a theoretical basis, testify to the fact that the Soviet leadership is very forcibly and urgently demanding the elimination of the borders, the liquidation of any remaining vestige of individuality and independence.

The Congress also touched on relations with the other revisionist parties, but Brezhnev tried to pass lightly over the ideological, political, tactical and other differences which have emerged between Moscow and many other parties of the revisionist camp.

The Moscow chieftains call their party «the mother party», the Soviet Union, «the centre of communism» and Moscow, «the headquarters of the world revolutionary process». It pleases Brezhnev to

frequently stress the «leading role» of his Party, and at the 25th Congress he missed no opportunity to remind the others of «the programme of the 1969 meeting», or «the laws collectively formulated at the international meetings of the sister parties». At the same time he does not fail to repeat his demand for a «new world meeting of the communist and workers' parties», at which, according to him, «the general laws of the development of the revolution and the construction of socialism and communism» will be «collectively» formulated.

But Brezhnev did not say either to the Congress or to his Party that the meeting of the European revisionist parties, on which the Kremlin has been so insistent, has been dragging on for years, because many «sister parties» do not want to be linked through a joint document with Moscow, do not want to take orders from it.

The «criticism» of the opportunists, without calling them by name, made at the 25th Congress by Brezhnev himself and many other leading figures of the Soviet Union and the revisionist countries of Eastern Europe, represents an ill-camouflaged bluff aimed directly at a number of western parties. Words such as those of Brezhnev at the Congress to the effect that allegedly for his party «there can be no talk of compromises over questions of principle, of reconciliation with viewpoints and actions in opposition to Communist ideology», sound not only demagogical, but are also quite ridiculous. The patriarchs of modern opportunism are now criticizing the minor representatives of revisionism because they are not advancing on a correct road.

But, was it not Khrushchev, Brezhnev, Suslov

and their ilk who, at the 20th Congress of the CPSU, brought out the theory of the parliamentary road and peaceful transition to socialism? Are they not the very ones who raised the revisionist «peaceful coexistence» between states and classes to a «general principle» of the communist movement? Was it not their 20th Congress that put forward the thesis of rapprochement and collaboration with social democracy? Who invented the «state of the entire people» and the «party of the entire people» which negate the dictatorship of the proletariat and the leading role of the working class and its vanguard party? Who was the first to call Titoism «genuine socialism»?

When Soviet leaders reprimand the Italian, French, Spanish and the other revisionists over «concessions to opportunism», they are not worried about their ideology, nor are they much concerned that these concessions «will rebound to the detriment of the parties which make them».

«The tragedy of Chile», says Brezhnev, «does not in the least infirm the conclusion of the communists on the possibility of different roads of the revolution, among which the peaceful road». We are not going to stop at this point to say that the «tragedy of Chile» confirmed precisely the bankruptcy of the «roads» preached by Brezhnev. This is already clear. But when the secretary general of the revisionist party of the Soviet Union is «for different and peaceful roads of the revolution», why does he deny this right to his Italian, French or Spanish colleagues? What else are Berlinguer, Marchais, Carrillo saying that is making Brezhnev so worried? On the other hand, why do the Soviet

leaders enthusiastically approve of such «concessions» like those of Ali Yata, secretary of the Communist Party of Morocco, who has turned into an open royalist, or Dange, secretary of the Communist Party of India, who is the most ardent supporter of the Indian Congress Party, a party which has established in that country a regime scarcely distinguishable from that of the fascists?

It is clear that the Soviet leaders are not in the least worried about the attitude the parties take towards Marxism-Leninism, which they themselves have betrayed. The criterion by which the Soviet Union appraises them is their loyalty to Soviet social-imperialism, the approval and the support of its foreign policy, their submission to its diplomatic gambles. It does not judge the parties on whether or not they are for the revolution, whether or not they are for socialism, but on to what extent they are pro-Soviet, to what extent they support the Soviet Union and submit themselves to it.

The Soviet revisionists want also to avoid having the revisionist parties of the West come out frankly, openly and officially with their social democratic views, and publicly proclaim their abandonment of the Marxist-Leninist science. This puts Brezhnev's party in a somewhat awkward position, because it tries to camouflage itself with Leninism and still speculates with the term socialism. The stand taken by the West European revisionists reduced many of Moscow's propaganda cards to ashes, but worse still, it was an incitement to the other parties to disobey Moscow and break away from it.

The ideological degeneration and the continuing disintegration of the revisionist camp are an incess-

ant process which nothing can stop. They are a consequence of the counter-revolutionary course of the Soviet Khrushchevite leadership, of its chauvinistic and hegemonistic policy, a consequence of the revisionist betrayal. The Party of Labour of Albania had warned from the very beginning that differences, quarrels, and disintegration are inevitable among the various representatives of modern revisionism, that they are like crabs struggling in a basket and the more the time passes, the more the contradictions increase and the more severe become their struggle.

Brezhnev and others had a great deal to say at the Congress about «proletarian internationalism», the principles of which allegedly guide the entire Soviet foreign policy, not only towards those countries and parties which he calls socialist and communist, but also towards the emerging countries of Asia, Africa and Latin America. «We, the Soviet communists», he said, «consider the defence of proletarian internationalism as a sacred duty for all Marxist-Leninists». He left it to his personal herald, Todor Zhivkov of Bulgaria, whose paeans of praise to the policy and the person of Brezhnev went far beyond all bounds and norms of the most zealous lackeys to explain what this «sacred duty» was. Speculating with the past, Zhivkov sought to explain that proletarian internationalism was identified today, just as it was in the past, with the stand towards the Soviet Union, and above all, with the stand towards Brezhnev's policy.

In this way, according to Zhivkov, it follows that when Brezhnev orders the occupation of Czechoslovakia, this is internationalism; when he defends

Lon Nol against the Cambodian people, again he is acting as an internationalist; when the Kremlin leaders send tens of thousands of emigrants to Israel, year after year, they are implementing their great internationalist duty; when they dismember Pakistan and stir up civil war in Angola, they are sacrificing themselves for others; when they grant credits to a great number of reactionary regimes to suppress revolution, then, too, they are acting in the name of internationalism.

But whatever the efforts of Brezhnev and his discredited supporters like Zhivkov and Husak, the counter-revolutionary principles by which the present day Soviet Union is guided cannot be put across as proletarian internationalism. The hegemonism and expansionism of the Soviet revisionist leaders, their brutal interference in the internal affairs of sovereign countries and states and the imperialist intrigues and plots they hatch up against them are apparent in each of their steps; all peoples oppose and fight them.

At the time of Lenin and Stalin, when the Soviet Union was the centre of the world revolution, the stand towards it was truly a criterion of proletarian internationalism. But today, when Marxism-Leninism and the revolution have been betrayed in the Soviet Union, when its former revolutionary policy, its support of and solidarity with the liberation struggle of the peoples have been replaced by a hegemonistic and expansionist policy, by brutal interference in internal affairs and imperialist intrigues and plots against sovereign states and countries, as comrade Enver Hoxha has said, an internationalist «is he who

fighters against the Soviet revisionists, exposes their treachery, opposes their anti-Marxist and imperialist policy and line with all his might».

Proletarian internationalism is the ideology of the proletariat alone, it represents its international class unity in struggle for the overthrow of capitalism, for the construction of socialism and the independence and liberation of the peoples.

Therefore, the anti-proletarian revisionist states, the social democratic and revisionist parties, which are lackeys of the bourgeoisie, cannot be internationalist. They regard and interpret internationalism according to their bourgeois and social-chauvinist interests. Proletarian internationalism can never be reconciled with, on the contrary, it is in struggle against, the big capitalist bourgeoisie, the imperialist trusts and monopolies, the suppressors of the revolution and enemies of communism.

It is a fundamental requirement of proletarian internationalism that the working class and its vanguard in each country help with all the strength and means the revolutionary struggle for national and social liberation, for the construction of socialism and the defence of the achievements of the revolution in other countries.

The 25th Congress made it clear once more that the social imperialists want to use the mask of «proletarian internationalism» as a means of interference and disruption, especially in the new developing countries. At the present time, the revisionists are up to the most diabolic demagogic manoeuvres, the most sophisticated intrigues and most barbarous plots against these countries. Posing as their defen-

der, the Soviet Union is trying in every way to force them into its economic orbit, and through the selling of arms, to hitch them to its chariot militarily and politically, too.

Brezhnev's theses in regard to the national liberation movements, however cloaked in «Leninist» terminology, remain reactionary in their essence, an expression of the savage social imperialist policy. Lenin saw the national liberation movements as a very important factor for the promotion of the world revolutionary process and as natural allies of the proletarian revolution. He considered the support of the people's liberation movements by the socialist states and the communists as a duty linked with the interests of the world proletarian revolution as a whole. While the «aid» Brezhnev has allegedly rendered to these movements, and which he boasted so much about at the Congress, has nothing to do either with the revolution, internationalism, or socialism. The aid of the Soviet revisionists has always been accompanied by political conditions and has always been connected with their expansion. The Arab East is the clearest example of it. They have regarded such aid as they have been giving this or that state from time to time, not as a means of helping the Arabs to carry their liberation struggle through to a victorious conclusion, but as a card in their rivalry with the USA and the deals with it over the division of the Middle East into spheres of influence. They have considered this aid as a capital investment to capture political, economic and military positions in that region of major strategic importance, as a loan to bind the Arabs hand and foot.

As expected, at the Congress a great fuss was made about the so-called «détente», the policy on which Brezhnev has staked his reputation and career. In this field, demagogy flowed in rivers and the oratory knew no bounds. The colours in which Brezhnev painted the present international situation were rosy. «It has required great efforts» he boasted, «for people, especially those who guide the policy of states, to begin to get used to the idea that it is not the balancing on the brink of war that is natural, but talks about contentious issues, not confrontation but peaceful collaboration». But the reality is quite different, and people are not in the least duped by the demagogy of the revisionists. The fact is that, as a result of the arms race, the fierce rivalry between the two superpowers, their persistence in their aggressive and neo-colonialist policies, their interference in the internal affairs of other peoples, their attacks on the freedom and sovereignty of nations, not only has the danger of war not been removed, but it is becoming more and more threatening. The war budgets of the two superpowers have reached astronomical levels and have surpassed the record figure of 100 billion dollars per year. Day by day, atomic weapons are being increased in quantity and perfected, new types of tanks and airplanes are being produced, the fleets of submarines are being expanded, the missiles are becoming more diversified. Why all this expenditure, why all these weapons? The aim of both the superpowers is the domination of the world, and war is the means to realize this aim.

The Soviet social imperialists and the US imperialists have always tried to conceal their expansion-

ism and hegemonism, interference and plunder behind fine phrases and false slogans.

This is still going on now. Brezhnev lauded the so-called Conference on European Security to the sky and, according to him, as a result of it, «favourable conditions have been created for the preservation and the strengthening of peace throughout the continent.» But the peoples of Europe and the world are becoming increasingly aware that pacifist euphoria, demagogy and the advertisement of the relaxation of tension represent a large-scale diabolical manoeuvre to confuse the minds of the people, to cover up with empty promises and false illusions the apprehensions stemming from the aggressive policy of the superpowers.

It is a fact that no matter how much Brezhnev may defend and advertise it, the Conference on European Security was a big fraud, that it produced nothing that can help peace and strengthen security.

The existence of foreign bases, the presence of US and Soviet troops in many countries, the extensive deployment of atomic weapons has been and remains a problem for Europe. Can the apprehensions of the European peoples be dispelled by the reassuring words the revisionists say at their congresses, when they are sleeping on a powder magazine? How can they feel at ease when the warships of the superpowers have surrounded the continent from the Arctic Ocean to the Black Sea, when their airplanes are flying like hungry ravens around the skies of Europe?

That is why, however many «peace programs», «security conferences», or «disarmament plans» Brezhnev may fabricate and from whatever tribune

he may trumpet them, he will find few people simple enough to be deceived.

When Brezhnev speaks about «the liquidation of the cold war», about the «transition from the danger of war to peaceful collaboration», etc., he has not in mind the efforts of the peoples to oppose the aggressive policy of imperialism and to prevent war. His appeal for «peaceful collaboration and not confrontation», for «talks about contentious issues», is directed exclusively to US imperialism. Despite the obscure language used by diplomacy in public statements, unlike that of secret tête-à-tête talks, Brezhnev made an open appeal to the USA to strengthen the Soviet-US collaboration and to make it the dominating factor of the present international life. It is not fortuitous that at the present Congress of the Soviet revisionists, «anti-imperialism» was not used even as a propaganda expression. The Soviet leadership thinks that the present ratio of forces between the two superpowers is such that the bargainings to the detriment of the peoples and against their freedom and independence should be made with US imperialism on an equal footing.

The Soviet social imperialists and their supporters show their real class hostility only against the PR of China and the Chinese people, against the PR of Albania and the Albanian people, against the revolution and socialism.

If the 25th Congress examined the present world processes and the foreign policy of the Soviet Union from the positions of an imperialist superpower, it saw the internal problems completely from the positions of bureaucracy and technocracy.

With its great ideological poverty, its lack of

creative ideas and its vulgar empirism in the treatment of the problems of the Party, the economy, culture, science, etc., this Congress was a convention of technocratic businessmen who are interested only in the efficiency of the economy, its dynamism, its profitability and profits, with everything measured in tons and rubles.

When Brezhnev came to power, one of his main justifications for the putsch that overthrew Khrushchev was the «urgent need» to lift agriculture from its state of backwardness and disorganization, and he proclaimed himself as the saviour of collective farms. He issued one program after another and promised white bread and roast meat for all. But today even the mice in the granaries of the Soviet Union are hungry. Twice in succession within a few years, despite its hundreds of millions of hectares of arable land, despite its boundless areas of pasture and forests, despite its great human resources and its huge fleets of farming machines, the Soviet Union has been on the brink of famine. But for the grain stores of the US, Canadian and Australian farmers and the gold of Siberia, the catastrophe would have been even greater than those experienced by the Volga peasants at the time of Tsarist Russia.

At the Congress Brezhnev gave no explanation at all, even as a matter of form, of this dreadful situation. He touched on it in passing, as if nothing had happened, as if everything in the field of agriculture was going normally, despite the fact that local newspapers and radio-stations are making daily appeals to the bakers to make the loaves smaller, so that not a crumb should be left either for hens or chickens.

Five years ago, Brezhnev called the 25th Congress an «historic one» for its «magnificent targets», for the expanded production of consumer goods, the improvement of their quality, the increase of their range, etc. Indeed, for the first time in the history of the Soviet Union, the rates of development of light industry were higher than those of heavy industry. In this field, too, the Soviet leadership has utterly failed. The rates remained very much lower than the levels set, the quality of commodities did not rise, the shelves of the stores stayed empty and the black market flourished.

According to Brezhnev, the shortage of commodities should be explained by the fact that «not everybody has managed to completely overcome the attitude towards consumer goods as something of second rate importance». But through such worn-out propaganda «arguments», the Kremlin rulers cannot convince the Soviet people to stand in rows for days on end to buy a woollen jersey, or a pair of warm shoes. The thing is that when guns are produced, butter disappears.

In his report to the Congress, Brezhnev said: «We have not yet learned that, while ensuring high rates of development of heavy industry, we must also rapidly develop group «B», as well as the sphere of services». Can it be said that this is a question of «learning» and education? It is clear to everybody that the great disproportions and distortions in various sectors of the Soviet economy, which have such a negative influence on the material well-being and the living standards of the working masses, are a result of the Khrushchevite line of capitalist restoration, the militarization of the country, the

arms race, and the expansionist course. The situation is such, because heavy industry is working for the army, the great funds poured into it go for the production of armaments, most of the best materials are stored in the military arsenals, the main scientific institutions and the best labour force are working for war.

In these conditions only a few miserable crumbs are left for the consumer goods industry, agriculture, services, etc.

Brezhnev boasts that the Soviet Union produces so many millions of tons of steel and so many millions of tons of oil, so many millions of tons of coal and so many millions of tons of cement. But where does all that wealth, all that toil and sweat of the Soviet working people go? The imperialist army and the preparations for aggressive wars are like an insatiable monster, which, the more it is fed, the more it demands. This is what eats up the iron, what consumes the oil, what burns the coal, or consumes the cement, what swallows the greater part of the state budget.

A meaningful example of the militarization of the life of the country and of the increase of the weight of the army in the political and economic fields was provided by this very Congress. For the first time, the army sent a special group of armymen to the Congress to greet it in the form of a parade, as young pioneers usually do. With this «ceremony», it tried to show that it was present not only as a military force, but also as a political force playing a decisive role in the life of the Soviet Union.

The phenomena occurring in the Soviet Union are identical with those in the United States of America. Within the framework of its plans of aggression against the freedom and independence of the peoples, for the preparation of a new world war, US imperialism has militarized its entire economy and has developed its frenzied arms race to unprecedented proportions. This has resulted in uncontrollable inflation which has seriously affected the standard of living of the masses, in the unemployment of almost nine million people, a thing unprecedented in the USA, without mentioning the rise of prices which has put many essential commodities beyond the reach of ordinary people. It has already been proved that the economic potential of the superpowers, their material and human resources, are incapable of coping with the huge military expenditure and the unbridled arms race and at the same time preserving some sort of stability of the standard of living of the masses of the people.

Brezhnev's cheap promises about «the further increase of the production of consumer goods, the improvement of services» or «the development of agriculture», are nothing but propaganda which is repeated from congress to congress and from year to year. As long as the course of the militarization of the economy and capitalist profit continues, the sectors connected with the meeting of the needs of the people will always go short, and along with them, the broad working masses who have to foot the bill.

Looking at the ideological and political directives of the Congress, it can clearly be seen that all the internal problems of the Soviet Union have been reduced to economic efficiency which in turn is

regarded entirely according to capitalist criteria and standards. The Soviet leaders regard «efficiency» as the key to solving all the problems, all the difficulties, all the crises they are experiencing. It is «efficiency» which will allegedly eliminate the growing social conflicts, which will reconcile mounting national animosities and also solve the many deepening contradictions of the new bourgeois society. The same language is being heard for years on end in the capitalist world of the West where the bourgeoisie is striving through a number of various economic expedients to ease the crisis, deceive the working people, and sabotage class struggle. The consideration of political and social problems outside class relationships as well as their identification with purely technical problems, as the Soviet leaders are doing, is not accidental, nor is it a question of methodology. It is an ideological expression of the restoration of capitalism in the Soviet Union, of the complete domination of bureaucracy and technocracy, which constitutes one of the characteristics of the present day societies of developed capitalism.

On the other hand, this tendency expresses the burning desire and the concrete efforts of the new bourgeoisie to increase its capitalist profits through the intensification of production.

The proceedings of the 25th Congress proved in all fields and aspects that the Soviet Union is ruled today by a caste of bureaucrats and technocrats which keeps all the commanding positions and instances of the party, state, economy, culture, etc., firmly in its hands. The figures about the composition of the party given at the Congress make this very plain.

Officials make up 44.5 per cent as against 41.6 per cent workers, and 13.9 per cent collective farmers in the total number of party members. But while the number of worker members is somewhere near that of officials, not a single representative of their ranks figures in the leading organs of the Party. According to figures provided by Brezhnev, 99.5 per cent of the secretaries of the party central committees of the republics, districts and regions, are intellectuals, mainly engineers and specialists of the economy. This ratio should also be true for party bureau members and secretaries of party basic organizations. Brezhnev tries to explain this technocratization of the party by referring to the so-called aim of its «qualitative improvement», but everybody can see for himself that the transformation of the party into a party of a stratum of bureaucrats and of working class aristocracy is becoming more marked year by year. It is precisely this stratum of technocrats who constitute the main support of the new bourgeoisie in the Soviet revisionist party.

Until now, the Soviet leaders have raised a hue and cry about what they called «problems of developed socialism». Indeed, they tried to formulate some of them into new «principles and theses» which they consider as a «further development of Leninism». They had a great deal to say also about how they would be reflected in a new Constitution which a commission led by Khrushchev and later by Brezhnev had undertaken to draft. But they ran out of ideas and now the theoretical problems have been reduced to problems of current administration of the economy and its technical aspects. The drafting of the Consti-

tution has been postponed for better times. On all these questions the Congress showed a state of routine and stagnation, which only an inert bureaucracy can bring about.

Brezhnev and his clique tried to give the 25th Congress a highly euphoric tone and present it as the Congress of stability, unity, and security. But the false optimism shown and the soothing words employed profusely at the Congress, cannot cover up the grave problems which preoccupy the present day capitalist society in the Soviet Union, cannot dispel the worries and disillusionment of the masses. Brezhnev had promised abundance at home and peace abroad. He went to the Congress with a torn sack and an empty spoon. Now he is singing the same old tune hoping that the masses will join in and will not stir as long as he is occupying the throne in the Kremlin. But can this situation last for long?

It is true that in the present day Soviet Union there is stagnation and a state of grave political and ideological passivity among the working people. Chauvinistic propaganda, social demagoguery, the incitement to Great Power arrogance has deeply stupefied the Soviet people. But this stupor cannot last long. Failures are piling up and one day they may burst out into a real tragedy. It would be good not only for the Soviet people but also for the peoples of the whole world to awake to the reality. Brezhnev and company have turned to Soviet Union into a capitalist country where the masses are exploited and the nations are oppressed, into an imperialist superpower hated and cursed by all the peoples.

We would like to hope that the Soviet people,

who have known freedom and socialism, a people from whose bosom Lenin, Stalin and the Bolsheviks emerged, will again find the strength to come out of this gloomy period of their history into which the revisionists have plunged them. The overthrow of revisionism would be for them a new page inscribed in the glorious history of the revolutions, freedom and independence of the peoples.

The Party of Labour of Albania predicted and warned that the betrayal by the Soviet revisionists would lead to great disasters for the Soviet people and dangerous threats for other peoples. Therefore, considering it as its great internationalist duty, in the future, just as in the past, our Party will resolutely continue its struggle for the exposure of Khrushchevite revisionism and the hegemonistic expansionist actions of the Soviet leaders, the aggressive policy of social imperialism and US imperialism, these two savage enemies of the revolution, socialism and the peoples.



