



From the Archives:

E.F Hill on the Seventh Congress of the Albanian Party of Labour

We are publishing here for the first time a letter from the founding Chairperson of the CPA (M-L), Comrade E.F (Ted) Hill to the Party of Labour of Albania (PLA) on November 13, 1976.

The letter was written after Ted Hill had arrived in London following his attendance at the PLA's Seventh Congress. Hill outlines his differences with the Albanians over their attempts to impose a critical view of China on the parties present at the Congress. He criticises their call for a new Comintern designed to give international authority to the PLA. He rejects their negative evaluation of Comrade Mao Zedong. In passing, he talks about the proper basis for relations between Communist Parties, and attendance by parties at each other's Congresses.

The PLA and its leaders, notably Enver Hoxha, Ramiz Alia and Mehmet Shehu were well-known to members of our Party in the 1960s and 70s. Their publications were readily available in our chain of bookshops. There was good cooperation on questions of publications and personnel. Hill and Central Committee member Charlie McCaffrey met with Enver Hoxha and other Albanian comrades and had friendly and productive discussions.



Comrade Ted Hill (2nd from left) and Comrade Charlie McCaffrey (2nd from right) meet with Enver Hoxha (centre) and comrades of the Albanian Party of Labour

However, the Albanians disagreed with changes in Chinese policy towards the US and Soviet superpowers and the basis of those changes that arose from the theory of Three Worlds espoused by Mao, which they rejected.

This letter by Comrade Hill contains the genesis of his more detailed study of the history of the Communist Party in Australia, and of the Comintern which exercised considerable influence over it after 1929. That study, written between July 1980 and June 1983 became his book "Reflections on Communism in Australia".

We are pleased to have steadily growing relations with other Marxist-Leninist parties and organisations. As those ties expand, it is worth reflecting on the experience, and the principles espoused on the basis of that experience, of our founding Chairperson, Comrade Ted Hill.



(E.F. Hill's Letter to Cde. Ramiz Alia):

November 13, 1976

Dear Comrade Ramiz,

I am enclosing some comments on the 7th Congress of your Party.

I am sure you will understand the comradely spirit in which I make them.

I thought your Congress in its dealing with the building of socialism in Albania and the role of your Party in it, was outstanding.

As to the matters I raise, no doubt they can be resolved in the process of time and maybe after further study, we can exchange opinions. For I think it is indeed important that all Communists should, to use Comrade Hoxha's words, stand shoulder to shoulder. I myself did not have a great deal of discussion with fraternal delegates but I am sure you know that a considerable number of them are deeply concerned about the international communist movement.

I am having this document delivered in this way for reasons I am sure you will understand.

Please give my warmest regards to Comrade Hoxha and the other leading comrades.

With warmest Communist greetings,

(Handwritten): (and warmest personal regards)

TH

.....

London,

November 11, 1976

PRELIMINARY COMMENTS ON SOME QUESTIONS OF THE INTERNATIONAL COMMUNIST MOVEMENT RAISED BY THE 7TH CONGRESS OF THE ALBANIAN PARTY OF LABOUR.

I indicated to the comrades of the Albanian Party of Labour that I had certain differences from the Albanian Party on some questions raised in the report to their Congress. At the time I raised these matters, I had not read the report and could therefore only give my views from the translated spoken word. In such a matter, for me at least, it is necessary to study and think over the problems. Since the Congress, I have read the English translation of the report but still I need to study it more closely. However, I deem the matter of such importance that I should set out to some extent my preliminary views. This is fortified because the Albanian comrades sought my frank views.

I do this conscious of the smallness and shortcomings of the Australian Party and conscious of my own personal shortcomings in striving to be a Marxist-Leninist. Compared with the Albanian Party of Labour, our achievements are indeed small.

In addition, I have not had the opportunity of discussing these views with my comrades nor for that matter, with anyone else. Hence they represent only my own impressions. Naturally I will discuss the whole matter with the leading comrades in Australia when the opportunity offers. At the present time, I hope to have the opportunity of conveying to your Party this document in an appropriate way.



I make these comments with ease of mind in the sense that a proper exchange of views in such a state of mind without recourse to lobbying, rancour, emotion or reprisals is an essential aspect of Marxism-Leninism.

At the reception to the foreign delegations held on October 30, 1976, Comrade Hoxha made an important statement. In that statement he was translated as saying that it was obligatory on a Party where possible to have delegations from fraternal Parties. At a similar reception at the 6th Congress, a similar statement was made. No doubt it can be said that Comrade Hoxha was expressing only the viewpoint of the Albanian Party of Labour and that he was perfectly entitled, indeed obliged, to express the view. To my mind that is not sufficient to dispose of the question. It is well known that the Communist Party of China neither invites fraternal delegates to its Congresses nor sends fraternal delegates to the Congresses of other Parties. The Communist party of China must, in the nature of things, have a right to its own views. So far as I am aware, it has not made a public declaration of its views on this matter.

But it is for each Party to make its own decision. My own view is that it is preferable not to have foreign delegations at one's own Congress. In our case, it would be possible to do so, at least to a limited extent. We do not do so. We do not follow the pattern of Party Congresses of the past which we regard as not appropriate. We set out to have close study of the Party's ideology, politics and organisation by democratic consultation in a form, as we believe, more calculated to get real opinions rather than repetition of formulae.

Apart from the Congress of the Albanian Party of Labour, we do not send delegates to other Congresses. Out of respect for the Albanian Party of Labour and because it adheres to this practice, we did on this and previous occasions send a delegation. The question of attendances at foreign Party Congresses has a history. It certainly has not been unvaried practice historically. At a certain period, a stereotype of reciprocal invitations appeared. It is doubtful how much value was derived from it. From the standpoint of the foreign delegates there are advantages. Exchanges of experience, learning of achievements, proletarian solidarity, are examples. But it also has serious disadvantages. The case of the Albanian 7th Congress is in point. It places the foreign delegation in a dilemma. For example, as I will come to later, I have a serious diversion of opinion from the Albanian Party, particularly on the views on the international communist movement. In a sense, I feel that one's Party is compromised by presence at and support of a Congress where such views are expressed, particularly without previous warning and without the opportunity to study over a period the relevant documents. What is one to do? Is one to sit mute or to stir up a controversy at a fraternal Party's Congress? Neither is desirable. There has been a good deal of previous experience of these things. I recall that at the 21st Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union at which I was present as leader of the Australian delegation, a passage of the report was sent to fraternal delegates prior to the Congress. This passage contained an appraisal of the Communist International. Objection was taken to it. (I will return to the question of the Communist International). I mention this to illustrate the difficulty. At the 22nd Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, an attack was made on the Albanian Party of Labour. The Communist Party of China represented by a delegation headed by the late revered and distinguished Comrade Chou En-lai, spoke against the attack and then walked out of the Congress in protest. It is to be remembered that this was at a time when nominally at least there were fraternal relations between the two parties concerned. There are many other instances. These suffice.



So far as the host Party is concerned, it is a matter of simple observation that an enormous amount of time and effort go to looking after fraternal delegates (translation, hospitality, transport etc.) when the primary purpose of such a Congress is the work of the host Party itself.

I do not subscribe to the view that it is obligatory on any Party to invite fraternal delegates nor do I think that it is obligatory on fraternal parties to respond affirmatively to such invitations. As to the latter, I see no slight in it and I believe there are good reasons for refraining from sending fraternal delegations.

In the case of the Australian Party, had I known in advance that the Albanian party intended to make at its Congress a unilateral declaration on the international Communist movement, I should probably have had different views as to sending a delegation.

Moreover, if I may be permitted to say so, I do not view with great enthusiasm the demonstrable discrimination against the delegates from Korea, Vietnam and Laos. These were delegations invited to the Congress but yet treated in a way demonstrably different from other delegations. Nor was this the only case. This sort of thing points up the problem. I too have views different from what I understand to be the views of these Parties but I believe that if one invites them to a Congress, then there should be no discrimination. If they are held to be Marxist-Leninist, then they were and are entitled to the different views they expressed. It all illustrates the type of dilemma that arises in such invitations.

All this goes to the questions raised at the Congress in Part VI of the Report. There are features of this that intertwine with Comrade Hoxha's statement at the reception and that intertwine with Section V of the Report.

I make my starting point Section VI and will try to show what I regard as its intertwining with parts of Section V of the report. I may say that there is a great deal in each section with which I agree. Moreover, Albania's foreign policy is a matter for Albania. However, in my opinion, it is not appropriate for a party to make a unilateral statement on the international Communist movement, particularly in the detail with which it was done here. This matter I do not now analyse exhaustively but I take the opportunity of expressing some views.

There is an appraisal of the Comintern particularly on pages 248-9 of the English translation. Not only do I think it is and was inappropriate for it to be made at the Congress but I certainly disagree with aspects of it. The position of the First, Second and Third Internationals is a matter of history and appraisal. Sufficient time has elapsed since the demise of the First International to make an appraisal of it. In addition, Marx and Engels themselves commented on it. The question of the Second International is clear. Also, it was subject to close analysis by Lenin. The Third International, however, is different from these 2 cases. Materialist dialectics show that it must have had two sides and that it must have reflected the class struggle external to it. Again, Lenin himself referred to quite serious shortcomings of the Communist International. The difficulties associated with its formation, the diverse views represented by those that sought affiliation, the 21 conditions, the varied nature of the people who participated in its foundation and life, all demonstrate the existence and acuteness of class struggle within it. Some years of my membership of the Communist Party of Australia were years embraced in the affiliation of that Party with the Communist International. There is no doubt whatever that the Communist International did in fact make a tremendous contribution to the spread of Communist ideas amongst the proletariat of the world. With this I fully agree. The report says: "There are people who do not fail to say that the Comintern allegedly made mistakes" (p. 249 English



translation). I am one of them. I do not say it publicly nor will I. The clear implication of this particular statement as I have quoted it is that the Comintern made no mistakes and this implication is not mitigated by statements such as “That mistakes have been committed cannot be ruled out...” Indeed the implication is emphasised. I beg to disagree. One can take Comrade Dimitrov’s report to the 7th World Congress of the Comintern. I yield to no one in my respect for the life and work of Comrade Dimitrov. I believe that his report to the 7th World Congress contained an extremely important analysis of the then world situation and extremely important material on the struggle against war and fascism. It also contained what I regard in retrospect as important shortcomings of principle. Such for example were its preoccupation with European problems. Certainly, Europe is very important. But Lenin pointed out several times and particularly in “Better Fewer but Better”, the decisive importance of the peoples of the East. Asia, Africa and Latin America are obviously tremendously important.

A second instance is the matter of armed struggle. The violent overthrow of the bourgeoisie and through that violent overthrow the establishment of the dictatorship of the proletariat is a cardinal principle of Marxism-Leninism. Comrade Dimitrov’s report in my opinion had the shortcoming that it paid all too little attention to armed struggle.

It may well be asked what was the outcome in practice of this report? One may refer to France, to Italy and even to Australia. This shows that what I now regard as unclear views of the united front resulted in unprincipled compromise with social democratic parties or with other parties of the bourgeoisie. Is it entirely an accident that people like Togliatti, Thorez, Duclos, Sharkey, Pollitt, Dutt were leaders of the Comintern? In addition, I recall well that Stalin himself criticised Comrade Dimitrov after WWII for Dimitrov’s incorrect views on the dictatorship of the proletariat. Did those views just arise after WWII? Surely they had a history. These are questions that history has not yet answered. It is by no means sufficient to say the Comintern was given inaccurate or wrong information. Not only were the people previously referred to leaders of the Comintern but the Comintern in many cases sent its own representatives to the given countries. Australia was a case in point. Most certainly it was not the only one. Thus I do not believe that the things mentioned on p. 249 offer an adequate analysis. To this may be added that the Comintern itself (as for example, at its 6th Congress) recognised that in its history it had made serious errors.

There is a passage in Stalin’s “Foundations of Leninism” (to which for the moment I do not have access) which refers to the Soviet Union as the base of the world revolution. This conception has its shortcomings. It is correct that all Communists must support each other. But I think in a sense that there were some aspects where the Communist Parties at least saw themselves as representatives of the Soviet Union. With that conception I disagree and I will deal with it in another connection a little later.

There is a question in my mind as to why the Albanian Party comrades raise this question of the Communist International and multi-lateral Party discussion so sharply at this time. I draw the inference from this and from what is said on p. 250 (English translation) in espousing the case for multi-lateral inter-Party discussions and the conception “may also mature to the point that a large meeting of the representatives of all the Marxist-Leninist communist and workers’ parties can be achieved”, that the



Albanian Party wants something in the nature of a Comintern in order to underwrite what it considers to be (and repeatedly affirms) its completely correct policy. Whether its policy is correct or incorrect I would still be opposed in present circumstances to any such meeting. Equally I would be opposed to it if the initiative came from the Communist Party of China to underwrite what I regard as its correct line and policy.

But there is an undercurrent in the Albanian material by necessary implication and sometimes by express statement of opposition to the Communist Party of China. I therefore draw the inference that the Albanian comrades have in mind that at such a meeting the Communist Party of China would be “called to order”. This “calling to order” is on the footing that the Communist Party of China has elements of revisionism and has made unprincipled deals with the imperialists. This appears to me to be the inference, or, if you like, implication. It is to be noted that this inference could be drawn or implication observed before the death of Chairman Mao Tsetung. It therefore cannot be said to be complicated by the recent changes in China.

The Albanian comrades’ opinion of the Chinese Communist Party and of Chairman Mao Tsetung is a matter for them. Nor is it for me to defend the Communist Party of China. Relations between the Parties are important and it is very important to have a correct analysis of them and a correct approach to them.

In all essentials, my party and I personally for what we regard as good reasons, agree with the analysis and line of the Communist Party of China. I believe it to be in very strict accord with Marxist-Leninist principle. In my opinion, as I wrote earlier, there is a necessary connection between Sections V and VI of the report. Examples of the allegations against the Communist Party of China lie in the rejection of the Chinese Communists’ emphasis on the contention and struggle between the superpowers; their relations with US imperialism and their warning of the greater danger of Soviet social-imperialism; rejection of the Chinese concept of the 1st, 2nd and 3rd World; rejection of the Chinese approach to the EEC. On each of these questions, my belief is that the Chinese Communists are correct, subject to the qualification that I have never liked the terms 1st and 2nd Worlds but I accept the correctness of the analysis. I believe the Chinese Communists are correct in defining the main enemy as the two superpowers with the main emphasis on the greater danger of Soviet social-imperialism and seeking to unite all who can be united against that enemy. Nor do I believe that the Chinese communists abet US imperialism. The question of the EEC, the relations with US imperialism, the 1st, 2nd and 3rd Worlds are exploitation of the contradictions amongst the imperialists and as between the imperialists and the Third World in the overall struggle for the complete overthrow of capitalism and victory of socialism.

Lenin’s article on the united states of Europe slogan, in my opinion, deals with a question different from the exploitation of these contradictions. The Communist attitude towards such contradictions was very well dealt with by Lenin in “Left-Wing Communism, an Infantile Disorder”. The principle of these matters is dealt with by Comrade Chou En-lai’s report to the 10th Congress of the Communist Party of China and as to it, I say no more than that I agree with the principles of that report.

It must also be said that the mere fact of principled agreement between States, socialist and capitalist, does not and should not inhibit the struggle of the working people in the capitalist state concerned. On the contrary.



The question for all Marxist-Leninists is what are the facts and what conclusions do the facts compel? The accuracy of the reflection of the facts and the conclusions compelled by them are the hallmark of the quality of Communists. In the respect, it seems to me the Chinese Communists accurately reflect the facts and the conclusions compelled by them and act accordingly.

This all raises the question of relations among the Marxist-Leninist Parties. There is an expression that is commonly used that the Communist Party of China or the Albanian Party of Labour recognises “this or that” Marxist-Leninist Party (or group). To me it is not a matter of “recognition” at all. “Recognition” in this sense implies a superior and an inferior, a father and son relationship. So far as the Communist Party of Australia (M.L.) is concerned, it has fraternal relations with both the Communist Party of China and the Albanian Party of Labour and for that matter, with other Marxist-Leninist Parties and groups. It fervently wants to see the development of Marxism-Leninism throughout the world. It is interested in all who genuinely aspire to and struggle for Marxism-Leninism.

But it is only the Australian proletariat which can create and test our Party as a genuine Marxist-Leninist Party. No “recognition” by any other Party however great or small, no posturing, no claims to Marxism-Leninism, in themselves make the Communist Party of Australia (M.L.) or any other Party or person Marxist-Leninist.

Whether or not they are Marxist-Leninist is objective fact. It does not turn on arbitrary “recognition”. “Recognition” in the true sense can only arise from accurate reflection of objective fact. It is too early in a number of cases to say that this or that Party, group or person is Marxist-Leninist. One may say it where the objective fact compels it. The objective fact lies in adherence to Marxist-Leninist principle and practice. There are people, and they were not absent from the fraternal delegations at the Albanian Party of Labour Congress who posture and proclaim, who seek and crave “recognition”, who fawn and flatter, about whom it has yet to be determined whether or not they are Marxist-Leninist as I believe it has yet to be determined whether the Communist Party of Australia (M.L.) and I personally measure up to the required standards. Certainly I reject any idea whatever that “recognition” establishes the fact. Authority on the proletariat of a given country can only be earned in struggle by the Communists. It cannot be conferred nor can “nice” words establish it.

There is another danger in this idea, and I believe in the whole way Section VI of the report is put. That is the danger that those who strive to Marxism-Leninism will see the decisions of such Parties as that of China and Albania as some sort of “holy writ” which automatically and mechanically solves their problems. These decisions no matter how great one’s respect for each Party may be, are not in the nature of “holy writ”. Yet it seems to me that there is that danger and particularly when in the case of this Congress Section VI has the appearance at least of laying down a line for the whole international Communist movement.

This simply cannot be. Such ideas in the past have done very great damage. The worship of the foreign is a well-known disease. It is only the correct integration of Marxism-Leninism into the actual conditions of a given country that constitutes the revolutionary struggle in that country. No one can do it through “recognition”, nor can the Communist Party of China nor the Albanian Party of Labour. Any talk or notion that feeds such an idea in my opinion is dangerously wrong. In the initial history of the Communist Party of Australia (M.L.) there was this tendency to worship the foreign “holy writ”.



Only when the Party got down the proper study of the facts of Australia, integration of the universal truths of Marxism-Leninism with them, did real progress begin to be made. One can see a similar thing in other cases. There is a generality and a particularity and they interpenetrate each other, are dependent on each other. The particularity of Australia (or any other place) can only be effectively studied, understood and accurately reflected by Australian Marxist-Leninists. Australian particularity goes to enlarge and prove the generality. It is a never-ending process. I very much doubt if this fundamental truth was sufficiently realised by some of the leaders of the Comintern. It is difficult enough to arrive at a good grasp of the universal (general) truths of Marxism-Leninism. For my part, I have, I hope, never claimed to be other than striving to be a Marxist-Leninist. The formulation “the great, glorious and correct” Communist Party of China is taken from Chairman Mao Tsetung; in the same passage, he says that the Communist Party of China also has shortcomings. This to me is genuine Marxism-Leninism. From my understanding of Marxism-Leninism I would question a number of statements in the Albanian report. For example, it appears to me that the reference to the crisis of capitalism on p. 162 (English translation) is not in strict accord with Lenin’s analysis of the general crisis of capitalism nor Marx’s characterisation of cyclical crises as crises of overproduction. It appears to me that the present crisis occurs when the general crisis has greatly intensified, within that general crisis the present crisis is fundamentally a crisis of overproduction aggravated by inflation which itself arises from capitalism. I mention this matter particularly because the bourgeoisie confuses it endlessly. Another example is the tendency on p. 244 (English translation) to counterpose, in a not wholly correct way, legal and illegal struggle. It seems to me that a general truth of Marxism-Leninism is the unity and division of legal and illegal struggle. Lenin dealt with this matter brilliantly in “Left-Wing ‘Communism’, an Infantile Disorder”. Dimitrov in the 7th World Congress report already referred to, pointed out that even in Nazi Germany the Communists must avail themselves of all opportunities of “legal” work. If what is meant in the Albanian report is the correct integration of legal and illegal work and open and secret work, then I have no quarrel with it. At least in the English translation, there is confusion in it. Another example, it is said on p. 80 (English translation) “Our Party has not allowed and will never allow the existence of factions within its ranks. It has had and has one line only, the Marxist-Leninist line, which it has loyally defended and resolutely implemented.”

Whether or not this is aimed at the concept of struggle between two lines within the Marxist-Leninist Party, I do not know. However, it is an objective fact that there is struggle between two lines in all Parties. This is of the nature of capitalism. It would be a denial of materialist dialectics to deny it. The supremacy of Marxism-Leninism emerges in struggle and the resolution of contradictions within the Party.

Mention is made of such matters to show that even on seemingly non-controversial questions, there is controversy. How then on obviously controversial questions is the controversy to be resolved? By majority vote at a multi-level meeting? By proclamations from a party Congress? Or how otherwise? Who is going to call such meetings? And who pronounce the “decision”? Who is going to discipline the dissident? And how? To pose these questions is to show that there is something not quite right with raising the question.



When I spoke in Tirana with Comrade Sadik Bocaj, I said that I had reservations about the report on 3 questions namely (1) some aspects of the international situation, (2) the international Communist movement and 3) the question of the evaluation of Chairman Mao Tsetung.

On the first two questions, the foregoing indicates sufficiently the general trend of my views; it does not exhaust them. But I require further time to study the matter and think it over. Another reason I have deemed it necessary to set out my views at this early stage is because my presence at the Congress and what I said in praise of it may be taken as endorsement of all the views expressed there. I have, as I have said, the utmost respect and love for the Albanian Party, its leaders and Comrade Enver Hoxha. It has and they have a record of astounding success. Its building of socialism, as the Congress showed, is inspiring and achieved in the face of enormous difficulty.

As to the third question, had I myself not raised it in Albania, I should not refer to it here. I have been conscious of the existence of a difference between the Albanian Party of Labour and our Party on this matter. When in Albania, I have refrained from referring to Chairman Mao in the way in which we refer to him in Australia. I have done this to avoid possible embarrassment to the Albanian comrades. Moreover it is a matter upon which differing opinions are open as on other questions.

However, having myself initiated the matter, I deem it necessary to refer to it briefly. The great theoreticians of Communism are recognised to have been Marx, Engels, Lenin and Stalin. Of these, in my opinion, Marx and Lenin stand out. Engels dealt with the situation as between himself and Marx. Engels was, in my view, a giant of Marxism but not of the stature of Marx. He made certain mistakes (it seems presumptuous even to refer to it here but it is a fact). Lenin undoubtedly inherited, defended and developed Marxism in a qualitative way. Stalin was a great Marxist and he inherited, defended and developed Leninism. But he made certain serious errors (and again it seems presumptuous to refer to them). It is a simple fact of Stalin's thought and writings that, for example, he confused the question of class struggle under socialism, a matter which had been dealt with in principle by Marx and Lenin. This confusion has been reflected in our Party and in other Parties. It was very dangerous. In my opinion, there is a certain weakness in Stalin's grasp of materialist dialectics. On other specific matters, he was not wholly correct.

My opinion is, and I do not seek to impose it on others, that Chairman Mao Tsetung was of the stature of Marx and Lenin. He truly inherited, defended and developed the general truths of Marxism-Leninism. It is correct to call it Marxism-Leninism-Mao Tsetung Thought. His work on the class struggle both before and after the achievement of the dictatorship of the proletariat is of classic quality. It is drawn upon to a degree in the Albanian report. His work on materialist dialectics is of classic quality; it includes a comprehensive analysis of the nature of contradictions among the people again drawn upon to a degree in the Albanian report. His work on the integration of Marxism-Leninism into the actual conditions of China is the revelation and development of a general truth of Marxism-Leninism. His work on the ideological, political and organisational development of the Party is of classic quality. Likewise his work on military science, on literature and art, on the nature of politics, on political economy. In my opinion, Chairman Mao in an all-round way greatly developed Marxism-Leninism. In keeping with this, he was of necessity in the practice of revolution, a master. I may say that I have no personal doubt whatsoever about this matter. Others have other opinions. That is a matter for them. History alone will test the truth. I myself believe that history has already done that.

XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX



I had several discussions with Chairman Mao. These I cherish. No man of our time had such a grasp of Marxism-Leninism, such capacity yet at the same time was so modest, so understanding, so condemnatory of the cult of his own personality. I well recall being alongside him at one of his receptions to the Red Guards when hundreds and thousands were shouting in unison “Long live Chairman Mao”. I said to him “It is very good”. He replied “Yes, but down there (pointing to the crowd) there are also some very bad people”. Chairman Mao gave me a far-sighted picture of the struggle against revisionism and even as early as 1956, Comrade Chou En-lai, under the leadership of Chairman Mao, systematically analysed Khrushchov’s position. I must say that my conclusion about Chairman Mao’s contribution to Marxism-Leninism has not come lightly nor merely from my personal contact with him but in the course of my experiences in the actual revolutionary struggle.

Though I have said I express these views with ease of mind, I repeat that I am quite conscious of the incomparably greater contribution to the cause of revolution by the Albanian Party of Labour and Comrade Enver Hoxha than our small contributions. The matters I have referred to, trouble the minds of others who strive to Marxism-Leninism. I am certain that I express sentiments held by comrades other than I. The existence of differences amongst Communists is natural. But I do not think an attempt to resolve them should be made unilaterally at a Congress of a Party particularly a Party at the head of a proletariat in power. I subscribe to the view that only bilateral Party discussions can be useful in such a matter and only then in a careful and painstaking way.

.....



Comrade Ted Hill meeting with Chairman Mao Zedong