

## Uge Duse

# Destroy or Build?

---

Published: *Nuova Unità* (New Unity) No.10 (Milan) December 1964 pp1-2

Transcription, Editing and Markup: Paul Saba and Sam Richards

Copyright: This work is in the Public Domain under the Creative Commons Common Deed. You can freely copy, distribute and display this work; as well as make derivative and commercial works. Please credit the Encyclopedia of Anti-Revisionism On-Line as your source, include the url to this work, and note any of the transcribers, editors & proof-readers above.

---

Profound confusion, equally profound indignation, actually consternation, have been aroused in that sector of the militants of the Italian Communist Party which has to some degree kept up the habit of reading the party press by the article by Amendola "Hypotheses on Reunification" appearing in the 28 November issue of *Rinascita* [See Translations on International Communist Developments, No. 685, JPRS: 28,069]. We wouldn't be able to swear that the Italian bourgeoisie had entirely opposite feelings, given the level of its politicians; one can nonetheless be sure that their most intelligent bosses, the Italian industrialists of the "center-left", Valletta and his colleagues, had something to be pleased about.

Let us state clearly right away that we are surprised neither by the article nor by the surprise of the PCI [*Partito Comunista Italiano*; Italian Communist Party] militants. We have pointed out more than once that the platform being enunciated today by Amendola, his proposal to the Party, is the view of the future which Togliatti always kept before him, is the platform which his memorial codified.

What does Amendola propose specifically? A "new party" which is supposed to be the party of the "Italian route to socialism." And what should such a party be like? It should be a single party of all the workers, formed on the basis of a program of renewal of Italian society, "open, without ideological presuppositions," "capable of uniting about a political program forces of different origins and inspirations." It is obvious that such a party cannot be created "on the ideological positions held by the Communist avant-garde."

From what facts does Amendola start to justify the urgency of such a proposal? From the declaration that "neither of the two solutions available to the working class of the capitalist countries of Western Europe in the last 50 years, the social democratic solution and the Communist solution, has up to this point shown itself valid for the goal of accomplishing a socialist transformation of society, a change of the system."

This is quite clearly the essence of the discussion. We should say, in fact, that it was too clear for a mere hypothesis. A last residue of Togliatti's Jesuitism, this hypothesis actually has no reason for being: Amendola would have done better to speak of a thesis. At least he would have been able to pretend to put his discussion into a dialectical scheme; instead, he seeks an experimentalist alibi which, if it resembles, on the one hand, the most classic traditions of Bourbon "transformism", lends itself, on the other, to casting a shadow of intellectual dishonesty on this most intimate sort of confession of a vocation on the part of a member of the PCI secretariat.

We shall not go into the merit of Amendola's article. The equalizing of Communism and social democracy in Western Europe, the destructive nature of the proposal of a single party on the above-indicated bases, the proclamation that what is needed is a party without ideology, these are all things that, in the last analysis, constitute nothing but a piteous projection into the future of a real situation already existing within the PCI.

What are, in fact, the essential distinctive characteristics today between social democracy and the Communist parties of Western Europe in general, and between Italian social democracy and the PCI in particular? Both social democracy and the Communist parties accept the principle of bourgeois parliamentary democracy; both social democracy and the Communist parties consider the dictatorship of the proletariat buried; both social democracy and the Communist parties are more or less intimately carrying on a dialogue with the Vatican; both social democracy and the Communist parties recognize the highly social nature of capitalist private property, but declare unctuously that they are only struggling against monopolies; both social democracy and the Communist parties are fighting for the full realization of bourgeois constitutions. Then in what do the differences consist? In the fact above all that social democracy turned to revision even before the birth of the Communist party, inserted itself into the governing activity of the respective countries as one of the principal supports of the bourgeoisie, has had long years of experience in government, and on this basis, has always upheld the programs but not the ideology of Marxism, with all its consequences. Secondly, in the fact that social democracy has, as a consequence renounced having a party organized along class and class avant-garde principles, openly modeling itself on the bourgeois parties, given the identity of objectives which it shares with them.

The Communist parties of Western Europe have, on the basis of their most recent policy, accepted revisionism in its most up to date forms, justifying their participation in the governments of the respective countries after having conducted and led with success, in the great part of them, the war of liberation from fascism. Secondly they are distinguished from social democracy because their organizational structure is still partially that of revolutionary parties.

Are these fundamental differences? From the historic point of view, or better, from that of an historian, there is no question. But from the point of view of possibilities for the future, in substance, if there are

indeed differences, they are purely quantitative. In this sense, Amendola's proposal to overcome the strident contrast which is caused by the contemporaneous existence of a still proletarian structure and a radical-bourgeois policy, which is the situation of the Communist parties of Atlantic Europe, tends to reduce as well the limits of the quantitative difference. To get out of an equivocal situation, in short. Consistently with the process of social democratization of the PCI which we have been denouncing for some time, Amendola's proposals are not unexpected; we maintain that consistently with the entire policy conducted by Togliatti and by a Central Committee haunted by maneuverings, those proposals point out with extreme clarity the inevitable point of arrival of the line of the VII, IX and X Congresses of the PCI. How should I explain then the reaction of certain leaders of the PCI to Amendola's proposals, their base indignation, the discussion which in the CC followed a report in which Amendola fundamentally reinforced his positions? How should we judge all that?

It is obviously necessary above all to make the premise that the majority of **Communists** registered in the PCI instinctively do not share the positions of Amendola, and for this reason, today, within the PCI many groups are fighting to hold or conquer given positions of power; this state of mind of the masses of Party members is coming from time to time from these various groups utilized as weights to support their arguments on the scale.

This premise is so much the more necessary because it reinforces the point of departure of every judgement of ours on these questions: the militants at the base of the PCI have nothing to do with what happens at the top of the party but, as always, their voice counts for nothing, if not for purely instrumental attitudes in the power polemic of the various leaders among themselves. That presupposed, how shall we judge the fact that Comrade Secchia reacted to Amendola's article in the way which it appears from his article in the issue of Rinascita for 12 December that he did? At first glance, Comrade Secchia's article could seem full of empirical common sense, which does not cease to be empirical even when it attempts to substantiate itself with certain classical affirmations of principle. But an even slightly less superficial reading, however simply it is moved by positions of principle, notes that the true polemic turns on judgments of departure, not on the point of arrival or destination. What does that mean? That Comrade Secchia does not share Amendola's judgment on the remote causes which must lead today to the liquidation of a party formed on the basis of Marxism-Leninism more than forty years ago; but it also means that he does share with Amendola the opinion that the present party must be destroyed. An important aspect of Secchia's article is given by his affirmation that "the necessity for the formation of a single party of the working class and the workers is recognized by all of us, but (that) it is not a question of an immediate objective, capable of rapid realization," as well as from this other affirmation, according to which "the new party must be the party of the working class and of the workers who are struggling for socialism." Comrade Secchia insists upon the concept of an avant-garde "party of the working class and the workers, a revolutionary party," as well as he insists upon the fact that in the construction of the

---

its interests, to the socialist future of Italian society, even to the immediate needs of the Italian workers, assailed by the bosses with an offensive of unheard of violence?

There is no room in the PCI, amid so much confusion, for groups ready to fight intransigently on revolutionary positions, for principles. The very situation of the party is leading anyone who wants to conduct any anonymous or circumspect struggle necessarily to plot with the Trotskyites, to work like the Trotskyites. To speak and not to speak: to put on one's makeup for a double role before the masses who are becoming increasingly disenchanted with such behavior.

From all this it may be clearly derived that even if there exist Marxist-Leninists in the PCI, they have understood only a little about the effective possibility of a return to the Leninist character of the Party. Comrade Secchia is right when he says that we cannot turn back. It is true, but in all senses. A party like the PCI cannot turn backward, because its leaders have turned traitor to the mandate entrusted to them by the class avant-garde; the party has been brought to a situation in which the only outcome is that foreseen by Amendola: outside of all sophism, its transformation into a laborist party. At this point they cannot turn back. And to go forward, it is necessary to change roads.

We know very well that the Amendolian points themselves, the positions which they are maintaining, are the reflections of the tremendous contradictions in which revisionism is debating. We know well that from such contradictions will issue the new party which will really lead the whole class, organizing its avant-garde. We also know quite well that the confusion, the indignation, the consternation of the members in the face of Amendola's article are nothing but confusion, indignation, consternation at the state of fearful confusion in which a party no longer fulfilling its revolutionary function is carrying on its debate. But we also know that those who do not have the revolutionary courage to speak at least as clearly as the worst revisionists who are proposing to work with alacrity for the destruction of any form of labor organization, those are precisely the ones who are the object of surprise, of consternation; their silence also arouses indignation. The postponement of the preparatory conference in Moscow is obviously being exploited to create faits accomplis: Amendola's action speaks clearly. And this is the true sense of the Yalta memorial, just as we immediately denounced it. Do it fast: this is the pass-word of the destroyers. Does Comrade Secchia think it is enough to take his time, writing that it is necessary to think about it, not to be over-hasty? It was hard, tremendously so, for us to leave the Party also, to be kicked out for holding high the banner of Leninism and of proletarian internationalism. We did it, because the revolution is above the party, because a party must serve to lead the working class and the peasants, with their allies, to revolution. We believe in the class, in the people, in socialism. For this we have abandoned or were kicked out or are ready to be kicked out of the party. We are working truly, clearly, in the light of the sun, to build that new party which the

---

working class needs. We have won no prizes for as much as we have done and for as much as we shall do. It is only our duty. Anyone who does his own revolutionary duty will never ask an accounting of anyone who has undertaken his duty belatedly. He will have done it when he has understood that there is no other way. His work, because it is longer, could also morally be more valuable. With modesty, patience, faith, we shall build, all of us honest Communists, our true party. And the clarity with which we shall build it will have for the corrupted the mark of primitivism and ingenuity, but for the revolutionaries, the workers, for all our working people, it will have the color of cleanliness, of honesty, of faithfulness to principles.