

Giuseppe Regis

(Anonymous) Letters to PCI members

Published: *Nuova Unità* (New Unity) No.10 (Milan) December 1964 p9

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.

Among the numerous groups which are at work both inside and outside the PCI [Partito Comunista Italiano; Italian Communist Party] supposedly conducting a struggle against revisionism and for the defense of the fundamental principles of our ideology, there is one which has been in existence since the middle of 1963, producing, from time to time, in the strictest anonymity, "Letters" directed "at the PCI comrades."

In the state of growing discomfort of many **Communists** in the face of the revisionist and reformist policy of the governing group of the Party, and in the eagerness to seek out a new orientation, many comrades have read these letters.

We too have done so, hoping that their generic anti-revisionist and anti-reformist positions would be better defined with time, and could make a contribution of some validity to the critical and redefining effort which the Marxist-Leninists are undertaking in Italy today.

However, this expectation of ours has been disappointed. If a year and a half ago it could seem that the anonymous authors of the letters were filling an avant-garde function, between that time and today the movement has had much longer legs than theirs and today we can say that even within the Party they have come to stand at the end of the line.

Their function, from a clarifying and propelling function, is being transformed into a confusing and slowing-down function in the development of the Marxist-Leninist movement. Certain important recent events were the touchstone of the judgment and the political positions of this group. These events were the calling of the Moscow meeting of 15 December, Togliatti's testament, the removal of Khrushchev, and the elections in Italy.

On the Moscow meeting, organized by Khrushchev to break up the international Communist movement, to isolate the Chinese comrades and all the other Marxist-Leninists, to obtain carte-blanche in his collaboration with

the imperialists and towards the dismantling of the socialist state, our anonymous writers have not been able to give any password to clarify the position taken by the Central Committee of the PCI--formally ambiguous and substantially ultra-revisionist--or to frustrate participation of a PCI delegation at such a meeting. Even today, after its postponement until the first of March, they continue to ignore the question.

Much more serious is the position taken by the "Letters" on Togliatti's testament. This was made to pass for an anti-revisionist document, while it suffices to study it in depth to understand that it constitutes one of the most factious, although one of the most able, documents in an anti-Marxist-Leninist vein. The "letter" for 25 October says: "In that memorial, Comrade Togliatti expressed a judgment on the international political situation diametrically opposed to one which would go along with Khrushchev's. Togliatti's judgment, rather, was very close to that rendered by the Chinese comrades, on the immutable aggressive nature of imperialism and further: "It is not by chance that the Chinese comrades, who in the past have often bitterly attacked certain erroneous ideas of Togliatti, have refrained from making any criticism of the content of the memorial, thus leaving us to understand their substantial agreement with it."

This judgment is absolutely false. It is sufficient to compare Togliatti's memorial with the two pamphlets, "On the Divergences between Comrade Togliatti and Us" and "More on the divergences between Comrade Togliatti and Us" published by the Jen-Min Jih-pao [People's Daily] and the more recent opinion in Zeri i Popullit [Voice of the People] called "Togliatti's Testament" to become aware of this. These documents have also been published in the Italian language by the Chinese and Albanian comrades and by Edizioni Oriente and can be readily obtained.

Although there were strong disagreements between Togliatti and Khrushchev, the responsibilities of the former, as head of modern revisionism, were no less than those of the latter. And the responsibilities of both were no less than those of Tito. To take up a position against Tito as is done in the "Letters" for October and November, and at the same time make an effort to rehabilitate Togliatti, is not only an historic fallacy. The judgment of the authors of the "Letters" on Togliatti's positions coincide completely with that of the revisionists and have nothing in common with that of the Marxists-Leninists. This does nothing but bring grief for the mill of the first group as well as for that of the second group.

An analogous judgment to the one on Togliatti is implicitly made about Longo: "We are nonetheless confident that Comrade Luigi Longo will be able in time to take steps to liberate the PCI from the throes of revisionism, opportunists, and careerists." Now giving Longo credit which he has now ceased to deserve, as they sought to do previously with Togliatti, they arrive at the result of exculpating the heads and the governing group of revisionists of the PCI of their very grave responsibilities, laying them on the shoulders, rather, of those comrades who in various segments of the party have been bringing forward a coherent struggle with complete clarity

of principle for the victory of Marxism-Leninism.

With regard to the removal of Khrushchev, the same "Letter" gives a false and dangerous interpretation. It states: "In less than 10 years, with ever increasing audacity, Khrushchev had succeeded in underhandedly modifying, falsifying the general political line emerging from the XX, XXI, and XXII Congresses." Does this mean that the line of those Congresses was in conformity with Marxism-Leninism and not, rather, profoundly revisionist as in fact it was?

The "Letter" continues: "For a certain period the maneuverings of Khrushchev were crowned with success and he, with the complicity of his cliques of friends and relatives, succeeded in defrauding the people and the party. Then, little by little, the revisionist, capitulating, and schismatic essence of his policy was revealed in all its dismaying vividness."

In this way the revisionism in the Soviet Union is reduced to a purely individual or clique matter, and once Khrushchev is eliminated, according to the authors of the "Letters", "The Soviet comrades, who, once certain hesitations have been overcome, moved to achieve that objective, have freed themselves from the old trumpeting demagogue and have given the party a new future plan of serious work, constructive and revolutionary. The revisionist involution has been overcome. The PCUS [Partito Comunista dell'Unione Sovietica; Communist Party of the Soviet Union] has taken up once more its role as the most advanced point of the entire world Communist movement." However, the euphoria of the authors of the "Letters" has very quickly been disabused by the facts. Khrushchev has fallen but revisionism remains. Khrushchev's successors continue faithfully the policy traced by the XX, XXI and XXII Congresses of the PCUS. The password in the November "Letter" for the demolition of the Khrushchev myth appears to be a false goal, which objectively distracts us from the struggle, which must be conducted today in the USSR against the Brezhnevs and the other revisionist leaders of today, for the total demolition not of the mythos of a man, but of the ideology and the political line of revisionism wherever and by whomever it is upheld.

It is not enough to stop with the most contingent and obvious manifestations of revisionism, believing that everything can be resolved with the (Khrushchevian) system of demolitions and rehabilitations on a personal level. To have any sense, such actions must always be framed within a wider and more radical platform and an ideological and political perspective.

Naturally, on the basis of these interpretations, the entire moral which the "Letters" would like to abstract from the event of the fall of Khrushchev, ends by falling into the realm of the completely ridiculous. They say: "Credit should be given the Soviet comrades for being able to carry out briefly and effectively a political struggle within the party against Khrushchev and his clique. The success achieved by the Soviet

comrades comforts us because it confirms that we have been moving along the right road." "We are accomplishing a drawing up of ranks which is very similar to that effected by the Soviet comrades." "The sceptics who uphold the uselessness of intra-party struggles have been clearly shown to be wrong by the facts."

Given the way in which the facts actually turned out, it remains proved that struggle within the party alone has led and can lead only to the replacement of a man or a group of men, but not to change of a political line, although on the other hand, it can, in certain cases, as could happen in the case of a man like Khrushchev, rather contribute to reinforcing it.

The renovation of the PCI, that the authors are opposing to the idea of the reconstruction of a new revolutionary Marxist-Leninist Communist party, from the context of the positions taken by the "Letters" can mean nothing but a change of certain men, leaving the ideology, the political line, and the structure of the present party substantially intact.

Now it is rather precisely this that the Italian working class and the true Communists wish to change. The internal issues among the present revisionist leaders do not interest them. They can make use of these contradictions for the victory of Marxism-Leninism, but could never put themselves at their service.

Basically it seems to us that our anonymous insiders who are the authors of the "Letters", with their haste to fix up--on paper--the present divergences in the Communist world, twisting and falsifying to such an end the positions of all parties, have not understood one fundamental thing: that between Marxism-Leninism and revisionism there is nothing in common, no compromise is or ever will be possible. The divergence between the two lines will become increasingly deep and the exertion required to jump from one to the other increasingly difficult.

The fact of giving publicity, as the "Letters" do, to the broadcasts of Radio Peking and Radio Tirana and to the publications of Edizioni Oriente is not enough to make anyone who listens to those broadcasts and reads those documents believe that the Chinese and Albanian positions and those of the other Marxist-Leninists correspond to those of the authors of the "Letters".

The very anonymity in which the "Letters" are shrouded generates suspicion. Why does this group of anti-revisionists within the PCI not sign what it writes? Why do they not carry on their battle openly? Why do we never hear that they have taken positions and proposed documents in the anti-revisionist struggle in the committees of the party in which they apparently take part? Or that, in the same committees, they have voted against the most scandalous revisionist documents?

A certain comrade among us, in jest, has made the hypothesis that it is Amendola himself who had these letters written by one of his assistant-executioners, in the intention of sowing confusion among the Marxists-Leninists inside and outside the party, to sugar coat the contradictions, to make discontent be reabsorbed, to maintain, behind the altar of unity, the present positions of the governing revisionist group. The hypothesis is rather hard to swallow, but it will be hard to declare that it is entirely without foundation until the comrades who are the authors of the "Letters" decide to uncover their faces and their positions before the true Italian Communists.