

Our Modena Comrades on Modern Revisionism

Published: *Nuova Unita* (New Unity) No.10 (Milan) December 1964 p11

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.

It is true that many workers who read our press are wondering about the reason for the birth of our movement, in opposition principally to the revisionism of the PCI [Partito Comunista Italiano; Italian Communist Party] It is not surprising that we often use hard words against our Communist comrades: we must realize that the working class has struggled, has suffered, has provided the movement with very beautiful martyr-figures, has, in short, given all of itself to bring itself to more advanced positions. These positions of advancement were represented by the Communist Party: the eight million votes were a sure guarantee of the success and esteem of the party among the masses and a prize for the struggle which had been undergone. The unity on a class basis seemed to have been achieved by the PCI and many comrades, so many workers, nourished the hope that in a not too distant future, the working class would come to power.

It is here that things begin not to work any more!

There is a lot of talk of crises, of changes, of turning-points: there is danger of making great confusion. In the Communist camp as well, change has taken place, there has been a turning-point. And to this change, this turning-point, we direct the attention of our comrades.

What is changing in the Communist world? We must make a very unprejudiced analysis: does the change favor the working class or doesn't it?

A few years ago it came into the minds of Khrushchev and his friends to take a step towards deStalinization: the XX Congress. Did the labor movement benefit from this operation? Was it necessary? What did it mean?

In the Soviet Union there were undoubtedly internal difficulties which made Khrushchev and his friends start to think that by continuing to proceed along the same route the USSR would not achieve the third phase of the historic process foreseen by both Marx and Lenin: that is, the passage from socialism to Communism, from the dictatorship of the proletariat to

the stateless society. These difficulties were represented above all by the enormous bureaucratic apparatus which, originating at the time of Stalin (in as much as it had its function at that point) it continued to increase to gigantic proportions and to consolidate itself. A bureaucratic apparatus never opposed by Khrushchev, indeed rather encouraged. The Chinese comrades in their documents have denounced the negative sides of this bureaucracy. It is well understood that it brings with it slowness and weightiness in administration, expense of means and money, abuse of power and, above all, class struggle. This is precisely the point: when Khrushchev had proclaimed the end of the dictatorship of the proletariat in the Soviet Union, because opposition of classes had been eliminated, he was not aware, or pretended not to be aware that a new class struggle had begun, still more crude and dangerous than the preceding one: the struggle between the bureaucrat class and the proletariat.

But this class, although originating in part in the old prerevolutionary bourgeoisie, adapted and transformed during the dictatorship of the proletariat during Stalin's time, was something "within" the system, and thus more difficult and more dangerous to combat.

Many center of power had been constituted and reinforced in the hands of this new class, and often indeed had become instruments of personal power and thus of privilege. Several times the Soviet press, constrained by the macroscopic scale of the scandal, had been forced in spite of itself, to denounce this or that director of public administration who had abused his power for his personal ends. They looked like sporadic cases. But they were not, in fact they were occurring with increasing frequency.

Then a scapegoat was found: Stalin and his collaborators. The Khrushchev group instead of making a true self-criticism and confessing its own errors and its own impotence, instead of taking the bull by the horns, preferred to accuse the dead.

Stalin had lived in a period which was certainly not tranquil: he had brought the revolution to an end, had given the people of the Soviet Union leadership according to the principles of Marx and Lenin, had fought Fascism and Nazism, had frustrated the espionage attempts of international imperialism. He had made errors in all this, as all men who take part in history are destined to do. At his death Communism had not been realized in the USSR and many and important problems remained unsolved. It was necessary to continue with courage: the route had been laid out.

The Khrushchev group preferred to abandon that route and open up a new one. But that is the route which leads directly to the restoration of capitalism in Russia.

The Khrushchev group had abandoned the revolutionary principle which had guided the Russian people to final victory and to the establishment of socialism. There's revisionism for you! That is, the Soviet leaders and

the leaders of the major Communist parties of Western Europe thought that there was another route to arrive at socialism, the so called "democratic or legal" road.

Is this concept true?

If by socialism (we are not speaking of Communism) we mean social democracy, that is collaboration between the workers and the capitalists to permit these latter to exploit the former better, then yes, this is the right road. But socialism is quite different. Socialism is the dictatorship of the proletariat, the sole form of organized society which we Marxist-Leninists consider "legal". We maintain that the workers cannot come to power if they have not first taken the true power, that is economic power, from those who presently hold it, the capitalists. And even a superficial study of human nature brings us to the conclusion that whoever has the money doesn't give it up easily, so that the sole means to take it is the use of force, the "illegality" of bourgeois terminology.

It is superfluous to explain why we rather consider revolutionary methods "legal"; that private property is larceny is not something we are now saying for the first time. Marx said it a long time ago and this principle has never been challenged by a Communist or socialist, at least up until a short time ago.

Now it seems that things have changed: today's revisionists are saying that to establish socialism it is sufficient to have the "participation" of the workers in the government of the state: the Saragat socialists have done it, with the results which we know; the Nenni socialists are doing it, and things worsen still more; and now the **Communists** are trying it too. We are not putting intentions on trial: the dialogue between Catholics and **Communists** is no longer something merely being bandied about, but is an actuality.

What has impelled the revisionist leaders to conceive such a hazardous course for the laboring class?

Ideological fatigue, the "false" conviction that the masses were tired of fighting, the most flagrant opportunism.

A revolution always involves uncertainties, and anyone who takes his seat in a comfortable armchair certainly is going to ask himself some questions before beginning a tiring trip and one full of uncertainties. This is why the present Italian Communist leaders are putting the stress of the so-called "reform of structure" which, specifically, means: houses, schools, public assistance: all beautiful things, but things which only serve to put the working class to sleep, to make it forget its role: that of taking over power to establish the dictatorship of the proletariat; the abolition of classes and, subsequently, the suppression of the state itself, the supreme and perfect form of true democracy, as we understand it, where man is man and

not the instrument of oppression and exploitation.

This is why we openly and without reservation condemn the revisionist policy of Khrushchev, and that of his successors and friends.