

# REVISIONISM SPELLS DISRUPTION OF UNITY *by LULZIM ÇOTA*

*Chauvinism and nationalism, the defence of the interests of the bourgeoisie of the country, is the fundamental cause of the division, disintegration and decay, of the revisionist parties*

DISAGREEMENTS AND QUARRELS AMONGST THE REVISIONISTS HAVE FLARED UP WITH NEW FURY, THE CONTRADICTIONS BETWEEN THE REVISIONIST PARTIES OF THE EAST AND THE WEST HAVE DEEPENED, THEIR RANKS ARE SAPPED FROM WITHIN BY FACTIONS. «WHEN OUR PARTY BEGAN THE STRUGGLE AGAINST KHRUSHCHEVITE REVISIONISM, THE COMMUNIST PARTIES WHICH MADE COMMON CAUSE WITH KHRUSHCHEV LOOKED, MORE OR LESS, LIKE A UNITED BLOC, WITH A SINGLE LINE, WHICH WAS THAT OF THE 20th CONGRESS OF THE COMMUNIST PARTY OF THE SOVIET UNION. TODAY, HOWEVER, 20 YEARS LATER, THEY ARE SPLIT AND DIVIDED INTO MANY TRENDS AND FACTIONS, ARE FIGHTING AND CLASHING WITH ONE ANOTHER AND HAVE BEEN OVERWHELMED BY BOURGEOIS NATIONALISM AND SOCIAL-DEMOCRATIC OPPORTUNISM.

THESE FORMER COMMUNIST PARTIES HAVE BEEN TRANSFORMED EITHER INTO GENUINE PARTIES OF THE NEW BOURGEOISIE RULING IN THE COUNTRIES WHERE THE REVISIONISTS ARE IN POWER, OR INTO COMPONENT PARTS OF THE STRUCTURES OF THE BOURGEOIS STATE, AS IN THE OLD CAPITALIST COUNTRIES. THE CRISIS OF MODERN REVISIONISM IS A DIRECT EXPRESSION OF THE CRISIS OF CAPITALISM AND THE BOURGEOIS IDEOLOGY, IN GENERAL.»<sup>1</sup>

## ANTI-MARXIST POLEMIC BETWEEN THE EUROCOMMUNISTS AND THE SOVIET REVISIONISTS

The whole history of the birth and development of revisionism, whether the old one – Bernsteinism and Kautskyism, or the modern one, has shown continually that revisionism can never ensure that unity of thought which only Marxism-Leninism, the ideology of the working class, is in a position to achieve.

LULZIM ÇOTA – Publicist

subsidies to the revisionist parties of the capitalist countries.

In the mid 70's, parallel with the preparations for and the conclusion of the Helsinki Conference of «European Security» and at a time when the Soviet-American counter-revolutionary détente seemed, for some time, to be on the «fair» way of success, the Soviet revisionists, after great efforts and with many difficulties, organized the anti-Marxist Conference of Berlin, which was described, at that time, as the model of «democratic» collaboration amongst the European revisionist parties of the East and the West. It was said, among other things, that «the quarrels and misunderstandings had been overcome». However, the truth was quite different. The Declaration of Berlin, in fact, marks a higher stage of the crystallization of the already formed revisionist trends, the marking out of their definite political and ideological physiognomies, a stage in which each of them was trying to gain primacy in the revisioning of Marxism-Leninism. The Soviet revisionists, in their endeavours to preserve the formal unity inside the revisionist mob, were forced to make a series of concessions to the Eurocommunists and the Titoites. They

complied half-heartedly to a number of Eurocommunist theses, such as the «national specific roads to socialism» and Eurocommunist models which were the opposite of Brezhnev's «mature socialism».

In the present time the disagreements amongst the revisionist parties, the spirit of factions and groupism, are on the order of the day. In fact, the whole of the revisionist camp is in disarray. The various detachments of modern revisionism have been divided into hostile groups of rivals each trying to defend and propagate its own variant of «national Marxism» and its own «specific road to socialism». Each revisionist party labours to capture superior positions in the ranks of world revisionism, and to eat the graces of the bourgeois opinion.

Contradictions and disagreements, division and disintegration, within the revisionist camp is connected with the fact that the revisionist parties do not represent the interests of the working class, which are one and the same for all the working people of the world, but the interests of the old and new bourgeoisie of the capitalist and revisionist countries. Chauvinism and nationalism, the defence of the interests of the bourgeoisie of the country, is the fundamental cause of the division, disintegration and decay in the revisionist parties. In this sense, the contradictions amidst the revisionist parties are antagonistic contradictions, just as those amidst the capitalist and imperialist countries are antagonistic contradictions.

Political developments in Europe and in the world, the exacerbation of inter-imperialist contradictions, especially the exacerbation of the rivalry between the two superpowers for markets and spheres of influence, have caused the inter-revisionist disagreements over various international questions and, especially, over the so-called models of socialism, to come out openly. The occupation of Afghanistan by Soviet social-imperialism and the events in Poland have hastened the

process of the exposure of the deep gap that divides the various revisionist parties, especially the Eurocommunist parties, from the parties of the pro-Soviet bloc. The proclamation of the state of war in Poland forced Marchais, Berlinguer and Carrillo to betray their direct and indirect links with the bourgeoisie of their countries and with the superpowers. Berlinguer and Carrillo adopted a stand in the interests of big Italian and Spanish capital and the American capital, with which they are bound by numerous links. Whereas Marchais, who has become notorious for his pro-Moscow stands, justified and expressed himself in favour of the proclamation of the state of war by the revisionist group of Warsaw with the support of the Soviets. Consequently, these events fanned up the flames of the polemic among the revisionists, in which the Italians and the Spanish, on the one hand, and the Soviets, on the other, level mutual accusations against one another of «revisionism», of «slipping away from the positions of Marxism-Leninism».

These events served to further deepen the division which exists for a long time now in the midst of the Soviet revisionists, on the one hand, and the Italian and Spanish revisionists, on the other hand. Disagreements and quarrels have existed before, and the gap between both sides has grown continuously deeper and more glaring. But they had never reached the degree of exacerbation they have reached now. Their division is out in the open.

From December 1981 until today the Italian revisionists and their paper «L'Unità» blame the situation in Poland on Moscow and its role. Berlinguer makes a fierce attack on the «Soviet model of socialism», calling it an abortive attempt. «The proclamation of the state of war in Poland,» declares Berlinguer, «shows that the model of socialism of East Europe has failed.» The attacks of the Italian revisionists on the Brezhnevite model of socialism were especially fierce in

the document published prior to the last congress of the Italian revisionist party. The document says: «We consider we have exhausted (as we said in December 1981 and in January 1982) the historical experience of socialism which was dictated by the political, state and ideological model practised in the Soviet Union.» And further on, speaking about the crisis in Poland and in the East-European countries, it says: «There is talk about a crisis which, as the facts show, either is solved through deep-going reforms of the system, or ends up in a process of degeneration and traumatic and tragic defeats,» as in Poland («L'Unità», November 28, 1982, p. 14). In the report to the last congress of the Italian revisionist party, Berlinguer levelled much the same accusations pointing out that, «The debate prior to the congress showed that the part of the document of the Central Committee on the situation in the so-called countries of real socialism, including the formulation about the exhaustion of the Soviet model («L'Unità», March 3, 1983, p. 6), has been received with general approval.»

The Soviet revisionists, for their part, accuse the Italian revisionists for slipping into the positions of «revisionism», that the Italian Communist Party with its stands «denigrates the interests of peace and socialism». What Moscow understands with the «third road to socialism» is a certain middle course between «the revolutionary course (read: the Soviet revisionist course) and the reformist course» («Komunist», No. 4, 1982).

Carrillo maintained the same stand as Berlinguer on the events in Poland and the «Soviet model of socialism», with the difference that the former did not involve himself completely in the polemic, because of the great division inside his own party, in which a strong pro-Soviet current operates.

In their propaganda against the revolution and socialism, the bourgeoisie and its tools, all the revisionists with-

out exception (including the Chinese revisionists), try to attach the socialist label to the capitalist order which has been established long ago in the Soviet Union and in the other East-European countries. They do this for ulterior motives. Pursuing their hostile aims against the revolution and socialism, the Italian and the Spanish revisionists treat the period of Stalin of the construction of socialism and the period of the restoration of capitalism under Khrushchev and Brezhnev on an equal footing. These two Eurocommunist parties represent the invasion of Czechoslovakia and Afghanistan, the events in Poland, the major set-backs and the deep crisis which is eroding the capitalist economy of the Soviet Union and the other East-European countries, as an unequivocal indication of the fact that the construction of socialism there has failed. They take the opportunity from this situation to declare, as the Spanish revisionists did, that «not a single communist country exists in the world today.» Whereas Berlinguer pushes the point still further. Declaring that the «process which began with the Bolshevik revolution in 1917 has come to an end, he openly opposes the Leninist definition of our epoch as the epoch of the destruction of imperialism and the triumph of the proletarian revolution. But these revisionists cannot wipe out that glorious historic period of the construction of socialism in the Soviet Union in the time of Lenin and Stalin and in many other former socialist countries, and the entire process of the construction of socialism with success in Albania, with one stroke of the pen.

The Italian revisionists, followed closely by the Spanish revisionists, tried to exploit the events in Poland in order to steal a step on Moscow in order to emerge as leaders of the revisionist parties, to place themselves at the head of all the other opportunists on a European scale. On this occasion, Berlinguer openly proclaimed his ambition and haste to replace the Kremlin as first fiddle in

the betrayal of the interests of the proletariat, saying that «The Italian Communist Party must become the locomotive of a European movement in which the progressive and social-democratic parties should participate.» Carrillo, who wanted this role for himself, proposed the creation of a «new international which will be a very elastic organization of the communist, socialist and other parties, and which will go beyond Eurocommunism.»

Unlike the Italian revisionist party and the Spanish party, the French revisionist party maintains a different attitude and is more privileged in its relations with Moscow. Unlike Berlinguer and Carrillo, Marchais not only has not condemned, but, on the contrary, has defended and continues to defend the invasion of Afghanistan, the situation in Poland and the aggressive policy of the Soviet social-imperialists in their rivalry with the American imperialists. Indeed, Moscow is using Marchais in the role of the intermediary, as its roving ambassador in order to improve its relations with China. If this is true, this fully explains the declaration he made in autumn of the last year in Beijing, in which speaking in the name of the Soviet revisionists, he said that «the Soviet Union recognizes China as a socialist country».

This attitude and the intimate relations of Marchais with Moscow have their reasons. They are explained away with the existence of some material links, which the French revisionists want to preserve, because they are lucrative, as well as some underlying reasons. The French revisionist party, as the tool of the French bourgeoisie it is, wants to defend, in the first place, the interests of this bourgeoisie. It is known that the French bourgeoisie is interested to maintain good regular relations with the countries of the East and to increase its expansion in their direction in order to regain its important role in world policies, and to consolidate its special position within the Atlantic Alliance.

Beside this, within the framework of the policy of equilibrium in Europe, at a time when the West-German bourgeoisie has created stable links with the East-European countries, the French bourgeoisie is keenly interested in preserving its old traditional links with the East. Hence, it can hardly find a better and more reliable channel of communication and of regular links than the French revisionist party. On the other hand, pursuing its own class interests, the French bourgeoisie wants to discredit communism before the eyes of the proletariat at home. Therefore, a «communist» party which has close links with the suppressor of the freedoms and the independence of the peoples, such as Soviet social-imperialism has become, suits their aim.

The collaboration of the French revisionists with Moscow has caused the disruption of the accord which existed between the three major Eurocommunist parties. Recently we observe a reduction of the contacts between the head of the French revisionist party, on the one hand, and the heads of the Italian and Spanish revisionist parties, on the other hand. The last meeting between Marchais and Berlinguer in Paris brought out into the open the disagreements over the question of Afghanistan and Poland. Indeed, they are divided even in the question of what the Eurocommunists offer the European proletariat with their «third road» to socialism. At the present stage, the «third road» consists of the «socialism» in French colours, «socialism» in Italian colours and «socialism» in Spanish colours. Berlinguer boasts that he has found the Italian model of socialism («the democratic alternative»). Whereas the French revisionists, according to the resolution of the 24th Congress of their party, have developed the idea of socialism in French colours. The Spanish revisionists, too, for their part, strive to excel the Eurocommunists.

A complete rupture of the Eurocommunist parties is not to the liking

of the leaders of the Kremlin. They do everything in their power to maintain these parties under their unserved influence. Therefore, faced with this situation they are compelled to make partial tactical concessions, to declare from time to time that they are inclined to end the polemics and continue the course of collaboration as before, accepting that each party has the right to be independent. Nevertheless, parallel with tactical concessions, Moscow does not overlook the slightest possibility of undermining them, using rubles and agents in the ranks of the Eurocommunist parties. As experience of recent years has shown, whenever the unprincipled polemics between Moscow, on the one hand, and the Italian and the Spanish revisionists, on the other, has built up, the rubles and agents within the Eurocommunist parties have fully justified themselves. Pro-Soviet factions not only have cropped up, but also have been organized within them right up to the highest levels of the leaderships of these parties. They are outspoken in their demands for the revisioning of the line of the leading group of the party up to cessation from its main trunk. This is happening in the most blatant manner in the Spanish revisionist party, in the Italian revisionist party, etc.

### **QUARRELS AND FACTIONS IN THE RANKS OF THE EUROCOMMUNISTS**

Complete departure from the teachings of Marxism-Leninism, ideological and political degeneration of the Eurocommunist parties, was bound to lead in an inevitable manner to their organizational disruption and degeneration, to the disruption of the formal unity which existed in them. These parties use much the same methods, organizational forms and orientations as the bourgeois parties. Renouncing every principle of the Marxist philo-

sophy, these parties admit in their ranks anyone at all, regardless of his philosophical, religious and other convictions and views, so long as their programs are accepted. Berlinguer stresses: «Registration in the communist party is conditional not on the basis of ideological unity, but on the basis of unity round its political program» («L'Unità», January 22, 1982; Berlinguer's interview on the 60th anniversary of the founding of the ICP). This platform is, no doubt, the cause for the swelling of this party with all sort of elements with different economic interests, political convictions, and views, elements who may be anything but not communists. The same counter-revolutionary process which Lenin forecast 80 years ago in his work, «One Step Forward, Two Steps Backward», in which he says, «Opportunism in program is connected in a natural manner with opportunism in tactics and with opportunism in organizational matters,»<sup>2</sup> is taking place in these parties.

The situation is gravest and crisis deepest in the Spanish revisionist party. This is for definite reasons. Carrillo, this revisionist with the gloves off in the service of the bourgeoisie and reaction, using his position at the top of the Spanish revisionists for 22 years, lined the Spanish revisionist party up in the forefront of the struggle organized by the international bourgeoisie and reaction against the revolution and socialism. The Spanish revisionist party renounced the republican traditions, accepting the monarchy and the king as the arbiter in the political struggle between the Spanish political parties and the bourgeoisie of the country, and accepted the system of the parliamentary monarchy for Spain. Apart from this Carrillo accepted that the main institutions of the Franco regime, such as the army, the police, the courts, etc., continue as before their great influence on the new administration, without making important reforms in them (see: «International Affairs», no. 4, year 1979, p. 581). At the 9th Con-

gress of the Spanish revisionists, Carrillo's proposal to change the Leninist name of the Party was accepted. This move was described as a factor «which opens the road to internal democracy». The next step Carrillo was to take was the opening of the doors of the party to any opportunist, pro-American, pro-Soviet and other element. For the sake of democracy in the Party, Carrillo allowed the creation of various factions and groups which, with the passage of time, assumed crystallized organizational forms. At a meeting held on the eve of the 10th Congress of the Spanish revisionists, it was decided to include in the Constitution of the Party «the right of organized trends to exist within the party». This is the reason why this party is eroded from within by the struggle between the three powerful factions: pro-Soviet, revivalist, and Eurocommunist factions.

The preventive measures of Carrillo and his leading group, such as expulsions from the party or compromises, have done nothing in the way of stopping the division and deep crisis. The political developments only served to give a fresh breath to the pro-Soviet and the revivalist trends within the party. At its congress, the revisionist party of the province of Cataloña, the biggest in number, demanded «the complete revisioning of the line of the Communist Party (read. revisionist) of Spain in this transitory period and its departure from the Eurocommunist direction». The intellectuals within this revisionist party, for their part, demanded «the further democratization of the party». The 10th Congress of the Spanish revisionists, held in July 1981, was clear evidence that the breach that was opened in Cataloña not only could not be filled, but became the signal for further disintegration. Almost one third of the Congress disagreed with the Carrillo's report. This large-scale discord with the policy of Carrillo was faithfully reflected in the ranks of the revisionist parties of the

region of the Basques, in Andalusia, Ballicia, Valencia, etc. As a counter to the demands of the factions in these provinces, Carrillo resorted to the hard line, expelling the heads of factions from the party, though they were legal and in the spirit of the Constitution of the party. As a result, the struggle between groups and factions within the Spanish revisionist party has grown worse and deeper. In the period October-December 1981, a number of the party organizations and committees of Madrid, in the provinces of Valladolid, Salamanca, Galicia, Andalusia, the Balear and Alecante Islands, were disbanded. The factional struggle at the Extraordinary Congress of the revisionist party of the Basque province led to its division into two parts, one of which decided to break away altogether from the party of Carrillo, and endorsed the decision for its merger with another political party of the Basque national bourgeoisie. Neither the anathemas, nor the many expulsions, with which Carrillo proceeded in this province could stop the crisis of the party which he leads. Only five months elapsed from the cessation of the revisionist party of the Basque province, when the same process was repeated in that of the province of Cataloña, which finally was split into two parts: a pro-Moscow group which rejected (not from principled positions) the Eurocommunist political line of Carrillo, and another group which is comprised of two factions: one Eurocommunist faction which is pro-Carrillo, and the faction that supports the revival of Eurocommunism.

All these defeats compelled Carrillo to abandon his false optimism about the temporary nature of the crisis in his party. «We considered ourselves to be a unified, homogenous party with good discipline, whereas today it is abundantly clear that it is not so», Carrillo was forced to admit in his analysis after the electoral defeat.

The group at the top of the Spanish revisionist party has been and,

of course, still is interested in controlling the division and crisis in the ranks of the party. The question is how? Therefore, they sought and found someone, on whom to lay all the blame for the shortcomings and weaknesses, for the mistakes made during the election campaigns and others. And this was none other than Santiago Carrillo, the head of the Spanish revisionists. In November last year Carrillo, the crowned Pope of Eurocommunism, was forced to resign. The new head of the party, Iglesias, has launched a campaign for the reorganization of the party, for the regroupment of the forces, for the admission of all those who had been expelled by Carrillo into the party.

A more or less similar picture of ideological, political, organizational crisis is noticed in the Italian revisionist party, in which the abandonment of the proletarian ideology and the opening of the doors of the party to anyone indiscriminately, has led to the creation of various groups with different tendencies. The Constitution of the Italian revisionist party stipulates that «all people above 18 years old who, regardless of race, philosophical views and religious beliefs, accept the political program of the party, pledge to work for its realization and militate in one of its organizations, are admitted into the party.» Hence, this party is so deep in opportunist waters that it admits into its ranks anyone at all, regardless of his philosophical views, a thing which accounts for the creation of different factions from the base to the top leadership of the party.

The last two years show that a powerful pro-Soviet faction has formed right in the secretariat of this party. Thus, for example, in the Plenum of the CC of this party held in October 1981, top leaders came up against the Berlinguer's evaluations of the international situation and the causes of the international crisis. They demanded that a pro-Soviet stand be maintained in the rivalry between the two superpowers. After the inter-revisionist polemic between

Berlinguer and Moscow chiefs in February 1982, the pro-Soviet faction published its own press organ, the political periodical «Interstampa», the aim of which, as the newspaper of the revisionists, «L'Unità», which is under Berlinguer's control, admits, was the creation of «organizations in support of the pro-Soviet faction» all over Italy. Speaking about the events in Poland, Cossutta, the head of the pro-Soviet faction, said to the Plenum of the CC of October 1982 that Berlinguer's line lacks «clarity» on the political plane. In the last congress of the party he repeated his criticism regarding the ideological disagreements between the Italian Communist Party and Moscow, stressing that «the communists of Italy owe a debt to the Soviet mode».

In order to lighten the impact of the crisis which has the Italian revisionist party in its grip, Berlinguer is pursuing a double policy: dictate and expulsions, coupled with concessions and tactical changes in the strategy of the «historical compromise». Almost two years ago, in November 1980, he proclaimed the «new strategy of the party in the struggle for socialism», which, according to him, will comply with the wishes and tendencies both of the Right and of the Left within the party. Berlinguer did not hesitate to present this «new strategy», «the democratic alternative», as «an important urgent change in the life of the country», one which will allegedly «save» the party and Italy from the crisis that is smothering them. This «democratic alternative» received confirmation in the last congress of the Italian revisionists.

However, nothing, not even the «democratic alternative», can save the revisionist party of Berlinguer from the ideological, political and organizational crisis, which is growing deeper. Therefore, despite his stand of seemingly firm opposition to the pro-Soviet faction, in his efforts to defend his party from suffering the same consequences as its Spanish counterpart, Berlinguer cannot totally disregard the in-

terests of this faction. This also explains the fact that after a round of «fierce» polemic with Moscow, Berlinguer received and had a cordial talk with the representative of the Moscow revisionists, Zagladin, who is in charge of the inter-party relations in the Central Committee of the Soviet revisionist party.

The group spirit is eroding the French revisionist party, too. With the penetration of all sorts of people with a variety of class interests and philosophical views in the ranks of the party, the emergence and development of various trends, which in the majority of cases refuse obedience to the orientations of the Central Committee has become a reality today.

The elements of «crucial importance» in the party, as Marchais called the intellectuals in the 23rd Congress of his party, were the first to group themselves into different directions since 1977 when the communists broke off with the socialists. Many of them, seeing no perspective for their political career outside the alliance with the socialists, began to oppose the home and foreign policy of Marchais, indeed some dropped out of the party altogether. A wave of departure and expulsions from the party spread in the end of 1980 and continued right up to the presidential elections of 1981 (April-May), when a great number of intellectuals, most of whom were historians, philosophers, journalists, artists and writers, etc. refused to sign the call of the party to support the candidature of Marchais in the presidential elections. A strong wave of expulsions followed thereupon in the ranks of the French revisionist

party, especially in the end of 1981, which is considered the greatest ever carried out in the last 20 years. A large membership was expelled because of having set up organizational structures parallel with the party, published their own bulletins and periodicals which were distributed in thousands of copies among the members of these factionist organizations. Apart from this, rank-and-file party members have dropped out of the party in great numbers during the recent years.

\*  
\* \* \*

The development inside the revisionist camp hitherto are irrefutable evidence that this camp is in complete disarray.

The only thing these revisionist parties have in common is their struggle to undermine the revolution and socialism and to lend a new lease of life to the capitalist system.

But this activity which is directed against the interests of the proletariat and the other exploited masses of city and countryside has exposed them before the public. «The most important thing is that the Eurocommunist parties have lost much of the influence they had among the masses, and this can be seen in the defeats which they consider their main battlefield»,<sup>3</sup> stressed Comrade Enver Hoxha. Thus, for instance, in the last elections in Italy and in France, the number of electors who voted for the party of Berlinguer and of Marchais

was respectively 1.5 million and 1 million less than in the previous elections. Whereas the Spanish revisionist party lost about 50 per cent of its votes against the previous elections.

Besides expulsions ordered from above, a large number of members deserted the party. From the reports of the foreign press, from 1977 to day, the Spanish revisionist party has lost half of its membership. The Italian revisionist leaders are very much worried about this phenomenon. From 1976 to day about 200 thousand of its members have left the party, and only last year more than 40 thousand others dropped out of membership.

In order to escape total defeat, various sections of modern revisionism are trying to reorganize themselves. The reestablishment of connections between the French and the Chinese revisionists, or the steps taken by the French revisionists to bring about a conciliation between the Soviets and the Chinese, as well as the recent contacts between the Italian revisionists and the Soviet revisionists, etc. are part of these efforts. But whatever unity they may achieve among them, it will be only temporary, because modern revisionism can never create that steel unity which only Marxism-Leninism, the scientific ideology of the working class, is in a position to achieve.

<sup>1</sup> Enver Hoxha, Report to the 8th Congress of the PLA, pp. 225-226, Eng. ed.

<sup>2</sup> V. I. Lenin, Selected Works, vol. 1, Tiranë 1973, p. 514, Alb. ed.

<sup>3</sup> Enver Hoxha, Report to the 8th Congress of the PLA, pp. 258-259, Eng. ed.