

# Inner Party Struggle? A Curious Attitude

(A TRANSLATION FROM NUOVA UNITA)

WE have received a letter from some Marxist-Leninist comrades in Naples. Because its content touches upon several central points of the policy of our journal and the activity of our movement, it deserves to be published as a contribution towards the common political work of Marxism-Leninism. Nevertheless, it is also necessary that we who are responsible for what is published in the paper, state our point of view on the observations of the Naples comrades.

## THE LETTER

WE must always remember that the most advanced part of the proletariat except the youth, are organised in the P.C.I., and it is to them that we must speak. We can only do this with language, clear but not sectarian, with attitudes, definite but not provocative.

We all know that the most difficult thing for our revolutionary conscience to accept is the necessity to conduct the struggle inside the Party. The revisionist splitters have in their hands the instruments of propaganda and organisation, and it is therefore necessary to counterpose to them Marxist-Leninist instruments of propaganda and organisation. This is the role which "Nuova Unità" must play, never forgetting that it directs its words to the members of the Party, who, although ideologically convinced, are sometimes put off by the wrong, sectarian and provocative attitudes of some anti-revisionists, at times schematic and infantile. It would be erroneous to ignore the dialectic actually taking place in the Party; and our job is to furnish sufficient themes (responsible ones) to cause a defeat for revisionist positions by arousing the full consciousness of the healthiest elements in the Party.

Most of our work is that of debate conducted inside the Party, truth is with us, and therefore, we can win the argument through discussion with individual comrades. In our city, we have been able to reawaken the debate in the Party after a long battle, in spite of the fact that the Federation does everything possible to evade it, and today we gather the first fruits.

It is certainly more difficult to work in this way because it requires that "infinite patience" which Comrade Mao Tse-tung so often told us to have. It is much easier to organise public meetings like the one in Genoa, but the first way is the right way. We must not assume the airs and graces of a big party, with public demonstrations, red flags flying, etc., because in this way we will only make the revisionists smile, while we engender the hostility of comrades who will say we are attacking the Party, and therefore think that they are fighting for and defending the unity of the Party. It seems to us that this public activity hinders the debate and that possibility of a split down the middle between Leninists and the revisionist positions.

Actions like those of the comrades who distributed leaflets to workers outside the Milan factories do not take account of Italian reality. They presuppose that the most advanced part of the proletariat are among those who after long years of hard struggle still do not feel the need to join the Party which has represented their interests. We must be able to convince the Communist workers that we can perform an effective function, as guide to the masses. It seems to us that this particular leaflet was very unconvincing; we cannot see how one strike of 8 hours duration is more effective than 4 strikes of 2 hours duration each. We do not think that the polemic with the revisionists should be based on such triviality, but must go deeper. We must be able to indicate the alternative line with clarity, and to fight for it inside the Party.

It would be illusory to believe that ideology is sufficient for the mobilisation of the working class, without organisation. It would be just as illusory, however, to suppose that the actual conditions exist now for the formation of another party.

Comrades who because of their just Marxist-Leninist position have been expelled from the Party, do not have to feel themselves "outside," but can contribute to the debate through the external pole, "Nuova Unità."

The Marxist-Leninist comrades, then, have a very precise job to do inside the Party. They must remain inside without surrendering any principle, so winning over the maximum number of comrades by words and by example.

## THE REPLY FROM NUOVA UNITA

This letter from the Naples comrades constitutes a contribution to the development of our work and to the elaboration of the tactics of our movement. It demonstrates how the practice of working in-

side and outside the Party for the victory of the Marxist-Leninist line against revisionism and reformism, has been almost completely accepted by authoritative and consistent groups inside the Party. This acceptance is manifested in the close collaboration and fraternal discussion which has taken place and is being ever more extended, between those comrades who have been expelled from the Party for their anti-revisionist activity and those who are still inside the ranks.

It is, moreover, a new confirmation that within just six months of its existence, "Nuova Unità" has not only come to constitute the ideological and political organ of the Italian Marxist-Leninists, but also their national centre. Correctly, the Naples comrades affirm that "the revisionist splitters have in their hands the instruments of propaganda and organisation, and it is therefore necessary to counterpose to them Marxist-Leninist instruments of propaganda and organisation." Their support of most of the material published by "Nuova Unità," proves that we adequately express the needs of the comrades who are fighting for Marxism-Leninism inside the Party.

The Naples comrades criticise the autonomous political actions and initiatives taken by Marxist-Leninist comrades in diverse localities, outside the political actions and initiatives of the P.C.I. They affirm that to encourage them is harmful to the Marxist-Leninist work carried out by comrades inside the Party. We are perfectly aware that our actions of clarification and criticism require time, caution and patience. Revisionism and reformism constitutes a deeply rooted, complex texture, which must be burned piece by piece. The Naples comrades say that "we must always remember that the most advanced part of the proletariat, except the youth, are organised in the P.C.I., and it is to them that we must speak." We fully agree.

But where we think they go wrong is in their conception that all the work of the Marxist-Leninist movement must be exclusively directed inside the Party. They forget that the revisionist leaders are using disciplinary measures against all those comrades who coherently carry on the struggle inside the Party, and are thus constituting ever more numerous groups of comrades outside the Party. These comrades are outside not because they want to give up the class struggle against the class enemy, but because they want to carry on the struggle in the most effective way possible. They cannot submit to revisionist blackmail, by tolerating the revisionist leadership or withdrawing from the struggle. They intend to struggle harder and better. To do this, they must be able to organise just those political and T.U. actions and initiatives which the P.C.I. leadership has blocked.

We have been extremely cautious in recognising the groups who are organising and expounding their political actions, calming the impatience of many comrades and sometimes attracting bitter comments for our caution. But we are convinced that to block mature political and organisational initiative, incurs the risk of demoralising the comrades expelled from the Party and subduing their revolutionary spirit. Therefore, it is our duty to give these comrades our full and unconditional support. If we do not, this means sacrificing the most combative vanguard of the Marxist-Leninist movement in favour of the more backward sections.

The Naples comrades correctly ask the Marxist-Leninists kicked out of the Party to give the maximum aid to those who are still fighting inside the Party. But they forget to say that it is also necessary for Marxist-Leninist comrades inside the Party to give all their support to those who are outside.

Our experience of struggle outside and inside the Party is an experience which has very few precedents in the history of the workers' movement. It is a new experience. It is a much more difficult way to bring victory for a political line than any other way. For this reason, we have had a lot of discussion on this question. "Nuova Unità" would never have been published if the group of comrades who produce it, did not organise independently placing themselves outside the discipline of the revisionists; neither would we have been able to carry out the task, which the Naples comrades recognise that we have carried

THE *Daily Worker* editorial of October 17th, headed "Ban all Bombs" is marked by contradictions and a lack of realism.

It attempts to deal with some factors which arise from China's first atomic test and, since it proceeds from the erroneous position of the C.P.G.B. regarding nuclear weapons and the relations between Socialist States, it slithers in the quicksands of opportunism.

It calls on the "Labour" Government to break completely with the nuclear policies of the Tories and the U.S.A.

These aggressive nuclear policies are the product of monopoly-capitalism—both American and British—and the Wilson Government is committed plainly to make capitalism work. Its very name, "Labour" is a big fraud and even to suggest that it will modify its own nuclear policy in the interests of the working people is pure wishful thinking and a dangerous deception. The Gordon-Walker-Dean Rusk conversations will certainly clarify matters on this point.

The Editorial goes on to say that "China has developed nuclear weapons for defensive and not offensive purposes." We agree.

It continues then: "that most friends of China will regret that this step has been taken, because it adds to the danger that these weapons will spread to other countries." We disagree 100%.

The Chinese explosion restricts the brazenness of imperialism and adds to the worker's arsenal of just retaliation, should imperialism dare to make this ultimate necessary. Therefore we hold that nuclear weapons in the hands of People's China are an important contribution to world peace, to the morale of the national liberation struggle and the struggle for Socialism in all countries—all three endeavours forming, objectively, one whole and directed precisely against the imperialist war-positions—primarily those of U.S. imperialism.

So, from the point of view of the real peace forces, what is there to "regret" and who will "regret"—save the warmongers themselves and those, who, consciously or not, cater to their interests?

The Editorial continues: "The Soviet Union's nuclear strength is sufficient to shield the Socialist camp—this will continue to be the position for years—since it will be a long time before China is a nuclear power." Again we disagree 100%. First of all, the latter few words are a prophesy, which has a queer affinity with the U.S. State Department's prediction. We would venture that neither the *Daily Worker* nor the U.S. State Department is exactly in the close confidence of the Chinese High Command and that, therefore, to guess is not to know.

Socialist States quite correctly conclude Treaties of Alliance. This does not absolve a Socialist State from adopting a policy of self-reliance in national defence similar to the policy of self-reliance in economic construction. Especially so, in the case of China, the largest nation, by far, in the world and one which has been subjected to military threats from the U.S.A.

To put it bluntly: How could any sincere friend of China insist that her Government entrust its national defence to the Soviet Government which, under the renegade, Khrushchev, conducted an active policy of outright hostility to her? In this despicable chapter of (to put it at its mildest) a distinctly shady career, Khrushchev was backed to the hilt by the leaders of the C.P.G.B. and the *Daily Worker*. What impertinence is this, to "advise" China to depend on the modern revisionists. "The utmost hostility has been shown towards China," says the Editorial. Yes, indeed, gentleman. You ought to know.

"Wild men like Goldwater have openly threatened her with H-weapons." And what of the Johnson-McNamara-Rusk gang? Are they less "wild" because

they are less overt in their intention? Why do you make this distinction, unless it is to try to justify your opportunist policy vis-a-vis U.S. imperialism—a policy accepted uncritically from the un-aimed Khrushchev. Did you not swallow, hook, line and sinker the fraudulent Test Ban Treaty? What was this a "first step" to, except to attempt to perpetuate an exclusive "nuclear club" who intended to lay the law down to the rest of the world and divide it into spheres of influence? When are you going to exercise a degree of modesty in the top ranks of the C.P.G.B. and indulge in self-criticism, so that the entire Party can participate, draw correct conclusions and return to a principled road?

You state that "it is this policy of imperialist aggression, which is at the root of tensions in the world." What then, do you propose to do about it? Try to make the imperialists draw their own teeth so that we can have toothless imperialists? Convert them to Christianity, so that they become pacifists—or what? Or will you now call for an uncompromising struggle against imperialism on a world front (including Britain) on the basis of the Moscow Statement (1960)—since so long as imperialism remains then the grave danger of world nuclear war also remains. Is it not clear, by now, that only a tremendous and historic world campaign to Ban and destroy all H-weapons will prevent many other States from acquiring them in due course? That no exclusive "nuclear club" will ever be able to forbid other States to test and acquire them? You mislead your readers when you say that the Soviet proposals for a Summit Conference were the same as the Chinese proposals vis-a-vis the outright banning of H-weapons (printed in full in this *Vanguard*).

This is to cling to your pro-Khrushchev position, which wanted only a Summit of the nuclear powers—and which excluded China.

If you still regard the H-weapon as the be-all and end-all of everything then you definitely depart from the Marxist-Leninist standpoint as to the real social forces which determine historical change.

The working people will destroy all nuclear weapons since these things constitute an obstacle to their advance.

The spring of all influence, power and decision in this, the era of rapid decay for capitalism, lies with the working peoples.

They will yet end both exploitation and every and any weapon which can be invented in the dialectical process of vanquishing reaction.

Herein is the bright hope for the future, and it remains, after the Chinese test, not only bright—but brighter than before.

DAVE VOLPE

tween comrades inside and outside the Party, recognising the indispensable role of each detachment, and actuating the most constructive co-operation between them. To arrive at this point, we must go further than participating in ideological debate and putting forward a general political line. Both inside and outside the Party, among the rank and file and the masses, in the course of class struggle at the place of work, we must translate concrete and immediate issues into Marxist-Leninist slogans and actions.

NGUYEN VAN TROI

On October 15 the agents of United States imperialism shot Nguyen Van Troi, a young Vietnamese patriot, allegedly for attempting to kill McNamara, United States Secretary of Defence, in Saigon last May. Before he was shot Nguyen Van Troi pulled the blindfold from his eyes, and shouted: "The American imperialists come here bringing death. Long live Ho Chi Minh! Long live Vietnam." He was 24 when he died.

The United States imperialists will suffer complete and total defeat in Vietnam at the hands of the people; and before very long. It will then be possible to begin the reconstruction of South Vietnam, and the building of a society in which happiness will be won by all the people. It is for this glorious future that men such as Nguyen Van Troi lay down their lives, in Vietnam and throughout the world. Their memory will never die.

To arrive at this point, we must strengthen the links and the unity be-