

**A SOCIAL DEMOCRATIC CONGRESS  
OF THE FRENCH REVISIONISTS**

*Editorial of the «Zëri i Popullit», Organ  
of the Central Committee of the Party of  
Labour of Albania,  
February 21, 1976*

OCTOBER BOOKS  
4B TEMPLE COURT  
LIVERPOOL 2  
A C.P.B.M.L. BOOKSHOP

**A SOCIAL DEMOCRATIC CONGRESS  
OF THE FRENCH REVISIONISTS**

*Editorial of the «Zëri i Popullit», Organ  
of the Central Committee of the Party of  
Labour of Albania,  
February 21, 1976*

**THE «8 NËNTORI» PUBLISHING HOUSE  
Tirana, 1976**



## **A SOCIAL DEMOCRATIC CONGRESS OF THE FRENCH REVISIONISTS**

The Party of Labour of Albania long ago warned that the revisionist course of the 20th Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union would inevitably lead to the complete Social Democratic degeneration of those parties which followed this course. It also pointed out that to join the Khrushchevite line of the fight against Stalin and his Marxist-Leninist teachings, against «dogmatism», allegedly creative development of Marxism-Leninism, would lead to complete deviation from Leninism and to plunging into the morass of opportunism and anti-communism.

Our article of April 7, 1964 entitled «Modern Revisionists On The Road Of Social Democratic Degeneration And Fusion With Social-Democracy» said that, by following the opportunist course of the 20th Congress and by recommending it to the communist and workers' parties of other countries, the Khrushchevite revisionists «aim to cause the degeneration of the communist parties into reformist parties of the Social-Democratic type, to strengthen the influence of bourgeois ideology and reformist illusions among the working masses, to weaken the militant revo-

lutionary spirit of the working class movement and to sidetrack it from the only correct road against the capitalist order of oppression and exploitation». This article dealing with the concessions made to the Social Democrats at the 17th Congress of the French Communist Party directly denounced the plot of the French revisionists for the Social Democratic degeneration of that party.

Since then 12 years have gone by and now, at the 22nd Congress some days ago, the French revisionists went over to the positions of open struggle against the revolution and communism.

The 22nd Congress of the French Communist Party put the seal on the complete transition of the French revisionists to the advanced opportunist and anti-Marxist positions of the Italian Togliattists, who have long since won the black reputation of the front-runners in lining themselves up and amalgamating with Social Democracy and putting themselves openly in service of the bourgeoisie.

The key problem on which the Secretary General of the French revisionist party, George Marchais, concentrated on his lengthy report, was that of the dictatorship of the proletariat. He did his utmost to justify the erasing of this fundamental principle of Marxism-Leninism from the party documents. He declared that the dictatorship of the proletariat does not figure in the draft-document presented to the congress, because «it does not respond to the reality of our policy, the reality of what we propose to the country». According to him, the state which allegedly will carry out the socialist transformations of the society will not be the dictatorship of the proletariat,

but the «state of the working class and other categories of the working people, of physical and intellectual labour, of town and country, that is, the overwhelming majority of the people».

In coming out so openly against the dictatorship of the proletariat Marchais rejects it as a dogma, obsolete, unnecessary, inapplicable, and impossible in the present conditions of France, and of our epoch in general. With his great zeal to serve the bourgeoisie, Marchais places himself in the ranks of the worst renegades from the cause of the working class, from Bernstein and Kautsky to Brawder, Tito and Khrushchev and their ilk. The theoretical havers he is trying to peddle as the creative application and development of Marxism-Leninism are nothing but a banal copy of the opportunist theses long since exposed and rejected by Marxism-Leninism and world revolutionary practice.

Marchais claims that in abandoning the principle of the dictatorship of the proletariat, he allegedly bases himself on the scientific socialism of Marx, Engels and Lenin, implying that they allegedly did not consider the dictatorship of the proletariat as a foundation principle, but only as something necessary for certain countries and conditions, and for a short period of time. But Marchais cannot hide his treachery to the immortal teachings of Marx and Lenin behind such manoeuvres. It is not fortuitous that in his long speech he never once referred to either Marx, Engels or Lenin on this question. Because Marx stressed that, «the class struggle inevitably leads to **the dictatorship of the proletariat**», that the state in the transition period from capitalism to communism

«cannot be anything else but the **revolutionary dictatorship of the proletariat**». While V.I. Lenin considered the dictatorship of the proletariat as the main thing in the Marxist theory and strongly emphasized that, «only he who **extends** the recognition of the class struggle to the recognition of the dictatorship of the proletariat is a Marxist». Lenin considered the rejection of the dictatorship of the proletariat as treachery and idiocy. He said, «Either the dictatorship (that is the iron power) of the landowners and capitalists, or the dictatorship of the working class. There is no middle road. The sons of the gentry, worthless intellectuals, petty-proprietors who have mislearned from bad books dream in vain of a middle road. There is not and cannot be a middle road in any country of the world. Either the dictatorship of the bourgeoisie... or the dictatorship of the proletariat. He who has not learnt this from history... is a hopeless idiot».

His abandoning the Marxist-Leninist teachings on the dictatorship of the proletariat could not but lead Marchais, as it did, to abandoning all the fundamental principles of scientific socialism, first and foremost, to abandoning the revolution through violence and the class struggle as the absolute law and the only road for the overthrow of capitalism and the socialist transformation of society.

For the proletarian revolution Marchais substitutes the so-called «democratic road». He says, «There is no better or shorter road to socialism than the road of democracy... today democracy and freedom are the main terrain of the class struggle, of the revolutionary struggle».



According to Marchais, on this road alleged reforms will be realized which are destined to make profound transformations in the economic, social and political structures of the country, and which will allegedly limit the hegemony of big capital and the exploitation of the working people, while they will give the latter the possibility of seriously influencing the running of the country. This is the French revisionist variant of the preachings of the Italian revisionists, who claim that they can allegedly pass to socialism through «structural reforms» within the framework of the bourgeois Constitution, through the parliamentary game, etc., without the need to destroy the bourgeois state machine with all its institutions.

And how will all these miracles be achieved? If you are to believe Marchais about all this, there is no need either for the revolution with violence or the class struggle or the dictatorship of the proletariat, but it is enough to secure the unity of the overwhelming majority of the people, and through universal suffrage, compel the big bourgeoisie to respect the will of the people. «In the struggle for socialism,» Marchais declares, «nothing, absolutely nothing, in our epoch and in a country like ours, can replace the popular will of the majority, which is expressed democratically through struggle and universal suffrage. Whatever the mode through which the march towards socialism in our country will be carried out... we must be certain that in every stage the political majority and the arithmetical majority must coincide».

Reading what Marchais states, it truly seems

as if one is hearing the words of, Bernstein, Kautsky and Co. Bernstein said: «Today, through voting, demonstrations and other such means of influence, we are able to realize reforms for which one hundred years ago bloody revolutions were required». Kautsky, on his part, tried to prove that in the conditions of bourgeois democracy violent revolution is unnecessary, that the aim of the political struggle of the Social Democrats is «the seizure of state power through winning the majority in the parliament and the transformation of parliament into master of the government».

Lenin long ago replied to these renegades, beginning from Bernstein down to Marchais. «The opportunist gentlemen, including the Kautskyites,» he wrote, «as if to trifle with the theory of Marx, «teach» the people in this way: first the proletariat must win the majority through the universal right to vote, then, on the basis of such a vote by the majority, seize the state power, and then, on the basis of this «consistent» democracy (some call it «pure») organize socialism. While we, on the basis of theory of Marx and the experience of the Russian revolution say: first the proletariat must overthrow the bourgeoisie and secure the state power for **itself**, and then use this state power, that is the dictatorship of the proletariat, as a weapon of its own class to win the sympathy of the majority of the working people». Like all the renegades, Marchais, too, tries to hide his betrayal of Marxism-Leninism by referring to the new conditions, the changes that have taken place in the development of society. According to him, the reformist, parliamentary and

«democratic» road is justifiable, because allegedly «in the final account it is reaction and fascism that are retreating, while democracy is advancing».

But the speculations of Marchais in regard to the new conditions are baseless in the face of history and facts. Naturally, changes have taken place and will take place in the development of capitalist society, too, but they have not changed its exploiting and oppressive essence. Moreover, daily facts prove that the tendency of this development is not towards extension of freedom and democracy, but towards its further limitation. Many facts speak about the increase of imperialist reaction in all fields, about the unprecedented inflation of the bureaucratic, military and police apparatus of the bourgeois state, about the extensive use of military fascist putsches and the increase of the danger of fascism. In these conditions, to preach that violent revolution and the dictatorship of the proletariat are outdated, as Marchais is doing, and to spread illusions that the bourgeoisie and reaction will peacefully agree to give up their domination and to obey «the democratic majority», without the need to exercise the dictatorship of the proletariat over them, means to go over openly to the side of the bourgeoisie and reaction, against the working class and the working people.

Marchais comes out openly against revolutionary violence and says that any idea of replacing «the political will of the majority of the people with the weapons of oppression» is a dangerous illusion and provocation, which puts the weapons in the hands of reaction and leads the revolutionary movement towards isolation and defeat. He tries to justify this

counter-revolutionary thesis with the lessons which allegedly stem from the events in Chile, and to peddle this as an invention to avoid a repetition of what happened there.

According to Marchais, it emerges that in the present conditions the revolution is fraught with the danger of the establishment of fascism. But what did the events in Chile show? They clearly showed the failure of the peaceful road preached by the revisionists, the failure of the reformist illusions. They showed that without opposing the forces of reaction with the armed force of the revolution, without smashing the bourgeois state machine to its foundations, and without the establishment of the dictatorship of the proletariat, without the leadership of the Marxist-Leninist proletarian party, the revolution is doomed to failure.

The revisionists were scared to death and capitulated completely in face of their defeat in Chile and plunged even deeper into the morass of opportunism. As a result, the new strategies of the revisionists emerged, such as that of Berlinguer in Italy on the «historic compromise» with the Christian-Democrats, that of Carillo in Spain on the unity with the Legitimists, that of Cunhal in Portugal on the revolution through the army, or that of Marchais on the rallying of the French people, etc. In this way, they want to sidetrack the working class from the revolution, to intimidate it with the bogey of fascism, and to assure the bourgeoisie that it has nothing to fear on the part of the revisionists, that they are its best guarantors and defenders.

The fascist coup in Chile showed that Allende

and his circle were Social Democrats. When they came to power and tried to take steps in the direction of democratic transformations, fascism cut off their heads. In face of these events, the revisionist Marchais, this petty bourgeois, prefers to remain the slave of the bourgeoisie rather than take the road of the revolution, the only road which can avoid fascism.

Marchais, as a typical representative of bourgeois liberal revisionism who worships class peace, went so far as to demand in the Congress the prohibition of the clenched fist salute. He declared that the French revisionist party «is not the party of the clenched fist, but the party of the outstretched hand».

In his attacks on the dictatorship of the proletariat Marchais outdid all the records of past renegades from the working class and went over openly to the camp of the most frenzied anti-communist propaganda. With utter shamelessness he says that the dictatorship of the proletariat «automatically reminds one of the fascist regimes of Hitler, Mussolini, Salazar and Franco».

The presentation of the dictatorship of the proletariat as the denial of the democracy, as Marchais is doing, is the most banal and discredited invention of the bourgeois propaganda against socialism. For whom does Marchais seek democracy? Democracy and freedom for the exploiters, for fascists, the bourgeoisie? The proletariat has publicly declared that there is no democracy in socialism for the enemies and exploiters, but oppression. There is freedom only for the people in socialism. The dictator-

ship of the proletariat, as Lenin stressed, is the broadest and most complete democracy for the working people.

It is precisely the oppression of the bourgeoisie and the reactionaries that Marchais does not accept. In his socialism not only is there room for small and middle capital, but even for the free political organization of the reactionary and anti-proletarian forces. «To ensure the success of socialism», he says, «is not a matter of depriving the minority, which the reactionary forces constitute, of their liberties... Can the reactionaries organize themselves in a reactionary party? They do this even now,» says Marchais, «this will not be anything new».

All the «arguments» Marchais brings out to justify the so-called socialism he preaches aim, in essence, at assuring the bourgeoisie that this will not be a proletarian and anti-bourgeois socialism, but a «socialism in French colours». The only thing lacking in these colours is the revolution, the overthrow of the bourgeoisie, the destruction of the bourgeois state machine, the dictatorship of the proletariat, the suppression of the exploiters, the liquidation of capitalist private property, the proletarian party and its unified leadership, proletarian centralism. But if the capitalist property and the bourgeois reactionary parties remain intact, then what sort of socialism is this?

This sort of «socialism à la Marchais», purchased in the consumer society, has nothing in common with genuine socialism which is built on the principles of Marxism-Leninism. The socialist society, Marchais preaches, is nothing but the present capitalist society

in which the workers' aristocracy, and together with it, the leaders of the French Communist Party and all the revisionists who follow them, aim at running the affairs of the bourgeoisie, at collaborating with it and sharing the surplus value, just as the Social Democrats have done and are doing in many countries.

The abandoning of the principle of the dictatorship of the proletariat is linked with the negation of the leading role of the working class in the struggle for the overthrow of capitalism and in socialist society. On this question, too, the anti-Marxist countenance of Marchais comes out clearly. He rises against the very notion «proletariat» counterposing it to the notion «working class», in which, openly distorting Marxism, he also includes broad non-proletarian strata, such as the intelligentsia and wage-earners in general, that is, all the officials and functionaries of the bourgeois state apparatus and of capitalist production, the trade union bureaucracy, etc. In essence, what we have to do with here is a refined variant of the known bourgeois theories of the deproletarianization of capitalist society and the replacement of the leading role of the working class with the role of the non-proletarian classes and strata. Thus, the leadership of the French revisionist party adopted the known ultra-opportunist theses of R. Garaudy whom it expelled from the party and branded, just as he was in reality, as a dyed-in-the-wool revisionist.

Marchais also comes out openly against the proletarian class nature of the party. The doors of his party, which has assumed the mission, not of

the revolution, the overthrow of the bourgeoisie and the establishment of the dictatorship of the proletariat, but the running of the affairs of the bourgeoisie, are wide open for people of all sorts, non-proletarian ideologies and outlooks, bourgeois, petty-bourgeois, idealist and even religious. Marchais says that even Christians «without giving up any part of their faith, or religious practice», may militate in his party.

This, in general terms, is the anti-Marxist road that Marchais, this petty-bourgeois megalomaniac and charlatan theoretician, this spokesman for the bourgeoisie in the workers' movement, is preaching from the rostrum of the 22nd Congress of the French revisionist party. He is trying to put the betrayal by the revisionists of Marxism-Leninism and the cause of the proletariat, which they have long been practicing, on a «theoretical» basis.

Though Marchais proclaims himself a champion of pluralism, though he speaks about «a French road towards socialism», at the same time he tries to impose this road, which is as far removed from Marxist-Leninist principles as the earth from the sky, on all countries and peoples, presenting it as the only road for the transition to socialism not only in France, but also in our epoch in general.

The 22nd Congress marks the complete and final transformation of the French revisionist party into a Social Democratic type party, its official and open going over to the camp of the bourgeoisie. This congress clearly proves that the French revisionists have openly and completely betrayed those revolutionary ideals which in 1920, at the Tours Congress,



led to the breaking away of the communists from the Socialist Party and the foundation of the French Communist Party as a party of the French proletariat. Now, nothing, absolutely nothing, distinguishes the revisionist communist party of Marchais from the «bourgeois workers' party» of Leo Blum and Guy Mollet and from the socialist or Social Democratic parties of other countries, known worldwide as loyal watchdogs of capitalism and bourgeois domination.

This great betrayal of the revolution and socialism by the French revisionists, their complete going over to the positions of Social Democracy, is a direct consequence of the betrayal and the counter-revolutionary course of the Soviet Khrushchevite leadership. It is not difficult to see that the present theories of Marchais, the entire open anti-Marxist course adopted at the congress of the French revisionists have as their foundation the ill-famed theses of the Khrushchevite revisionist renegades, on the so-called «peaceful, democratic and parliamentary road to socialism», on the «state and the party of the entire people», on the rapprochement and collaboration with Social Democracy, their thesis on the struggle against «dogmatism» and Stalin, with which they imply Marxism-Leninism, etc.

Nevertheless, the Soviet revisionists pretend to be astonished that their disciples and followers are going so far. In fact, the Soviet leaders are not worried about the principles, about the fate of the revolution and socialism.

What worries the Soviet revisionist chieftains is something else. The 22nd Congress of the French

revisionist party shows that the revisionist parties in various capitalist countries, in placing themselves ever more openly at the service of the local bourgeoisie, are showing signs of breaking away from Moscow, going so far that, to prove this break to their bourgeoisie, they are making some criticism to the Soviet leadership and coming out in defence of the Right dissidents in the Soviet Union, as Marchais did. These centrifugal tendencies are contrary to the expansionist interests and aims of Soviet social imperialism, which wants to keep the revisionist parties of other countries under its control, to have them as support points and tools of its policy in its aims for world domination.

The French revisionists, just like the Italian Togliattists before them, have flagrantly cast aside Marxism-Leninism and adopted the tattered banner of Social Democracy and betrayal of the interests of the proletariat. But the French working class, with its outstanding revolutionary traditions, will certainly not fall into line with this treacherous course. On the contrary, it will march on the road which Marxism-Leninism points to, until the achievement of the inevitable victory of socialism. It is the duty of the Marxist--Leninist revolutionaries, the French working class and its vanguard, a truly Marxist-Leninist party, while mercilessly exposing the revisionist betrayal, to raise high the red banner of the revolution and of the dictatorship of the proletariat, the banner of Marxism-Leninism, and carry it forward unwaveringly.

---



