

Union of Revolutionary Communists (Marxists-Leninists-Maoists)

Revisionism, main danger for the victory of the Chilean Democratic Revolution

Published: August 2007 Republished <http://lesmaterialistes.com/urc-mlm-revisionnisme-danger-principal-pour-victoire-revolution-democratique-chilienne>

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.

Revisionism, which is expressed today by different political groups and leaders, finds in the [PCCh] Teillier-Carmona clique its greatest advocates.

Revisionism is a danger that exists within the workers' and people's movement itself. These are false Marxists, who truncate the fundamental principles established by Marx, Engels, Lenin, Stalin and Mao.

They are an advance of the bourgeoisie within the workers' movement, and therefore constitute a real threat to the development of the revolutionary struggle of our people.

These individuals, who represent a fraction of the Chilean bureaucratic bourgeoisie, aspire to use the bourgeois state-landowner as a lever to promote themselves as a class.

To succeed in imposing their objectives, the revisionists use the organization, the mobilization and the struggle of the masses: by encouraging, limiting or deviating, as the case may be, just popular protest.

Today, they are busy negotiating and politically manipulating to find an electoral niche. These goals have nothing to do with the interests of the class and the people.

The electoral system constitutes one of the principal mechanisms of domination and legitimization of the current order, the elections represent, in this sense, an objective against which the struggle of the revolutionary masses must be directed; and not doing so would imply that we would be mortgaging the future of the new democracy revolution in our country.

1. The harmful role of revisionism in Chile

The 20th Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union (CPSU) in 1956 marked an important step in the advance towards the final usurpation of the power of the Soviet state by the bourgeoisie, led at that time by the clique Khrushchev.

This was made up of a series of declassified elements, whose social base, formed by a differentiated layer of the proletariat, enabled this right-opportunist sector to carry out a coup to wrest political power from the hands of the proletariat and the people. Soviet Union and impose a series of political and economic reforms intended to restore capitalism in the USSR.

Towards the end of the 1950s - beginning of the 1960s, the Khrushchevite revisionists (or contemporary revisionists as the revolutionaries said), triumphantly established a fascist regime to defend themselves and oppress them.

In Chile, an important part of the leadership of the old Communist Party of Chile (the same as today) echoed this Congress. This was facilitated by the inveterate action of a right-wing opportunist line which predominated in the old Party. To this, two elements must be added.

First, Luis Emilio Recabarren, worker typographer, founder of the Socialist Workers Party [the ancestor of the CP of Chile] in 1912, never got rid of a series of ideological bullets inherited from his past militancy in the late Democratic Party.

Despite his activity as organizer of the Chilean working class, his thinking remained and remained until his death, moulded by influences foreign to the

scientific ideology of the class; an ideology which he could not know in depth and which he could not, for this very reason, apply in practice.

His conceptions were closer to utopian socialism than scientific socialism, and he could not correct them, although he visited the republic of the Soviets.

His faith in the electoral route, his positions on the exhaustion of the need for violence as a means of revolutionary transformation of society, have fogged his efforts to propagate in the working and working class the virtues of socialism and the need for conquest of power by this class.

Second, things did not change with the death of Recabarren.

To the point that in 1929, a representative of the Comintern signalled to the Chilean Communists their "complete incomprehension of the Bolshevik principles of organization" and warned them that by taking this path, they were heading straight for the liquidation of the party as communist proletarian organization.

The new upsurge in mass struggles in the early 1930s demonstrated the combative disposition of the masses of the people and the basic communist militants.

Certain radicalized manifestations of the mass struggle took the form of attempts at armed resistance against abuse and exploitation, such as the Uprising of the Squad [great mutiny by sailors and soldiers] in September 1931, the tragic Passover in Copiapó and Vallenar in December 1931 [barracks taken, followed by repression] and the peasant uprising in Alto Biobío, Ranquil and Lonquimay in April 1934.

However, this did not translate into a revolutionary policy aimed at preparing and triggering the armed struggle for the conquest of power for and by the class and the people.

From the VII Congress of the III International in 1935 and the impulse of the policy of popular fronts to fight against the overwhelming advance of fascism on a world scale, could have been adopted and applied in Chile a resolute line of unity of all the anti-fascist forces, on condition of ensuring proletarian leadership of the front on the basis of a firm worker-peasant alliance.

The leadership of the Communist Party nevertheless opted for an opportunistic interpretation, foreign to Marxist-Leninist principles (which consisted in

making serious preparations for the revolution), leading the party to place its action and the proletariat in tow of the bourgeoisie.

This situation resulted in debilitating parliamentary cretinism and the refusal to unleash and direct the armed uprising of the peasant and Mapuche masses [the “Amerindian” indigenous people of Chile] with the revolutionary proletariat at its head.

On the contrary, restraining the struggle of the poor peasantry, he sold the right to peasant unionism in order to convince the radical party to participate in the Popular Front and then to press for integration into the front of the socialist (social-fascist) party.

In April 1936 was signed the act of constitution of the Popular Front with the historic oppressors of the rural masses - the radical party - thus sealing a pact of conciliation and abandoning the class struggle.

The radicals were a party made up of sectors of the bourgeoisie, the urban petty bourgeoisie and landowners in the Central Valley.

This tactical step consisted in fact in strategically abandoning the task of boosting the workers-peasant alliance, the basis of the front and of the future state of popular democratic dictatorship - a specific form of the proletarian dictatorship in countries like ours. To follow this reformist strategy in practice had a very high cost for the masses.

This erroneous and opportunistic interpretation of the politics of the popular fronts put off the agrarian tasks of the popular-democratic revolution.

At the same time, in China, a correct interpretation and application of the front policy established by the Third International not only enabled an overwhelming victory over Japanese imperialism in 1945, but also laid the foundations for the Communist Party's coming triumph. China in 1949 at the head of the popular masses in the revolutionary war waged against the Kuomintang (the Chinese nationalist party funded by Yankee imperialism), against the big landowners and the monopoly bourgeoisie, the main enemies of the Chinese people.

From 1938, the Communist Party of Chile supports and collaborates with radical governments (pro-Yankees), until 1947. In that year, radical President Gabriel González Videla, obeying the anti-Soviet policies of the Yankee imperialism, enacts a law "defending" democracy (bourgeois, of course) and bans the Party.

Faced with this, far from entering a more decided phase of struggle, the revisionist clique of the CP pursues a policy of containment of the class struggle with a view to recovering its legal status, which is finally obtained at the end of the years 1950, as a reward for his "good behaviour".

When the revisionist leadership of Corvalan and Teitelboim assumed the policy of the renegade Khrushchev from 1956, it did so with flying colours. The peaceful path to socialism becomes their maxim, and tirelessly, they take up the Khrushchevite revisionist line "in Chilean", but based on a "rich" experience accumulated during decades of right-wing opportunism.

The "irreproachable" action of these revisionists made the pride of the big creole bourgeoisie and made sigh all the opportunists of Latin America and beyond, Chile being considered politically as the "Switzerland" of this part of the world, they went flashing and chugging in chorus on Chile's alleged "flawless democratic tradition".

However, a handful of Communists got out of this path by cutting in part with this democratic-liberal and social-fascist orgy.

Chilean anti-revisionists devoted themselves to disseminating the documents by which Chairman Mao - the head of the Communist Party of China - bombed the political and ideological positions of the Russian revisionists and their associates within the false communist parties which had displayed the positions from the revisionist leadership of the CPSU, such as Corvalan-Teitelboim.

2. The defense of Marxism-Leninism against contemporary revisionism in Chile

It was a handful of communist revolutionaries, led by David Benquis (comrade Velasquez) who took on the task of propagating and defending the Chinese proposal of June 14, 1963 around the general line for the international communist movement, as soon as it this was known to them.

They tried to develop the line struggle inside the CP of Chile, by founding the Spartacus Editions to publish a large part of the documents of the Great Polemic (at that time, the Chinese letter "in 25 points" and its nine comments were practically a reading prohibited for party activists).

As soon as they were expelled by the revisionist clique, far from abandoning the just propaganda task they had started, Comrade Velasquez and a stronger hand formed the Spartacus Group.

Later, joining other communists and other activists who had incorporated during more than two years of revolutionary work re-established among the masses, they adopted the decision to found the Communist Party in 1966 Revolutionary (PCR).

It was to them that the task of defending and claiming Marxism-Leninism (today we say Marxism-Leninism-Maoism) fell in the middle of the rise of contemporary revisionism and parliamentary cretinism of Chilean acolytes.

Precisely, during the years of the government of the Popular Unity, the PCR and Benquis had the courage to attack firmly the peaceful way which one shouted on all the rooftops, and at the same time to signal the fatal consequences that this one would bring to the class and the people, while emphasizing the class character of the government of Popular Unity and its project of bureaucratic state monopoly capitalism which it was trying to apply to our country.

What is more, a project subject to the regime established by Soviet social-imperialism in the USSR.

However, this intense and necessary theoretical-practical work of denunciation and elucidation was unfortunately interrupted in the early 1980s by the liquidation of the PCR.

Besides other reasons which it is useless to deal with here, what contributed to this inexcusable capitulation was the premature death in 1978 of the one who was the soul of this party: Comrade Velasquez.

The fascist coup of September 1973 destroyed in a few hours the peaceful way and the electoral practice developed for decades by opportunism.

The masses had to face in their flesh the devastating results of the preaching for the peaceful way to socialism. Legalistic, electoralist and pacifist illusions were rejected; but not hopes. These throb in each of the struggles waged by the proletariat and the people until today.

3. Chilean revisionism since the fascist coup of 1973

The situation generated by the military coup made it impossible to use the parliamentary route - to the chagrin of the revisionists - but also drastically resolved the inter-imperialist dispute for domination and control of the country.

The attempted peaceful path strategy of Soviet social-imperialism to penetrate the countries which belonged to the area of domination or direct influence of Yankee imperialism, had as a necessary counterpart the violent path to subdue those who dared to alter the order imposed by them in Eastern Europe, as happened in Czechoslovakia in 1968.

As can be seen, revisionism too acted with weapons in hand if conditions demanded it. The violence was not foreign to him.

For this reason, it should come as no surprise that the Chilean revisionists, who have been seeking since the 1960s a political alliance with the Christian Democratic Party (pro-Yankee party, collaborationist with the Fascist Military Junta until 1977) exhausted any real possibility of achieving unity with them and once defeated the illusion of a rapid restoration of representative institutions of a democratic-bourgeois character, began to discuss and prepare to use acute political violence.

It will be up to a more in-depth study to determine - on the basis of the military theory of the proletariat, people's war - if there was, in the strategic sense, armed struggle in the 1980s. The use of weapons, the installation Explosive devices, the organization of armed detachments, and even the creation of militias, is not necessarily exactly the same thing as developing the revolutionary armed struggle.

It was Luis Corvalán himself who, in 1977, when assessing the causes of the coup and the lack of preparation to defend the government of the UP, formulated the problem of the "historic vacuum" in party politics, link with "the lack of a military policy".

But it was not until 1980 that Corvalán called for the employment of "all forms of struggle".

There is no doubt that this decision had the agreement of the Soviet social-imperialist government.

A whole legend has been woven around the preparation and the outbreak of the acute political violence carried out by Chilean revisionism.

There is a confusion of versions about the identity of the participants, about the international support they received (through Soviet social-imperialism and its dependencies), or about the character of the mistakes that were made.

But the important thing is to investigate first of all the ideological roots of Chilean revisionism, and to see in what way the revolutionary aura which the use of armed political violence possesses can pose new dangers for the revolutionary struggle of the proletariat and of the Chilean people.

4. Some characteristics of (armed) revisionism

The scientific ideology of the proletariat (the science of the proletarian revolution) is the theoretical synthesis of the experience accumulated in the class struggle against the bourgeoisie, and also collects the fundamental contributions of the revolutionary struggle of the oppressed masses and peoples of the world. The proletarian conception, the Marxist-Leninist-Maoist ideology is distinct from and opposed to the ideology of the bourgeoisie.

These are two ideological conceptions which are mutually exclusive and cannot be reconciled. Bourgeois ideology is the conception of the world of the oppressors, and with this conception, the proletariat cannot have any kind of indulgence.

From this point of view, revisionism is the most misleading and subtle expression of bourgeois ideology.

They look Marxist, by their phraseology; they formally appeal to the masses and are even in certain political circumstances ready not only to take up arms, but also to launch the armed struggle (although this is never to conquer power for the class and the people and establish the integral dictatorship of the proletariat).

The revisionists can organize the masses, direct their struggles, prepare their resistance to a common enemy. However, revisionism always puts its own interests before those of the masses.

He is afraid of the masses, he fears their revolutionary politicization, he fears that they will raise their ideological level, because he knows that if this is the case, he runs the risk of being exposed as an opportunist.

The paradox is that revisionism needs the masses, the revisionist party itself is made up of the masses, but it needs them to ride on their backs.

He uses them to manoeuvre and wrest some political laurels, like a post in the senate or in the administration of the bourgeois state. Once reached his goal, he must pull the reins, slow down the movement of masses, or for lack of better, deflect it if he can no longer stop it.

Whether the revisionists call themselves Marxists, Marxists-Leninists or even Marxists-Leninists-Maoists, it is in their political practice (with or without arms) that their bourgeois ideology and their true class interests are revealed.

They transform Marxist philosophy into bourgeois philosophy, the revolutionary dialectic into vulgar evolutionism.

They change the Marxist economy into a bourgeois economy, scientific socialism into bourgeois socialism, the proletarian dictatorship into a bourgeois dictatorship, the proletarian party into a bourgeois workers' party; people's war is traded for a bourgeois military line.

They alter Marxism, make it an acceptable doctrine for the system of domination and spend their lives signalling that the revolution and the dictatorship of the proletariat will be achieved in a future that they never determine; they deceive their world by saying that once the class contradictions are sharp enough, fascist regimes will arise as an answer, which the masses will not tolerate, and that in this way the insurrection will be unleashed like lightning and power will be conquered.

However, "let us be careful not to provoke the bourgeoisie, let us conquer the parliamentary majorities, let us win the cause of the people, the army and the police, and thus we will end up with a favourable balance of power within the state and will be imposed on the bourgeoisie all the political requirements we want"; democracy will defeat neoliberalism.

This is their maximum possible, it is the doctrine of the lesser evil, it is "tactical, tactical".

They do not define or explain what “democracy” means to them, it is no more than the conquest of a set of political freedoms which can be conceded while leaving fundamental order as it is of class.

As we said above, between 1980 and 1986, revisionism applied the tactic of waging all forms of struggle.

If we consider the policy followed by the Corvalán-Teitelboim clique before the 1973 coup, up to that adopted in connection with the political events that took place after the "decisive year" of 1986 (the plebiscite of 1988 and the elections of 1989), we will see that the tactic of waging "all forms of struggle" (which included the use of violence through the armed apparatus of the party) is nothing other than an inter-reign within a political and ideological continuity of a revisionist and electoral-opportunist character.

5. The use of armed violence

The use of armed struggle (in its narrowest meaning) or "acute violence" - as it is said in the documents of revisionism - as a form of struggle does not change the historically revisionist nature of its politics, it that is to say: armed revisionism.

"Everything is an illusion, except power," said Lenin in 1905. What is central in a revolution is power, which is gained by violence and is defended by the revolutionary dictatorship.

Marx explained that one should not play with the insurrection, that this one was a serious business, a true art.

For his part, Chairman Mao pointed out in 1938 that "the central task and the supreme form of the revolution is the seizure of power by armed struggle, that is to say, solving the problem by war. This revolutionary Marxist-Leninist principle, he adds, has universal value”.

For the proletariat and the Chilean people these are questions of principle, fundamental and unforgettable questions, they are inevitable historical laws.

If the proletariat and the people abandon these principles, they condemn themselves to keep their chains and therefore to perpetuate imperialist domination, that of the big bourgeoisie and the landowners: its main

enemies. Revisionism never wanted to understand this ba ba of the military line of Marxism-Leninism-Maoism.

The failure of the attack on Pinochet in September 1986, to which was added the directives of the Yankee State Department addressed to the fascist military junta so that they "move towards democracy" - which included the requirement for the Christian Democratic Party to publicly and definitively renounce political violence, and therefore the end of all alliance with those who exercised it - led Chilean revisionism, confronted with the political isolation it was beginning to suffer vis-à-vis of the other parties, to "reinterpret" the policy of popular rebellion and to "soften" the call to use "all forms of struggle".

This reinterpretation led them to exchange weapons for the ballot boxes, that is to say: to offload "acute violence", to persevere in the search for a political alliance with the DC-PS bloc (basis of the Concertation) with the objective of being part of a future transitional government, as a result of open elections. The political plan of Yankee imperialism for Chile and Latin America was gaining across the board.

However, the national political scene, marked by days of popular protest and the significant development of the popular movement, objectively manifested the development of the revolutionary situation and fully justified the armed rebellion of the masses.

About September 9, 1986 [September 7, 2007 had taken place the operation "20th century", failed attack against Pinochet by the FPMR –[EROL note: The **Manuel Rodríguez Patriotic Front** / *Frente Patriótico Manuel Rodríguez*, founded on 14 December 1983 as the paramilitary arm of the PCCh)]--, the Spanish daily *El País* affirmed: "Although the moderate forces of the opposition, in especially the Christian Democrats, condemn any use of violent means, we cannot close our eyes to the fact that the influence of the Communist Party of Chile, which supports the Front [FPMR], is growing appreciably, especially in the country's youngest and most radical sectors, in universities and the populations living around the capital, where the most despoiled and desperate strata are concentrated. This has resulted in the recent communist successes in university and union elections. "

What the Spanish daily newspaper does not say is that the subjective conditions were lacking - and still are - the Marxist-Leninist-Maoist party, the people's army and the front, the three basic instruments of the democratic revolution.

This set of things was the risk that Yankee imperialism was trying to prevent by any means.

They did not accept the Nicaraguisation of the country, and even less another popular war like that which was directed by the Communist Party of Peru.

Was Revisionism Willing to Drive a Real Revolution in Chile? No, he was not. The time had come for him to demonstrate good conduct and sell political and social stability coupons in exchange for the soft parliamentary seats.

6. End of the national uprising

As a good pro-Soviet agent (without neglecting its own and original contributions to the initiative), the Chilean revisionist clique followed in the footsteps of Gorbachev and the perestroika.

The "revolution within the revolution" and the change in orientation of Soviet revisionism vis-à-vis the armed struggle were reflected in the new policies of the Soviet revisionist leadership for Latin America and the Caribbean.

Armed violence - or rather armed revisionism - as a means of pressure to achieve certain political objectives, was no longer used in the new peacetime (the peace of the cemeteries of course) and the apparent detente inter-imperialist.

Almost at the same time, the capitalist restoration in the USSR, a process started in 1956 with the rise of Khrushchev, ended up leading, in the years 1989-1991, to a capitalism unleashed in the West, with the re-establishment of democratic institutions. Liberals, who first weakened, then ended all aid to revisionists of various latitudes, and among others to Latin Americans.

Lacking a "strategic rear guard for the revolution", frightened by their status as political orphans and even more by the popular torrent which began to overflow their policy of rebellion, the Chilean revisionists decided to backtrack, "s 'adapt' to the new political conditions and collaborate actively to contain the powerful advance of the masses.

One of the conditions for its relative political inclusion, that is to say its legalization, was its total distance from "the armed adventure"; to do this, they passed the national uprising up for an occasional slaughter (as the hardened revisionist Luis Corvalán Lepe had jokingly said in the early 1990s), then, so as

not to appear to be to renounce their policy of popular mass rebellion, they said that it was continuing, but henceforth in agreement with the new situation, by diffusing it in the form of an electoral rebellion, as "raising" the "conscious" votes .

Let us now see, through their documents, what was the path they followed between 1987 and 1994.

In February 1987, the revisionists explained in a document entitled "Proposals for a political outcome", that "once the law is laid down, and basically the duty to end the fascist order, it is possible to find a consensus for the use of all forms of struggle which make it possible to obtain victory”.

The document adds: "It is certain that we consider knowledge of the military art, the preparation of military cadres and the development of a special policy for the men who will join the army, as unalterable imperatives of 'a revolutionary party.

But it should not be used and we will never use armed means when the will of the people can be expressed and carried out freely and democratically”.

There is no shadow of a doubt: ambiguity is a real art with them. The phrase "all forms of struggle" loses its force by being accommodated to the new political situation.

Following this new political situation, in 1987 the revisionists separated from their armed wing the FPMR, transforming it into the Patriotic Movement Manuel Rodriguez (MPMR).

About the autonomous FPMR, we will say no more, because this experience of armed revisionism requires a study apart.

Denying what they had once said - namely that they would not participate in the plebiscite by what it would only be a fraud - the Central Committee meeting in Plenum in June 1988 called to vote for "no" to October 1988 referendum. Obviously, they actively participated in the "no" campaign, thus legitimizing the Constitution of 1980.

In May 1989, the declaration of the XVth Congress explained: “The popular mass rebellion, this is the name of our political line in this period. It is the articulation point of strategy and tactics to resolve the main dictatorship /

democracy contradiction. Its objective is to advance towards the end of fascism, to conquer and to deepen democracy”.

A little before, in March of the same year, Volodia Teitelboim, at the head of the pro-Soviet revisionist clique, explained the content of the policy of popular mass rebellion: "About the popular rebellion of the masses, I must say that denominations must try to respond to the essence of a policy. The names may be more or less appropriate.

But when we proposed the denomination "popular rebellion of the masses", we obviously did not intend to propose the social revolution, because in this case we would have used other words.

For us, rebellion is a massive act in the face of an unjust situation. It is not the seizure of power.

It is not the change of the system, although a series of rebellions can, in a given country, culminate in a revolutionary process which leads to the seizure of power and a revolution. But here it is not about that. It cannot be that. "

A confession is worth proof. He adds: "It seems to me that the popular mass rebellion must be understood in this period as the necessary mode of action by the ballot box, by vote, which is also a weapon, and very powerful. "

Such were the political preparations to support the candidates of the Concertation for the presidential elections of the end of 1989, about which they had declared that they were not going to participate.

In other documents of the end of February 1990, they said that: "it is with our defending body that the people identified the Popular Rebellion with a certain form of struggle."

It was natural that increasingly large popular layers began to see in armed violence not only the highest form of struggle against oppression, but also, in its possible development as a revolutionary armed struggle, the only practicable way. for the democratic revolution, solution of the contradictions of Chilean society.

And for this reason: the main form of struggle, the only one capable of giving a decisive resolution to the political tasks which arise from these contradictions.

Obviously, where the people can and wants, revisionism cannot and will not.

Revisionism, which in the face of the refusal of the fascist military junta, had triggered the use of "heightened violence" to "open political spaces for participation", can only ultimately get a bad seat in the tail wagon the big bourgeoisie.

In addition, the Christian Democratic Party, which had vetoed the entry of the revisionist clique in the Concertation, knew well that among "all forms", there were the votes, from which it would benefit. For their part, the revisionists were going to justify this tactical passage by the logic of "lesser evil", just as they knew that in exchange for the abandonment of "acute violence", they would obtain their legalization.

Yankee imperialism and the bourgeoisie, then represented by the Concertation, could therefore safely continue the accumulation on the basis of the plunder of natural resources, the overexploitation of the working class and the oppression of the national masses.

The main enemies of the people knew that the numerous mass organizations - which depended on the revisionist leadership - harnessed to it and following it until the almost total pacification of the popular movement, would generate the conditions for governability: the political and social stability that the Junta could not guarantee for their business.

We must insist for a moment on this. "The state," says Lenin, "is the product and expression of the irreconcilable character of class contradictions. The state arises at the time and to the extent that class contradictions can no longer objectively be reconciled.

And conversely, the existence of the state shows that class contradictions are irreconcilable. "

He also adds: "According to Marx, the state is the instrument of class domination, an instrument of repression from one class to another, it is the creation of an order "that legalizes and strengthens this oppression, by absorbing the shocks between the classes".

This is where Lenin's thesis comes from on the need to destroy, to demolish this tool of domination.

Therefore, when the people of our country began to understand that revolutionary violence should not only be used to exchange one military government for another, civilian; when the people began to discern, as a product

of their own fighting spirit, that this change would be a simple consequence of the accomplishment of their fundamental political task, that is to say, the destruction of the bourgeois state-landowner; when precisely there were the most favourable conditions for making revolutionary propaganda understood by the people, around the necessity of the dictatorship of the revolutionary classes over the reactionary classes, of the dictatorship of the majority over the minority, at that time the revisionism,

Let's continue the journey. At the Xth Plenum of the Central Committee in 1990, they affirmed: "The Congress and the Conference agree on the general aspects of our political line aimed at establishing in Chile a socialist, democratic and humanitarian society, with pluralist leadership, which accepts the principle of alternating government and which does not invoke the dictatorship of the proletariat as a form of exercising the hegemony of the working class in society."

Now it is precisely this - the dictatorship of the proletariat - which is for any consistent Marxist, as Lenin said, a non-negotiable principle.

In 1994, they complete the abandonment of the policy of "popular mass rebellion" and formulate their policy of "democratic revolution", by which they claim to drive a change in the balance of power, to put an end to the bipartisanship which prevents them to participate in parliament.

The declaration of the XX Congress in 1994 says: "The need to reach the strategic objective of conquering a truly democratic regime, not subject to military tutelage or to imperial and employer powers, such is the meaning of our proposal for revolution democratic. "

This evaluation of their policy of popular rebellion is symptomatic of their shameless opportunism: "Time has given us reason. If the path we had proposed had been followed, consisting of a political outcome for the masses, with a united opposition, led by a democratic coalition encompassing all the opposition sectors of the time (political parties, human rights organizations; the social world, with its unions, professional groups, cultural entities, of youth, all gathered in a Citizenship Assembly), and carrying out actions as powerful and combative as mass protests which would have thrown tyranny in the greatest embarrassment , then it would have collapsed.

The strength of an entire people in the street, would have made it possible, through its mobilization, to achieve an unhindered democracy, genuine

freedom, without mortgage or military dependence, without the "leading role" of the army. "

This single paragraph clearly shows what they look like. They speak of a "political outcome of the masses".

But all Marxists know that the solution of the fundamental problems of Chilean society requires an armed exit of the masses for the conquest of power, by the armed organization of the masses for the defense of conquered power, that is a question of principle which must constitute the highest expression of a revolutionary communist policy.

To avoid confusion, we emphasize that the problem does not lie in a change of government, but in the total demolition of the old state, the expulsion of imperialism and the confiscation of the property of the big bourgeoisie and landowners.

The height of this declaration is that they refer to the "leading role" of the army, nothing more. It is for this reason that their policy on this subject consists in dePinochettising the army and the police, because they regard them as a heritage of the whole people, and not of a single sector of Chilean society. The Chilean state army constitutes a counter-revolutionary strategic pillar, isn't this one of the great lessons of history, confirmed by the Coup d'état and what preceded it?

7. The "turn": revisionism recovers memory

In 1994, when they exposed their way to a "political outcome of the masses", they did not discuss their military achievements in the face of the fascist military junta.

But as the decade advances and we enter the 21st century, they begin to "recover" memory. For its part, the workers' and popular movement is starting to experience a new boom in its struggles.

For this reason, revisionism had to dust off its armed experience, on the one hand to "re-enchant" the masses and a large part of their militants, and on the other hand to "remind" the government of the memory of what happened is produced when they were put in the ropes politically from the Coup of 1973.

Despite this flirtation with their memory and their skills, the Tellier and Carmona clique never forgot to assert, as was the case in the 1950s with Corvalan, that they posed no threat to any respectable interest.

Indeed, during the convocation to the XXIIth congress, they explain the tactic of the shift in the application of the line of democratic revolution, consisting in that "only the organization, the struggle and the social mobilization will impose democratic changes and will break the obstacles imposed by the current institutional structure."

They add to this the need "for a change in our mode of political action, which makes social mobilization, in rebellion against the political orders of the system, the key to the accumulation of forces ... This must be the centre of our political practice in the coming period ...

A system so illegitimate and undemocratic as the current system can only be confronted by an attitude of rebellion and total confrontation ...

This does not mean abandoning electoral battles, but participating in them in an absolutely different way than today. We only come to elections after the most intense social struggle and only as an expression of it.

The main thing today is not participation in electoral processes or institutional structures. This implies a change in the way we do politics. "

Further, they affirm in the same convocation. "We demand in particular that the monopoly of militarist and right-wing political currents in the army be ended, and that the indispensable pluralism which is the condition of democracy be assumed".

And further on, as an indirect reminder to the government, they add: "The military aspects of politics cannot and should not be ignored and it is our duty to safeguard as experience of the party all the experiences and capabilities that we have acquired in the period when we passed the historical vacuum of our political development which was highlighted by the military coup of September 11, 1973.

This is only possible if these aspects of politics are the subject of constant concern on the part of party structures, and we take the offensive whenever we claim to discredit the immense contribution developed in the fight against dictatorship by hundreds of our comrades. "

The "electoral battles" are not abandoned, but to win them you must accumulate forces, that is to say increase the number of voters, and this is done by mobilizing the masses to the polls.

It is, as Lenin said, "a submissive uprising". They say that elections are not the main thing, but then what is the main thing?

In ambiguity, no expert can beat the revisionists.

"The main thing today is not participation in electoral processes or institutional structures," they formulated at the time of the turn. This is what we call "sentences that look pretty", but we should clarify: a pretty opportunistic look.

These are sentences made to fool the naive, since anyone knows that their fight against their exclusion from the political system and for the end of bipartisanship, they do not lead it to look at the parliament from the opposite window.

It is rather that with this sentence, they claim to calm the growing dissatisfaction of their activists, not only vis-à-vis the poor electoral results, it is obvious, but also in the face of uselessness and the counter-revolutionary character elections, and what is worse, faced with the complicity which is acquired by participating in and legitimizing them.

On the other hand, as we have said, the problem of the Chilean army, since they recognize it as a democratic institution of all Chileans, arises in their eyes as that of ending the monopoly of the right and its currents within it, to reach "the indispensable pluralism".

8. The development of the "turn" around the XXIIth Congress: a little more parliamentary cretinism, always the same, old and rotten

In June 2006, during his "Convocation to the XXIIIth Congress" considering the political changes which took place in Latin America, they launched a set of more radical proposals, from the point of view of "the use of the most diverse forms of struggle" (we emphasize, "the most diverse" are no longer "all forms of struggle").

This convocation tries to make believe that the workers and students mobilizations were the fruit of the "tactical turn", in the midst of which developed the proposals made to Bachelet [the current Social Democrat

president] during the electoral campaign for the second round and which in their view has the backdrop of "wide convergence" to end the electoral system of bipartisanship.

It deserves to be said that the popular struggles constitute for them, at the same time as a bargaining chip to negotiate their obstinate electoral ambitions, a mechanism that can get them out of trouble in the face of the growing discredit that they undergo within of the masses and in the face of their own internal crisis, produced precisely by the "tactical step" made during the second round of the presidential elections, which left in the greatest dejection a significant part of their militants, who work honestly and genuinely for a revolution democratic.

But the revisionist leadership, blind of arrogance, dares to assert in the convocation: "Our challenge consists in appropriating this new political moment, which will allow us to determine the character and the rhythm of the initiatives to be undertaken to isolate the sectors which represent transnational financial capital and its allies, and thus succeed in the strategic advances that we are tracing for the current period".

This amounts to admitting openly that if it is necessary to curb the popular movement, according to their policies, they will do it.

"Character" and "rhythm" are what determine it, against any expression of "maximalism" in the party or outside of it.

It is a question of insinuating a repositioning vis-à-vis all forms of radicalized or "acute" struggle.

In this sense, it took consummate art to keep the militants and sympathizers deluded by the reestablishment of the policy of mass rebellion, while displaying a speech which wipes out the preparation for the uprising, in other words "total confrontation" as it was said in 2002.

"The Communists, educated by the tragic experience lived by the Chilean people, know that we must always be ready to use all forms of struggle, but it must also be very clear that there are times adapted to each of them.

Provocations and violent actions without meaning and without political reason, detached from the real movement of the masses, slow down and prevent the struggle of the masses, which is today the main one.

This does not discredit self-defense in any way if one persists in subjecting the people to aggression or provocations, and to the neo-Nazi attacks which have emerged in recent times.

These forms of struggle and self-defense must generate better conditions for street movements and protests to be expressed in massive and multiple ways. The revisionist discourse is becoming very sophisticated, since the achievements of the 1980s have given it a revolutionary aura.

But it quickly vanishes, as soon as it is shaken, its true background appears: old and putrid parliamentary cretinism. With or without weapons, what has not changed in the space of 50 years is not going to change everything suddenly, neither with the “tactical turn”, nor with the recall of the “acquired”.

This is how, in the words of Lautaro Carmona himself - the top leader of revisionism - pronounced in early 2006, we can see the truth on the evidence: "We need a state, he says, that takes charge the task of generating decent sources of work, which provides services to everyone, such as health and education, and electoral laws which allow all sensitivities to be represented in institutions. We do not want to return to socialism, we have proposals for the 21st century. "

Compare these words to those said half a century ago, by Luis Corvalán, at the 24th Plenary Session of the Central Committee: “We want and we demand our freedom. And we solemnly declare that, free to act in political life, we will not be a threat to any respectable interest.

We are in favour of everything being resolved democratically, in accordance with the will of the majority of the country within the framework of the free play of all parties and currents. We do not aspire today to replace the private property of the Chilean capitalists with collective property.

And when tomorrow it will be necessary to advance on this ground, we think that it must also be done with the agreement of the majority of the Chileans, by the peaceful way and by guaranteeing the well-being and the rights of the capitalists, it that is, by compensating them as it should. "

9. More on the bourgeois military line of revisionism

With regard to the thirtieth anniversary of the Triggering of the Task [defeating fascism], in this convocation to the 2006 congress, they clarify - intended for

those who may have "forgotten" - the characteristics of the policy of mass rebellion, and who, they say, breathed life into the Task.

"In April of this year, we will celebrate the 30 years of the Triggering of the Task, and in September the 20 years of the Carrizal operation [operation of reception by the Patriotic Front Manuel Rodriguez of a large quantity of weapons coming from the Cuban Sea, having been discovered and defeated on August 6, 1986] and the armed attack on the tyrant's convoy.

To carry out these actions, we brought together more than a hundred ex-officers trained in Cuba and in other countries who made common cause with us, revolutionary internationalist officers. Nineteen of them lost their lives in combat. Ten have returned to their countries. They have contributed to the implementation of our popular rebellion policy against the dictatorship. Many have been imprisoned, many are still being prosecuted, others are living abroad because of the banishment ban, a significant number of them have lost their lives in premeditated assassinations carried out by the repressive forces. Those who live in Chile have integrated into civilian life. "

The document continues:

"The Communist Party recognizes the role of each of them in one name: that of Raúl Pellegrini, first leader of the Frente Patriótico Manuel Rodríguez, which was largely made up of militants of the Communist Party. Rodriguism was an achievement of the Communist Party, which continues today and remains in each of us. "

Patient readers, compare these "sentences" with those of Volodia Teitelboim in the interview of May 1990, which we repeat: "It is with our defending body that the people identified the Popular Rebellion with a certain form of struggle".

Waking up from an opportunist coma and once the tactical amnesia has ended, the party's "heritage" in military matters is unearthed, in the same convocation:

"These commemorations have helped to recognize more fully the role played by the Party in the incorporation of forms of self-defense and armed struggle into the historical heritage of the Chilean popular movement, and in connection with this, they have highlighted worth the need to implement with determination the military policy of the Party in this period, because by advancing towards the achievement of the political objectives that we set, the political confrontation will sharpen and clarify what will be the form of development of the

revolutionary struggle. We must be prepared politically and ideologically to wage distinct forms of struggle if the circumstances demand it. "

Note that the use of weapons in the political struggle, "acute violence" as the revisionist clique occasionally calls it, can be considered as an "armed struggle", but then in this case, the use of this concept would reflect a partial and limited use of the thing, a use not very rigorous with regard to the military doctrine of the proletariat.

In this sense, the massive protests developed between 1983 and 1986, which in part only obeyed the application of the "Popular Mass Rebellion Policy" (PRPM), could have resulted in a "national uprising" in 1986, that is to say an insurrection, which would have placed revisionism at the head of a provisional government (this is how they posed the problem in the early 1980s).

Without ignoring these aspects, it must be seen that the armed struggle waged by revisionism was used as a strategy of "acute violence" under the watchword "all forms of struggle", but this strategy never counted on a "democratic coalition" "united - as they wished - and which was fundamental for their model of uprising necessarily passing for them by political alliances. That is to say that their strategy never had the support of the Christian Democratic Party, but on the contrary its most absolute rejection.

But in 2006, referring to the 1980s, the "PRPM" and its crowning achievement in the national uprising turned into a "political outcome for the masses".

They speak of the armed struggle as "historical heritage" and then affirm "the need to implement with determination the military policy of the Party". What a sentence again! As if they were going to take up arms again!

It is nothing but a mirror with larks, they wave fireflies to dazzle the simple. They say they are prepared "to undertake separate forms of struggle", but no longer all forms of struggle. It is therefore possible that they are preparing for the national uprising, the electoral uprising.

Between 1905 and 1921, Russia went through three revolutions and the Civil War.

In October 1902, Lenin had not experienced any revolutionary attempt, still less a triumphant revolution; but let us look carefully at how this Bolshevik leader reflected and compare with the hesitant revisionist assertion of a while ago,

about how in the future "the form of development of the revolutionary struggle will be clarified".

Lenin said: "As long as we do not have solidly united revolutionary organizations capable of assembling sufficient detachments to direct all aspects of a demonstration, failure will be inevitable.

But once this organization is structured and strengthened in the course of its work, thanks to a series of experiences, it can then solve the problem of when and how to arm, when and how to use weapons. This organization must work seriously, as much to increase the "speed of the demonstration" (very important factor, which the author of the letter rightly points out), to increase the number of active demonstrators, to train the leaders of the demonstration, to attract the "mass of spectators" to participate in "the task" and to "corrupt" the troops.

It is precisely because a process like that of launching into the armed street struggle is "hard", and because "sooner or later it is inevitable", that it is necessary to give it a solid revolutionary organization, which immediately placed itself at the outposts of the movement. "

The problem is that, despite the existence of honest foundations, the Tellier-Carmona revisionist clique and the party they lead are not a "solid revolutionary organization", but the opposite of that. The path to hell is paved with good intentions.

Before continuing, we must make a small but useful theoretical digression.

The proletarian military line is the application of the military theory of the proletariat, which is the accumulation of the experience of the armed struggle against oppression and exploitation in different countries: this is the People's War led by the proletarian parties, and it must be stressed that this theory requires the establishment of bases of support, that is to say the new power, which can only exist at the end of the gun.

The Marxist theory on the State starts from the fact that the army, the courts, the parliament, are constituent parts of it and that in the final analysis it is institutions which defend the interests of the reactionary ruling classes that they represent, and which must therefore be destroyed, demolished.

Revisionism, on the contrary, spreads the illusion of a peaceful change in the attitude of the army and the police towards the people.

Revisionism is based on the principle that the state expresses determined power relations which can be changed without having to destroy it from top to bottom as an apparatus.

From there flows its bourgeois military line which was so magnificently exhibited at the XXIII Congress:

“Thus, we must give continuity and a systematic character to initiatives directed towards the army and the gendarmerie. ”

Although it is certain that the Chilean army is not yet democratized and has not separated from the defense of reactionary interests or its doctrine of national security, and that many responsible for human rights violations go unpunished , it is not written that the army will necessarily obstruct any popular project of alternative to neoliberalism.

The experience of various revolutionary and progressive processes in Latin America and our own experience show that military institutions are not impervious to the ideas of social change. Sometimes the strength of the popular movement is such that they play, in whole or in part, a different role, favorable to popular interests. ”

What is certain is that they cannot give a concrete example of this for our country or for the other Latin American nations.

The army and the police are the last resort of the Chilean bourgeois landowner, and 100 years after the events of the Santa María de Iquique School [massacre which took place on December 21, 1907, where thousands of striking saltpeter workers were killed while taking refuge in a school in the town of Iquique], it is irresponsible and criminal (given their repressive and genocidal trajectory) to spread illusions about them.

However, revisionism in Chile can do it, and it did. To say that it is not "written" is to say that the exception confirms the rule, and the rule is that historical experience in each concrete case shows that the essentially anti-popular and counter-revolutionary character of the army in each country and internationally, is indisputable.

We are far from having exhausted the characterization of this opportunist current within the popular movement by this article.

In any case, the ambivalent nature of revisionism, its imprecise definitions which seek to please everyone have nothing to do with Marxist tactics, which always evolve within well-defined principles, something on which Lenin has always been categorical.

Tactical flexibility was admitted, but never about principles, as this amounts to capitulation.

We end this part with this quote, which is a real synthesis, made by Lenin in 1904:

“When we talk about the fight against opportunism, we must not forget a characteristic feature of all contemporary opportunism on all grounds: its indefinite, diffuse, elusive nature. The opportunist, by nature, always seeks to dodge the precise and defined position of problems, he seeks the result, he slides like a snake between irreconcilable points of view, trying to remain in agreement with some and the others, to transform disagreements into small amendments, doubts, innocent good wills, etc., etc. ”

10. Our tasks

Why is revisionism the main danger?

The struggle against revisionism is not only waged outside the communist organizations, but also within them.

This necessary line struggle is the engine of any real communist party.

The problem of colour change and the struggle to always preserve red is a reflection in the communist parties of the class struggle existing in society, regardless of which are the dominant classes at such and such a time.

In this sense, the struggle to the death between socialist and capitalist way was a new battle and a hard problem to face for the communist movement. The USSR and China have been part of the socialist camp for decades. From the moment of the triumph of the proletarian revolution or the revolution of new democracy, the struggle against attempts at capitalist restoration was very hard.

Chairman Mao, head of the Chinese Communist Party, was able not only to critically take up the Soviet experience of building a new society, but also, by applying it to his nation, he took it to the next level. .

This is why the Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution in China (1966-1976), an expression of Chairman Mao's theory of the continuation of the class struggle under the dictatorship of the proletariat, has meant in human history the highest stage in the struggle of the oppressed classes to conquer their final emancipation.

It was, it is certain, one of the forms which the struggle against revisionism took within socialist society and within the communist parties which ruled it.

Propaganda on these important problems is a constant task of all who consider themselves communists. It is a matter of principle when one tackles the struggle against revisionism.

In 1963, the CCP's open letter to the CPSU said: "If the Communists take the path of opportunism, they will transform themselves into bourgeois nationalists and appendages of imperialism and the reactionary bourgeoisie."

Chilean revisionism, embodied in the pseudo-Communist Party of Chile, in the Action Proletarian group and other organizations, fully corresponds to the definition cited above.

They need the masses to wrest some concessions from the government, while trying to keep the illusion alive in a tomorrow free from exploitation, by parliamentary means. Revisionism tries to make people believe that their interests and theirs are one and indistinct; whereas they constitute one more pillar for the maintenance in the state of the current order of things.

In all this lies their danger and the need for revolutionaries to fight against it.

Since its genesis in our country, the workers' and popular movement has not succeeded in getting rid of the influence of the bourgeoisie and the ideology of the ruling classes.

On this subject, Engels explained that during long periods the workers movement accumulates a "colossal pile of refuse", and that it is necessary to sweep it. All revolutions have shown the need to sweep this colossal pile of garbage, to break the crust under which the low and deep masses claim the organization of rebellion.

One of the fundamental aspects of Marxist tactics is precisely to go to the bottom and deep of the masses.

In our revolutionary political work, we cannot relax vigilance in the face of revisionism and its role within the popular movement.

While directing ourselves from the bottom and deep of the masses, towards the partyless and unorganized masses, we must work systematically on all grounds to unmask the revisionists in the very process where we bind ourselves to the masses and their struggles.

Whenever they persist in riding on the backs of the masses, we must know how to take advantage of the impulse they must give to the popular movement (something they cannot not do, under pain of expulsion outside its ranks) to better denounce them when once satisfied with their petty political demands, they try to slow down and stem the popular outburst.

We must act flexibly when binding on the masses, despite the existence or the presence of revisionism in people's organizations. We have to take the direction of the movement away from them.

The occasional denunciation of revisionism is insufficient to dislodge them from the leadership and expel them from the ranks of the workers' and popular movement.

Because it is a task which the masses themselves must take up, a patient action of explanation is necessary among them.

We must teach the masses and learn from them at all times: when the struggles are preparing, when they take place and when they have ended, in the intervals between such and such a period of open struggle, etc.

To achieve this, we must unite with the masses, organize them, mobilize them, politicize them and build the communist organization - with a view to founding the Communist Party of Chile (Marxist-Leninist-Maoist).

We repeat. Explain, educate, learn and fight resolutely with the masses without losing sight of the fact that all this is part of the inevitable preparations to start the people's war first and then develop it.

Union of Revolutionary Communists (Marxists-Leninists-Maoists)