

Revolution

In general for the authors of Marxist inspiration, revolution is "an act of insurrection, an act of violence, for which a class defeats another." Here the violence is marked by the fight of classes. Violence and revolution are intertwined. The very organized violence is, then, the shortest distance between two points, between two socio-economic and political systems. Marx who defined the revolutionary role that has the "force" like "the midwife of all pregnant society of the new one was". Engels, in turn, highlights "the moral and spiritual immense impulse that has been of all victorious revolution". And Mao Sedung affirms that "the essential mission and the highest form in revolution is the taking of the political power for the armed force and the solution of the problems by means of the war."

The Marxist-Leninist conception of revolution

According to Marx's theory and Engels, the step in a social way to other -in the societies divided by classes -it can only happen for a revolution, that is to say, for a social deep transformation, thoroughly using the political power. "The fundamental problem is the problem of the power", Lenin said pointing with clarity to the heart of the matter.

Regarding the way of making this revolution of the labor class, Lenin criticizes simultaneously:

- the call 'revolutionarism' (or vulgar 'putschism') that very to the slight one, it rushes to the taking of the power, without mediating the previous conditions - objective and subjective- for a true revolution

- and the call continuous way (or cowardly conformism) that accepts that the things continue like they are, without preparing actively the psychological and social conditions of the revolution.

Lenin is constant in his thesis that the demolition of the bureaucratic-military machinery of the bourgeois State is "previous condition of all popular true revolution". But this statement of the unavoidable character of the violent revolution, has -in his opinion- two exceptions: 1) first, that only refers to the bourgeois State; and 2) second, that is only given like general rule. It allows exceptions and diverse applications. "The revolutions are not made by responsibility." Of ordinary and the most probable thing is that the revolution will happen for the road of a revolutionary armed violence.

They should not forget the three conditions that Lenin demanded they were given so that the insurrection could triumph. The insurrection cannot rely on simple actions terrorists, but rather it should ride on the revolutionary ascent of the people and it should be given in the opportune and favorable moment of the 'turning around of the history.' Not before neither later. And ¿which this moment is it? It is the critical moment in the history of a country. "Only when those <of below> they don't want, and those <of up> they cannot continue living as before ".

The revolution doesn't arise of all revolutionary situation, but only of a situation in the one that to the *objective* changes before enunciated it comes to be added a *subjective* change, that is: the capacity of the revolutionary class to carry out actions revolutionaries of masses the quite strong ones as to destroy (or to smash) the old government that never <he will fall>, not even in the crisis times, if he is not made fall.

For Lenin, the revolution it is something serious, responsible and creative. It is not an risky play, neither it can be a daring game of youths that they seek to make the war like they make love. And condition 'sine qua non' of the Marxist-Leninist revolution it is to "come closer to the masses." The approaching to the masses is the prerequisite for the conquest of the popular power.

It is, this way, undoubtedly for the Marxist-Leninist authentic strategy, the terrorist actions, detached of a revolutionary true ascent of the masses, they are desperate simple expressions, 'stertors' of those who don't really believe in the

revolution. They don't pass of being simple armed mannerisms of non-revolutionaries.

The terror (terrorism of small-bourgeois anarchist groups and semi-anarchists) is the result, as well as the symptom and the partner, of the lack of faith in the insurrection, of the lack of conditions for the insurrection.

The Gramscian conception of revolution

In feeling of Italian Antonio Gramsci -who wrote his reflections from the jail in that it maintained him per years Mussolini-, the characteristics of the capitalist current societies of West (inside which Venezuela is counted), impose a global new approach of the Marxist revolutionary strategy.

They give the back to the history and they are not very Marxist-Leninist the revolutionaries that wanted today to propose like a model the Bolshevik revolution as applicable to all situation, forgetting the concrete context that facilitated it. For Gramsci, the characteristics of the Russian society in 1917 are not those of the current societies of West, but rather those of the French society of 1789.

"They didn't still exist the big parties of masses neither the economic big unions, and the society was still in state of fluency in many aspects: bigger backwardness of the field and almost complete monopoly of the state efficiency in few cities, state apparatus little developed, and bigger autonomy of the civil society regarding the state activity.

In East, the State was everything, the civil society was primary and jellied; in West, between State and civil society there is a precise relationship, and behind the hesitations of the State it is discovered a robust structure of the civil society immediately. The State is not but an advanced trench, behind which appears a solid chain of strengths and bunkers" (A. Gramsci).

The theory of the revolutionary armed violence -formulated by Lenin in 1917- was adjusted to some concrete economic and cultural conditions. Russia was then an Oriental country, with "a civil primary and jellied society", and a State apparatus little developed. The strategy 'insurreccional' adopted by Lenin was not due to a supposed 'jacobinism' or his risky intention, but it was dictated by the circumstances of then that they recommended as more effective "*a movement war*", to the style military. This strategy is inadequate today in capitalist societies, like it is the case of Venezuela. These societies are very well today safeguarded by "two defense lines, that is: one of State type that is strong and organized; and another conformed by the hundred of bunkers and strengths of the civil society, ramified to the wide thing, that they are endowed with bigger resources and much bigger resistance that before". In this case, the most advisable thing is "*a position war*":

"The step of the movement (and of the front attack) war to the position war, finds me it is the question of political more important theory outlined by the period of post-war, and the most difficult of solving wisely. It is related with the questions raised by Bronstein [Trotsky], which can be considered, in a way or other, as the theoretical politician of the front attack... In the politics one has movement war while it is about conquering non decisive positions and, therefore, all the resources of the hegemony of the State are not mobilized. But when -for an or another reason- those positions have lost all value and they only care the decisive positions, then it spends to the fence war, compressed, difficult, in which exceptional qualities of patience and invention spirit are required" (A. Gramsci, according to J.C. Portantiero 1977)..

In other words, for Gramsci, the revolutionary conquest of the power today -in a western country and capitalist as Venezuela- cannot be the result of a sparkling action that provoke insurrection the day X a hour 0, neither the taking of Government's Palace or of the Parliament for a terrorist command. It should be the result of an entire socio-cultural process that was penetrating and dominating the bunkers and strengths of the civil society, before giving the final claw to the Palace of the czars. Only this way today the "revolution of the majorities" is made.

Commenting this gramscian strategy of the revolution, Bonomi says with sharpness :

"We are habituated to a type reading <bulldozer> of Lenin, for who the bourgeois State is demolished, it is not changed. And habituated to a reading <rifle> of Mao, for who the power is in the tip of the rifle. We don't do without this way of the absurd proposal here and now, of the taking of Palace of Winter or of a long march".

False revolution concepts

The Colombian sociologist Antonio García has a study, not very well-known but valuable, on the leader 'revolutionary' Jorge Eliécer Gaitán, murdered April 9 1948 in Bogotá. It allows us to ponder what is and what is not a true revolution.

Leaving of the revolutionary and dialectical concept of revolution, just as it comes off of the Gaitán thought, we can adopt this square of negations, in order to specifying his ideological frontiers:

1. The revolution is not the return in the history

Anything has been as dangerous as the sublimation that has made the classic sociology of the "primitive collectivism". Because it has taken to believe that the Age of Gold is to our backs, in that foggy age in the one that -like in the speech of Don Quixote- there was not neither yours neither mine. This superstition of return trip is not only married with the romantic conceptions from those who have returned the view behind, to the agrarian and primitive societies to find in them a spontaneous form of life and an absence of conflicts. It is identified with the most reactionary thought, individualist and hostile to the true socialism. The naturalistic dreams of Rousseau or the one heightened project of Cooperative Republic, the

yearning to arrive to a society without internal conflicts, they are not more neither less idealistic than other dreams: because the humanity doesn't progress beginning again and because the primitive societies didn't have the spontaneity, the fluency and the absence of conflicts that the communist and liberal philosophers attribute her. All society is fight and there is not revolution that is good to put an end to the human conflicts, but to exchange some conflicts for others. The rest is a negation of the society and of the history. A true revolution cannot go nowadays against the industrialization and the technical progress. The industrialization like only means of improving the economic supports of the system of life, and the technical progress as only base to transform the nature and conditions of a late economy and clerk.

2. The revolution is not the catastrophe decreed for tomorrow

The revolution is a process of deep transformations and not a change of curtains. And less still to place a catastrophic curtain, so of the pleasure of the anarchists of all the times. All anarchist conception of the revolution has a catastrophic essence. Similar doctrine was the consequence in the way like it was focused the character of the capitalism, as a sandy system, without defenses, without possibilities of facing the crisis or the revolutionary fights. To the thesis of the automatic landslide it should correspond the thesis of the catastrophic revolution, made without appeal, assault carried out when the dawn to a strength disarmed and without defenders. The social transformation is not for an immediate realization. It is not it works at the moment; they are not enough the simple enthusiasms, but rather you need to give time at the time.

3. The revolution is not a simple act of illuminated

The revolution doesn't resemble the trains that are limited to already travel some rails layouts, at one hour on the dot. There is something of 'illumination', of mystic accent, of intuition, in the French revolution or in the Russian revolution, in the Chinese revolution, in the Mexican revolution and in the Cuban, the biggest revolutions in the contemporary world. But the 'illumination' is not the characteristic of the revolution, but one of its emotive ingredients. The revolutionary doesn't

resemble Elías, of face to the sky, in search of the prophetic inspiration. All revolution is work of a conscience and of a organization for the fight.

This is the great misunderstanding of so many 'revolutionaries' in our Latin-American countries: the one of believing that the simple and confused class resentment can be a substitute of the conscience. "Fight, yes but conscious fight". If the revolution is not an act of illuminated as Bakunin or Elías, its bottom problem is arming to the people, with the weapons of those that cannot be robbed, that is: the organization and the conscious fight.

4. The revolution is not revolt

The revolt is the employment of the force -military or political, organized or rainy- without ulterior objectives of transformation: the force for the same force, the force for the power, the force for the revenge. Its dynamics is not revolutionary, since it doesn't look for to transform anything, neither its horizon goes beyond the physical taking of the power or of the collapse of a political order. The revolution supposes the application of some means -violent or not, bloody or bloodless- of conquering some ends of social transformation that don't finish in the physical capture of the power. All revolution looks for the transformation of the society, taking it later on and above, the taking of the power doesn't only suppose the destruction of a "legal "order, but the creation of a new right order and of some new conditions of operation of the society.

In the revolt there is a terrorist and tactical employment of the force, because only search the annihilation of something or of somebody; behind that violent impulse there is not any horizon, any hope, any on the way to liberation. The revolt is pure and simple negation -destruction, blow, rupture- as long as the revolution is a negation phenomenon in order to being able to build a new world. The revolution should be a river that advances for the history and it cannot transform into a calm and nauseous well.

5. The revolution is not jump to the hole

One of the essential defects of all anarchist and negative employment of the force is that ignores the way to traffic and the arrival point. The revolt is the jump to the hole. When is destroyed what exists without replacing it for another world, for another order, for another bed, the laws of the history are substituting for those of the chance, the causation is replacing for the chance. The revolt is negative and sterile -historically- because who destroys or obstructs an order, without creating one new, he doesn't make -in definitive- but producing disorder. The revolution is encouraged by the dynamics of its objectives, as the arrow for the impulse that shoots it toward the target. For that reason anything is so contrary to the revolution that the hitchhike of to break or to dislocate an existent order, without knowing why and for what reason. No great revolutionary man has been an adventurer: neither Robespierre, neither Marat, neither Lenin, neither Bolívar, neither Washington, they have sympathized with the "jump to the hole." For them, the revolution is a traffic mission in the development of the human life, not an adventure, neither an useless and unconscious gating of the social forces. The revolutionary is the theoretical one and the strategist of the transformation -and for that reason it should work in past function, of present and of future- never a gambler that plays irresponsibly with the life and the hope of the people.

6. The revolution is not reformism

When we affirm that "the revolution is not reformism", we don't want to deny the importance and the necessity of the reformation, neither less to accept the classic communist dilemma of revolution or reforms. The truth is that the reformation can be revolutionary or against revolutionary, as one has for object to give exit to the social pressures or to repress those pressures, blinding them, obstructing its drainage channels.

The conservative reformation doesn't look for to remedy the wrongs, but to offer palliatives and to simulate solutions of the problems. The revolutionary reformation pursues to give partial solutions that accelerate the evolution of the society and don't obstruct the revolutionary impulses. Sweden that is today a developed country and egalitarian, it has not had in their history a great revolution (with violence and destruction), but a continuous succession of small and medium reformations that

they allow it to be what is today. The same thing, the establishment of the socialist system of social security in England -when the Labour Party was in the power- it was a revolutionary reformation, because it improved the life of the society and it was a new slice in the evolution of the English community toward the democracy of full participation and toward the humanist socialism that characterizes it. Today in Venezuela we should try to reconcile the revolutionary objectives with the reformist tactics. Not to be simply reformist, but aspiring to transform the entirety of our system of life, believing in the validity of the reformist tactics to arrive to the Engaged Earth.