

## Jacques Grippa and Maurice Massoz the TV broadcast complete text

---

**Published:** *La Voix du Peuple* #22 May 28<sup>th</sup> 1965 pp4-5 English translation JPRS, Translations on International Communist Developments #726 June 23 1965

**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 & proofreaders above.

---

### First Question

First question by Mr. Gillot d'Anderlecht:

Since the Communist Party is already weak in Belgium, why divide it by questions of ideology which have nothing to do with Belgium?

This same question was asked by Mr. Dobbstein of Verriers, Mr. Paul Defosset of Woluwe-Saint-Pierre, Mr. Charles Matriche of Ans. A question on the same order was asked by Mr. Sagorge from Bruxelles and Mr. Jagens of Forest. Mr. Cauwe from Strepv-Bracquegnies would like to see the difference between your party and the Belgian communist party clarified. The same question was posed by Mr. Rouisse from Schaerbeek and Mrs. Monique Charlier, from Uccle.

### Answer:

Well, I believe that this question has three subdivisions:

- 1) Are these simply ideological questions?
- 2) Would these ideological questions be exported or imported in some way into Belgium from abroad?
- 3) Who divides and who has divided?

The comrades, the listeners who posed the question, anxious about the force of the Communist Party in Belgium, anxious about its unity, should remember why the Communist Party was created in Belgium in 1921.

Precisely in opposition to a policy of treason, a reformist policy, the policy of the social-democracy which led to the betrayal of 1914, which led to a policy of total collaboration of the classes between the leaders of the social

democracy -- from the P.O.B. to the present -- and the bourgeoisie.

And what provoked the schism, in fact, fundamentally within the Communist Party in 1953, are the same questions, not only ideological ones -- though of course ideological ones also -- but political ones, organizational ones in the domain of the immediate struggle for demands also.

In fact, it is a question of the entire difference between subsequent revolutionaries, faithful to the principles, faithful to their final goal, that is, the overthrow of the capitalist society and the establishment of a classless society, where all remnants of oppression and exploitation of man by man characterizing the bourgeois society would be banished, which makes it necessary for the Communist Party to be the vanguard party, a revolutionary party heading the daily combat of the working class, of its allies, of the whole of the workers of the country, practising the consequent proletarian internationalism, with firmness, and opposing the bourgeoisie without fear, without dread. These are all the problems which have been thrown into the debate for several years and which led to the schism, which we regret, certainly, but which was desired and organized literally by those whom we call the revisionists. Why revisionists? Because they are trying to revise precisely the fundamental problems of the doctrine, they are trying to revise marxism-leninism, and in fact, they are denying it.

And when one looks at it from close up, it is beginning with the Belgian problem that the divergences were fundamental, notably during the course of the great strike of 60-61, notably in regard to the events in the Congo, and then took on a greater and greater scope in all domains.

#### Second Question

The Speaker: Second question from Mrs. or Miss Marguerite Van Temsche from Laeken:

Is it not excessive to compare the actions of the American troops to those of the Nazis and the policy of President Johnson to those of Hitler?

Kassoos.-- This clarifies the answer which Grippa gave to the first question.

When we were with those who had abandoned us to their fate, it was not possible for us to tell the truth, the whole truth, because they, and you heard it, were in favor of constituting a fourth force, a "governmental" party, a party within the regime, and we do not wish to be this party, and we wish to combat the regime and we wish to combat the crimes being committed in the name of this regime.

We say "yes" that the American troops, the troops of American imperialism are behaving like the Nazi troops did,

democracy -- from the P.O.B. to the present -- and the bourgeoisie.

And what provoked the schism, in fact, fundamentally within the Communist Party in 1953, are the same questions, not only ideological ones -- though of course ideological ones also -- but political ones, organizational ones in the domain of the immediate struggle for demands also.

In fact, it is a question of the entire difference between subsequent revolutionaries, faithful to the principles, faithful to their final goal, that is, the overthrow of the capitalist society and the establishment of a classless society, where all remnants of oppression and exploitation of man by man characterizing the bourgeois society would be banished, which makes it necessary for the Communist Party to be the vanguard party, a revolutionary party heading the daily combat of the working class, of its allies, of the whole of the workers of the country, practising the consequent proletarian internationalism, with firmness, and opposing the bourgeoisie without fear, without dread. These are all the problems which have been thrown into the debate for several years and which led to the schism, which we regret, certainly, but which was desired and organized literally by those whom we call the revisionists. Why revisionists? Because they are trying to revise precisely the fundamental problems of the doctrine, they are trying to revise marxism-leninism, and in fact, they are denying it.

And when one looks at it from close up, it is beginning with the Belgian problem that the divergences were fundamental, notably during the course of the great strike of 60-61, notably in regard to the events in the Congo, and then took on a greater and greater scope in all domains.

#### Second Question

The Speaker: Second question from Mrs. or Miss Marguerite Van Tenseke from Laeken:

Is it not excessive to compare the actions of the American troops to those of the Nazis and the policy of President Johnson to those of Hitler?

Kassov.-- This clarifies the answer which Grippa gave to the first question.

When we were with those who had abandoned us to their fate, it was not possible for us to tell the truth, the whole truth, because they, and you heard it, were in favor of constituting a fourth force, a "governmental" party, a party within the regime, and we do not wish to be this party, and we wish to combat the regime and we wish to combat the crimes being committed in the name of this regime.

We say "yes" that the American troops, the troops of American imperialism are behaving like the Nazi troops did,

and that Johnson has followed in Hitler's direction.

And the entire world sees it. We are not alone in saying so. Throughout the entire world, at the present time, it is known, and throughout the entire world, there is arising, against the Americans, a great movement of indignation and of reprobation. And finally, the Americans themselves, to sow terror among people, are organizing around their crimes -- in Vietnam for instance -- a propaganda which shows us how, there, their soldiers and their puppets are disemboweling, tearing out the liver, the heart of the prisoners, violating the women and committing murders whose horror is beyond description.

Well! What did Hitler do that was different, what did his troops do that was different? What did they do at Lidice or Oradour that was different? Or at Sande? And we all know, of course, that the Americans used poison there, gas, bacteria, and they are ready to use atomic weapons tomorrow. Would Hitler have done anything else? No.

There are thousands of concentration camps in Vietnam which are just like Buchenwald, Breendonck, Auschwitz.

And as for Vietnam!

One might speak of the aggressions against Cuba, against Santo Domingo, the aggression in the Congo where, unfortunately, the Americans benefited from the help of the Belgian government, benefited from the active complicity of Lefevre and Spaak, where Belgian soldiers -- unfortunately the Belgian troops! -- commit, on orders from and for American imperialism, heinous crimes which are only too well known throughout the world.

We know that in the Congo, the troops have one order, one single order: to kill without pity, women, old people, children, even though they ask for mercy while crying. We have read this in all the papers. And we know that Spaak promised to send more troops after the elections.

The "Arbitrator" -- We invite you to respect the rules of a certain courtesy a certain objectivity, a certain moderation in the expression of your political thought. I am saying this here so that noone deludes himself. And I would like to say that, of course, you are entirely responsible for your subject matter.

Third Question

Speaker: Third question: It comes from Mr. Emile Marchal, from Woluwe-Saint-Lambert.

What is your position in regard to peaceful coexistence?

Grippa.--We are absolutely and totally in favor of peaceful coexistence among countries and States of different social systems. And I wish, I hope that the listeners

Same question asked by Mr. Pierre Isabeau of Bruxelles.  
Same type of question asked by Mr. Solbre from Gansheren.

Grippa.-- This is a matter of elementary political honesty. I believe that I answered it, though briefly, of course, in the first question, by underlining all that separates us from the Khrushchevians, the revisionists. It is a matter of the revolutionaries on the one hand, and the partisans of class collaboration on the other.

We do not wish to deceive the workers, to court parliamentary seats, to beg for them, we do not wish to deceive them. We want to go to the electoral campaign under our own flag with our own well-defined program, because we feel that this electoral campaign as our entire political struggle is a means of elevating the class conscience of the workers, it is a means of dealing blows to the capitalist system and more precisely to the policy of the government in power, to the policy of subjection to American imperialism.

And, consequently, we cannot make any arithmetic alliances, as some say, which would bring confusion to the spirit of the workers...

(Massoz takes over from Grippa)

Massoz.-- ...And it is no longer a matter of channeling the discontent of the workers. Because a newspaper which reflects the tendency of the socialists of the left who left the P.S.B. (Belgian Socialist Party) has just written that the socialists of the left, particularly in Bruxelles, who are allied with the Khrushchevians, do not question the fact that the P.S.B. is a party of the working class. They accuse us, because we say that the P.S.B. is a bourgeois party within the working class. They say: no, the P.S.B. is a party of the working class where, unfortunately, at the present time, a part of the working class is turning away because it has all good reasons for being dissatisfied with this party and above all its leaders Spaak, etc... AND ABOUT WHOM YOU KEPT ME FROM SAYING EARLIER THAT HE WISHED TO SEND BELGIAN SOLDIERS TO THE CONGO AFTER THE ELECTIONS. And la Gauche (The Left), in the face of this fact, said: "We have created our party to channel the discontent of the workers." We do not agree, we are not here to channel the discontent of the workers and to bring them back into the framework of the systems. We are not here to create a fourth force, we are not there to create a diversion for objectives which are vague, unprecise, or which lead to nothing. For instance, the so-called structural reforms which noone, including their inventors, knows anything about, or else that famous popularly initiated referendum which can serve all purposes and which, furthermore, has existed in Switzerland for more than a

hundred years and of which Marx said, during the last century "that it serves some purpose, of course, though one does not quite wish, but certainly nothing good." And, in effect, it later served, as all plebiscites, men such as Napoleon, Hitler and company. We do not want it, No!

#### Fifth Question

Fifth question from Mr. Roger Brassour from Bruxelles.  
How is the concept of federalism of the Communist Party, Grippa tendency, different from the other parties which have included federalism in their program?

Massee.-- First I will explain the Party's position on federalism, which is the marxists' position. For the marxists, there is no right to federalism. For them the right to federalism would be like the right to marriage for some. In order to get married, there have to be two. For the people, for the peoples, there is a right, the essential right, the first of the rights, which is the right to self-determination. Each person has the right to self-determination. And the people who make up Belgium at the present time each have the right to live their own lives, one might say, to chose their own destinies without interference from anyone. But that is not the case at the present time.

At the present time, in Belgium, the peoples, both the Flemish and the Walloon and the Bruxelles community, are subjected to the ukases of the unitary State, are subjected to its yoke, to its chains which make exploited masses out of them for the benefit of those who hold the reins of the bourgeois State. And we know who they are, we said it earlier. In Belgium, first of all, it is the large trusts, the capitalists, and behind them -- and behind them, and we come back to this again, and this precisely is one of the differences from the other parties -- American imperialism which we denounce as you might have realized, as we denounced with many others throughout the world besides.

We say that the peoples, and the peoples of Belgium included, have the right to self-determination, that is to say, they have the right to chose their destiny without having anyone infringe on this right. And, in effect, what we want is, first of all, that the people overthrow this unitary government which keeps them from spreading, from development. And I think that Grippa will tell you...

Grippa.-- I believe that the goal to be attained, a democratic goal nothing more, is to permit the Walloon people, the Flemish people and the Bruxelles population to assure their self-determination. And that federalism is a method which seems to us able to achieve this self-determination. And, in this way, we differ, in completing this watchword of

Federalism with the watchword of self-determination, we differ effectively from the other partisans of federalism since we see that, when they try to define it, to define their concepts, they place direct limitations on the self-determination of the federated powers, by increasing its scope, by reserving a certain number of matters to the jurisdiction of the federal State. For us, there can be no question of that. Federalism will be a contract among the three communities, the two peoples of Belgium to assure their self-determination, a contract which does not reserve any matter a priori.

The "Arbitrator"-- I would like to justify my intervention earlier. If I thought it necessary to interrupt, it is because I felt that in soul and conscience your topics went beyond the bounds we discussed for this type of broadcast. Of course you are free to affirm yourselves to be revolutionaries and I would not enter into a debate with you on this. But the regulation and the recommendations sent to you before this broadcast, like the representatives of the other parties, particularly recommend to the participants of these broadcasts to strike out from the talk all personal imputation and all terms which might legitimately be considered as injurious. This is what we considered. This is the reason why I asked you to stop your answer to that question.

Grippa: Can we answer?

The "Arbitrator": No

Grippa: One word!

The "Arbitrator": No, you can answer in your press if you desire.

