100th Anniversary of International Workers Day

better society, for the end of wage slavery and the elimination of the exploitation of man by man! Long live the First of May!

Report to the Internationalist Rally, Montreal

by Hardial Bains

Dear Comrades and Friends,

We have come a long way towards this day – more than 20 years of work and struggle, seeking for the working class and people a different life to that which they live today and have lived during the last two decades and more. These days, when we are gathering together, are particular days, days of reflection, of thinking things out – the days of preparation which will determine what is to become of the future. These more than 20 years have brought these days into being today. These more than 20 years have not only been full of an aspiration for a different future, but also full of activity in order to create that future.

It is said and repeated, nationally as well as
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internationally, by those who wish us evil, that we are nowhere. Nay, more, it is said that everything is lost - history has turned its back on us, on freedom, on progress, on socialism; socialism is not the destiny of mankind; the working class is not the builder of socialism; the working class is not the most thoroughly revolutionary class. The extent of brutality and uncultured behaviour in this propaganda is reminiscent of the days of Goebbels and others. It is anathema to mankind, to the very essence of civilized and free society. The arguments for which the McCarthy era was notorious are today presented as facts by the governments which claim to be not only democratic, but fighting for freedom, and by the media, which not only present themselves as being for freedom, but also as the product of freedom, and by those who claim themselves to be the representatives of the working class, the trade union leaders, the social democrats and the revisionists. Now that the revolution has suffered a setback, they have openly come out against what they call Stalinism, that is, scientific socialism, socialist democracy and the independent, hegemonic and leading role of the working class. They unashamedly admit and proudly declare that which they can no longer hide - that they were behind all the counter-revolutionary, anti-communist and anti-worker developments in the world working class and communist movement, in the movement for national liberation, in the struggle of the peoples against the two superpowers, and behind the right wing in Eastern Europe and on the world scale. Such an admission in the name of "defence of democracy" should make the workers and those interested in real democracy, freedom and progress think and draw the pertinent conclusions.

Why all this violence and brutality, all this hooliganism and all the calumnies and slanders against communism, against Marxism-Leninism? It is because world capitalism is on the verge of a new world-wide crisis. The much-touted hybrid system of "developed socialism" in

Eastern Europe turned out to be a dismal failure and is in collapse. Neo-colonialism is in equal crisis, and the entire world of capitalism is facing an extremely bleak future. Thus, it is convenient and helpful to world capitalism and the bourgeoisie to call the collapse of the hybrid system in Eastern Europe and the crisis of neo-colonialism the collapse of communism. In this way, not only would the workers and those who are concerned not know why this disaster in Eastern Europe and the neo-colonial states took place, but also they would be blocked from blaming the capitalists and imperialists and their lackeys for these tragedies and from looking to communism as a way out of the present situation which holds grave dangers for the people.

Can we say that communism and Marxism-Leninism have brought disaster to Eastern Europe, to the Soviet Union? Can we say that Marxism-Leninism, which brought the people of Russia out of Tsarist darkness, was later to lead them into another kind of darkness, another kind of enslavement? Can we say that because some claim this to be the case, there is no need for changes in Quebec, in Canada, and elsewhere? When we talk about changes here, we are referring to a qualitative change, to the movement of the society which is based on exploitation to one which is not. We are speaking of transition from class to classless society. Living in Montreal or in Quebec or Canada or elsewhere, and coming to this conclusion that change is not necessary because of the developments in Eastern Europe or the Soviet Union, would be an impossible task. I have lived here, and you have also. Can we say that the developments in various spheres, most importantly in the spheres of the economy and culture, the spiritual side, the motive for living and in politics, tell us that we should strive for no change? Do these conditions point to the necessity of the continuation of the status quo? If this is the case, then we can proclaim the end of Marxism-Leninism, then we can proclaim the end
of history, then we can say that there is no future whatsoever for freedom, progress and socialism.

There are philosophers who are theorising this, who are suggesting that history has come to an end. What they mean by history coming to an end is that the age-old quest of the people for a society without exploitation of man by man has come to an end. According to them, liberal democracy has won. What are the main benefits for the workers and people as a consequence of this victory? Can we say that the rise of the right wing is a gain for the workers and peoples? If we do that, then the peoples of the world will wonder, "What kind of people are these who cannot see the forest for the trees?" They will ask: "If you do not want change, then what about us?" The billions upon billions of oppressed and exploited on the world scale will tell us: "We want change! We want a new life!" They will say that they want a system where there is no exploitation and oppression. Can we go to them and say, "Well, do not worry about the exploitation and oppression in the world. This is the price we have to pay for democracy. You should be happy and joyful about this". Will this convince them? Can they be convinced that there is no such thing as imperialism or social imperialism? Or that oligopolies and monopolies are the price we must pay for democracy? Are these merely our phrases, coined by us, or are they things which describe the reality of life? Have they not spread their tentacles all over the world? Have the two superpowers and others not united not only against revolutionary change, but even a minor reform which threatens their very existence? They would tell us: "We won't agree with you. We, the billions upon billions of people upon this globe, want change. If you want to go for the status quo, you will have to go it alone! You should also think about this: We need an ideology, one which is necessary to bring about this qualitative change, and it can only be a qualitatively new ideology. But what you are suggesting to us

smacks of the same thing we have heard before — not this year, nor last year, but for all the decades of this century. We have always been told that there is no need for revolution, there is no need for change. Forty-five years of 'evolution' have only strengthened the chains of enslavement, and not broken or loosened them. Forty-five years of 'evolution' confirm ever more the necessity for revolution".

Comrades and Friends,

Our Party has organised this Internationalist Rally, and we have invited all of you here to celebrate not only the 20th anniversary of the founding of the Party, and the 120th anniversary of the birth of V.I. Lenin, but also to be with us and reflect upon what our enemies are suggesting. What are they saying? Do you think it is appropriate for me here to declare on behalf of the Canadian Marxist-Leninists that the present developments indicate that the world has sorted out its main problems, and that there is no need for any further change, there is no need for any further improvement? The name of our Party is Communist Party, and its long-term objective is to bring in the communist system. Do you think that we should change the name and our long-term objective because "communism has failed"? Do you think that we should offer self-criticism and account for our deeds as Marxist-Leninists?

No, comrades; no, friends, all those who want to hear: we should do no such thing. History would condemn us as it will condemn all those who did such a thing. The working class and people on the world scale would condemn us. The enlightened and justice-loving people would condemn us if we did such a thing. If we have to offer self-criticism, what would we offer? Should we have self-criticism that in the 1960s we called for discussion about our situation, that we should oppose the decadent educational system which was facilitating the US economic penetration, which in the name of education was incul-
cating blindness, fanaticism and chauvinism, which was
telling us that dependence on the US is better than inde-
pendence, which was telling us that we should join with
the US in aggression against other peoples, especially
the people of Indo-China? Will this be the self-criticism?
Should we have self-criticism that in August, 1964, we
pointed out that the US has imperialist ambitions and
aggression at heart, that it wants to dominate the world?
Should we have self-criticism that in 1966 we opposed
revisionism in the People's Republic of China and took
a stand against the Kosygin reforms in the Soviet Union?
Should we offer self-criticism for carrying out work in
an organised fashion on the basis of democratic centralism
and organising the Necessity for Change Conference in
August 1967? Should we have self-criticism about events
in Czechoslovakia in August 1968, when we pointed out
to the Canadian working class and people that the invasion
of Czechoslovakia was not by a socialist and fraternal
nation, but by a swaggering social-imperialist Soviet
Union? When in May 1968 we gave the call, right here
in Montreal, that there should be a genuine communist
party, a communist party whose first and only aim is to
organise the working class of Canada, not on some chauvin-
ist basis, not on the basis of some reactionary views, but
on the basis of unity with the workers of all lands for
the liberation and emancipation of the entire working
class? Should we have self-criticism for fighting for this
particular ideology of the working class, the only ideology
which can represent the true aspirations of the Canadian
workers, in their true struggle for not only emancipation
from the system of wage-slavery in Canada, but also
their support for all those who fight for national liberation
and social emancipation? Should we have self-criticism
that right here, in the fall of 1968, we stood against the
division of the people of Quebec, especially the workers
of Quebec, on the basis of language, and opposed the
language fascists who wanted to organise attacks on the
people?

Comrades and friends, most importantly, should we
have self-criticism on the question of founding our Party
20 years ago? Today, the bourgeois press is informing
the workers that the Communist Party of Canada is
planning to change its name. But, 20 years have created
a new situation. The name of the Communist Party is
not theirs to change! This party will stay, they will not
be able to change its name. (Applause)

Comrades and friends, as we recall many struggles,
let us remember one of the most important which our
Party fought, the struggle for its independence from the
encroachments and intervention by the Communist Party
of China which did not wish to have a Party which is the
party of the working class of Canada. They wanted some
other party, a party with another aim. Should we have
self-criticism for fighting for the independence of the
Party, for having our head on our shoulders, for doing
our own thinking, for solving our own problems?

Comrades and friends, right after its founding our
Party was in the fire of resistance against the state-organ-
isated attacks carried out in close collaboration with the
holy alliance of the "left". Hundreds of our members coura-
geously stood up and faced the courts and prisons of the
class enemy, fought the introduction of terrorism and
the splittist gang of the "left sloganising front of Khrush-
chevite revisionism". Should we have self-criticism for
this heroic deed? None of those who committed crimes
against our Party has ever been punished even though
the Macdonald Commission on the Wrong-Doings of the
RCMP came to know and record many of the things which
are still kept secret.

Comrades and friends, we recall the days of 1972,
when the Marxist-Leninists from all across the country
built a vigorous, momentous movement for the unity of
all Marxist-Leninists in one Party in Canada. Should we
have self-criticism for that? Should we have self-criticism
that in 1974-75 we stood against the theory of three worlds? Or because again, in 1978, we opposed Maoism? Or because we waged many struggles in defence of our ideology and for the right of the working class to emancipate itself and for its unity against all the splitters, whether they were labour aristocrats or the revisionists of the "Communist Party", or the social democrats of the NDP or similar enemies internationally? From the days when we struggled for the necessity for the leading role of the Party to these days of the building of the Mass Press, each step of the way, our Party has marched forward, under the banner of Marxism-Leninism, for the victory of revolution and socialism. It has called for the unity of the working class around the Party at each step, for the building of a society which is fit for human existence.

Comrades and friends, nothing has happened which can convince us that we have been proven wrong. On the contrary, it is the enemies of communism, it is the enemies of Marxism-Leninism, who have been proven wrong. It is they who supported Nikita Khrushchev, which brought disaster to the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe. It is they who supported Leonid Brezhnev, and it is they who are hobnobbing with Mikhail Gorbachev. In the same fashion, they were the friends of Mao Zedong; they were the friends of every opportunist and revisionist in this world. Let me say, on behalf of all the Canadian communists, that we find no fault of principle in our Party, or our brother Parties. We do not betray their confidence in us, because if we have self-criticism, this will be betrayal of them. We will do no such thing. We can neither betray our workers, nor can we betray the workers of any other lands. History has put us in this position, not to answer questions for the wrongs of our enemies, but to put the enemy in the dock. It is the enemies who should answer these questions, and history will force them to answer these questions.

Already history has taken its initial verdict. As all of you know, democracy has recently returned to those countries where it was a thing of the past under the revisionists. But remember, the revisionists were yelling themselves hoarse at that time also. They claimed they did not have Stalinist repression, but a new kind of system, a system which they named by various names, including "developed socialism". We had theoreticians, after the time of J.V. Stalin, who tried to convince the world that contradictions themselves have ended in the Soviet Union once and for all. We ask these theoreticians that if the contradictions ended, why are they at each other's throats now? Are these fights not the manifestation of class contradictions? When they shoot down the people of Azerbaijan, then what kind of contradictions are being expressed? Where did they come from? When they deny the people of Lithuania, Estonia and Latvia the right to self-determination, which the names of Lenin and Stalin were famous for upholding, then is this not an expression of the heightening of national contradictions?

Comrades and friends, where did these contradictions come from if they had disappeared? These theoreticians of the past, they have been proven wrong, and the present-day theoreticians of their kind will also be proven wrong, because these elements are trying to turn the just discontent of the masses against their own rule into a movement against communism, and this will not happen. Before 1989, all these countries of Eastern Europe were called socialist. We told the people, we told our workers that they were not socialist countries. We wrote one article after another. We organised conference after conference. We even organised a year-long national programme on the occasion of the centenary of the death of Karl Marx in 1983. Again and again and again, we proved that the Soviet Union was not socialist. These media tsars and others were telling us that the Soviet Union was socialist. They were telling us that the Soviet Union was the way
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it had been at the time of Lenin but, more importantly, that this was a Soviet Union which could be talked with, negotiated with much better than in the days of J.V. Stalin. They were proven wrong about this question, comrades, while we were proven right. But the question is, why should the workers believe what our enemies say? Why should they listen to everything which comes from the newspapers, the radio and television? The answer to this is that from the time of the Second World War and before, to the present day, our enemies established a base in the trade union movement, an anti-communist movement on the social base of the labour aristocracy. They whisper, they gossip, they create fear, they say all kinds of things against communism. They don’t speak openly, and they are the ones who were telling the workers the same tales which the media and the capitalists wanted them to tell. They were the transmission belt of the bourgeoisie, as were the social democrats and others. Now, should the workers not ask them: “Why is it that the country, which was, according to you, socialist before and with which you were hobnobbing, has given up socialism?” Every infamy which has taken place over the past more than 30 years in Eastern Europe has been applauded by them. And now, the same elements, the same enemies, call these countries democratic and free. Just the other day in Budapest, it came to the knowledge of world public opinion that two monopolies, one from Britain and the other from Germany, gobbled up all the press. This is the freedom Budapest has now, according to which “communist” tyranny is a thing of the past. Now they will have the press which we are blessed with here...

Comrades and friends, we, the communists, who have gone through many many struggles, must reflect on these things, as to why they are happening. Our Party looks at the developments within Canada and internationally extremely seriously. There is no reason whatsoever for us to be discouraged or goggly-eyed. As in the past, today too, we must look at our conditions seriously. Why are there so many problems, and what can be done about them? We have every kind of problem in Canada. These days, as all of you know, the Meech Lake Accord has even brought the Catholic Church in Montreal to demand that young kids must get its permission about which language they can speak. In the name of defence of “distinct society”, in the name of defence of French culture, everybody’s culture should be destroyed, they say. Is this a demand from a true nationalist, a true democrat? Is this a demand from those who work for the well-being of their people? Or is it a demand from those who stand for autocracy, as is the case in the United States, which is against the interests of all cultures and nationalities? We have today this problem of the Meech Lake Accord, which is not only setting people at each other’s throats, giving space to every chauvinist to speak and issue threats and so on, whether in Quebec or elsewhere, but hides the real fact, the real problem of the rights and duties of the citizens, which are not enshrined in the Constitution, where no discussion has ever taken place on this question since 1867. There has always been discussion about what should be the powers of the federal government and the provincial governments. For 123 years they have not sorted out this problem.

Comrades and friends, there is the problem of the economy. Besides the question of interest rates and unemployment, etc., here in Canada economic insecurity has spread like a plague. Working people fear the impending general sales tax. Working people are extremely afraid that what they have today they may not have in the afternoon or tomorrow. In place of serious discussion on these matters and other matters internationally, an atmosphere of fear has been created, of gossip and slander, an atmosphere which forbids deep reflection and serious thought, in which diversion is the preferred method to ensure that passions flare, not for the solution of problems, but for
their aggravation.

Comrades and friends, the developments in Eastern Europe should make us think, but there is another agenda being imposed on us in order to zero in the most brutal attacks on us. In place of serious thought about why these developments are taking place, there is a ferocious attack on communism. Will these attacks provide a solution to the problem? The fact that the occasion is used to attack communism shows the bad conscience of those who engage in it. It shows that they do not want to resolve anything. They have merely self-serving aims. We should seriously reflect on why this is the case.

Our Party has said that real socialism can only be brought about through violent revolution, that is revolution by the use of force, and by force is meant compulsion. We have been accused of being violent for saying so. Have the changes which are being brought about in Romania or in Panama been brought about peacefully? Has the change in Nicaragua been brought about peacefully? Those who accused us of violence now justify violence. It is clear that violence is all right to bring back capitalism, but it is not all right if it is used to bring about socialism. Shouldn't we conclude from this that there is a need for revolutionary violence? Revolutionaries do not use violence against the people. They do not use compulsion over people to bring about change. On the contrary, they make the masses conscious and it is then they who bring about change. The reactionary violence, on the other hand, is always destined against the people who seek change. Because we have said that socialism can only be brought about through violent revolution, does it follow that we can conclude that we, our Party, is going to compel everyone to have communism against their will? Can a new system come into being through compulsion? When the old system is ready to depart from the scene of history, can we say that right on the first day the vast majority of people are ready to dump it? Can we say, on the contrary, from the other side, that if they are not willing to dump it on the first day, then we should wait for when the majority agree to dump it? Again, the question is not a simple one and the answer can't be simple. It is not a matter of a yes or no answer. What we can say for sure is that no system has lasted for ever and what we have in mind are very definite systems which had one thing in common—that is the running of the society by the minority in the interests of the minority. Historically, one such system replaced another. Can we say that every time a system has been replaced by another, one minority has replaced another? No, we cannot say such a thing. There is a fear that such a change may again not benefit the majority. This is the conclusion which the enemy, which the bourgeoisie, which the capitalists want to spread amongst the masses, that a change is like a spiral which never gives rise to anything, that people with good will and good sentiments come forward, organise revolution, then get corrupted, and revolution is finished. This is not, comrades, how history has moved in the past. Retrospection may take place but is not necessary and mandatory for the advance of the society. For example, from slave society, we did see feudalism, we did see the end of slave society. From feudalism, we did see the end of feudalism and the rise of capitalist society. There may be periods when the two may have coexisted, but there has been a break within a historical epoch. And today too, on the world scale in the 20th century, we see that socialism has become one of the greatest aspirations. All the enemies of socialism in the 20th century who saw actual possibilities of socialist revolution triumphing—and one-sixth of the globe did become socialist—pretended to be socialists. This was the case of the Italian fascist party, through which the king and the ruling class, afraid of the working class and revolution, brought forth the corporate fascist state. It was true in the case of the Nazis in Germany, who presented themselves as national
socialists. And since that time, besides the Italian fascists and the German National Socialists, we have democratic socialists, and socialists of many varieties, and in Eastern Europe we had a hybrid in place of real socialism. There was developed socialism in the Soviet Union. What does it prove? That people want change, the working class wants socialism, and the enemies of socialism want the working class to go on another path, to be diverted and so on. This is why in Canada David Lewis, a personality the bourgeoisie says is so pure he should not even be touched, said many times that he would always be for democracy which should be put in the first place, and for socialism which should be put in the second place. How is it that democracy and socialism should be put in contradiction with one another? How can socialism be relegated to the second place? We know in this world there is such a thing as socialist democracy. David Lewis, his son Stephen Lewis, Audrey McLaughlin and all the others, don't want socialist democracy. They want democratic socialism. Are these just different words? Or do they stand for different things? When they say they are for democracy, just the word has to be changed to understand that they are for capitalism, for imperialism, for every kind of exploitation. When they say they are for socialism, then also the sentence should be completed to say they want socialism merely as a phrase, merely to tell the workers that "Look, we are so successful, we can even constitute governments, while these Marxist-Leninists are nowhere! We are the people who are doing something while the Marxist-Leninists are merely talking." Very well, but what has the 20th century proven? That just as corporate fascism or national socialism brought disaster to mankind, so democratic socialism has also done the same thing. It is not uncommon for these champions of the Second International to justify either suppression inside a country or aggression abroad. In 1968 there was a Labour party government in Britain.

It sent the army to Ireland. They think that people have short memories. And many times since then, the Labour party has also been "against" the army being in Ireland. How is it possible? Sister parties of the New Democratic Party are the zionist Labour party of Israel, the Indian National Congress, organisations known for their aggression abroad and their internal suppression of the people, and so on. In other words, none of these parties is really socialist, none of these parties is really democratic, but the workers want genuine democracy and real socialism.

Look at the situation at the present time. We all want change. One thing common to all, to one degree or the other, is that we want change. This means that the society is pregnant with change. This means that the vast majority want this change but are not quite ready. There is a fear that such a change may again not benefit the majority. A new minority may manipulate the situation in its own favour. Yes, such a danger comes from the social-democrats and the revisionists. Thus, what is common to all is the desire for change. At the same time, we want a change which favours the whole of our humanity.

When we say "whole of our humanity", here, of course, we are pointing not to NUMBERS but to what it means to be human. In this world, there are those who proclaim themselves to be human but than apostatize, truncate the concept "whole of our humanity". The "whole of our humanity" is what is distinct, differentiated, and completely separated from the "whole of animality". The whole of animality has as its component part the "complete enslavement to all given conditions of existence". A beaver may live in conditions in which the "whole of beaverliness" can be expressed but a beaver cannot create these conditions. They are given to it, and it has to adapt to them, and not the other way around.

If a beaver were to say that because of my nature I am only going to adapt to part of these conditions, then the beaver would be in serious trouble. It does not really
have a say in the matter. But men and women, we human beings, are not beavers. We create conditions for our existence, making use of what nature has in store. We do not reject nature but we are not slaves to nature either. We not only face nature, but, more importantly, we are products of the society to which we are born. The "whole of our humanity" rebels against the very thought of either being slave to the blind forces of nature, or more importantly, of the blind forces of society. This really, comrades and friends, is what we must look at closely and reflect on deeply. Only then will you be able to appreciate what we Marxist-Leninists say.

There are those in the society who compel us to remain slave to the blind forces of society. They are humans too. They are very conscious, but their consciousness leads them to attack the "whole of our humanity", that which differentiates us from the "whole of animality". We are being COMPelled TO SUBmit TO WHAT WE DO NOT LIKE. Because there exists such a compulsion, we can only end it through compulsion. A man who works in snuffing out fire knows very well: extinguish fire with fire. We must end compulsion through compulsion too. There is a branch of medicine which bases itself on "like kills like": a poison which creates certain symptoms in a healthy body can also rid the body of a malady with similar symptoms.

Comrades and friends, we are living in a society where there are more people concerned about protecting the habitat of some animals and such things. They write articles, they demonstrate, and when it comes to the habitat of man, that is society, they say we are not going to say a word. What kind of humanity is this, which accepts that the habitat of an animal should be protected, but about man's habitat, they say this is out of our hands? They invoke the name of human nature to say that men and women who want to bring about change are merely causing trouble. But men and women, we human beings, are not beavers. We create conditions for our existence, making use of what nature has in store. We do not reject nature, but we are not slaves to the blind forces of nature either. We not only face nature, but more importantly, we are products of the society to which we are born. The whole of humanity rebels against the very thought of either being the slaves to the blind forces of nature or, more importantly, the blind forces of the society. Are we now to give up this "whole of our humanity"?

You and I have come here today not to participate in empty philosophising. I have a motive in talking to you in this way. I want to pose to ourselves a question: Why can't we have the whole of our humanity, our entire consciousness aimed, deployed, to solve the problems we face? Again, you know very well that those who profit from the status quo would rather forgo the whole of humanity than let go of their own interests. You know very well that the present society really serves only a small minority. We have at one pole a minority of rich, and on the other pole, the increasing number of poor. In terms of division between rich and poor, in between, we have a whole majority, who are neither rich nor poor. But it so happens that the vast majority of them are workers, and the vast majority of poor are workers also. As is historically the case, the increase in the number of workers is based on the ruin and impoverishment of the petty producers and the middle strata, and the increase in the number of poor is the result of the increase in impoverishment of the workers. In other words, there is ruination of the middle strata and the petty bourgeoisie, and there is impoverishment and ruination of the working class. Should the middle strata not make common cause with all those who face the same consequences? Should they not think about what kind of emancipation the working class could bring about? Maybe there is a salvation for the middle strata in the working class rule. Those who are neither rich nor poor, it can be clearly seen, are also
facing the pressure. It is really becoming a Herculean task to keep out of the ranks of the poor, while there is no danger whatsoever in being pushed into the ranks of the rich. It can be easily said that we have a society in which the majority are powerless: the poor do not count, and the rich are willing to sacrifice the whole of our humanity. It is only we Marxist-Leninists who speak about real humanity. According to our critics, Marxist-Leninists don't even want to use the name humanity. Marxist-Leninists do not believe, according to them, in humanity. If Marxism-Leninism did not believe in humanity, if the socialist system is not the most humane system there is, then you know what happened in Eastern Europe, and you know what happened in Russia in 1917. Inhumane systems do get overthrown, and Marxist-Leninists are the ones who lead such an overthrow and who can build a really humane system. In Eastern Europe one inhumane regime has been replaced by another. There is yet to be a real champion of overthrow who brings to the fore what is really humane. The Marxist-Leninists will lead the workers to do such a thing. We are not only confident but certain of it.

It is proclaimed now that communism is finished and Marxist-Leninist ideology is discredited too. What are we to do now with the whole of our humanity? All those whose hearts were filled with the future of communism, what are they going to do? Look for another "ism"? What kind of "ism" will that be? To be happy with enslavement? What? No, this is not the way things stand. The question here is not of communism ending, the question is that we are in a new situation, a situation created by the smashing of the illusion called "developed socialism" in the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe. There we had a case of the minority ruling the majority, a case where they ruled in the name of the working class, but the working class was not actually in power, in the same fashion as it is not in power in Canada either. The Canadian ruling class rules in the name of Canada. The ruling classes in Eastern Europe ruled in the name of the working class. The new ruling classes there have become like the Canadian ruling class. The People's Republic of Hungary has become the Republic of Hungary, with a system like Canada's. What kind of country it is, they do not want to speak about; in a country where within days of their "liberation", the entire press can be taken over by the tears of the media from Britain and Germany. They do not want to write there that this is a semi-fascist and a capitalist republic. They are afraid to openly pronounce themselves, even though they boast that an amalgam of bourgeois and social-democratic ideas is guiding them.

In Hungary, as well as in the other Eastern European countries, anti-Semitism has raised its head, and they are trying to repeat the same hackneyed phrase: Well, this is the price we pay for freedom. Yes, hunger, poverty, disease, crime, racism, fascism—all are justified in the name of "the price we pay for freedom." Shouldn't one ask what kind of freedom it is which is bringing forth all these terrible things? Why should we pay such a price? Should we not raise the issue then, that those who say such things also considered a European inter-imperialist war to be a price to pay? If they say such a thing and in such a callous and calculated manner, then they are the enemies of mankind. And such rulers have come into existence in Eastern Europe, replacing others, who were also the enemies of mankind.

Comrades and friends, the changes in Eastern Europe have unsettled all the settled problems, while they have settled none of the unsettled problems. A serious danger exists there to the freedom and progress of the peoples, especially a danger to national independence and sovereignty. As you remember at the beginning of this year, it was simply proclaimed that now it's Albania's turn, forgetting that Albania is not like Hungary, that Albania is not like Poland. But of course, what does it
matter to those who are punch-drunk with aggression and interference, to those who suppress the people at home and carry out aggressions abroad.

Let us for a minute dwell a little bit more on what kind of regimes would have allowed such a thing. The regimes in Eastern Europe were two-faced. We are quite familiar with such a phenomenon because in Canada the bourgeois parties say one thing, and they do another. In Eastern Europe, the regimes had inherited a situation which demanded solutions, that is, real socialism required further deepening and broadening, socialist democracy further required deepening and broadening, it required the planned development and renewal of the productive forces there, it required a law objectively in operation where there could be an uninterrupted reproduction, where the productivity of labour could express itself in the brilliance of a real socialist society which would have made hide-bound attitudes a thing of the past, and which would look forward to a time the whole world would be without exploitation of man by man—where a man, the labouring man, would emerge at the centre of all development, a new man, expressing the whole of our humanity. What did these "communists" achieve in Eastern Europe? There, the participation of the masses in every way possible in the political and state affairs, in the economic affairs, in the cultural affairs, was the necessary ingredient for the construction of real socialism. There, it was necessary that the Party not replace the masses and take up their role. Today they slander the name of J.V. Stalin, saying that he substituted the leading and hegemonic role of the Party for the role of the masses, which is to say that he advocated a Party dictatorship in place of the dictatorship of the proletariat. J.V. Stalin in his time fought against such a conception. He did not believe that there should be a dictatorship of the Party. He did not believe that the Party should replace the leading and hegemonic role of the working class. He talked about the necessity of the trade unions and of the collectivised peasantry. He talked about the necessity of the youth organisations, women's organisations, as major factors, major participants in the development of socialism in the Soviet Union. But those who followed him did not solve the outstanding problems. They did not improve upon where he left off. There were historical weaknesses there, some caused by the necessity to collectivise agriculture and develop the productive forces at a very rapid rate. There were other problems as well, but Stalin died in 1953. Did those who followed him, who called themselves champions of humanity, champions of socialism, solve these problems in 37 years? We would have gladly joined them if they had corrected the "mistakes" of Stalin, about which they so loudly shout. And they would have joined us to hail Stalin. They would not have thrown mud at his name and work.

Comrades and friends, the name of J.V. Stalin can be besmirched, slandered and so on, but this cannot change reality. Coming back to what they achieved in Eastern Europe, everyone knows that the developments in Eastern Europe are new, in the sense that even the remnants and symbols of socialism are being overthrown there, but nothing has changed in North America, nothing has changed in the rest of the world. Why then should the new situation in Eastern Europe change the character of the society here? Then why should the long-term and short-term plan of the Party change? No it does not, but what it does show is that we should not keep looking toward the situation somewhere else, in other countries, and keep debating as to whether or not this thing or that thing happened there. Yes, we are very much interested in the experience of others, negative and positive, but it will have value if we have our own work at the centre of the Party's preoccupations. This is what we emphasised in 1963 and from that time on. We must continue on this path and strengthen it.
Just on Friday, all the newspapers reported that the Bank of Canada interest rate went up to 13.77 percent, and this is the interest rate offered to preferred customers, and all the commercial banks raised their rate to 14.75 percent. And of course, the masses of the people in Canada are not their best customers, so the rate is much greater for them. They said this is the highest interest rate since 1982. Why has this happened? Why do we allow such a thing? Were you consulted when the declaration was made? Are we not a democratic country, where everybody's wish is listened to? How can a man named Crow, Governor of the Bank of Canada make such an important decision, which concerns your very lives, without consulting you? It will mean that there will be more poor. It will mean that there will be more middle strata and petty bourgeois ruined. It will mean that those who are living on the poverty line will now fall beneath the poverty line. Should we not reflect that we who are living in a democracy have the Governor of the Bank of Canada announce every Thursday without consulting us what will happen to the interest rates? Still, every day, we are told we are in a democracy. In whose interests does the Governor of the Bank of Canada raise the interest rates? It has been said that he is doing it to decrease inflation, or keep inflation in check. But, why is there inflation? As far as inflation goes, the capitalists do not have to make any declaration whatsoever — it goes up and down on its own, it seems. But in a society which is so monopolised, to fix prices is a right which the monopolies have given to themselves, and when the Bank of Canada happily announces the rise of interest rates, you never know who has ordered it. You never know who the Bank of Canada is connected with, or whether it is a Canadian, American, German, Japanese concern or an oligopoly. Such statements are also made by the Chancellor of the Exchequer of Britain, and others with the same positions and responsibilities in other countries. In a democracy, comrades, which they tout so much, there is not a single issue which concerns us so deeply which is ever decided by the people. Surely there still is need for deriving some conclusion from this. We can discuss Eastern Europe, but it would be better if Canada were discussed as well, and as far as the Party is concerned, it would be better if this were discussed all the time. Otherwise, we will be caught off guard.

This new situation has one most important lesson, that we must be masters of our house. If we are not, then what happened to Eastern Europe will happen here as well. The countries of Hungary, Poland, Romania, Czechoslovakia, East Germany and Bulgaria had become the satellites of the Soviet Union, through economic chains, Comecon, and military enslavement, the Warsaw Pact. What brought disaster to them is not communism, but satelliteism, to coin a word. It is tragic indeed that now they have replaced one form of satelliteism with another form of satelliteism. Their situation will go from bad to worse. They are still not masters of their own houses. This lesson from the developments of Eastern Europe is a crucial one to learn.

A story comes to mind of a man who sent his sons to get educated in a faraway land. After twelve long years of education, they returned with a camel load of books. But whenever a problem arose, they had to consult their books, because on their own they had no clue about the problem. What happened? Did those who gave them these books not educate them? Did the education not enable them to function in real life, to deal with the problems? On the contrary, their education was not to develop their faculties, but a new burden to suppress these faculties. Why? The answer is not so unclear. Because when the father sent them to get educated, he never gave them an aim. He failed to tell them why they need an education, why they want to learn. In the same fashion, the previous regimes in Eastern Europe didn't know why they wanted
Marxism-Leninism. Those poor souls who at the time of liberation never fought for their own liberation, who were satisfied that somebody else could give them liberation on a silver platter, then sent their sons for education, and they came back with a camel load of books. As a result, socialism was the last thing they could construct. Those who were revolutionary Marxist-Leninists, such as Georgi Dimitrov in Bulgaria, whose great name shines in the annals of the international communist movement and world revolution, and Bierut of Poland, and others, were in one way or another gotten rid of. Somebody caught a flu in Moscow and then died from it, somebody else died of something else. Then those who were real lackeys took up positions, comrades and friends. It is tragic, but the situation has not changed there.

This kind of education also exists in Canada. American imperialists are interested in such an education. The Canadian ruling class is interested in such an education. They say that the main aim of education is to have a career. Even if this were true, one could go along with it, but hundreds of thousands of educated people are unemployed. It puts a lie to this claim that education is for a career. Education here is in the service of those who own and control the economic and political affairs, and they do not want to educate the younger generation with an aim that they should build a new society.

Comrades and friends, in the end I would like to emphasise to you that the failure or success of a system is not some kind of a game. It determines whether the people will live in dignity, in progress and prosperity, in independence, or they will live in enslavement and die. We cannot rejoice at the enslaving system which has been imposed on the people in Eastern Europe. We cannot sit idly by when a country like Albania is called upon, under this excuse or the other, to divert from real socialism. In the same way, the Yankees want Cuba to come under their thumb, because the existence of Cuba as an independent nation is anathema to imperialism. For them it is just a tea party, it's a joke: Nicaragua today, Panama yesterday, now they want Cuba. But, this domino theory will break its neck at the rise of the people's consciousness and the revolution. It will not go on forever. After all, it is the people who give birth to, work for, and make possible a system at whose foundation is the relations between people. The very essence of these relations determines what is going to happen to the people, and when something happens to the people, they will definitely rise. In Eastern Europe they say that now, in various places, whatever gains they have made, the people will lose them, especially in the spheres of social welfare, free education and health, affordable housing and so on. The bourgeoisie can say, "Well, this is the price one has to pay for freedom," but this is no consolation for the people.

What has happened in Eastern Europe, as well as in countries such as Mexico, Brazil and others which are suffering the consequences of the debt crisis and other forms of crises, that is, the bankruptcy of the neo-colonial system, as well as what is happening to the financial and other institutions in the capitalist countries, points to the fact that when one crisis ends for the capitalist system, another crisis much worse than the previous one is in the making.

At this time, just because revolution has suffered a setback, it does not mean that revolution has become a thing of the past. It means that this revolution will re-emerge with an even greater vengeance. As J.V. Stalin said, in this era the link in the chain of imperialism will break somewhere. It could very well be in Canada. It could very well be in one of the countries our fraternal comrades come from. It could be in some other country. This remains the issue on the agenda at this time. In spite of the setbacks, a communist party like ours has its vigorous programme to organise the class, to build ever greater
links with the working masses and the middle strata, in order to ensure that when the new situation comes, we are ready. In fact, the objective conditions have been ripe for revolution for a long time. It is the subjective conditions which have been lagging behind. This is what we said in 1970, this is what we are saying today. And we should create these subjective conditions, with our methods which we adopted in the late 1960s. The Party makes all its decisions on the basis of consultation with and in the interests of the masses. We have nothing to hide. These views of ours are open views. We don't hold private discussions and settle matters concerning the masses of the people behind their backs. The two super-powers participate in secret diplomacy. Eleven first ministers and some others in Canada also make decisions behind the backs of the people. And they of course call themselves democrats. Let everyone know the Marxist-Leninists' views. I remember those days in the 1960s when this was not just an exception, but a rule, where hundreds upon hundreds of people in Montreal and other places agreed with us and implemented our programme. Everything was discussed in their midst, and they also considered themselves to be Marxist-Leninists. The bourgeoisie was very afraid that we had infiltrated everyone. Let this "infiltration" be taken up systematically in a planned way. Let us use this anniversary of the founding of our Party and the birth of V.I. Lenin in order to make sure that things turn around, that those who are slanderers of communism cannot hide amongst the workers, cannot hide amongst the middle strata, and so on. Let us with all our might, militancy and reasonableness, and with the science of Marxism-Leninism on our side, take these things in hand with ever greater firmness.

[...] In this democracy, workers cannot even get together to discuss what concerns them. The same is the situation in the universities, and so on. We had many cases where even a student is declared to be a trespasser in a university and then convicted. Why? Because this student is agitating for something positive. In Montreal at Vieux-Montreal, some students have been literally expelled, others have been arrested and there are charges pending against them. Why? Because they shouted the slogan, No to Fee Increases! This is democracy and the price we have to pay for it! In the same fashion, when the Native Indians lay claim to their lands and put up barricades, they send armed policemen to attack them. They are there for "law and order". They are there to clear highways—not to deny the Native Indians and Inuit their hereditary rights! In the same fashion, a racist professor can be defended at the University of Western Ontario, in the name of defending freedom of speech, but Marxist-Leninists could simply be banned from entering these universities.

But let the banner of democracy—of real democracy—be the banner of communism. Let us test these individuals. Let the people get together and participate together in the form of elections, in the form of mass meetings, in various forms, to expose and demand that this rotten system must come to an end. Let the voices rise, not only in the federal parliament, but also in the provincial assemblies, coming from factories and other work places.

Comrades and friends, our party has such a quality that we turn our words into deeds. Let the working people come to know our line, our policies, in the real life, in the problems which they face. Let our theory emerge by finding a solution, in the agitation, in the movement of the class for its rights. And let this work be carried out in a planned way and guided by our ideology of Marxism-Leninism.

Comrades and friends, while we carry out our programme, let there be a challenge to all those who say that Marxism-Leninism is finished. Let them explain the situation, why there are economic problems, why
there is an all-sided crisis. Let them be accountable, and you will find no other ideology can find solutions for real problems, no bourgeois ideology which they present as being very confident about the future can find a solution which can be worthwhile and useful for the workers and broad masses of the people.

Internationally, our Party, as in the past, so too at the present time, stands steadfastly with our friends, with our brothers, in the form of the Marxist-Leninist Communist Parties. I want to declare to you that on behalf of our Party, we express this loyalty not just for some self-serving aim, but that this unity of all the genuine Marxist-Leninist parties is crucial for the solution of different problems as they pose themselves in different countries. We share with our comrades the experience of our work, as they share theirs with us, and between us, there is common ideology and common aims. Together we defend socialist Albania, real socialism, but at the same time independence and sovereignty, which is absolutely necessary for the continuation of real socialism under the leadership of the Party of Labour of Albania with Comrade Ramiz Alia at the head.

Comrades and friends, our Party stands with all the oppressed and exploited, with all those who are fighting for their national liberation. We stand with the people of Panama, we stand with the people of the Middle East, with the people of Central America, and we stand with the people of South Africa in this very complex situation, where all kind of intrigues are being hatched against them. In this period, the expression of support for independence and sovereignty is the expression of our real internationalism, is the expression that we Canadian workers and people will not stand on the side, when imperialism, when the US, the Soviet Union and others, are creating such disasters for others.

Comrades and friends, today is declared Earth Day. Various people have celebrated Earth Day in different ways. And we celebrate in this way: To save this earth, to save these beavers, to save this natural environment, the real humanity of the men and women workers and others must be expressed, it must be brought to the fore. Then this earth can be saved. Let us pledge together to bring this about on this Earth Day—the anniversary of the birth of our great leader, great teacher, V.I. Lenin. Let us pledge that every year on this day, we will discuss the problems in the world, and together proclaim solutions, which we can then spend the year implementing.

From the bottom of my heart, in the name of our Central Committee and all the Canadian Marxist-Leninists, I would once again like to thank our brother Parties for coming here, the PLA for sending us this message and the other parties who have sent us messages. They are with us at this moment of joy, as they are with us in moments of difficulty in this complex situation. We will never forget this support which has been given to us. I would also like to once again thank all of you who have come on this important occasion to be with us.

Comrades and friends, this decade the Party is facing a new situation, a situation where the Party at the head of the working class will ask, not only accountability, but it is quite possible that new situations, other situations, other moments, other opportunities will also arise. We are not soothsayers, but this setback to revolution, this ebb is not going to last forever. The situation will change, and we should also contribute towards this change. Let us unite ever more closely in the course of implementing our decisions, the decisions we made just three weeks ago at the Twelfth Consultative Conference on March 31, decisions reaffirmed in the course of their implementation. I am absolutely certain that following this policy, our Party will become stronger, its ranks will expand, its links with the working class will increase. Let us work for this organisation and mobilisation of the working class. Let us work for the realisation of the saying of Karl Marx.
Hardial Bains

The proletariat is the grave-digger of the bourgeoisie, and as all the other exploiting systems have been replaced one after another, capitalism too will have to make way for the new system, for the socialist system. Let us together stand behind what he said, that we have nothing to lose but our chains, we have a world to win. Workers of all Countries, Unite! This must be our banner. This must be the banner which we take forward under the leadership of the Party and the leadership of the class.

Comrades and friends, with the ideology which V.I. Lenin gave rise to, and with its further development and enrichment, it is not possible to fail. Let us together march on!

GLORY TO MARXISM–LENINISM!
LONG LIVE THE UNITY OF ALL OUR BROTHER PARTIES!
LONG LIVE THE INTERNATIONAL MARXIST–LENINIST COMMUNIST MOVEMENT!
LONG LIVE THE COMMUNIST PARTY OF CANADA (MARXIST–LENINIST)!
WORKERS OF ALL COUNTRIES, UNITE!

[Prolonged applause and standing ovation]

The Deepening of the Revolutionisation of the Life of the Party and the Country
- A Permanent Task
by Ramiz Alia

Comrades,

Today's meeting is, in a way, the continuation of the work of the 8th Plenum of the Central Committee. Then we put forward for discussion many questions which had to do with the need for the further revolutionisation of the life of the Party and the country so that we can respond better to the present stage of the socialist construction. At today's meeting we propose to convert into decisions those questions and others that the comrades will find necessary.

To facilitate the proceedings of this meeting of the Central Committee, allow me to present some ideas which might serve as a basis for a most fruitful discussion.

Extracts from the speech delivered by Ramiz Alia, First Secretary of the Central Committee of the Party of Labour of Albania, at the 9th Plenum of the CC of the PLA, January 22, 1990.