

Down with revisionism, opportunism, renegacy and betrayal! . . . from page 3

line pursued by the Chinese revisionists at home and abroad, the Party began its open polemic against the "three world theory" and Chinese revisionism culminating in the denunciation of "Mao Tsetung Thought" in November 1978.

Right in 1972 (January), the Party hit at the social-chauvinist thinking behind the line pushed by the anti-Party renegades. "Talking superficially simply means that 'China's correct policy' is the basis of the 'broad United Front' and that when this policy changes there will be no broad united front. It is the same wishful thinking on which the imperialists pin their hopes — that once capitalism is restored in the Soviet Union, the revolutionary struggles will cease. Like the imperialists, our ultra-left also minimizes the significance and inevitability of the world's people rising and overthrowing imperialism, revisionism and all reaction. The Chinese people, like the Russian people, have made tremendous contribution towards the liberation of mankind and we are certain that they will never deviate from this correct path. But this superficiality of analysis could be ignored if the following sentence had clarified the situation. In fact, the following sentences put light on any ambiguity left over by the first sentence and 'clarify' what these editors support and show the real reactionary nature of the writers, exposing their Khrushchovite revisionism.

"2. 'China enter various negotiations because the threat of war still exists.' This is real 'Camp David' spirit. Here our revisionist theoreticians are caught. Dear sirs, China enters various negotiations not because of 'threat of war' but because China always supported just negotiations — that is, negotiations which assist the basic aspirations of the people of the world, and China always opposes unjust negotiations. China has all along followed this policy. As far as the question of 'threat of war' is concerned, China has ruled out any possibility of averting it through negotiations. Chairman Mao has clearly stated, 'There are but two possibilities. One is that war will give rise to revolution and the other is that revolution will prevent the war.' You can clearly see that China's stand is on the side of revolution. Whether it comes with war or with the elimination of war, ultimately only revolution will eliminate war. Only Khrushchov peddled such muck that Russia enters various negotiations because the threat of war still exists."

"The following sentence tries to take refuge in 'dialectics' and provides the 'material' basis of Khrushchovism and there the editors also fail miserably: 'Negotiations and war form a dialectical unity of opposites.' Fantastic concoction! Is the opposite of war negotiations? In terms of the struggle of opposites, the opposite of war is peace and the opposite of negotiations is no negotiations. War has seeds of peace in it; that is seeds of its opposite, and peace has seeds of war in it until the entire basis of disruption of peace, that is, exploitation of man by man, is eliminated — that is, until class society is abolished. Between the two contending aspects of war and peace, peace is primary, while war is secondary. The more we oppose unjust wars through organizing social revolution all over the world, the more lasting peace will prosper. Concrete analysis of the real world shows that war gives rise to peace and peace gives rise to war and that this has been the feature of the class society and will remain so until class society is liquidated. . . . How did our 'dialecticians' get things muddled up? The only way they could do so is if they follow the Khrushchovite revisionist line of not seeking truth from facts but on concocting 'facts' to suit their counter-revolution. It was Khrushchov who believed that negotiations and war form a dialectical unity of opposites and vilified China and Chairman Mao as 'war-mongers.'"

Thus, we can see by hitting at the Chinese agents who were promoting Chinese social chauvinism through their agents in January 1972, and by resolutely defending Leninism at the time, the Party could not help but hit at the Chinese social-imperialist policies and the "Mao Tsetung Thought" which lay behind them. This is especially clear with the analysis of the Khrushchovite revisionist line. "Because of the strength of the anti-imperialist front, and because of China's own preparedness, China is in a good position to enter into various negotiations and achieve strategic victory over imperialism and reaction. Well done, you pious ultra-left! We heartily congratulate you for your self-

exposure! So, the 'strength of anti-imperialist front' and 'China's own preparedness' would lead to 'strategic victory over imperialism' through 'negotiations'. Is this what you call 'China's correct foreign policy'? When China was under foreign domination (part of China still is) and was 'weak' (China still is) and the 'anti-imperialist front' was weak (the anti-imperialist front is still weak) what did the Chinese do? Just engaged in revolutionary war and 'no negotiations' and now with 'China's preparedness' and the 'strength of the anti-imperialist front', China has 'changed' its strategy of 'no negotiations and all war' to 'no war and all negotiations'? If you do not mean this then what are you jabbering about? It is social-imperialism which is talking through you. It was Khrushchov who arrogantly boasted about the 'Soviet Union's preparedness', the 'strength of the anti-imperialist front', to oppose all revolutionary national liberation struggles and advocate 'winning' 'strategic victory over imperialism' through negotiations! When you peddle this stuff you are also opposing the national liberation struggles and supporting imperialism." Here the class partisanship of the Party cut right through their demagogy and exposed in no uncertain terms that "social-imperialism" is talking here, and that this treachery, like Khrushchov's is "opposing national liberation struggles" and "supporting imperialism". Precisely that was the case only the source at this time was social-imperialism talking through Peking. Is not the essence of the "three world theory" a social-imperialist policy of China? Facts show this to be the case. Is not the "three world theory" a negation of the national liberation struggles? Nowhere can this be more clearly seen than in the Peking regime's support for Mobutu, Pinochet, and now quite shamelessly, for the bloody Shah of Iran. Of course today these features are open and clear for anyone with eyes who cares to look can see. But in 1971, just after Kissinger's visit and in preparation for Nixon's visit, those who were preparing public opinion for the shift in China's foreign policy were stopped dead in their tracks here in Canada. Thus, the Party gloriously defended Marxism-Leninism in opposition to this new opportunist line right at its inception. It was able to do so because the Marxist-Leninist revolutionaries had taken up the mission right from March 1963 to oppose modern revisionism, and from the summer of 1967 they resolutely took up Marxism-Leninism and proletarian internationalism as the only scientific doctrine to assist the revolutionaries to defeat imperialism and revisionism. This meant in practical terms building a monolithic proletarian Party and leading the workers and other strata in opposing opportunism of all hues. If this task had not been taken up and fought for against Jack Scott and the whole alliance of revisionist-New Left ideologues in the 1968-70 period, then the defence against this new brand of opportunism would not have been possible. That is why those who are screaming the loudest against CPC(M-L) from the angle of being the most "resolute opponents" of "Mao Tsetung Thought" are the most dishonest, the most diabolical and criminal of all these gangsters. But they are in fact a rather weak parody of their forerunners, they who are merely "copy cats" (as they accuse others of being) of an analysis which had historical significance in the crucial period of 1971-72 when China was altering its opportunist course once again. The cheap posturing of the opportunist agents and the wretched apostasy of the renegades running into the arms of the opportunist circles with cries about how "anti-Mao Tsetung Thought" they are have only one thing in mind: further opposition to Marxism-Leninism. Real defence of Marxism-Leninism against Chinese revisionism and "Mao Tsetung Thought" began in Canada with the Party's defence of Leninism against the Varma clique and its efforts to liquidate CPC(M-L) and float the embryonic form of the "three world theory", a form which was justly denounced as "left-sloganeering front of Khrushchovite revisionism". This fight persisted through many years and inevitably ended up in the confrontation between the Marxist-Leninists and "Mao Tsetung Thought" itself. There is nothing Marxist or Leninist in the theories advanced by any of the opportunists or renegades whether they posture as pro- or anti-"Mao Tsetung Thought" these days. Genuine Marxism-Leninism, the application of the revolutionary theory to the real life of the class struggle as it unfolds, this is what we can see clearly in the Party's analysis of the Khrushchovites in 1971-72.

What is to be seen in the opportunists mobilized from 1974 through to date, especially in In Struggle! and the opportunist agency is nothing more than a crude caricature of the Party's work, an abstraction of the distortions of the anti-Party elements which is paraded as the Party line, when in fact it is nothing but a shadow of their former selves. One thing common to all the opportunists is that what they call others is merely a projection of their own souls, their own ideology and politics, which being thorough idealists and metaphysicians, they believe to be the "eternal" consciousness of the human species, just as they believe that imperialism is the final and eternal state of society, rather than a transition point to the necessary violent revolution of proletarian, the proletarian dictatorship and construction of socialism as predicted and practiced by Marx, Engels, then Lenin and Stalin.

Once the Chinese opportunists suffered a serious blow with the expulsion of their agents from the Party's ranks, and their whole thesis for collaboration with U.S. imperialism given a very stern rebuff, their politics of liquidating the communist movement in Canada were sent into a tailspin. It is an historical fact that with the defeat of the "left-sloganeering front of Khrushchovite revisionist" line from the Party, that the police security forces in Canada, together with hardened counter-revolutionary Chinese agents such as Jack Scott, began a concerted effort to liquidate all possible connection between CPC(M-L) and the various progressive groups and individuals in the youth and student movement who had as yet still not made up their minds about the burning political questions of the day: that is who were participating in various political struggles against U.S. imperialism and the evils of capitalist society, but had not yet freed themselves from the illusions of revisionism, or the vestiges of various "isms" fiercely promoted by U.S. imperialism during the uprisings of the late 60s. It cannot be forgotten that in this period of the Nixon-Mao alignments, there was a very broad and deep motion in Canadian society, as elsewhere around the world, against U.S. imperialism. Central to the plans of the U.S. imperialists and Chinese social-imperialists was to make sure this motion, especially the fighting, advanced elements in it, should not crystallize themselves into a Marxist-Leninist Party. The struggle from 1970 (November-December) through to the expulsion of the Daya Varma clique was, in fact, a struggle precisely to crystallize the advanced elements of this revolutionary upsurge of the 60s into a Marxist-Leninist Party. Once that happened it was the state which was on the defensive in the sense that they were forced to scurry around doing massive propaganda and setting all sorts of baits and rewards to entice or intimidate various "personalities" and activists to prevent them from endorsing the historical victory of Leninism in Canada, that is to say to prevent them from moving forward to support or join CPC(M-L). Thus on the one hand there was the politics of the RCMP and Jack Scott in early 1972 of doing everything possible to denigrate and negate CPC(M-L), to isolate the Party from other activists in the popular movements, while on the other hand the Party began its politics of making links with the popular movement.

In the historical conditions prevailing at the time, that is after the recovery from the War Measures Act and the economic recession of 1970, with the speeding up of the economy (a boom which lasted through to May 1974), the main political motion was still around the question of opposition to U.S. imperialism, and in particular, the politics revolving around the question of Canadian independence and Quebec national liberation from foreign domination. Central to this political motion was the issue: which class should lead? We have already examined in detail how Jack Scott, following also "Mao Tsetung Thought" ("Very disciplined about not being too red" in Endicott's immortal words) had done his best to oppose the proletariat from taking up the banner of the nation. His tack was to raise the issue of nationalism apart from the question of proletarian socialist revolution. He openly called for an "independentist" party led by the social democrats (Waffle, etc.). In short he pursued a revisionist, capitulationist course which in political practice means liquidating the just and continuing struggle of the Canadian people to rid themselves of the disastrous domination of U.S. imperialism over Canada. The other tack promoted by

U.S. imperialism to liquidate the anti-imperialist struggle in Canada was promoted through CPL who simply stood on the side-lines and screamed that all nationalism is reactionary, also in an attempt to stop the proletariat from boldly picking up the question of national independence as part and parcel of the social revolution, led by the proletariat. In effect their position was nothing more than a "left" sounding trotskyist theory of telling the workers to take up trade union politics and leaving "national politics" for the bourgeoisie. Only CPC(M-L) made every effort to link the struggle to build the Party of the proletariat with the movement in the society for Canadian independence, to link the aspirations of the proletariat for overthrowing the wage-slave system with the aspirations of the proletariat and other strata (including the patriotic elements of the petty bourgeoisie, etc.) for independence from U.S. imperialist control.

The Party prepared itself with an orientation and plan of work in March 1972 for the next round of struggle against opportunism and building the Party in the revolutionary movement. The most important document in this period is the *Internal Mass Line* dated March 6, 1972 and dated April 2, 1972 containing reports on the Third Plenary Session of the First Central Committee of the Party (March 18-27, 1972). In the April 2nd document it is pointed out that, "Today, to build the united front we must have staunch Marxist-Leninist leadership. To have staunch Marxist-Leninist leadership and to persist in building the united front is to persist in uniting the people on the basis of political line." "Unity on the basis of the political line is the clarion call of the Party. By following this call we can build a united front on the protracted basis (that is, lay down its foundations now even though the foundations are weak and fragile). Our united front is not a revisionist or an opportunist united front. Our united front is a proletarian united front. In our united front, those who are actually opposing U.S. imperialism and are doing so in practice join. In our united front there is not room for bourgeois individualists and other political mummies. All individuals who are opposed to U.S. imperialism should unite by fighting our national enemies. All organizations who are opposed to U.S. imperialism should form friendly relations and cooperate with the united front. All staunch Marxist-Leninists should work hard to rally anti-imperialist fighters around ourselves, the core of the leadership of the united front.

"We are certainly opposed to a revisionist and opportunist united front where the main unity is based on 1) opposing the correct political orientation, 2) opposing correct methods of work, and 3) having no way of testing whether anyone is putting their theory into practice or not. This kind of united front is only good for the bourgeoisie and it is for this reason they promote that united front. While we do not oppose some bourgeois, and to that matter some well-known personalities, joining us we do oppose: 1) giving up our independence within the united front and 2) losing initiative and handing over initiative to the bourgeois individualists.

"It is common knowledge to all that the social democrats build parliamentary caucuses. Through these parliamentary caucuses they plan to usher 'democratic socialism' onto the earth. They will unite with anyone who can assist them to land in parliament. They discourage any political and ideological discussions and ban any progressive ideas. This slogan is **Everything for Getting Elected!** Their close friends, the revisionists and opportunists, would like to build a 'united front' in their support. That kind of united front is based on **Everything for Getting Elected!** Why do they have such united fronts? They have them because the bourgeoisie is incapable of getting elected directly so they will try through 'socialist' slogans. We do not want such a united front! Our slogan is **Everything for the Masses!** Our united front works for the people, arouses them and builds the rudiments of political power amongst them. This united front will be built by arousing our gods, hundreds and thousands of the broad masses of the working people. Let us go to our gods and build a united front!"

WE UNITE WITH THOSE WHO ARE AGAINST U.S. IMPERIALISM AND THEIR INTENTIONS ARE RECOGNIZED BY THEIR DEEDS AND NOT JUST THEIR WORDS!"

TO BE CONTINUED