DOWN WITH REVISIONISM, OPPORTUNISM, RENEGACY AND BETRAYAL! BOLSHEVIZE THE PARTY! PREPARE FOR THE COMING REVOLUTIONARY STORMS!

Reference material published at the request made by Party activists in Montreal at the Rally organized by the Party to usher in the Year of Stalin'

Reference material published in this issue, PCDN is continuing the reference material published at the request made by Party activists in Monreal. For previous portions, see Vol. 9 Nos. 12, 15, 16, 17, 18, 22, 23, 24 and 26, dated January 13, 17, 18, 19, 20, 25, 26, 27, 36, 1979. We have already looked at how the Party deale gravist to China. It insisted that China had right to negotiate to advance its interests with respect to Taiwan and UNO, that CPC(M-L) was an independent Party and UNO, that CPC(M-L) was an independent Party and Choc communist movement which had taken up the question of proletarian revolution in Canada, and reprinted documents from China and Albania to show the content of our Party's stand, i.e. anti-U.S. imperialist and Canadian monopoly bourgeoisie and anti-opportunist. We know that the Chinese never approved of the Party's anti-opportunist stand. It is quite possible that they thought that the Party, once his to hard by the deep the bailed out" politically, thus allowing the Party to be twamped with these elements or to enter into unprincipled alliances for the sake of "unity", etc. Both lines would have been disastrout or five sake of "unity", etc. Both lines would have been disastrout or FC(M-L).

Those elements who had pushed the liquidationist line of "alliances to the sake of "unity", etc. Both lines would have been disastrout or FC(M-L).

would have been disastrous for CPC(M-L).

Those elements who had pushed the liquidationist line of "leftism" through their demagogy about "terrorism" in the October Crisis, and who continued their policy of refusing to build a stable, democratic centralist Leninist Party by promoting the liquidationist adventures such as the May 20, 1971 the demonstration, shifted their opportunist politics to the "right" in the fall of 1971. In October of that year a well worked-out line rationalizing Chinese capitulation to U.S. imperialism to prepare public opinion for the Nixon visit the following summer was published in a Parryl-ed mass organization journal, Solidarity. It is very interesting that when the Chinese front attacks CPC(M-L) in the 1975-78 period and tries to discredit the Party's efforts to build the Party and lead the mass revolutionary movements on a Leninist line, it does its best to attack the Party from very conceivable angle. Thus for example those who Party's efforts to build the Party and Jead the mast revolutionary movements on a Leninist line, it does its best to attack the Party from every conceivable angle. Thus for example those who pushed the left-adventurits positions to liquidate the Party in the November 1970 - May 1971 period (terrorism, no need for Party in crisis, "prove" to police strength of communists, etc., etc.) are most vociferous in 1975-78 in attacking the Party from this side to show that CPC(M-L) was a mere "copy-cat" of the Chinese "Lief Lion". Now we have the spectice of the Party being denounced by the U.S. imperialist opportunist agency as a "left" phrasemongering front for Khrushchovite revisionism. So very interestingly both these "left" and "right" factions of the 1974-78 Chinese "three world" bloc attack the Party for the lines given both in theory and practice by the Daya Varma faction of communalists, terrorists and nazi social chauvinists who did their utmost to liquidate the Party from "left" and right positions, on Party building, politics, ideology, alliances, etc. All their lines were anti-Leninist and in fact in keeping with "Mao Tsetung Thought". Thus it is no accident that CPC(M-L) would inevitably come into an open clash with Mao Tsetung and refute his "Thought". Thus it is no accident that CPC(M-L) would inevitably come into an open clash with Mao Tsetung and refute his "Thought" as anti-Marsit-Leninist, etc. positions, on these anti-Party liquidationist factions is that, despite the weight of Mao Tsetung's confusion-making ideology on the Sack, of the Party, the Party consistently fought to implement a Leninist line, consistently fought to represent a sea the main and Party, the Party consistently fought to implement a Leinist line, consistently fought for the principles of democratic centralism in Party building, for mobilizing the working class as the main and leading force in all the politics of the nation, worked extremely patiently to build principled alliances (even if only temporary—an absolutely fundamental Leinist tactic) with various elements from the other classes, fought to take proletarian politics and ideology to all strata of the society, and most crucially, at every serious turn of events defended Marxism-Leinism against modern revisionism of all hues as the only guarantee of the Canadian revolutionary movement. Canadian revolutionary movement.

To any serious student of the history of the Communist Party

To any serious student of the history of the Communist Party of Canada (Marxist-Leninist) it is pernicious and stupid to use the label "'left-phrasemongering front of Khrushchovite revisionitim" to describe CPC(M-L) in the year 1978. This sort of lie-mongeding is typical of the imperialist police mentality cast in the United States of America. These imperialist agents know that the most important single document written by CPC(M-L) in this period of very difficult and complicated class struggle against the emergence of Chinese social-imperialism and its "Mao Tsetung Thought", was published in People's Canada Daliy News Release on January 11, 1972 entitled "Down with the Left-'Slognatering Front of Khrushchovite Revisionism'. The Party leadership opposed Daya Varma and his clique for promoting the revisionist political line in Soldartyra and insiste that the article be withdrawn. But in violation of Leninist Party discipline they published the article and distributed it widely. The Party waged an implacable fight against the life which was nothing more than an embryonic form of the "three world theory" and a pitch for the Nixon-Mao alliance being hatched in Machiavellian fashion behind the backs of the people.

The article was published after the anti-Party elements showed their hand completely by splitting Afro-Asian Latin American People's Solidarity Movement after failing to use this organization as a platform from which to attack the Party, It was abundantly clear that these elements were more than self-notivated careerists and anti-communists. They had discontinuations and the provision of the self-notivated careerists and anti-communists. They had discontinuations. of Canada (Marxist-Leninist) it is pernicious and stupid to us

organization as a platform from which to attack the Party. It was abundantly clear that these elements were more than self-motivated careerists and anti-communists. They had tied themselves as agent to the Chinese social-imperialists who were extremely anxious to repeat Khrushchov's efforts in converting the International Communist Movement into an agency for their own social-imperialist ends. Chinese social-imperialist did not have either the means or the ability to achieve this end. The main reason is that the new Marxist-Lennist communist parties, such as CPC(M-L), despite their ardent love and pure feelings towards the Communist Partiey of China and Mao Tsetung, grew up in struggle against modern revisionism. If the Chinese opposed Khrushchovism for pragmatic and selfish reasons in order to promote their own social-imperialist ambitions, this was not the case of the Marxist-Lennist revolutionaries who built up in struggle against modern revisionism. If the Chinese opposed Khrushchovism for pragmatic and selfish reasons in order to promote their own social-imperialist ambitions, this was not the case of the Marxist-Lennist revolutionaries who built their parties in opposition to Soviet social-imperialism. They were upholding the ideology and politics of Marx, Engels, Lenin and Stalin, of the Bolshevik Party, of the Marxist doctrine of historical masterialism which teaches the historic necessity for the violent proletarian revolution, the dictatorship of the proletariat, the building of scientific socialism coincident with the economic laws of the development of society from capitalism at its highest stage of development (imperialism — monopoly capital) to socialism, and from socialism to the classless communist society.

The inevitable clash between the pragmatic policies of the Chinese Party in its effort to manoeuvre a "rapprochement" with Us. Imperialism in its rivalry with Soviet social-imperialism and the Leninist polities of CPC(M-L) which was a life-and-death battle against U.S. imperialism as well as Soviet social-imperialism and the Leninist polities of CPC(M-L) which was a life-and-death battle against U.S. imperialism as well as Soviet social-imperialism and independent Marxiss-Leninist Party in opposition to both U.S. imperialism and Soviet social-imperialism, reaction and opportunism of all hues, the Party met the attempt to float the

At the request made by Party activists in I Khrushchovite line in service of Chinese opportunism head on The article first of all exposes the anti-Leninist organizational line taken by the Chinese agents. This itself was an attack on Mao's "philosophy" of letting a "hundred flowers bloom, etc.", a line, it will be remembered from the earlier section of the essay, Jack Scott had continuously pushed from PWM in opposition to the formation of CPC(M-L) is the first place. Thus it doesn't take much to correlate that Scott's line, then Daya Varma's line inside the Party and finally the hysteria of all the opportunist sagainst CPC(M-L)'s view of what "political line" constitutes have the same source (Chinese opportunism) and all have the same end, attack against Leninist theory and practice on Party building, on democratic centralism and a monoithite politics and outlook necessary for the Party of the proletariat to defeat the bourgeoisie and all its opportunist elements infesting the working class and popular movements.

The Party's article characterized their anti-Leninist organizational policies as follows: "Right from the beginning, the ultra-leftists and rightists agreed with the programme in words, but opposed it in practice. They were led by individual overlords who put themselves over and above the discipline of the Solidarity Movement, over and above the genuine aspirations of their own national groups. So these reactionary overlords with their hollow bluster tried to use the Solidarity Movement for their own purposes. Instead of upholding principle, uniting with one another in the antional groups and, through these groups, uniting in the Solidarity Movement, they attempted to build their own fieldoms and tried to dismember and liquidate the Solidarity Movement. They deliberately spread the counter-revolutionary propaganda that the Solidarity Movement, and the solidarity movement, a Stiff decument in the solidarity movement. They deliberately spread the counter-revolutionary propaganda that the Solidarity Mov

Solidarity Movement." This final activity was of course their last resort because in all their other efforts to submit the Solidarity Movement to revisionist politics, they failed as a result of the Party upholding Leninist principles.

The source of the line pushed by the splittists is well-known enough as a typical revisionist tactio of Khrushchovite revisionists who always and everywhere subverted proletarian politics to ensure the proletarian and its political Party never exercised hegemony over the revolutionary movement, leaving instead in the hands of bourgeois academics, social-democratic trade union aristocrats, priests and other "notables" and always themselves been the promoters of these anti-Leninist going the properties of the bourgeoise. But that the Chinese had always themselves been the promoters of these anti-Leninist sown proletarian line in leading the anti-imperialist politics which were surging throughout Canada in the 1972-74 period. Dr. James Endicott, who re-emerged on the scene after the Kissinger Mao talks in 1971, began floating his public presence in Canada, in part, on the platforms provided for him by CPC(M-L) and its Canadian People's Fortun, for those enagged in educational and cultural work, organized by the Provisional Committee of the Canadian People's Fortun, for floore and properties. When he spock, Endicott promoted the line that "During my communist friends were always emphasizing 'don't be too red', that is to say, himit yourself for what are the political possibities of the time. I would emphasize that in the Anti-Japanese United front we mere under strict discipline not to criticize Chiang Kaishek other of all the forces. cause he was necessary at that particular time and in those particular circumstances for the holding together of all the forces against Japan, and they sometimes explained it to us that the reason that we have to support him is that he has raised aloft the hanner of resistance to Japan and we are getting under his elbow so that he can't pull it down. It was necessary to be very disciplined about not being ion or ed." Here Endloctot outlines the anti-Marxist-Leninist line of the Chinese Communist Party headed by Mao Tsetung. The theory of propping up Chiang Kaishek on the basis that the Chinese revolution must rely on U.S. imperialism to fight Japanese imperialism, of relying on one imperialist power to fight another, has been the cornerstone of heir pragmatic policies. It is a policy of submitting the political Party of the protectariat to the hegemony of the monopoly ourgeoise and the agents of foreign imperialism. Thus the politics which Daya Varma and others in his clique were trying to usual in the Soldarity Movement ("anti-imperialist" but "not communist") is simply another version of being "very disciplined about not being too red."

Since those times in 1972, Endicott has found himself out of he company of CPC(M-L), which he now abuses in his newsletter as a ClA front, and in the company of those who have his line of being "very disciplined about not being too red." These elements are of course none other than Daya Varma's renegade clique and others mobilized in 1972-28 AREQ, which I changed its name to "Communist League", and became the official representative in Canada of Chine. particular circumstances for the holding together of all the force against Japan, and they sometimes explained it to us that the

renegade clique and others mobilized in 1972 as MREQ, which in 1974-75 headed the "three world theory" bloo against CPC(M-L), then after its slanderous attack against CPC(M-L), then after its slanderous attack against CPC(M-L) changed its name to "Communist League", and became the official representative in Canada of Chihees social-imperialism and the agents-provoacteurs for the police. Now from the other "left" side there are those attacking CPC(M-L) for participating in any alliance with non-proletarian elements who are disposed for their own interests to fight U.S. imperialism and the sell-out policies of the Canadian state. These opportungks fake up precisely the line advanced in the days of 1972 back through 1969 when the line dayanced in the days of 1972 back through 1969 when the line dayanced in the days of 1972 back through 1969 when the line dayanced in the days of 1972 back through 1969 when the line dayanced in the days of 1972 back through 1969 when the line dayanced in the days of 1972 back through 1969 when the line dayanced in the first self-anticonstruction of the country) in CPL floated the line "all nationalism is reactionary" and went so far as to denounce the heroic Victamance people led by their leader Ho Chi Minh as being "anti-communist" etc. because they persisted in theirs self-ascrificing struggles against U.S. imperialism from this left-sounding Trotskyite line (in fact the Daya Varman clique in its "left" phrase also used to puff itself up as being "most revolutionary" as the demonstration on May 20, 1971 proved, as did too their "terrorist" posture in November 1970), is that the Party, or 2) submergs the independent position of the Party, or 2) submergs the independent position of the Party, or 3) authorized the revolutionary and the victam This is precisely why fandicated was so nervous in the company of CPC/CM-L). He was used to dominating the revisionist 'united from' in the Canadian Peace Congress and succeeded in subverting the independent position of the Party, or 2) submerg

Endicott. Of course, Dr. Endicott sees in this new bloc of anticommunists a reincarnation of the politics of being "very
disciplined about not being too red", which he remembers with
such Christian look oftom his days with Chou En-lai and the
Canadian revisionist party. The other point to make is that Dr.
Endicott has not burned all his bridges with the old revisionist
party either, and still has important links with influential
revisionist leaders which enables the Chinese social-imperialists
in infiltrate and influence these circles as well as floating their
own sects to attack CPC(M-L). This is all part of the
Machiavellian intrigue and conspiracy being hatched by the
"Mao Tsetung Thought" cultists, and various opportunists to
attack Marxim-Leninism with a united front of revisionists,
social democrats, Trotskyites and anarchists. This is the yellow
front aimed against the revolution and socialism. This explains
why they are one with each other when CPC(M-L) exposes the
fascist charlantsism of Endicott and his alleged concern for
peace" and "Chinese-Canadian Friendship".

But let us return to the Party's analysis of the Chinese
revisionist agents who had tried in vain from November 1970 on
to take over CPC(M-L) and liquidate its Marxist-Leninist line
and convert it into a social-imperialist party tied to the war chariot of Chinese social-imperialism. "Ideologically, organizationally and politically, the ultra-leftists and rightists have
sone bankrupt and have become hysterical in their opposition to Marxism-Leninism and in their promotion of racism
(...) Just let's look at the trash they have been peddling. They
say that the "Afro-Asians" are more revolutionary's
than North Americans; that we only have a responsishibilty towards our own countries and will not participate in
the organization of the production of the control of the control

revolutionary struggie nere . is this not raold characterism and racism? One would not call it proletarian internationalism! It does not matter how many absurd rationalizations they concoct, does not matter how many absurd rationalizations they concord, these ultra-leftists and rightists can only fool themselves. Proletarian internationalism is extremely well-known to all genuine communists, especially to Canadian and Quebecois communists who gave birth to such a great proletarian internationalist as Norman Bethune. . . . In fact in Quebecos of these characters have become so arrogant and wild that they behave like imperialist fords and vilify the Quebecois Marxist-Leninists and other progressive people. They have joined the ranks of the U.S. imperialists and imperialists from other countries to attack the Quebecois Marxist-Leninists and other progressive people. Bit it this attitude of vilification of the progressive people which makes them 'more revolutionary' than North Americans?

"The ultra-feltists and the rightists work hand in hand. While

North Americans?

"The ultra-leftists and the rightists work hand in hand: While the rightists, through metaphysics and idealism, concoct all the possible 'objections' the 'people' will have to the correct line, the 'ultra-leftists', close brothers of the rightists, stead the correct line into as 'pure left' a line as possible (that is, they make it as incorrect as possible), again through metaphysics and idealism, and they disrupt the organization by fighting the genuine Marxist-Lennists on that basis. Instead of concretely changing the gituation in a step-wise maganger, the rightists and the ultra-left astempt to liquidate the movement even before it starts remaining stagents. the situation in a step-wise manner, the rightists and the ultra-left attempt to liquidate the movement eyen before it starts growing. It is the history of over two and a half years that the ultra-left and its the instory of over two and a nail years that the ultra-left and the rightists attempt to liquidate the movement while the genuine Marxist-Leninists led by Comrade Bains helped the overall development against this degeneration and built the organization amongst the people."

This line that Leninism is not applicable to the "advanced capitalist" countries because the proletariat is allegedly no longer a revolutionary class, is just a repetition of the line pushed by the social chauvinists of the Second International after the Great

social chanvinists of the Second informational after the Great October Revolution which promoted the line that Leninism was applicable only to "peasant countries". Thus by posturing as Leftists, these anti-Leninists were merely doing propaganda for the Chinese social chauvinists, who while posturing that revolution was only for the countries of Asia, Africa and Latin revolution was only for the countries of Asia, Africa and Latin America, were actually opposing Leninism for these countries as well through their demagogy about the "third world", i.e. the reactionary neo-colonial and fascist cliques running these countries so that Chinese social-imperialism could have a "go" at exploiting them under the name of being a "third world" country, etc. Chinese revisionism floated this "theory" in 1971 under the penmanship of George Thomson in England, in his anti-Leninist book, From Marx to Mao The-tung, in which he posits the "theory" that the working class in the West is "sold out" and therefore Leninism is no longer applicable to the working class movement, and the building of Marxist-Leninist parties in opposition to social democracy and Khrushchovite revisionism is not necessary either. This makes it clear that the line behind the splitters and wreckers in Canada was a line promoted opposition to social cemotically and Kindshictorie tevisionism is not necessary either. This makes it clear that the line behind the splitters and wreckers in Canada was a line promoted internationally by Chineser visionism, thus opening up a second front of attack against the new Marxist-Leninist forces of the proletariat in the countries of Western Europe and North America to build their proletarian parties. What all of these opportunists were doing was embellishing the revisionist theories of the Khrushchovites, the "Eurocommunists" and others from yet another angle. The Party denunciation of the line that the "third world" is allegedly the "molive force of history" as it reystallized itself in 1974 with the emergence of the "three world theory," was thus attacked and throughly discredicted in the revolutionary circles led by CPC(M-L) right from January 1972. This was an extremely big victory for Leninism and it prepared the conditions for the final elimination of the Chinese revisionist influence on the new Marxist-Leninist forces led by CPC(M-L) culminating in the rejection of "Mao Tsetung Thought" in 1978. It is a sheer fraud and a big lie on the part of the U.S. imperial-stropportunist agency to pretend that their hindsight actions It is a sheer fraud and a big lie on the part of the U.S. imperialist opportunist agency to pretend that their hindight actions
have anything to do with the preparation and education of the
revolutionary forces against the emergence of Chinese
revisionism. To hide the history of the communist movement in
order to float themselves among the blind and ignorant as some
"anguard intellectual" wonders simply will not usab given the
eloquent facts of the history of CPC(M-L).
Let us quote further from the article, "Down with the 'Left'Slogancering Front of Khrushchovite Revisionism", an historic
essay, in defence of Leinisim against the emerging Chinese
revisionist front. "The ultra-left is more creative than the right
and more dishonest. This is the only aspect that differentiates

and more dishonest. This is the only aspect that differentiates them from the rightists because in all basic policies the ultrathem from the rightists because in all basic policies the ultra-leftists and the rightists are the same. The ultra-left, which arose in the summer of 1971, is constituted of 1) nazis, 2) communalists, and 3) liberials. Their basic unity is based on opposing the Party and revolution. They are national chauvinists and anti-communists. They are doing everything to corrode the revolutionary movement amongst the Afro-Asians from within Ideologically, they indulge in "left"-phrasemongering and practice extreme rightist politics. Organizationally, they are past-masters in building fascist cliques. They despise three basic things most: 1) revolutionary principle, 2) revolutionary struggle, and 3) the revolutionary Party. They are a wretched type of neo-troskysts and neo-revisionist as they go from one position to the other with extreme love of shamelessness and hysterical espousal of idealism and metaphysics. With them gone, the solidarity movement is bound to make another leap forward." This analysis of the political physiognomy of the Chinese agents inside CPC(M-L) prepared the Party to recognize the features of those who emerged in the 1974-78 period for exactly what they were. Only those who for their own blind and selfish reasons could not remember (or better, wanted to forget) the Party's historic fight against Daya Varma in the 1970-71 period could fail to see in the opportunist agency exactly the features outlined above. They started out with a "left" bluer in 1975 as part of the Canadian Revolution magazine along with Dave Paterson and others who have since either merged with In Struggle! or the League. The agency went their own sectiarian way after "splitting" a second time from the "centrain" and agency and the struggle! All this has the same features exhibited by the Daya Varma cilique when they were still doing their utmost to subvert and split the Party. Now we see the same idealist, metaphysical thinking coming from the opportunist agency and the renegades who form the tail end of the Chinese revisionist front splitting from the Party. Common to them all is their anarchistic individualism, their inability and unwillingness to build the monolithic Party of the proletariat, and when it comes right down to it, their deep-stated lack of conviction in the industrial proletariat of Canada (and the rest of the Western world) as the social class destined, under the leadership of its proletarian tell in proletariat of cland force (i.e. the Party) in Marxist-Leninist science is, in fact, a capitulation to the imperialist-revisionist renirclement of socialism and the communist movement and its all-sided integrate of conviction in the industrial proletariat with its massive arrenal of lying propagnada and police terror. Thus, all the screaming of hypericalism and the communist movement and its all-sided integrates of conviction and will to transform into a politica

commemorating the 22nd anniversary of the founding of the People's Republic of China, the ultra-left writes: 'Because of the correct policy of China, a broad United Front of the world' people against U.S. imperialism and its running dogs is steadil-developing. China enters into various negotiations because the developing. China enters into various negotiations because threat of war still exists. Negotiations and war form a dialect threat of war still exists. Negotiations and war form a dialectical unity of opposites. In accordance with the great strategic concept of Chairman Mao "Be Prepared against Natural Diassters and Do Everything for the People. Chinese people have made tremendous advances. Because of the strength of the anti-imperialist front, and because of China's own preparedness China's in a good position to enter into various negotiations and achieve strategic victory over imperialism and reaction." Of course with the hindsight of the past seven years it does not take much genius to see, provided one wants to, what this line entailed. It was preparation of public opinion for China's capitulation to U.S. imperialism, its alignment with the reactionary governments of Europe, Japan and the various capitulation to U.S. imperialism, its alignment with the reactionary governments of Europe, Japan and the various reactionary states in Asia, Africa and Latin America in order to "modernize" China, Le. turn it into a superpower. It was a strategic concept" of Chinese social-imperialism to align with U.S. imperialism against the "main danger", i.e. the Soviet U.S. imperialism against the "main danger", i.e. the Soviet social-imperialist bloe. It was a line of hegemonism, aggression and war being pursued with such haste these days by the Chinese social-imperialists who needed to hijack the revolutionary Marxist-Leninist movement (or so they hoped to do) in order to liquidate the resistance to their treacherous, counter-revolutionary activity as part of their effort to climinate socialism on the world scale and enslave the profedrait to darkness and exploitation without resistance everywhere — the dream of Hitler, Mussoliniand Tojo. These days there are some who but yesterday were praising the "three world theory" to the skies in their efforts to join in this heimous counter-revolutionary conspiracy with Peking and are today, with hindsight, but with conspiracy with Peking and are today, with hindsight, but with

conspiracy with Peking and are today, with hindsight, but with the same counter-revolutionary purpose of liquidating the Marxist-Leninist centre in Canada, pretending that they have "analyzed" Chinese opportunism first and foremost.

CPC(M-L) fought the Chinese revisionists without the aid of hindsight. They were forced to fight "Mao Tsetung Thought" in order to build the Leninist Party in Canada against the agents of China who tried to liquidate it. Thus, when we re-read the analysis written to expose and denounce the Khrushchovite revisionism of the Varrna clique, we can apply it equally well to the whole "three world" bloc which re-surfaced to attack CPC(M-L) in 1974-76. The arguments against Warma are a ringing defence of Leninism against "Mao Testung Thought" "1. Because of the correct policy of China, a broad United Front of the world's people against U.S. imperialism and its running dogs is steadily developing." This is a correct formulation as far as it goes but it only talks about China 7 to e, and treats the role of the world's people very superficially. The question is: Can China, a Kina, a world's people very superficially. The question is: Can China, a country ravaged by colonialism, militarism and imperialism during a period of reconstruction and during a period of ism during a period of reconstruction and during a period of liberating all her territories and safeguarding her independence, do other than follow the foreign policies of the 'three resolutes and one more'. The 'three resolutes and one more' is the policy of Chairman Mao, as opposed to the 'three capitulations and one less' followed by the revisionists. That is, resolute opposition to mear's insolute opposition to revisionism, resolute opposition to all reaction and more support to the revolutionary struggles of the people of the world, versus capitulation to imperialism, capitulation to revisionism, capitulation to all reaction and less support to the revolutionary struggles of the people of the revolutionary struggles of the people of the world. "This hits directly at the policy makers who 'were floating public opinion precisely so they could carry out a were floating public opinion precisely so they could carry out a policy of "three capitulations and one less". Thus by hitting ou at the promoters of this "three capitulations and one less" the Party was preparing itself to deal head on with the real authors of Party was preparing itself to deal head on with the real authors of this thesis. By 1976, after having waged yet another round of battles against the promoters (in another form, having been re-mobilized in 1974-76 as the "genuine Marxist-Leninists" to attack CPC(M-L) and promote the "three world theory" of Chinese revisionism and seen very clearly the practical political See page 4: DOWN WITH REVISIONISM!

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 Russsian 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 counterrevolution. 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 romoting Chinese social chauvinism through their agents in Linuary 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 tront, 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 antiimperialist 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 proletariat, 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 foward 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 trotskvist 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 unit 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