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

prence material published at the request made by Party activists in Montreal at the Raily organized by the Party to usher in the Year of Stalin

In this issue, PCDN is continuing the reference material ablished at the request made by Party activists in Montreal. For vevious portions, see Vol. 9 Nos. 12, 15, 16, 17, 18, 22 and 23, sted January 13, 17, 18, 19, 20, 25 and 26, 1979.

In the immortal classic, Foundations of Leninism, Stalin

In the immortal classic, Foundations of Leninism. Stain writes:

"The theory of 'defeating' opportunist elements by ideological struggle within the Party, the theory of 'overcoming' these elements within the confines of a single party is a rotten and dangerous theory, which threatens to condemn the Party to a paralysis and chronic infilmity, threatens to make the Party a prey to opportunism, threatens to leave the proletariat without a revolutionary Party, threatens to deprive the proletariat of its main weapon in its fight against imperialism. Our Party could not have seized power and organized the dictatorship of the proletariat, it could not have emerged victorious from the civil war, if it and within its ranks people like Martov and Dan. Potresov and within its ranks people like Martov and Dan. Potresov and within its ranks people like Martov and Dan. Potresov and within its ranks people like Martov and Dan. Potresov and unexampled cohesion of its ranks primarily because it was able in good time to purge itself of the opportunist pollution, because it was able to rid its ranks of Liquidators and Menshewiks. Proletarian parties develop and become strong by purging themselves of opportunists and reformists, social-imperialists and social chauvinists, social-patriots and social-pacifists."

Description in the lies and distortions, they expose them-

The Social Pharins of the lies and distortions, they expose them-pless as factionalists who advocate two-line struggle in the Party. According to their story, the differences which hey had with the Party date back to the Special Cyn-ress of the Party, if not before. Through a conspicu-us silence on this question, if becomes evident that from that time to the end of July, they raised no differences inside to Party Is for the member and the size of the Party Is for the member and the party of the party Is for the member and the party Is for the party Is that time to the end of July, they raised no differences inside the Party. In fact, the member writes that he was a delegate to the Special Congress, who was present at the first session but missed the remainder of the sessions due to an unspecified illness. Did he raise any of his serious political questions in the Congress either at the figst session or in writing if he were not "able" to attend? No. This sincere "revolutionary" raised nothing to the Congress, the highest organ of the Party, nor afterwards, for that matter. The only thing they refer to is that the "member" advocated a cheate after the Congress with a "responsible comrade" who ran out on the Party right during the Congress and who they write was expelled by the Congress. They write that the Party comrade dehate after the Congress with a "responsible comrade" who ran out on the Party right during the Congress and who they write was expelled by the Congress. They write that the Party comrade answered that this is to advocate two-line struggle in the Party; but then they have nothing further to say. So the next event according to their story where their differences come up is as follows: "During the period of July 20 to 25, 1978. It went above the fascist rorms of CPCCM-L) and had many discussions with a few people close to me who were all more or less involved with a few people close to me who were all more or less involved with a few people close to me who were all more or less involved with contempt of its norms, which have nothing Marxist-Leninist about them. We rejoice because in has become crystal clear that contempt of its norms, which have nothing Marxist-Leninist about them. We rejoice because in has become crystal clear that CPCCM-L) is not a revolutionary party, and we have intensified our work to brand this opportunist organization and put the axe to its rotten political line. Thus, having raised no criticistness of this organization according to the Marxist-Leninist norms, they undertake "the criticism of this organization in contempt of its norms" which they simply assert "have nothing Marxist-Leninist about them". Not only that, they shamelessly write that these were undertaken "with a few people close to me who were all more or less involved with "CPC/LAL" of one to me who were all more or less involved with "CPC/LAL" of the one who were all more or less involved with "CPC/LAL" of one to me who were all more or less involved with "CPC/LAL" of one to me who were all more or less involved with "CPC/LAL" of one to me who were all more or less involved with "CPC/LAL" of one to me who were all more or less involved with "CPC/LAL" of one to me who were all more or less involved with "CPC/LAL" of one to me who were all more or less involved with "CPC/LAL" of one to me who were all more or less involved wi "with a few people close to me who were all more or less involves with a CVPC(M-L)." Close indeed! They were all family member either from the immediate family or through marriage. A fin example of how a Marxist-Leninist deals with politica differences!

example of how a Marxist-Leninist deals with political differences!

As they had, in their own words, admitted that they were violating the norms of the Party—and clearly in a most serious, anti-Party manner—then any Marxist-Leninist knows that it was the responsibility of the Party, which it carried out, to point to the clements concerned the seriousness of their violations and that the existence of factions and the acceptance of two-line struggle in the Party will taled to the paralysis of the Party, turning it from a militant and voluntary union into a loose debating society; that in the Party, once discussion has taken place and decisions have been made, they must be implemented. The Party explained this to them, pointing out that for them to carry on in this why_was to serve imperialism and reaction objectively as it was an attack on the very existence of the Marxist-Leninist Party. Having explained this, one of two things had to follow. Either they were honest revolutionaries who hadn't realized the seriousness of their activities and would rectify, come under the discipline of the Party and raise whatever questions they had through the appropriate channels or they had joined the camp of reaction and they would insist on carrying out that atter is the case.

Now to cover un their nefarious activities and to try to

joined the camp of reaction and they would insist on carrying out their activities against the Party. The developments have shown that the latter is the case.

Now, to cover up their nefarious activities and to try to discredit the Party, they repeat over and over again that the Party was being bureaucratie as violation of the norms of the Party was being bureaucratie as violation of the norms of the Party was acceptable as they had political differences with the line of the Party is on the Party in a letter from a "ympathizer with the line of the Party, to Comrade Bains, which they have printed in en appendix to their yellow journal, he writes: "There have been violations of the norms of the Party, agreed. But it is necessary to go further and pose the question of why there have been violations of the horms of the Party, agreed. But it is necessary on the norms of the Party. The response is very simple, there have been violations of the norms because numerous comrades, sincere communists and those dedicated to the cause of the protestariat and the revolution have a heavy heat recurse of the protestariat and the revolution have a heavy heat recurse of the protestariat and the revolution have a heavy heat recurse of the protestariat and the revolution have a heavy heat recurse of the protestariat and the revolution have a heavy heat recurse of the protestariat and the revolution have a heavy heat recurse the two describes the protestary and the important political questions and furthermore, the style of work of the Party, and its manner of string is extremely defective. This is a substrating on their art. How does the fact that someone has political difference art. How does the fact that someone has political difference art. How does the fact that someone has political difference art. How does the fact that someone has political difference art. How does the fact that someone has political difference art. How does the fact that someone has political difference art. How does the fact that someone has political dif

proletariat, the building of socialism to the ultimate aim of communism. So, one or the other. Either you had serious differences with the Marxist-Lenninst Party in which case you should have defended its norms and raised your criticisms in a principled manner and not in a factional manner or you thought the Party was revisionist in which case for you, the issue is not that you have serious political differences so you are violating the norms, but because you are determined to destroy the revisionist party. And if you had serious doubts as to whether the Party was a genuine Party or not, you still would have raised your criticisms according to the norms. because either then, it answers your according to the norms, because either then, it answers questions and this helps to clarify whether it is Marxist-Ler

questions and this helps to clarify whether it is Marxist-Leninis or not or it doesn't answer your questions and criticisms in which case it is clear that it is not the Party.

But they started off by raising their criticisms in violation of the norms of the Party and when this was pointed out they justified it and said they would continue on this path. When the Party refuses to convert itself into a loose-debating society and criticism it would be a contracted in the party refuses to convert itself into a loose-debating society and the party refuses to convert itself into a loose-debating society and the party refuses to convert itself into a loose-debating society and the party refuses to convert itself into a loose-debating society and the party refuses the party refuses with them is replainted to the party refuses with them is replainted to the party refuses the party in the party refuses the party in the party refuses the party r But they started oft by raising time criticisms in vocations, the norms of the Party and when this was pointed out they justified it and said they would continue on this path. When the Party refuses to convert itself ifto a loose-debating society and engage in factional two-line struggle with them in violation of all individual and the control of the party refuses to convert itself into a loose-debating society and engage in factional two-line struggle with them in violation of all individual differences. But it is precisely an exposure of their political differences. But it is precisely an exposure of their political differences. But it is precisely an exposure of their political differences. Whit the Party on a principled basis, but first formed a communalist clique to wage factional struggle against the Party. As Lenin pointed out; "Refusal to accept the lorence of the central bodies is taniamount to a refusit to remain in the Party, it is tantamount to disrupting the Party; its a method of destroying, not of convincing. And these efforts of destroy instead of to convince indicate their lack of comistens of the party is being bureaucratic by upholding its Marxist-Leninist norms and by refusing to engage in factional struggle with them over their "political differences" is to say that they do not consider the defence of the integrity of the Party as a political question. It is to say that the Party is bureaucratic if implements the decisions arrived at through democratic discussion and if it insists that the minority submit to the majority. Lenin in exposing the line of certain Menshewick, writes." You are a bureaucrate because you were appointed by the Congress and not on my consent; you are earling in a good marked to the party in the party with the work of the Congress and not on my consent; you are earling in a good marked conditions of the Congress and not on my consent; you are earling in a good marked to have discussion with them in violation of all its norms and according to their dicates, and their o

which they write is an example of the seriousness with which they were raising the questions is their open letter of 40 questions which they addressed to "all the members, supporters and friends of CPC(M-1) as well as to other Marxist-Lennist individuals and organizations as well as to the broad masses". This letter by the very way that it is addressed, let alone by its content, negates the very existence of the Party, unless they want to openly admit that they are following the line of "Mao I Setting Thought" and believe that there are Marxist-Lennist organizations in a country outside of the Party 8 years after the Party has been re-established on the basis of Marxism-Lennism. In this document they do not date to remirth this letter which it is hears and the set of the party has been rethey do not dare to reprint this letter which is a blatant expos one one or reprint this letter which is a blatant exposure of their unprincipled, lying and slanderous nature, while they do try to pass off the fact that they wrote this letter as a sign that they were raising serious questions with the Party which it was refusing to anwer.

And then there is the letter of a "sympathicar" of the arms.

of the act has they wrote this letter as a sign that they try to pass of the fact that they wrote this letter as a sign that they were raising serious questions with the Party which it was refusing to anwer.

And then there is the letter of a "sympatizer" of the Party they justified that it was correct for them to violate the Party shorms. And this is also supposed to be an example showing how they were raising their "political questions" in a "principled" fashion but the Party was being unprincipled because it was refusing to discuss with them.

All these things are supposed to show that the Party was so weak it dared not have political discussion with them. What they are also trying to confuse here is that when we refuse to answer criticisms from whatever quarter this is supposed to indicate the bankruptey of the Party's line, the beause according to them if the Party's line is correct it will be able to answer all criticisms. This is a subterfuge. It is true that the Party's line, if it is correct, will be able to maintain its integrity no matter what or whom makes articism of it. The fact of the matter is that it has defended its integrity in the face of all the attacks made on it, including all the attacks made on it by the revisionists and opportunists of all hous, including their latest police-socialist abuse. But the point which they are trying to obscure is that the disjufferation would have taken place, if the Party had agreed to allow two-time struggle in the Party over the agreed upon decisions. It is norder to obscure this and to make it seem that the Party serious political differences which "proves" the "barky prover" the bark greed upon decisions. It is not roter to show the sine shall decisions which they one rote of the "ray had a greed to allow two-time struggle in the Party were the expected upon decisions. It is not the decisions with them on their "political differences" which

the leading bodies informed all the comrades of these developments (which it has in greater or lesser detail) they have been running around wildly trying to win comrades to their position, although this has been mainly on the fringes of the Party as thy know that the actual Party comrades who have been trained by the Party would not take too kindly to their policio-socialist activity.

The key to Leninist strategy and tactics is building the Leninist Party and its closest links with the proletariat and the oppressor of the processor of the party as the processor of the party and tactics is publicable that the processor of the party of a Leninist type that leads this opportunist agency and its allies to instinctively come to praise the Kaustkys, Plekhanovs and other impotent renegades and cowards of the Second International. This is not too say that these men did not write some valuable essays in their youth and in the peace period of social democracy before the war. But once Leninism arose in 1903 in opposition to menshevism, then Kautsky and other heroes of the Second International played an outright disruptive, liquidationist, then Kautsky and other heroes of the Second International played an outright disruptive, liquidationist counter-revolutionary role thoroughly condemmed by the proletariat. This opportunist agency no doubt fancies itself as the processor of the second International played an outright disruptive, liquidationist counter-revolutionary role thoroughly condemmed by the proletariat. This opportunist agency no doubt fancies itself as their international played an outright disruptive, liquidationist the proletariat. This opportunist agency no doubt fancies itself as their international played an outright disruptive, liquidationist the proletariat. This opportunist agency no doubt fancies itself as their international played an outright disruptive, liquidation in the proletariat. This opportunist agency no doubt fancies itself as the proletariat. This opportunist agency no doubt fancies itself as

A No. 54, May 6, 1973, as well as in the pamphle entitled. Learn from the Teachers by Negative Example.

The article analyzes in great detail the history of the Afro-Asian-Latin American People's Solidarity Movement founded in March 1969 by revolutionaries led by the Canadian Markis-Leninists. It analyzes the liquidationist path followed by Daya dram (without mentioning him by name) and his splittist clique which we have already referred to. As part of this conspiratorial cique's efforts to liquidate the Party they used their important positions to usurp the Solidarity Movement's paper and published an editorial on "People's China" which contained in it all the essential components of what emerged three years later as the "three world theory." The article was written in October 1971 just after Kissinger's "secret" diplomacy had set in motion the beriffotous re-alignment of China's strategy from a line of a "very broad united front of the proletariat and the revolutionary peoples of all countries against U.S. imperialism. Soviet revisionism and reaction of various countries" to the line after Nixon's wisit of a "broad united front", this time including in it "all those who can be united" incorporating in it even the United States of America against Soviet social-imperialism. At that time in history, the Canadian state, action as the agency for United States of America against Soviet social-imperialism. At that time in history, the Canadian state, acting as the agency for U.S. imperialism, had established diplomatic relations with People's China as a step in the direction of the emerging U.S. Chinese alliance. Conditions were set for the Chinese revisionists to step up their line of liquidating the newly emerging Marxist-Leninst communist movement as they proclaimed they would in their article "Long Live the Victory of the Dictatorship of the Protleariat" in March 1971, anarticle which as we showed earlier resents the thesis tone held by Jack Scull that the elses streamle protestrate in Marcen 1971, anarticle which as we showed earlier presents the thesis long held by Jack Scott, that the class struggle would give rise to "various groups" and "trends" and the "masses would decide" who was revolutionary or not through "debates" and "ideological struggle". Thus the polycentrist and liberal-anarchist ideas in opposition to Leninist monolitie unity in a democratic centralist vanguard Party were given "authoritative status" in the Chinese press. This reveals that Jack Scott had all loon mergly been exprised the line of a feromework the line amarchist ideas in opposition to Leninist monolithic unity in a democratic centralist vanguard Party were given "authoritative status" in the Chinese press. This reveals that Jack Scott had all along merely been carrying the line of a foreign party and had in no way based his stand on either the historical needs of the Canadian revolution nor upon the fundamental Leninist-Stalinist teachings on building the proletarian Party. Day Arama became Jack Scott sclass ally, only he was in a position to do more damage to the recently formed Communist Party of Canada (Marxist-Leninist) because of his position inside it. He was directly incited by the Chinese, an act of gross interference in the internal affairs of a fraternal Party and a flagrant act of social-imperialism, to puff himself up as the most authoritative interpreter of the Communist Party of China, and hence of the International Communist Movement, etc. Varma's arrogance against CPCM-L1, like that of all the opportunists, is based on his connection with social-imperialism and the state apparatus. Puffed up by his link with the Chinese machiavellian intriguers, this jesuitical Maoist began his splittist manoeuvres and conspiracies to figuidate the Party at precisely the same time the Kissinger-Nixon-Mao conspiracy was being hatched against Leninist Communist Movement behind the backsof the world's people in the summer of 1971.

Before we look with more detail at the Party a demunciation of 1973 when his splittist, poportunist cipieu, MREQ (CCL) which Daya Varma gave birth to with his split in 1971-72 wrote, their abuse and slander against CPCM-1). They worte: "A newspaper jointly published by The Worker, Maxt Line and CPDN on December 1970 reported a conference held on China where the slogan was given: 'China's Chairman is Our Chairman,' China's Path is Our Path'.

"These examples show how the CPC(M-1,1) blindly applies slogans and areami-cloudial and semi-cloudial country (such excember 1974 in the control of the Chinese may have the majority of the populati

theorists", which included those who called themselves "In theorists", which included those who called themselves swell. After all, the opportunist agency as well. After all, the opportunist agency still writes in 1978 that CPC(M-L) was "typing to get a license to import the Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution". First of all the CCL line is precisely the line advanced by Jack Scott in his pamphet Five Roads, and the essence of this thesis is that Leninsins is not 'the international doctrine of the proletarians of all the CCL line is and obligatory for all countries without exception, including the capitalistically developed countries. Only this time the social charavist of the public witernational were relegating Lenin as a "simple "peasant philospher" as foreign literary buildings and obligatory for advanced capitalistic countries. They have taken up the rotten opportunist line that there are "two roads" to social and national revolution, a Soviet road (October Revolution) which they deliberately mix up with the present coals—imperialist regime in Moscow, and the Chinese road, which they assert is the correct road for "peasant countries". But in fact, the "Chinese road" including "Mao Tistung Thought" is a deviation from the October Road and Leninism, and is denounced and repudiated by the Communist Party of Canada (Marxist-Leninist).

The present-day opportunists and renegades with the power of nindsight would like to abstract events from the 1963-70 period completely out of context in typical metaphysical style in order to push their anti-Leninist theses and liquidate the political Party of communists. But they can never do that. Nor can they erect their Chinese Wall between the proletariat, headed by their vanguard communist parties in the countries of Asia, Africa and Latin. America and Latin. America and guard commist parties in the countries of Asia, Africa and Latin America and the proteatral headed by their vanguard commists parties in the developed capitalist-revisionist countries. They are all bound together by Leninism, by the theory and practice of the Great October Socialist Revolution whose road is mandatory and obligatory for all countries witherory and practice of the Great October Socialist Revolution whose road is mandatory and obligatory for all countries witherory and practice of the Great October Socialist Revolution whose road is mandatory and obligatory for all countries witherory and practice of the Great October Contribution of Anglo-French semi-colonial country (under the domination of Anglo-French finance capital) with a majority (80 percent) of its population composed of peasants, but Lenin did not surround the clitics from the countryside! He built the Bolshevik Party as a Party able and worthy to lead the insurrection of October and took the proletarian revolution to the countryside building the steel-like unity between workers and peasants, a unity which is a law of development of proletarian revolution and the dictatorship of development of proletarian revolution and the dictatorship of the proletarial. All of the huffing and puffing by Varma and his Chiness social-imperialist clique about "surround the clitics from the countryside" in a "semi-feudal and semi-colonial country" shows in fact to what an extent he adheres to the anti-Leninist hencies of "Mao Testung Thought" which today he cumnot refute because of his servicus of othness social-imperialism. But even because of his servitude to Chinese social-imperialism. But even his efforts to slander CPC(M-L) with this charge, as we shall show shortly, is yet another around.

the countryside" in a "semi-teudal and semi-colonial country, shows in fact to what an extent he adhers to the anti-Leninist theories of "Mao I Setung Thought" which today he cannot refute because of his servitude to Chinese social-imperialism. But even his efforts to slander CPC(M-L) with this charge, as we shall show shortly, is yet another example of his own perificions activity of blaming others for his own sins. All these opportunists want to push with all their might from their absurd leftist posturing the central social-democratic thesis being pushed from Peking, that Leninism is dead, that countries in Europe and North America should be ruled by Shahs and Sheiks, fascist generals and social-fascist cliques; that countries in Europe and North America can't possibly have proletarian revolutions because this will weaken the united front against the "main danger". Soviet social-imperialism. This is the same yellow banner hoisted by the renegades and social-democratic traitors of the Second International in Western Europe, especially in Germany, at that crucial juncture of world history when proletarian revolution was a pressing necessity and it was declared, along with Leninian sensibility of peasant-fountries." With that terrible leas a justification for the Saiaghter of the German sensibility of the Social-Democratic Party and Free Corps alliance, the German revolution was drowned in blood, giving rise to fascisim and war. These monsters, clothing themselves as pro-Chinege and even pro-Alhanian "experts" are trying from both the "left" and reposition was drowned in blood, giving rise to fascisim and war. These monsters, clothing themselves as pro-Chinege and even pro-Alhanian "experts" are trying from both the "left" and reposition was drowned in blood, giving rise to fascisim and war. These monsters, clothing themselves as pro-Chinege and even pro-Alhanian "experts" are trying from both the "left" and reposition of the properion of the p

ar.

The opportunists are trying to wipe out the glorious history of

See page 3: DOWN WITH REVISIONISM!

our Party in its life-and-death struggle to defend Leninism and the road of the October Revolution. CPC(M-L) defended Mao's China because it considered this to be socialist China; the China following Lenin's road of the dictatorship of the proletariat. CPC(M-L) defended the Cultural Revolution because it considered it to be; prediction in opposition to modern revisionism and imperialism. This was the view shared by the whole international wrist-Leninst Communist Movement. It is to the shame of the Chinese social-imperialists that they told so thany lies and made such efforts to hide the real state of affairs in their party and country.

their party and country.

We have already quoted from the North American Conference
of Anti-Imperialist Youth held May 7-12, 1969. But we quote We have already quoted from the North American Conference of Anti-Imperialist Youth held May 7-12, 1969. But we quote again from the resolution to show what the Internationalists, against the "advice" of Jack Scott, who did all he could to deny the Cultural Revolution and the necessary head-on struggle against opportunism, especially Soviet social-imperialism, in keeping with Teng Hsiao-ping's line of the day that the Soviet Union could never-become a capitalist country like Yugoslavia. The resolution states: "The GPCR has: 1) been a genuine proletarian revolution on an immense scale . . . 2) been agenuine proletarian revolution on an immense scale . . . 2) been agenuine proletarian revolution on an aimmense scale . . . 2) been the new form for arousing the broad anothed to Chinese Communist party . . . 3) exposed the handful of reagades, enemy agents and absolutely unrepentant persons in power taking the capitalist road within the Chinese Communist Party and smashed their plot to restore capitalism; 4) Become a new and great contribution to the theory and practice of Marxism-Leninism by showing that the class struggle does not die out with the seizure of state power by the proletarian. S) Demonstrated that the proletarian revolutionaries must continue to struggle in order to carry out the socialist revolution in the realm of the superstructure through to the end. 6) Encouraged revolutionary waves of people's war throughout Southeast Asia. India, Plaestine, and elsewhere in Asia. Africa and Latin America and encouraged revolutionary mass movements in Japan. Western Palestine, and elsewhere in Asia, Africa and Latin America and encouraged revolutionary mass movements in Japan. Western Larope and North America, by propagating Marxism-Leninism throughout the world and has? It Exposed the true nature of the Soviet revisionist relayed as socialist in words hat imperialist in deeds. Internally the Soviet revisionist renegade clique has intensified the suppression of the Soviet people and sped up the all-round restoration of capitalism, externally it has stepped up the all-round restoration of capitalism, externally it has stepped up the all-round restoration of capitalism, externally it has stepped up the all-round restoration of capitalism, externally it has stepped up the all-round restoration of capitalism. Externally is has stepped up the all-round restoration of capitalism and suppression of the revolutionary struggles of the peoples of various countries intensified its exploitation of various East European countries and intensified its threat of aggression against China. In North American Conference of Anti-Imperialisty youth haist the Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution. This resolution was a defence of Leninism, it was an act of proletarian internationalism and a strong attack on revisionism and opportunism of all hues, against the capitalist roaders in China, against U.S. imperialism and Soviet modern revisionism. Those who come up today to strong attack of the property against me capitalist roaders in China, against U.S. imperialism and Soviet modern revisionism. Hose who come up today to attack CPC(M-L)'s courageous stand in Javour of the Cultural Revolution and against the Soviet social-imperialists, forget that in 1969 there was a Soviet-U.S. alliance against Leninism and against the Communism Party of China headed by Mao as well as People's Albania Party of China headed by Mao as well as People's Albania Party of China headed by Comrade Envier Hoxha. That is how things stood at that time, and the genuine Leninists, those secking to implant Leninism in Canada after it had been liquidated by the modern revisionists of the "C"P, had of necessity and indeed ever inspired by their class love for the international proletariat to take a bold, unequivocating stand for China's Chairman and China's road, But this was a road not different from Lenin's road, from the road of the October Revolution.

The opportunists would like the revolutionaries to forget that while the Internationalists vigorously supported the struggle against the modern revisionist clique in Moscow and supported the Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution against the restoration of capitalism by the capitalist roaders in China, they also vigorously rebuffed Jack Scott's opportunist cowardice and cal opposition to the Cultural Revolution and the struggle against modern Soviet revisions and that it was this same Jack

against modern Soviet revisionism and that it was this same facts. Scott who five years later, possing as the real champion of China fin fact, as it later turned out—of Chinag Kai-shek's China fin fact, as it later turned out—of Chinag Kai-shek's China wrote—his counter-revolutionary, anti-Leninst, anti-October Revolution thesis and slanders called Two Roads, exposed in great detail by CPC(M-L). It is too much for these opportunists to correlate that this foul anti-communist book, which only CPC(M-L) ruithyed) exposed, and not once, but consistently throughout The Party's literature, was published by the Canada-China Friendship Society, directly financed by Chinese social-impertailsm as well as by the New Star Books, one of the welfare recipients of several thousands of doffars from Canada Councilis financed they should check the stocks and bonds they hold as one of the prime sources of revenue. This state agency is nothing more than the means by which to funnel "enormous superprofits which stone the profits which stone the profits which against modern Soviet revisionism and that it was this same lack financed they should check the stocks and bonds they hold as one of the prime sources of revenue. This state agency is nothing more than the means by which to funnel "enormous unperprofile since they are obtained over and above the profits which capitalists squeeze out of the workers of their own country)" whereby "it is possible to brite the labout enders and the upper stratum of the labour aristocrace. And the capitalists of the advanced countries are briting them: they brite then in a thousand different wars, direct and indirect, over and covert." The money dished out to Jack Scott's pocket in order to publish its distribe against Loninism, against the obligatory road of the October Revolution for the world proletariat, a line taken up by all the opportunists of the "third world theory" (those still for it and those pretending like In Struggle and the U.S. imperialis a opportunist agency to be against it), is nothing more than a patitry bribe. But it does not take much coinage to pay off a soul so enslaved, so sycophantish to finance capital as Jack Scott to promote the bourgeois ideology of the social-fascitique in Peking to liquidate in the continuous and the capital solution and the continuous and the international Marxist-Leninist Communist Movement. This alone explains the Chinese opportunists have been trying to "prove" themselves to international finance capital that they could iquidate stocialism in Albania, and the International Marxist-Leninist Communist Movement. This alone explains the Chinese-opportunist have been trying to "prove" themselves to internationalists from his position in the Party and liquidate it (1970-72); 3) to the camegance of the "three world theory bloc of opportunists (1974-76); and 5) to the incitement of the U.S. imperialist opport at their Necessity for Change Conference in 1957 and which in one battle after another against opportunism of all hues has led to the foundation and building of our monolithic unity around the Central Committee of CPC(M-L), headed by Hardial Bains. This Lennist course meant in 1964-60 right through to the time of Mao's death, upholding the Cultural Revolution, fighting for the monolithic unity of the International Communits Movement on the basis of Lennism, struggling might and main against opportunism and social chauvinism of all hues.

The Varma slanders against CPC(M-L) published by MREQ (now "Communist" League) in 1975 include a contribution from Jack Scott in which he brags about his own passport to China. What Scott does not mention in this pamphlet of lies is that his passport was renewed when he carried out the

China. What Scott does not mention in this painpines of that his passport was renewed when he carried out the instructions of the Chinese embassy, as Scott himself admits, to write his anti-Leninist diatribe called Two Roads. Naturally and the comparable against write ins anti-Leninst dutribe called Two Roads. Naturally cough, the Chinese-sponsored lying propaganda against CPC(M-L) does not mention either that the Party vigorously denounced and exposed Scotts "two roads" theory as counter-revolutionary right from 1974 throughout the continuing polemic against the "three world theorists" and their Chinese social-imperialist sponsors. Here is what the leader of CPC(M-L) told a counter-revolutionary continuing the continuing th revolutionary right from 1974 throughout the continuing polemic against the "three world theorists" and their Chinese social-imperialist sponsors. Here is what the leader of CPC(M-L) told a mass meeting of several hundred people in February 1975:

1975.
"So on the question of international experience, the pernicious propaganda being carried out is both against learning from Soviet experience and Chinese experience, any more, pitting Chinese experience against Soviet experience and telling the masses of people to learn from neither, thus blusting the great weapon the international proteatrait has of following the path of the Great October Revolution which is continued in the People's Democratic Revolution of China and the Great Proteatrain Cultural Revolution of China. Of course, between the two revolutions there are similarities as well as disince features but evolutions there are similarities as well as disince features but

Cultural Revolution of China and the Great 'Profetarian Cultural Revolution of China. Of course, between the two revolutions there are similarities as well as distinct features but the basic general course of the Chinese revolution is the path opened up by the Great October Revolution. 'Here I quote from one so-called friend of China: 'Except for an interlude of one month at the founding of the state, the Soviet Union simply carried on Crairst imperialist policies concerning at that time, a weak and divided China; policies which included sciture of territories, armed attacks to preserve economic interests, collusion with the Japanese during their invasion of China, and looting of Manchurian industry following World War Iwo.' And just imagine how 'foolish' the Chinese communists were, that in those individuals like Lenin and Station who 'simply carried on Crarist imperialist policies concerning, at that time, a weak and divided China' they found the salvoes of the Chinese revolution and to date they are calling upon the entire Chinese people to read their works and learn from them!!'

In what absurding these individuals go!!!

Where I quote from another individual who also calls himself a scealled friend' of China: 'It should not be forgotten, either, that historical experience has demonstrated too clearly how a musches type sciure of power from above cas in Russia in 1917).

that historical experience has demonstrated too clearly how a putsch-style scizure of power from above (as in Russia in 917), putsch-style scizure of power from above (as in Russia in 917), and in the nature of things, readily deteriorate into a dictatorship under a new class of commissars, with their own material class interests. . Solzhenitsyn's The Gulag Archipelago may have its weaknesses — but it carries terrible warnings too.

"And then we have an example of another individual who first raises the phoney issue of whether or not one should follow what is called "China's model." Then he deviously suggests that there are some individuals who want to follow "China's model." Then two quotations and the one example I have given have one thing in common, that is they all despise anyone following the road of the Great October Revolution. It is very significant to note that these individuals do not attack China directly, they merely attack the Great October Revolution. Lie is very significant to note that these individuals do not attack China directly, they merely attack the Great October Revolution. Lenin and more often Stalin and those who attempt to apply Marxism-Leninism-Mao I setung thought to the concrete conditions prevailing in the imperialist countries.

imperialist countries.

"The central issue is that the Great October Revolution opened up the path for social revolutions of the proletariat all over the world and the struggles of the oppressed nations and peoples of Asia, Africa and Latin America. China has followed the path of the Great October Revolution and remaining loyal to the basic teachings of Marxism-Lennism actually organized People's Democratic Revolution and has come a long way from semi-colonial and semi-feudal society to a socialist society setting a brilliant example for the nations and people of the world in their own struggles. At the present time, the struggles of the nations and people of Asia, Africa and Latin America are developing against imperialism, colonialism, neo-colonialism and hegemonism of the two superpowers and the proletariat of the imperialist and social-imperialist countries is awakening. It is at this very crucial time when the revolution ary people should strengthen their ranks and build unity in struggle that the permicious attempt is being made to detach the Chinese revolution. These individuals who are doing this have a sinister notive. These individuals who are doing this have a sinister notive. These individuals who are doing this have a sinister notive. These individuals who are doing this have a sinister notive. These individuals who are doing this have a sinister notive. These individuals what are doing this have a sinister notive. These individuals who are doing this have a sinister notive. These individuals who are doing this have a sinister notive. These individuals who are doing this have a sinister notive. These individuals who are doing this have a sinister notive. These individuals who are doing this have a sinister notive. These individuals who are doing this have a sinister notive. These individuals who are doing this have a sinister notive. These individuals who are doing this have a sinister notive. These individuals who are doing this have a sinister notive. These individuals who are doing this have a s The central issue is that the Great October Revolution

the Great October Revolution. It is extremely important that clear lines are drawn between these individuals and the Marxist-Leninists."

The Party also published in its press a pamphlet against Jack Scott's anti-Leninist tract. With reference to the remarks in the preface, the pamphlet Two Roads states:

"Birnie bases his profoundly anti-communist slander against the first socialist society on the nature of the Great October Socialist Revolution itself. He says:

"The CPSU.... after a virtual agried coup by a relatively small band of Botheviks, was forced to incorporate a host of former Czarist officials and pseudor-velytrioniary opportunists into its power structure which eventually helped promote the development of an elite bourgeois class..."

"Anyone familiar at all with the history of the world communist movement during the past sixty years or so will recognize that Birnle, is simply repeating all of the slanders against Bolshevism promoted by Kaustky and the opportunist imperialist agency (the so-called fourth international), and the outright reactionary line of Chiang Kaisshek. The latter uses almost the same terminology as Birnle. Chiang says: 'Lenins' successful coup d'étair in Russia, in 1917, not only usbered in a new Russian regime, but also started a chain of events which later came to pose a deady threat to humanistic voilvillations both in Asia and Europe.' Chiang proceeds to claim: 'I came to the conclusion that once the Russian Communist consolidated their political power, the possibility of a revisual of Czarist ambitions against Chian could not be rule out.' Later in our criticism of the specific examples' used by Scott to slander the Soviet Union during the period of the dictatorship of the proletariat, we shall show how in fact it is impossible not to conclude that these two 'friends of Chian' and experts' on Sino-Soviet Palitions, used Chiang Kais-she as both a source of 'information as well as ideological 'inspiration' in their writing of Two Roads.

"Birnie proceeds to cast slander agai

from then until the death of Stain in 1953. With the puffed-up arrogance of a little Trotsky, Birnie advises his readers that Scott's pamphlet 'does however (ouch on some brief explanations of how the socialist goals of the Bolsheviks became explanations of how the socialist goals of the Bolsheviks became aphyreted — the Soviet experience being a rich but relatively wild proposed to the world. (Our emphasis) Thus, the glorious Qoober Revolution, the civil war against counter-revolution, the conomic reconstruction, collectivation of agriculture and industrialization of the economy (1925-41), the complete rout of the anti-Soviet conspiracy and fifth column within the Communiar Yarry in 1937-38, the Great Patriotic War against fascism (1941-45), and finally the economic recovery from the war and implacable resistance to U.S. imperialist nuclear blackmal (1941-45), and finally the economic recovery from the war and implacable resistance to U.S. imperialist nuclear blackmal (1941-45), and finally the economic recovery from the war and implacable resistance to U.S. imperialist nuclear blackmal (1941-45), and finally the economic recovery from the war and implacable resistance to U.S. imperialist nuclear blackmal (1941-45), and finally the economic recovery from the ward of the manufacture of the control of the Jack Scott's pamphlet in order to further advance the Canadian people's struggle against superpower politics, and advance the friendship between the Canadian and Chinese people. By opposing the opportunists, neo-revisionist line of Jack Scott's two-road theory, we are opposing imperialist and social-imperialist lines being spread among the Canadian revolutionary forces. Only by uniting the genuine Marxis-Leninists and isolating the sham ones, the real opportunists and splitters, coden we advance the struggle against the main enemy, modern revisionism, and deepen and broaden the genjuine friendship between the Canadian people and the Peoples Republic of China."

Today, Jack Scott's paymasters, the monopoly capitalist state and the Chinese social-imperialists, are rejoicing that the

Ioday, Jack Scott's paymasters, the monopoly capitalist state and the Chinese social-imperialists, are rejoicing that the friendship between the Canadian and Chinese people has been dealt such a serious blow by the counter-revolution in China which has opened all the windows and doors to the banks of international finance capital, to flood China with imperialist corruption, slavery and poverty once again. Today's "friends" of China, along with the "social prop" of imperialisth represented by Scott and his alprop to imperialist propresent of the contract of the contrac capitalists intenserves, who have sizes Scott and instants to thank for assisting them obtain a "passport to China". What a victory Scott can boast to his paymaters — see, the proletarian representatives of Canada can not go to Peking for their proletarian class brothers are crushed by social-fascism. Instead you, owners of banks and multi-national corporations, can sip tea like sahibs not only in the Himilayas, but in Peking too, and plan your 'investments and schemes for enslaving to the maximum the proletariat and people both of China and Canada. Inus, it seems the "two roads" for China, like for the Soviet Union and others, is the road of proletarian revolution and dictatorship of the proletariat, the road of October, or the road of capitalist restoration and imperialist slavery, the road of Khrushchov and Tegn Hsiao-ping. With their "victories" in China the international financiers and their police chiefs think they can pull the same thing of fin Albania; they dream of it and make their plans. The propping up of the In Strugglei-opportunist agency front as "pro-Albanian" is one side-show in their international conspiracy to liquidate socialism and the Maxvist-Leninist PLA and the International Communist Movement. They are rallying to their fants the doubters, those Marxist-Leninist PLA and the International Communist Movement. They are rallying to their ranks the doubters, those who have taken to God, building or lamenting over gods that failed. They are opposed to dialectical materialism, they cling to their historic idealism, their metaphysics, refuse to analyze the material world of proletarian class struggle and the continuing necessity to build the monolithic Leninist Party of the bolshewit type as the "only (and we date emphasize) concrete form of opposing revisionism".

opposing revisionism".

Throughout the renewed assault against Leninism in the . Throughout the renewed assault against Leninism in, the summer of 1975 the Party waged a consistent counter-attack, both internally and externally, for the principles of Leninism and the monolithic unity of the International Communist Movement. The series of articles entitled: "Mao Tsetung Thought" — the Marxism-Leninism of Our Era", was despite the title and the confusion over the actual ideo-political content of "Mao Tsetung Thought", a confusion eliminated and rectificate the historic Third Plenum of CPC(M-L), a defence of Leninism of the Marxism-Lenum of CPC(M-L), a defence of Leninism to the confusion eliminated and rectifications. the historie Third Plenum of CPC(M-L), a defence of Leninism and the Marxist-Leninist communist movement, against the revisionist theories of "two roads" and Canadian "exceptionalism", the theories meant to erect a Chinese wall between the proletarian and national liberation revolutions and extinguish the Leninist theory as the doctrine of the world proletarian revolution, the doctrine of proletarian avaluation and communist parties in all countries of the world. The opportunist agency and others would like to forget that in 1975, they joined in the chorus of promoting the "two road" theory and attacking the great life and work of J.V. Stalin, by promoting the Chinese revisionist thesis that Stalin and the Soviet Union of the dictatorship of the proletariat acted as social-imperialists after World War II. Jack Scott made a big point of this in his pamphlet Two Roads, attributing to Mao Tsetung the assertion that borders in Europe and Asia

should be re-altered, in effect stating the Soviet Union had acted in an imperialist, annexationist manner under Stalin's leadership. CPC(M-L) uterity rejected this assertion by Jack Scott because through relying on our own research we traced Jack Scotty propaganda directly to a publication from the notoriously anti-communist U.S. imperialist Hoover Institution on War, Revolution and Peace. We had documentary evidence that Scott simply lifted his allegations from one of their books and we cited our proof as follows: "Scott of course pretends he has researched his own material and so, following this denunciation of the non-existent vector Treaty of Yaltal, he cites an alleged statement from Chairman Mao given to. Scott claims a Vocialist journalist from Japan'. In truth, the quotation Scott gives is lifted from Trioriotal Claims in the Smo-Soviet Conflict (Pocuments and Analysis) by Dennis J. Doolin, published by the Hoover Institution on War, Revolution and Peace, Stanford University, July 11, 1964. (This book makes a typographical Terror and dates the statement August 11", which Scott Carefacishly repeats in his pamphlet — proving conclusively the source of his material. The quotation is from the Japanese Socialists Party which had met with Chairman Mao. The importance of the statement was that it was immediately picked up by the Soviet which had met with Chairman Mao. The importance of Insiman Mao and the Chinese Communist Party. If Scott harboured one ounce of friendship towards China or even a shred of bourgeois honesty he would have cited the fact that the same book carried an alleged interview with Premier Chou En-lai is quoted as Saying: 1) There were some incorrect comments by the Japanese press concerning Chairman Mao Tsetung's statement. "We mistakenly took this to mean that the allegations by Mao Isottung over the post-World-War Two boundaries were a slander. We interest by the Lapanese press concerning Chairman Mao Tsetung's statement." We mistakenly took this to mean that the allegations by Mao Iso that would in essence be social-chauvinist and an attack ag Stalin's leadership of the Soviet Union.

that would in essence be social-enauvinist and an attack against Stalin's leadership of the Soviet Union.

The PLA has since informed world public opinion in its Letter of the CC of the Party of Labour and the Government of Atlanta to the CC of the Communist Party and the Government of China (July 29, 1978) written in response to the perfidious and hostile act of the Chinese revisionists against socialist Albania of several historical facts kept secret previous to that date. We have learned for example, "3) In summer 1964, Chinese propaganda took up the Sino-Soviet border problem. Referring to a talk of Mao Tsetung with a group of Japanese socialist parliamentarians, it claimed that China had been disposessed by the Russian Cars of vast territories of hundreds of thousands of square kilometres, that in Europe, too, the Soviet Union had territorial problems which had emerged as a result of the Second World War.

"The Party of Labour of Albania did not approve of Mao Tsetung's risating the problem of rectification of borders. According to the view of our Party, the Chinese leadershin was making two gross mistakes. In the first place, the raising of the border-problem at that moment did not assist the ideological

akang to gross mistakes. In the first place, the raising of the border-problem at that moment did not assist the ideological struggle against Khrushchoism. On the contrary, it provided the Soviet leadership with a powerful weapon against China and the Marxist-Leninists in order to neutralize the effect of the ideological struggle they were waging to expose the Khrushchovite betrayal and to present our struggle as a border dispute or territorial claim. On the other hand, by calling into question the rectification of the borders of the Soviet Union with some European countries following the Second World War, J.Y. Stalin was unjustly attacked, and the accustrion leveldey by international reaction against him for creating 'spheres of influence' was backed up. The Chinese leadership agreed with Tito, who, when it came to redress the injustices Yugoslavia had suffered in the past at the hands of the victorious powers, upheld this thesis and raised his voice to the skies, while he kept completely silent about the injustices done to another people. If they were in Yugoslavia's favour.

"The Chinese thesis on the rectification of borders was not as simple as that. It expressed the chanvinsitie sprit of great-state

simple as that. It expressed the chauvinistic spirit of great-state and bourgeois nationalism, it was an instigation of war in

Europe.

"In keeping with Leninist norms, in the spirit of complete correctness and in a comradely manner, the Central Committee of the Party of Labour of Albania informed the Central Committee of the Communist Parity of China and Chairman Mao Tsetung personally of its opinions on these questions in a letter addressed to them on September 10, 1964.

"The letter reads in part:

"The letter reads in part:
"We think that raising territorial problems with the Soviet
Union now would gravely harm our stigugle. If we were to do
this, we would be giving the enemy a powerful weapont of fight us,
and this would paralyze our march forward.
"Under the pressure of Khrushchov's revisionist propaganda, under the influence of Khrushchov's revisionist propaganda, under the influence of Khrushchov's anders and calumnies,
and for many other reasons, the masses of the Soviet people will
to understand why People's China is now putting forth
territorial claims to the Soviet Union, they will not accept this,
and Soviet nonagenda is working to make them revolt against and Soviet propaganda is working to make them revolt against you. But we think that even true Soviet communists will not understand it, nor will they accept it. This would be a colossal loss for our struggle

loss for our struggle.

In the start a controversy and polemics over whether or not the Soviet Union has appropriated other countries land; but only conventional start a controversy and polemics over whether or not the Soviet Union has appropriated other countries land; but our only concentrated struggle should be speatheaded against the great betrayal, represented by imperialism and modern revisionism, the traitor groups of Khrushehov, Tio and all their henchmen.

"The Central Committee of the Communist Party of China did not reply to the principled and correct letter of our Party. The Chinese leadership never gave our Party and explanation on this question of sò-called importance. Man Tsetting limited himself to a verbal statement to the effect that we will not reply to your letter because we do not want to stir up polemics. In our view, which is in keeping with Leninist norms, the exchange of opinions, comradely criticism and each other's enlightenment are normal things between two communist parties. They can by opinions, comradely criticism and each other's emparations, are normal things between two communist parties. They can by no means be considered polemics.

"Despite this incorrect stand of the Chinese leadership, our Parts did not make this disagreement public. It continued its

Despite inis incorrect stand of the Chinese leadership, ou. Party did not make this disagreement public. It continued it, revolutionary struggle against imperialism and revisonism together with China."

revolutionary struggle against impertation and revisionism together with China."

Our Party of course had no knowledge of this historical fact, nor could it have had. We had assessed the social-chauvinist policies crystallized in the "three world theory" as a product of the "capitalist roaders" within the Communist Party, a bourgeois headquarters aimed at liquidating the Marxist-Leninist line of Mao Tsetung. That is why we always emphasized our support of Mao Tsetungs's China and the Marxist-Leninist line of Mao Tsetung and the Cultural Revolution. This was an expression of our unbounded loyalty to the monolithic unity of the International Marxist-Leninist Communist Movement against all the attacks of the main enemy, the imperialist-revisionist counter-revolutionary front, in which we included, and correctly so, the Canadian representatives of the "three world theory", so, the Canadian representatives of the "three world theory". so, the Canadian representatives of the "three world theory with whom we never for a moment conciliated or spared denunciations and criticisms. In fact our articles in defer

See page 4: DOWN WITH REVISIONISM

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

Leninism were directed precisely against the line of accusing the Soviet Union headed by Stalin of territorial annexation after World War II. In essence our political stand against the representatives of Chinese chauvinism in Canada was identical in

content to the line of the PLA.
This stand of CPC(M-L) in 1975 against the calumnies and lies promoted against Stalin and the Bolshevik Party, against the glorious socialist regime of the Soviet Union after World War II, was directed against the whole Canadian opportunist front, including today's "critics" of "three worlds", both In Struggle! and this opportunist agency, and was undertaken by CPC(M-L) on its own initiative, based on its own analysis of both the opportunist stands and the authoritative documents of the International Communist Movement, in defence of Leninism and Stalinism and against Khrushchovite, Titoite and Chinese revisionism. Those who bray so loudly today about being faithful to the line of the Third International and the communist movement are merely hypocrites and liars. In 1975 when the pressure of Chinese revisionism was in full swing to slander Lenin and Stalin's Soviet Union and to promote a line of "two roads", all the opportunists, including In Struggle and this opportunist agency, took a cowardly and expedient opportunist stand, while only CPC(M-L) stood firm and courageously refuted these slanders and lies against Stalin and the Soviet Union of the post-war period.

We will document this historic fact with a lengthy quotation from the essay published by our Party entitled, "Mao Tsetung Thought the Marxism-Leninism of Our Era". In the portion of the essay which follows, the author had singled out Jack Scott's many years of counter-revolutionary activity in promoting "polycentrism" in opposition to the monolithic I eninist unity between the proletariat headed by their vanguard Marxist-Leninist parties in all countries. To this end the author cited as an authority from the Communist Party of China a section of the "Constitution of the Com-munist Party of China" adopted at its 10th Congress in 1973: "The Communist Party of China upholds proletarian internationalism and opposes great-power chauvinism; it firmly unites with the genuine Marxist-Leninist parties and organizations the world over, unites with the proletariat, the oppressed people and nations of the whole world and fights together with them to oppose the hegemonism of the two superpowers - the United States and the Soviet Union, to overthrow imperialism, modern revisionism and all reaction, and to abolish the system of exploitation of man by man over the globe, so that all mankind will be emancipated." These were fine words and CPC(M-L) fully supported and continues to support them, as we have done in the past, but insists on like deeds also Our Party had no illusions whatever about the practice of Chinese revisionism attempting to liquidate our Canadian Party and assist counter-revolution, but it was our correct assessment not to make the fight against the Chinese "advisors" to the opportunist trend, but to focus all our class hatred and energy in fighting the Chinese agents such as Jack Scott, In Struggle! MRFQ-CCL, this opportunist agency, etc., etc., and in this way uphold Leninism and proletarian internationalism. Thus after citing these correct words from the Chinese constitution, we added

"To illustrate how once an individual or group which considers itself 'Marxist-Leninist' but refuses to recognize the international authority of the leading comrade, and the leading Party, and follow the general line laid out by them for the international movement inevitably opens the door to revisionism and trotskyism, let us look at an essay written by Workers' Unity. 'a small collective of Marxist-Leninists in Toronto' " (actually a small group of scabs and anti-communists who, in addition to helping to liquidate various workers' struggles such as the Artistic Woodworkers' strike when they were disguised as "strike support committees", did a quick costume change to re-appear on the stage as "Marxist-Leninists", and have now done yet another costume change, and have now re-emerged as genuine followers of the "three world theory" in CCL). "The essay, 'Imperialism and Canadian Political Economy' is itself a complete rejection of the central thesis of Chairman Mao and the Communist Party of China with respect to the two superpowers being the main enemy of the world's peoples. But aside from their completely wrong line on the question of the Canadian political economy, and their enthusiasm for the vicious anti-China, anti-Mao Tsetung arch-revisionist, Tim Buck, let us see how their 'free-lance Marxism-Leninism' ends them up in the camp of the trotskyite Titoists and Khrushchovite revisionists on the question of the International Communist Movement. They say: 'The Soviet Union, which was the world's first socialist state, is now a country which has experienced a restoration of a bureaucrat-capitalist class. It has deserted all principles of proletarian internationalism, and has consistently since the end of the Second World War followed a course of socialism in words and imperialism in deeds'. Both through the cold war period and the more recent period of detente, the Soviet Union has consistently vied with U.S. imperialism in carving out territories for markets, and raw materials, in expansion of arms production and in subjecting one country after another to its influence and policies." Marxist-Leninists across Canada should ask this Toronto Workers' Unity what is the source of your ideas? What is your authority for this statement that the Soviet Union 'consistently since the end of the Second World War followed a course of 'socialism in words, and imperialism in deeds?' Where did you get this idea that 'both through the "cold war" period and the more recent period of detente, the Soviet Union has consistently vied with U.S. imperialism in carving out

territories for markets, etc.? The Cold War was declared by Anglo-American imperialism, by Winston Churchilla Fulton, Missouri in 1946, when he formally passed the mantle of world empire from the failing hands of British imperialism, to the rising star. U.S. imperialism. Who declared the era of 'detente?' The traitors to communism and the dictatorship of the proletariat did. Khrushchov declared the doctrine of 'peaceful competition with U.S. imperialism; Brezhnev declared the era of 'detente, Why does the Toronto Workers' Unity mix up these two periods of Soviet history, of the history of our International Communist Movement?

"How did matters really stand at the end of World War II? The world was split up into two camps: the anti-imperialist democratic camp and the anti-democratic imperialist camp, with aims and objectives diametrically opposed.

"The democratic camp was made up of the Soviet Union and the countries of people's democracy. At its head stood the Soviet Union. It was supported by the entire international democratic and workers' movement, by all progressive-minded persons fighting in defence of democracy, freedom and the independence of the peoples. The aim of this camp was to secure world peace, the independence of the peoples, democracy and progress toward socialism. This could be attained only in struggle against imperialism.

"The imperialist camp had the USA as its leading force. It relied on the reactionary classes and on all the anti-democratic forces in the capitalist countries. The aim of this camp was to save the old capitalist order, to suppress the workers revolutionary and natiohal-liberation movements, to re-establish the capitalist regime in the countries of people's democracy. By making use of their great economic and military potential, the U.S. imperialists sought to establish their domination over the world. To achieve this aim, the imperialists headed by the USA launched a frenzied hostile campaign against the Soviet Union and against all the socialist, freedom and peaceleaving forces.

"Does Workers' Unity recognize the authority of our statement on the alignment of forces at the end of the Second World War until 1953 when Comrade Stalin died? Clearly they do not. The Canadian Marxist-Leninists should ponder over this seriously. Why? Because our analysis is word for word taken from the History of the Party of Labour of Albania published under the authority of the Institute of Marxist-Leninist Studies at the Central Committee of the Party of Labour of Albania We recognize this authority, not because the Party of Labour said it. but because it is correct. Furthermore, we know it is correct not because of some 'creative application of Marxism-Leninism', but because the social practice of the Albanian Party of Labour as a leader in fighting imperialism, social-imperialism, modern revisionism. Titoism and every other reactionary trend in or out of the world communist movement, has been consistently Marxist-Léninist, consistently correct. Marxist-Leninists in Canada demand to know why the Workers' Unity collective in Toronto set themselves apart from the authority of the Albanian Party of Labourt

"Furthermore the Marxist-Leninists in Canada tell the Toronto Workers' Unity clearly and in no uncertain terms just who called Comrade Stalin an imperialist warmonger. Harry Truman called the Soviet Union an imperialist power at the end of the Second World War. Winston Churchill said the same thing. Tito said it. Trotskyists and social democrats joined in the chorus. The deposed kings, queens, junkers, landlords, capitalists, nazi collaborators fleeing the people's democracies and who pinned their hopes on Anglo-American imperialism to restore their lost paradise, added their creaking voices.

"After 1956 Khrushchov and the modern revisionists also said similar things. Marxist-Leninists in Canada cannot shirk their international responsibility on these historical problems in the International Communist Movement, Marxist-Leninists, regardless of how young or old they may be, must take a stand on this matter. The 'veteran' communists had and still have a particularly important and responsible role to educate the young revolutionary forces as to the glorious and immortal of Comrade Stalin as the world leader and authority in the International Communist Movement before he died. But one 'veteran' communist has only misled and miseducated the new revolutinary forces on this vital question. Jack Scott's line in Two Roads repeats all the reactionary slanders of the imperialists, revisionists and trotskyists about Comrade Stalin and opens the door of eclecticism to such groups as Workers' Unity. As far back as November 1967 Scott obscuring the immortal contribution of Comrade Stalin. In Progressive Worker a story on the 50th anniversary celebration of the October Revolution reporting on the line Jack Scott gave at the meeting says not one single word about Comrade Stalin.

Only the Khrushchovite revisionists try to deny that Comrade Stalin was the great student of Lenin, and the leading Marxist-Leninist who gloriously took up the mission of building socialism, defeating fascism, and opposing U.S. imperialism after World War II. On what authority does Jack Scott present the history of the Soviet Union without mentioning Comrade Stalin's name? Does Jack Scott recognize the correctness of Comrade Enver Hoxha's verdict that he who does not defend Stalin is an opportunist and a coward? Who is the authority for our movement? The Albanian Party of Labour led by Enver Hoxha, the Communist Party of China led by Mao Tsetung, or Churchill, Dulles, Tito and Khrushchov? Did the Workers' Collective not investigate and study the documents of the Communist Party under Chairman Mao's supervision to find

out what this leading authority had to say about the Soviet Union under the leadership of Comrade Stalin? They said emphatically on March 23, 1966 in a letter fully endorsed by the 11th Plenary Session of the Eighth Central Committee that: ... at the 20th Congress of the CPSU you (modern revisionists) suddenly lashed out at Stalin. Stalin was a great Marxist-Leninist. In attacking Stalin you were attacking Marxism-Leninism, the Soviet Union, communist parties, China, the people, and all Marxist-Leninists of the world. . . Russia is the native land of Leninism and used to be in the centre of the international working class movement. After Stalin's death the leaders of the CPSU, headed by Khrushchov, gradually revealed their true features as betrayers of Lenin and Leninism." (Central Committee of the Communist Party of China, Letter of Reply dated March 22, 1966 of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of China to the Central Committee of the Communist Party of China to the Central Communist Party of the Soviet Union) Is it possible that a 'great Marxist-Leninist' could lead the Soviet Union and engage in 'imperialism in deeds'. What is Workers' Unity trying to smuggle into the Canadian communist movement? What is En Lutte! trying to smuggle into the Canadian communist movement with their assertion that 'after the Second World war, a new crisis arose within the international communist movement when the leaders of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union definitively broke from the principles of Marxism-Leninism. . . When after the Second World War, the Marxist-Leninists of Canada demand of In Struggle!? Not until eight years after the Second World War. The Report to the Tenth National Congress of the Communist Party of China clearly says that, 'over the last two decades the Soviet revisionist ruling clique, from Khrushchov to Brezhnev, has made a socialist country degenerate into a socialimperialist country.' Two decades from the date of the report (1973) is the year 1953, the date of Comrade Stalin's death. If the Communist Party of China led by Chairman Mao Tsetung can be so precise, why is En Lutte! so evasive, inaccurate? Why use the Second World War as the dividing line; why promote the same line of Red Imperialism as promoted by Churchill, Dulles, Tito and their nazi allies? From where do these genuine Marxist-Leninists' get their ideas? What does In Struggle! mean by speaking of Marxism-Leninism and Mao Tsetung Thought" in its important policy statement of December 12, 1974? Was this

Now we know the answers to these serious questions posed in the summer of 1975. In Struggle and the rest of the opportunist sects, including the U.S. imperialist opportunist agency, did view the two. Marxism-Leninism and Mao Tsetung Thought, separately, and they were the practitioners of "Mao Tsetung Thought", that is to say the followers of the Chinese revisionist social-chauvinist line. When the crunch came in 1974-75 with the promotion of the "three world" and "two road" theory, and the slanderous attacks against Stalin and the Soviet Union after World War Two, we denounced these allegations that Mao Tsetung was issuing this line. We upheld the glorious name and work of J.V. Stalin when once again international opportunism had come up to sully them as part of their offensive against probletarian revolution and the dictatorship of the

Where were the opportunist heroes who are posing these days as the great "followers" of the PLA and Comrade Enver Hoxha in 1975? They had their heads up under the stinking skirts of Teng Hsiao-ping and Jack Scott. On their knees they tried to spew their slanders against Stalin and the dictatorship of the proletariat; like real cowards they were wriggling and manoeuvring to make their attacks. The U.S. imperialist opportunist agency is especially hypocritical and slimy in this matter how many holy marys they utter in "self-criticism", the fact is that they were part of the opportunist Canadian Revolution rag which was used as a springboard to launch these foul anti-communist tirades. With all their posturing these days as the true followers of the Third International, where were they in 1975, just three years ago, when right under their noses the social-fascists were spewing their poison at Stalin, the International Communist Movement and CPC(M-L)? They were one with them. And it doesn't matter how much they manoeuvre and claim they split with CR, their own filthy rag, with all its self-righteous breast-beating in July-August 1976, has not one single word of criticism or self-criticism for CR promoting its attack against the Soviet Union and Stalin.

These cheap crooks who denounce others for "copying" are jumping up and down to stop the Canadian Marxist-Leninists, bound in steel unity around the Central Com-mittee of CPC(M-L), headed by Hardial Bains, from link-ing theory with practice to build our Party relying on our own efforts, following the Leninist principles of self-reliance and proletarian internationalism. They can never succeed. Their path is the road to liquidation and disaster for the proletariat, which is why they are here on this earth, for they are carrying out the will of the state, of imperialism and social-imperi CPC(M-L), allegedly "isolated" and without friends according to the opportunists, on the basis of its Marxist-Leninist analysis. ferociously fought since 1970 (and the Internationalists before that) to defend Leninism and the International Marxist-Leninist Communist Movement, when it crossed swords with those who rose up to slander Stalin and Stalin's Soviet Union, all those who are screaming from the rafters against our Party were united as one against Leninism, were in fact the real champions of a doctrine known through the Chinese revisionists as "Mao Tsetung Thought", a pragmatic and opportunist doctrine which in practice never upheld Leninism and the road of October despite their words and promises. The

Canadian communists who suffered on their backs the calumnies and perfidious collaboration of the Chinese revisionists with the Canadian state and its opportunist front, stood loyal to Leninism. CPC(M-L) stood loyal to the Leninist norms of proletarian internationalism and in defence of the monolithic unity of the International Marxist-Leninist Communist Movement, refrained from any public criticism of the Communist Party of China or Mao Tsetung, who we then still regarded as a Marxist-Leninist. Now at this juncture of history hen the unwarranted myth of Mao has been exposed by the facts of life and the Marxist-Leninists everywhere are analyzing the roots of his pragmatic and social-imperialist policies, policies which have consistently led China away from the road of the October Revolution and socialist construction, we have the spectacle of the U.S. imperialist opportunist agency joined by a handful of renegades simply declaring with the knowledge of hindsight: see how counter-revolutionary CPC(M-L) is, all along they were supporting Mao Tsetung and Mao's China! This is the renegades' big excuse to become outright police spies and supporters of the "three world" bloc. In short, it is their excuse to continue along their own road of supporting Mao's subjective idealist world outlook and pragmatic politics of collaboration with imperialism. For CPC(M-L), support for Mao and Mao's China meant support for Lenin and the road of the October Revolution. That is the road the Internationalists set out on against Khrushchovite revisionisn in 1963 and it is the road the Party continues along today against revisionism and opportunism of all hues, including so-called "Mao Tsetung Thought". It is precisely against Leninism these vile opportunists and renegades are rebelling on their knees. But the Party grows stronger by purging such elements, and is determined to fulfill its duty to the Canadian proletariat and complete the tasks set out for the Party at its Third Congress. By building the Party in the centres of production and waging a ceaseless, Leninist class war against social-democracy, revisionism and opportunism of all hues, we shall prepare conditions so that the proletariat, through one wave of revolutionary struggle after another, will eventually topple the monopoly capitalist system itself and defeat the U.S imperialist domination of Canada.

But in order to succeed in this great task the Leninist forms of Party organization and discipline must actually evolve and advance; the communists must become even more steeled and mature leaders of their class against enemies steeped in their counter-revolutionary trade. Thus the issue again is whether to uphold and strengthen the Leninist forms of Party organization in order to advance the socialist content of revolutionary politics amongst the masses, or to liquidate the Leninist form so that the revolutionary content is dissipated and socialist revolution suffers a setback. We showed how precisely this was the issue at the time of the struggle against Jack Scott and remained so at every juncture of the struggle against opportunism, especially the Chinese brand of social-imperialism. As CPCM-L) told In Struggle! in October 1974 just before they ran off to join the "three world" cabal in their conspiracy and intrigue against the Party, "The struggles of the revolutionary people in Quebec in the 1960s has already given rise to new content, new experience, new historical lessons, and if these lessons are not used to destroy the old forms which are keeping the new content down, then the new content will fritter away and revolution will suffer a setback. The old struggles hard and raises its head repeatedly to obstruct the emergence of the new and it is the old form which attempts to strangulate and kill the new content. Lenin explains 'the struggle of content with form and conversely. The throwing off of the form, the transformation of content.' CPC(M-L) came into existence as part of the new content. This is why the state machine had to hit extremely hard right at the birth of our Party. The state spends much money and effort, using all sorts of ways to discredit the Party, split it and liquidate it or transform it into a revisionist and opportunist party." This is precisely what In Struggle! took up for its mission as did its illegitimate child, the U.S. imperialist opportunist agency. Now the renegades have joined them in the work of trying "to discredit the Party, split it and liquidate it or transform it into a revisionist and opportunist party." But they too have hit their heads against the steel shield of the Party Leninist discipline, its iron-clad Marxist-Leninist logic, which explains why they are whimpering against the Party and putting on all sorts of childish airs about being the "most loyal followers" of the communist movement. They are true followers of Lenin's opportunist political adversaries, the aristocratic anarchists, who all give homage to the Platonic conception of a Party, the immaculate ideal, but when it comes to the nitty gritty of flesh and blood, then they find themselves in the company of hardened opportunists, sectarian circles of petty intriguers and police spies. And all the while they are screaming at the Canadian Marxist-Leninists to join them, to set history backwards. No. that which has been created with so much effort and sacrifice by the Canadian revolutionaries will not be so easily liquidated. Let them howl for the state will soon find more use for them now that they have told all their gossips and lies in public. It is not by chance that the old gang of the 60s, including the FLQ "neroes", the descendants of the Arcand fascists and other socialchauvinists, are being re-mobilized by the Trudeau and Lévesque sections of monopoly capitalism. But whatever conspiracies they are hatching against the Canadian proletariat and people they will have to reckon with the Leninist politics and Leninist Party, CPC(M-L).