

**FOR THE UNITY
OF THE
CANADIAN PROLETARIAT**

**Brief notes
on the present conjuncture**

april 1977

★ Published by IN STRUGGLE!

**FOR THE UNITY
OF THE
CANADIAN PROLETARIAT**

**Brief notes
on the present conjuncture**

april 1977

INTRODUCTION

Today the Canadian workers movement is faced with numerous problems. They all arise from the aggravation of the contradictions of imperialism - firstly in Canada but also on a world scale.

We know that the only way out of the contradictions of capitalism, which has reached the stage of imperialism, is through socialist revolution. Only by embarking on this path can the proletariat come to resolve the problems it must face, and which have their origin in capitalist exploitation.

By the same token we know (and workers are coming in increasing numbers to share this view) that socialist revolution necessitates the revolutionary proletarian Party, the Marxist-Leninist Communist Party.

The communist Party is built in the fire of class struggle and not outside of it. At all times, in all situations, the class struggle takes on various forms. The economic struggles of the workers and the masses, strikes, factory occupations... all are forms of class struggle. Struggles within the unions over the way to go in one situation or another, struggles around the democratization or canadianization of the unions... are forms of the class struggle. Struggles in the workers movement on tripartism and collaboration with the capitalist State and the bosses, struggles against the Wage Control Act and the repressive policies of the Canadian State are all forms of the class struggle.

And there's more than that. The struggle for the unity of communists, the struggle to elaborate the communist program, the struggle in the final analysis to build the communist Party are as well forms of class struggle.

Today we should centre our attention on the struggle for the Party, i.e. on the struggle to elaborate the communist program, for the unity of communists and for the rallying of the proletarian vanguard to communism. But this should by no means lead us to ignore the other forms of class struggle. For in order to build the Party, the communist point of view must win out in the immediate struggles of the proletariat and the masses. Only in this way will the proletariat and the masses be led progressively to put their long-term interests in the foreground.

IN STRUGGLE Montreal, april 1977
Deposited at the Bibliotheque Nationale du Quebec,
2nd trimester 1977.
Supplement to the newspaper **IN STRUGGLE**

To completely separate the immediate struggles of the proletariat and masses from the long-term struggle for socialism is a serious error. It is to reduce the revolutionary struggle for socialism to only its insurrectionary phase, when the armed proletariat, led by its Party will be able to undertake to throw the bourgeoisie from power. Such a simplistic view of things denies that it's on the battlefield of the immediate struggles, and ONLY on this terrain, that the masses can be won to the historic necessity for revolutionary struggle. Further, such a view leads, in the present situation, to a refusal to see that Party-building (or the rallying of the proletarian vanguard to communism, which is an essential precondition for the creation of the Party) proceeds by a struggle on the terrain of the immediate struggles.

On the other hand, it's equally an error to reduce the struggle for socialism to intervention in the immediate struggles. In this way we open the door wide to the development and consolidation of opportunism and reformism. Only if it's undertaken and conducted with the basic and determinant objective of making the proletarian point of view win out will intervention in the immediate struggles serve the cause of the socialist revolution, that is to say the long-term interests of the proletariat.

What exactly does this mean in the present stage, when the communist forces have taken very little root in the workers movement and the central task today is the building of the Party? It means making the Marxist analysis of conflicts win out over the bourgeois analysis; it means making the ideology of class struggle win out over the ideology of class collaboration; it means making the ideology of the struggle for socialism win out over the ideology of the vague "reform" of capitalism. It means bringing the most conscious workers to themselves wage this struggle among their comrades who are still dominated by bourgeois ideology. It means bringing these same workers to systematically grasp Marxism-Leninism, to rally the ranks of the Marxist-Leninist movement and to actively engage in the struggle to build the proletarian Party.

Correctly intervening in the immediate struggles of the proletariat and the masses isn't something obvious. There's more to it than presenting oneself in various struggles with the single slogan: "create the Party" since without a Party there can be no revolution. To correctly intervene in immediate struggles we must be able to appreciate the significance of a proletarian point of view, we must be able to situate these struggles in relation to the interests of the whole working class, and we must be able to show how, in whatever disguise, the interests of the bourgeoisie and its agents appear. In a word, in order to correctly intervene in the immediate struggles, (i.e. to intervene in a way which serves the long-term interests of the prole-

tariat - the interests of the socialist revolution) we must be able to situate these struggles within the balance of power characterising the class struggle in our society at any given time. To do otherwise leads to the domination of spontaneism and opportunism in our actions.

This means that a correct communist intervention in the immediate struggles must be based on a Marxist analysis of the situation. Establishing the path of the revolution - in other words establishing the foundations of its strategic line - is something which at the present time is the most important task for the Marxist-Leninist movement if it wants to develop a revolutionary program. It's quite something else to learn to apply this strategic line to the actual conditions, that is to say to transform this strategic line into tactical slogans. This requires not only a general analysis of social classes in our country, but also a rigorous analysis of the present balance of power between different classes and fractions of classes of Canadian society and on a world scale.

* * *

In spite of its obvious limitations, we think that the present text constitutes a valuable basis for a deeper analysis of the international and Canadian situation. The reader might remark that in some ways this text is a little dated; this is because of the fact that it's a very slightly abridged version of the political report adopted by the Central Committee of IN STRUGGLE! during its meeting last January.

Chapter One

THE INTERNATIONAL SITUATION

International relations are constantly changing at the present time precisely because of the nature of the imperialist stage of capitalism, the stage of the giant monopolies whose tentacles reach into numerous countries. If we wish to properly understand the contradictions which exist in our own country, it is essential to study the international situation. To do this it is important to correctly understand Canada's place amongst the other countries in the world. Canada is a rising imperialist country which is struggling to raise itself to a higher rank among the imperialist powers by multiplying its economic as well as its political, cultural and military ties with many countries of the Third World, by diversifying its relations with the other imperialist countries and by its attempt to loosen United States domination over it.

In consequence, we can predict that the contradictions between Canada and the USA are likely to develop further. But there is no evidence at the present time that these contradictions will lead in the immediate future to a split in the alliance between these two countries. Indeed, these contradictions must be viewed in relation to the development of the other inter-imperialist contradictions. History has shown many times that contradictions between imperialist countries are always accompanied by collaboration and various types of alliances of varying duration. History has shown that when there is world conflict, the imperialist countries, while remaining fundamentally in opposition to each other, have a tendency to form "blocs" on the basis of their immediate interests. These rival blocs have a more or less transitory existence, according to the situation; this tendency is well illustrated by the two world wars.

The worldwide crisis of imperialism is accompanied by political instability on a world scale, particularly in certain countries which reach the point of political crisis. This is a frequent occurrence in the countries of the Third World. In Africa, the remaining traces of old European colonialism have disappeared with the liberation of Mozambique, Guinea and Angola. The struggles in South Africa and Rhodesia are advancing more and more rapidly; the days are numbered for the racist white minorities which still hold power.

In the Middle East, where the contradictions and the stakes of inter-imperialist rivalry are of great importance, the situation is more confused. As things develop, it becomes clearer that the fate of the Palestinian people is linked to that of the Arab peoples of the region. The intense activity of the superpowers in this region appears to be increasingly leading the present Arab states to reduce their support for the struggle of the Palestinians. The Palestinians will soon have no other choice than to seek increasing support amongst the Arab masses, and decreasing support from countries which are dominated by reactionary regimes and are largely subservient to the imperialist powers.

In South East Asia, the major factor in recent years is certainly the disintegration of US imperialism, forced out of Indochina by the Peoples War of the Vietnamese and Cambodians. At the same time we have seen the USSR intensify its efforts to "fill the gap", which it has to some extent succeeded in doing in certain countries, trying also to realize its plan to encircle socialist China. But the latter occupies a strategic position in the region and in the last few years has considerably developed its ties with many of its neighbours.

In the same period we have seen all of South America fall under the yoke of right wing military regimes whose role, as we see very well in particular in Brazil, is clearly to ensure that popular demands do not hamper the development of capitalism in this region of the world. The hegemony of American imperialism is being contested there too and we can see the other imperialisms, particularly the USSR and, incidentally, Canada, multiply their moves to penetrate the markets and develop their investments in this region.

Europe has also been the stage of many upheavals in the past few years. In certain cases these upheavals took the form of major political crises. In Greece, Portugal, and Spain, the old social order was profoundly affected. Italy and France are far from political stability. Great Britain is torn not only by the Irish national question, but also by the movement for Scottish autonomy, and even more, by the chronic incapacity of the bourgeois State (in the hands of a social democratic party) to resolve these contradictions. It is also torn by the

seriousness of the economic crisis which is in the process of reducing this former great imperialist power to almost nothing.

As in the countries of Western Europe, the crisis has deepened in the revisionist countries of Eastern Europe. The events in Czechoslovakia, Yugoslavia and Poland are testimony to this. In all these cases, the USSR was forced to intervene, militarily in Czechoslovakia or more discreetly in the other cases, trying to profit from these crises which were provoked to a large extent by its own neo-colonialism against which the masses are increasingly rebelling.

Despite their incessant efforts to force other countries to bear the burden of the crisis, the superpowers are not sheltered from internal contradictions which the present crisis brings upon them as well. For over 10 years the USA has experienced periods of people's revolt which greatly contributed to discrediting the bourgeois political regime: the revolt of the oppressed Black people, revolt of young people, people's support for the cause of the Vietnamese people, labour struggles and strikes which would have been even more numerous if, the trade unions in this country in particular, were not among the most solid pillars of the monopoly bourgeoisie against the attacks of the proletariat.

In the USSR as well, the conflicts have grown and become more radical in the past few years. We know that worker revolts are a frequent occurrence there and that Soviet social-fascism succeeds in repressing them only by spilling blood. This regime's savage repression against dissident intellectuals is well known, as well as its total denial of the national rights of non-Russian minorities.

All these contradictions, presented in brief summary, show that on a world scale the struggle is developing between the forces of revolution and the forces of reaction, capitalist exploitation and imperialist oppression. The present crisis of imperialism is not a matter of chance; it arises out of the continuation of the great movement for national liberation which followed the Second World War and is indissociable from the considerable rise in the struggle of the proletariat and the peoples everywhere in the world during the past ten years.

* * *

A marked tendency exists within the Canadian and international Marxist-Leninist movement to reduce analysis of the international situation to a fixed and mechanical version of the "theory of three worlds" advanced by the Communist Party of China. In summary, the "theory of three worlds" puts forward that the world is presently divided into "three worlds": the "first world", which is composed of the two superpowers, the USA and USSR, whose rivalry is sharpening and who are threatening to plunge the world into a third world war; the "third

world", which includes the underdeveloped countries still dominated by foreign imperialism; the "second world", consisting of the imperialist and capitalist countries which, on the one hand, participate in the oppression of the "third world", while, on the other hand they are victimized by the harassment or the grasping of one or the other superpower or of both at once.

The erroneous application of the "theory of three worlds" leads to a simplistic view of the international situation, particularly to the failure to denounce reactionary regimes in the Third World. These regimes are often servants of imperialism and torturers of the peoples under their heel. This error also leads to indiscriminate support for alliances between countries of the "second World" and the "third World" on the grounds that such alliances automatically strengthen the unity between the "second" and "third World" in their common resistance against the hegemonic ambitions of the superpowers of the "first World".

Such positions are in flagrant opposition to a correct analysis of the fundamental contradictions of the present stage of the development of imperialism in the world. These contradictions were formulated by the Chinese Communist Party, and are the elaboration of positions set out by Lenin and later by Stalin before World War Two. There are four such contradictions:

1. The contradiction between the peoples of the oppressed nations, on the one hand, and imperialism and social imperialism, on the other;
2. the contradiction between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie;
3. the contradiction between the various capitalist and imperialist countries (including social imperialism);
4. the contradiction between the socialist countries and the capitalist and imperialist countries (social imperialist).

To analyse the international situation solely on the basis of the "theory of three worlds" and to fail to see that the four great contradictions define the situation at the present stage is to put tactics ahead of strategy. This method leads to minimizing the fundamental contradictions of the imperialist era, to class collaboration with the reactionary regimes of the "third World" and with imperialist powers of the "second World". Taken to its logical limits, this method is a form of social chauvinism.

Besides, the erroneous basis of this tendency is clear to anyone who takes the trouble to consider the international situation in all its real complexity instead of reducing it to a formula. For example, during the 1960's it might have seemed that NATO was beginning to fall apart when de Gaulle decided that France should withdraw from this US-dominated military

alliance. In fact, it was a case of a realignment of French foreign policy. France was promoting the building of a strong Europe, independent of the United States. This policy favoured closer ties with the USSR precisely in order to loosen the noose of American domination over Europe. It will be recalled that during the next few years Trudeau adopted a policy similar to that of de Gaulle and announced that Canada would reduce its participation in NATO.

Now it happens that today, in face of the development of the Soviet superpower, in face of its growing hegemonism and militarism, the countries of Western Europe and Canada are favorably disposed towards consolidating NATO and developing its arms capability. Member countries like Canada which had not been terribly interested in NATO are being pressured to fulfil their obligations and even to increase their contribution to the military forces stationed in Europe.

This fact alone should keep us from falling into the simplifications of the dogmatists who swear only by the "theory of three worlds". They reduce the application of this theory to a caricature of Marxism-Leninism according to which the countries of the "second world" will all equally inevitably end up opposing the TWO superpowers and all, equally and simultaneously, ally themselves with the countries of the "third World".

Fundamentally, all the imperialist countries, and even more so all the monopolies, are unyielding enemies of each other. They are enemies which, all the while, make and break alliances as their interests require. As long as the USA was principal restraint on the development of their monopoly capital, after having been its principal support in the post-World War II years, the countries of Western Europe had to try to unite more closely to break this restraint in order to broaden the scope of their foreign investments. This situation encouraged the development of closer ties to the USSR whose hegemonic ambitions were not apparent, and this situation still exists up to a certain point.

But AT THE SAME TIME, the USSR is no longer what it was ten years ago. No longer simply a possible and welcome economic partner to counter American hegemonism, the USSR has itself become a hegemonic superpower. It is in the process of becoming an increasingly dangerous enemy, an enemy which is setting up a military encirclement of Europe. Western Europe can no longer remain indifferent to this new situation. Either it arms itself on its own to counter the Soviet danger (and certain European NATO members have recently supported this point of view) or else it continues as in the past, since the Second World War, to count on American power and... on Canada which has now for 30 years faithfully "accompanied" the USA in the majority of its military ventures around the world.

All this shows how the "second World" is far from being a simple and fixed reality, even less a homogenous bloc of countries who all have the same interests and who would all oppose the two superpowers of the "first World" with the same persistence and strength. It is ridiculous, for example, to argue that Canada's relations with the USA on the one hand, and the USSR on the other, are of the same nature. To argue that the countries of Western Europe are equally opposed to the TWO superpowers does not conform to reality.

If we examine the situation in the "Third World" with the slightest bit of attention, we will see that there too exist many and varied contradictions, if only because these countries do not by any means all have the same types of relationships with the same imperialist countries, including the superpowers. In the past few years the USSR has won some important victories in its quest for deeper economic, political, and even military penetration in the countries of the Third World. Its activities in Bangladesh and Angola, for example, are well known - even if it acted through the intermediary of a third country. At the same time the USSR sustained some important reversals: for example in Egypt, and in India where its position has become uncertain since the recent elections. In short, we cannot analyze the "Third World" as a homogeneous bloc of countries engaged in the same way in the struggle against the grasp of the foreign imperialists, and in particular the superpowers. On the contrary, each country of the "Third World" maintains specific links with various imperialist powers including the superpowers...

These few examples are presented with one objective: to show the necessity to approach the analysis of the international situation without tirelessly repeating the statement that the world is divided in three and that war is inevitable! To be more exact, it is a question of seeking out the revolutionary forces where they really exist in the long term: in the exploited proletariat, in the poor peasantry, in the oppressed peoples who still bear the yoke of imperialism, rather than in the inevitably self-seeking and often deceitful manoeuvres of the big and petty bourgeoisies of the "second" and "Third World". Nevertheless, this does not excuse us from constantly paying attention to how the many contradictions in the camp of the bourgeoisie and of imperialism in various countries and the world might and should be used to benefit the revolution. It is precisely in this way that the "theory of three worlds" is clearly of value. But to argue, supposedly on the basis of the "theory of three worlds", that the bourgeoisie of any or many countries could engage in war against imperialism and hegemonism, is to cross a very dangerous line!

An imperialist bourgeoisie or an imperialist 'bloc' can engage in war with another bourgeoisie or another bloc,

but this is not a revolutionary war; this is an imperialist war, a war of pillage, a war for hegemony. An imperialist war is not a war against imperialism!

* * *

Criticism of the abusive - or, as Lenin would say, "irrelevant" use of the "theory of three worlds" should not, however, lead us to deny the existence of the great trends which mark international relations at the present time. It is certain, for example, that for several years the Third World has been swept by a profound movement for liberation against imperialist, colonialist and hegemonist oppression; it is equally certain that this movement has played a decisive role in the development of the revolutionary forces of the other countries - if for no other reason than that the liberation struggles of the oppressed nations and peoples have revealed even more clearly the essentially reactionary character of imperialism.

It is equally certain that inter-imperialist rivalries have grown sharper over the past several years. The two superpowers confront each other more and more in their race for world hegemony, to the point that the other imperialist countries, which must bear the effects of these confrontations, are increasingly troubled by the designs of the superpowers. The danger of a third world war smoulders under the deceitful appeals to disarmament by the superpowers.

Meanwhile, the manoeuvres of the superpowers and of all the imperialists are constantly being unmasked and the tendency towards revolution grows everywhere in the world. The Marxist-Leninist parties and organizations which are developing in all regions of the world are concrete evidence of this tendency. All the revolutionary forces of the various countries must take up their historic task and ensure that the sharpening of the fundamental contradictions of our era will be transformed into a vast revolutionary movement which will strike a mortal blow at reactionary imperialism to the benefit of popular liberation and the building of socialism.

Chapter 2

THE PRESENT

CANADIAN SITUATION

The characteristics of the present Canadian situation are to a certain degree the reflection at the level of our country of the contradictions acting on the whole world in the present general crisis it's going through. There has been an important upswing in the last fifteen years and more in popular and workingclass struggles, with the Quebec national question nearly always being among them. Canadian political history of the last twenty years is yet to be written; and it must be written if we want to really understand the present situation. But there can be no doubt that the Quebec national question has played a central role ever since the demonstrations in Montreal in the very early sixties against Gordon, the Chairman of the CNR, who had shown total contempt for the French Canadians.

The question of Canada's independence from the US and more recently, the question of the national rights of the Amerindians and Inuit have also taken an important place next to student, immigrant and women's struggles. Although they have never reached the extent of the struggles around the Quebec national question, they nevertheless have been developing in the last few years. However, the fundamental contradictions determining the political life of our country, characterising the class struggle, should not get obscured by all these particular struggles.

Today in Canada, we're seeing grass-roots movements taking root out of the contradictions arising from the development of capitalism at the stage of imperialism. The dawning of national struggles in Quebec and among the Native people fully illustrates this fact. Quebec nationalism bloomed with the "Quiet Revolution", i.e. with the development of monopoly capitalism. This situation also explains the recent anger of Quebec farmers. Native people's demands as well developed at the same time as

the big companies - in oil, gas, mines and hydro-electric power - undertook the pillage of the lands of the Great Canadian North.

We can also view with the Canadian bourgeoisie a movement which is moving to make of Canada a true imperialist power. This movement must be seen in terms of the inevitable extension in our country of monopoly capitalism - monopolies which aren't all foreign (especially American) but monopolies where Canadian capital and thus the Canadian bourgeoisie, play an essential role.

As for the proletariat, the striving for socialism is growing, and workers' and peoples' struggles are becoming radicalised. However, the bourgeoisie has assured itself of the leadership of the workers movement. We see that they don't hesitate to rely on the reformists, revisionists, social democrats and petty-bourgeois nationalists to block the transformation of the revolt of the masses into an irresistible revolutionary tide.

Already by 1972, in FOR THE PROLETARIAN PARTY, we were saying that bourgeois nationalism and social democracy were the main obstacles to the development of the revolutionary struggle in our country. This remains just as true today, even if we must considerably bolster our analysis of the situation if we want to adopt a correct orientation in relation to the immediate struggles of the proletariat and people.

For the bourgeoisie, the present crisis of imperialism brings with it the sharpening of old contradictions, whose origin is to be found in Canada's birth as a unified country in 1867. At that time the advocates of the autonomy of the British colonies which were to become the first Canadian provinces were opposed to the advocates of Canadian Confederation. A lot of things have changed in Canada since 1867, but there are still ten provinces that sometimes come out unanimously against Ottawa's right to further centralise power. Exactly at this time, with the Canadian bourgeoisie (or in any case one of its fractions) striving to constitute itself as an imperialist power, since the development of monopolies demands it, and for this very reason, it needs to further unify the country, economically and politically. Nevertheless the divisive factors remain important right within the bourgeoisie and are reinforced by the existence of a strong autonomist current in Quebec.

Let's first of all recognize that the analysis of contradictions within the Canadian bourgeoisie still remains quite sketchy and that therefore we ought to attach greater importance to it in the future.

In spite of the weakness of our analysis, we can definitely state that today as it has been up till now, our country's political unity is quite precarious. We have only to look, for example, at the regional character of all the Canadian political parties. Be it the Liberal Party, Progressive Conservative Party, NDP or the Socreds, not to mention the formally regio-

nal parties like the Union Nationale and the Parti Québécois or even the Bloc Populaire of the 1940's... no Canadian political party has succeeded up to this point in establishing solid and permanent roots in all the regions of the country. Some parties don't even want to be established thus and those who do haven't reached their goal. Today we see the extreme weakness of the Liberal Party in the West while the Tories have gained no major support in Quebec; similarly the NDP has never succeeded in taking root in Quebec, and remains very weak in the Maritimes.

None of this is accidental. It's because the Canadian bourgeoisie isn't solidly united that the bourgeois political parties haven't come to achieve a strong unity throughout the country even given their lengthy existence. Besides the regional character of the bourgeois parties there's the constant attraction exercised by the USA on various parts of the country. There are PQ members, more than a few, who talk of a Common Market between Quebec and the States - and they aren't the first Quebecois to talk this way. Previously the Patriots of 1837-38 were tempted by this view and it has never completely died. And this tendency exists in nearly all regions of Canada, from BC to the Maritimes. Questioned on the future of the Atlantic provinces if Quebec were to come independent, one of the Maritime Premiers spontaneously stated that these provinces should tighten their economic links with the States. Even without Quebec independence, frequent declarations are made by the provincial Premiers defending the importance of economic ties with the US. Lougheed has become over the last several years a major spokesperson for this tendency.

Of all the Canadian provinces, Ontario is without doubt the one which shows the greatest will to keep Canada united, in the face of the threat of Quebec independence, but also in the face of other manifestations of regionalism in Canada. We should pay attention to this. Ontario is still the most industrialized province, whose industrialization was achieved with a strong element of American capital. Branches of American monopoly enterprises are very numerous in this province. Ontario helped create the American-Canadian alliance after the Second World War, undoubtedly because the capitalists of this region saw in it the most promising means to develop their own capital. Now it's also true today that Ontario is a fervent partisan of Canadian unity. Thus, coming out of the Federal Provincial Conference of Premiers in December of 1976, Premier Davis said he was happy with the results of the conference, happy that his province contributes through equalization payments to a better distribution of the country's riches, and anxious to assure Canadian unity. In doing this, Davis quite definitely expressed the viewpoint of all Canadian monopoly capitalists for whom Canada as a whole constitutes an internal market which is necessary for the development of their business.

In doing this Davis supported the centralizing policy of Trudeau. This is the same Trudeau who for some years has undertaken many efforts to develop markets (for commodities and for capital) for Canada in Brazil, Venezuela, France, Belgium, Germany, Japan, many African and Middle-Eastern countries, etc. through trade missions, ministerial trips, organizations which "aid" the third world, all of which correspond to the interests of Canadian monopoly capital.

It's only one step from there to conclude that the tendency to unite Canada more strongly and to remove our country from American domination is mainly "based" in Ontario. Our country's whole history shows that in effect Ontario is the nexus of the Canadian monopoly bourgeoisie. This bourgeoisie at the present time is interested both in further centralizing the country and in gaining a greater margin of manoeuvre on the international level, a margin of manoeuvre which is often restricted by the weight of American domination.

The Conference of Premiers was just barely finished when the Quebec government announced that Levesque was going to New York to meet the American businessmen next January 25. He wasn't going in order to talk to them about the political independence of Quebec, but to give them his government's orientation in relation to foreign (i.e., American) investment, and labour relations, i.e. how the government was going to establish "equilibrium" in owner-worker relations in the province. We should also pay attention to this, for it's obvious that what interests American capitalists is mainly the possibility of investing to advantage in the vast territory next to them. What needs to happen for the American capitalists to accomplish this? Basically two things: on the one hand, that the government in office not oppose foreign investment through laws or numerous nationalizations; on the other hand, that this government know how to contain workers' demands within such demands that satisfy the necessity for the greatest possible capitalist profit. Within this context we can better understand that constitutional reshufflings and even political autonomy for Quebec are not of decisive importance for American capital, to the extent that these changes don't block their activities. In certain respects, the American would have the same interest in Canadian political unity continuing to totter.

This is why the election of the PQ last November 15 is so important for the future of Canada. The "pequiste" plan for Quebec independence poses in all its acuteness the old, chronic problem of Canadian unity. We should expect to see in the next few months the emergence, with vigour, of contradictions within the Canadian bourgeoisie. On one hand, Quebec could well take the lead in the movement for decentralization among the Canadian bourgeoisie, or to be more exact, within its non-monopoly fraction. We might see other "separatist movements"

developing in various parts of the country. On the other hand, all the elements which want to maintain their unity in the country are undoubtedly going to band together more strongly.

Each of the various political parties are going to have to declare themselves. Clark's Conservative Party, for example, will not be able to indefinitely avoid the questions which the country's future poses, not only in relation to Canada's foreign affairs, particularly with the USA, but also in terms of Quebec independence and the regionalism of other parts of the country. However, we can certainly understand Clark's hesitations if we realize that for 75 years the Conservative Party has tried to represent the interests of the regional capitalists against the goal of centralization on the part of the monopoly capitalists represented by the Liberal Party.

In fact it was the Liberal Party which led the struggle at the turn of the century for Canada's independence from the British Empire, in the interests of Canadian monopolies. Again it was this party which at the end of the Second World War consolidated Canada's alliance with the States, again to the advantage of the monopolization of capital in Canada. Once again this party has become the chief defender of Canadian unity against all forms of nationalism and regionalism in Canada, on the one hand. On the other hand, it's trying to break the grip of American domination through establishing tighter economic links with the EEC, Japan and the countries of the Third World. Here again the liberal party puts itself in the vanguard of the defense of the interests of Canadian monopoly capital.

As for the NDP, it seems just as hesitant as the Conservative Party, even if historically it has always been more hostile to Quebec nationalism, and a greater defender of Canadian unity. Incidentally, this party has considerably stepped up its attacks against American capital in Canada since the second to last election campaign in 1973, after the success to a certain degree of the Waffle trend in imposing its viewpoint on the "corporate welfare bums".

We should also clearly see that the domination of American imperialism over the Canadian economy brings with it important contradictions within the Canadian bourgeoisie - contradictions which the Liberal Party has confronted regularly in the course of the last 10 or 12 years. We have only to recall, among other things, the numerous resignations of Ministers, from Gordon to Richardson, not to mention Kierans and Gray, all of which had to do with differences within the government over economic relations between Canada and the US...

All this should convince us of the extreme importance in carefully analyzing in the next few months the development of the political situation in the country. By the same token, we should deepen our analysis of the major contradictions which divide the Canadian bourgeoisie in order to come to a clear

understanding of its constituent fractions and their respective places within the relation of forces on which is based the present situation in our country.

While it helps crystallize the contradictions within the Canadian bourgeoisie the election of the PQ also allows us to deepen our understanding of the contradictions which exist within the Canadian workers movement and therefore to clarify the path to its unity.

The PQ is presently faced with enormous contradictions. It comes to power in the midst of crisis, not only in Canada but throughout the world: inflation and unemployment are the two pressing problems everywhere in the capitalist world, notably in the USA. In such a situation, the interests of the bourgeoisie and those of the proletariat and the masses are opposed more than ever. What is the PQ going to do? How will it be able to, on the one hand, clean up Quebec's financial picture and modernize the administration - in short, to be a "good" government in the eyes of investors, without, on the other hand, largely abandoning its reformist program? And how could it abandon its promised reforms without alienating itself from the electorate - workers, petty-bourgeois, farmers and small capitalists, the improvement of whose economic situation is in direct contradiction with monopolization, with the interests of the monopolies? How could it do all this and still have clean hands on the day of the referendum?

The contradictions which the PQ meets are not the first of their kind in Canada. In fact, we can learn from the history of various NDP governments elected in the West in the last few years, in this regard. While wanting to adopt a strictly reformist style, Barrett's social democratic government lasted only one term in B.C. Elsewhere, the governments of Manitoba and Saskatchewan have maintained power up till now by breaking more completely with radical aspects, while in Ontario the NDP has attained the rank of official opposition, pushing out the Liberal Party. The NDP and the PQ share a common important popular electoral base and real support from the union movement. Analyzing their programs, policies and electoral base is thus a good means to understand the character and importance as well as the contradictions of the reformist trend in the workers' movement. In the West, where the CCF was born in 1932, social democracy was at first largely supported by the farmers, whose interests were threatened by the development of monopolies. Today, the labour aristocracy and the petty-bourgeoisie in general (no longer only its agrarian elements) constitute the class base of social democracy. In this regard, the recent successes of the PQ rest not only on its position with relation to the national question, but also on the later development in Quebec of a labour aristocracy and a stratum of farmers who, some years after their counterparts

in the West, are seeing the monopolies cut the ground from under their feet.

We should expect to see the rise of social democracy throughout the whole country along with the sharpening of contradictions within the workers' movement between the reformist tendency (which tends to become conservative) and the tendency which we will call "radical" within which are found the elements which have been won over to Marxism-Leninism. The rise of social democracy is to be expected because the bourgeoisie's interests lead it more and more to appeal to the corrupted leaders of the workers' movement in order to obtain "social peace". The Joe Morris and the entire leadership of the CLC, the Jean Gérin-Lajoie and many Quebec union bosses are already completely won over to the most complete class collaboration... in exchange for concessions which Morris and the CLC call tripartism, which essentially consist in forms of participation in power, not for the working class, since that is impossible, but for the union bosses. Jean Gérin-Lajoie, in offering his support to the PQ, has already received his first reward: he's a member of the committee of Minister Charron, which is going to study the fate of the Olympic site. We have good reason to wonder by what logic Gérin-Lajoie can come to believe that the future use of Montreal's Olympic stadium is an important question for the future of the workers movement, for the immediate and long-term well-being of the working class and labouring masses! No, this is only of interest to the future of Gérin-Lajoie!

However, the union movement includes important "pockets of resistance" opposed to the intrigues of the corrupted collaborators of the Gérin-Lajoie type, particularly in Quebec. Here also, the contradictions are sharpening. For the past four or five years Gérin-Lajoie has been attacking the extremists of the CNTU, of the CEQ, and even of the QFL. This latter body, at the instigation of the other union centrals, denounced the capitalist state at its congresses in the early seventies, denounced it through Laberge himself, who confirmed it in a bout of fever at the time of the Common Front struggle in 1972 and his imprisonment with Pépin and Charbonneau. It was, as we recall, the period when all the union leaders in Quebec outdid themselves in attacking the capitalist state, capitalism and foreign monopolies. It was the period when these same union leaders did their best to convince the Quebec workers that their liberation would come through the independence of Quebec, when there were sharp contradictions between the QFL and the CLC, when the movement for autonomy in regard to American unions as well as to the CLC was developing.

Well, now it would seem that the nationalism of the Quebec reformists in the unions is not such a big obstacle to their collaboration with English Canadian social democrats.

This is by no means the product of chance. The reformist union bosses, as much in Quebec as in English Canada, have to deal with the fact that they have a developing common enemy: the Canadian communist (ML) movement. Thus, while they are coming very close to gaining power, at least in certain provinces, the social democrats note that their hegemony in the workers' movement is being seriously challenged. In order to continue their climb towards power, in order to properly play their role in extinguishing the flames of the class struggle of the proletariat in the context of the crisis of imperialism, the social democrats - traitors to the workers' movement and collaborators with the monopoly bourgeoisie - find themselves faced with the necessity of unmasking their reactionary manoeuvre for the workers' movement to see. There we have the basis for the resurgence of anti-communism in our country. It's of some importance to recall this fact in order to situate manifestations of sectarianism and leftism on the part of certain communists, which objectively nourish this anti-communism, but which are by no means its main causes.

An analysis of the present situation in the Canadian union movement has to take up many complex problems. It's certainly no longer enough to simply say that the unions today are largely subordinated to the bourgeois state apparatus, as we've been content for too long to do, even if this is well-founded, even if this is more and more true as social democratic or reformist parties like the PQ take power. There are important contradictions between the capitalist state and certain sections of the union movement. It has even come to pass in the last few years, mainly in Quebec, that the entire union movement finds itself in an open and sharp confrontation with the capitalist state. It would be too simplistic to reduce these confrontations to contradictions within the camp of the bourgeoisie. Moreover, the various laws and bills slated to better restrict the activities of the union movement and completely transform the union leaders into agents of the capitalist state also illustrate that important contradictions remain.

This type of situation is very favourable for the rise of social democracy and further for the rise to power of social democratic parties, where we find numerous careerist unionists. In the coming together at a certain moment in the development of capitalism of the interests of imperialism and those of the labour aristocracy and of that fraction of the petty-bourgeoisie to whom the development of monopoly brings advantages, we have the basis for the social democratic current. In fact, several social democratic governments have been elected in the Canadian provinces during the last few years the election of the PQ in Quebec also falls, in many respects, within this current. Imperialism - particularly American imperialism - actively supports social democrats and social democratic parties each

time that the sharpening of its contradictions with the proletariat and the labouring masses in general threatens to become a revolutionary movement directly attacking capitalist power. We find the proof in Portugal, France, Italy, West Germany... Social democracy is therefore the best defence in the face of the radicalization of the popular masses and more exactly in face of the "communist peril".

It's this phenomenon, which we will have to analyze more deeply, which we find at present in Canada. The NDP and the PQ represent the two main reformist political forces in the country; they are in power in three provinces and constitute the opposition party in two or three others (B.C., Ontario, and Alberta). At this point it isn't necessary to show the strong links unifying Canadian unions, particularly the CLC, and the NDP. You can find comparable links between the Quebec unions, particularly the QFL, and the PQ. Thus there is the growing real danger in our country that it will be the social democrats who bring in measures to more completely subjugate the unions to the capitalist state. We know of the enormous illusions which social democracy cultivates in the workers' movement in the western world. Haven't we heard enough about "Swedish socialism" in Canada over the last ten years?

Meanwhile, the rise of social democracy to power is not without its contradictions. In English Canada we saw the Waffle which up till 1972 was a radical wing within the NDP. In the same way the rise of the PQ in Quebec has been accompanied since the sixties by the development of a more radical wing within the party, and further by the development of "socialist trends" influenced by the Trotskyists and also to a certain degree by the pro-Moscow revisionists. These revisionists are today once again dreaming of launching their old project - which led to the creation of the Parti Socialiste Québécois in 1958 - that of a Quebec workers' party.

These same contradictions divide the union movement, and thus Canadian unions don't form a monolithic block. Thus we've seen the development in the last few years in English Canada of the CCU, in reaction to the unlimited class collaboration unionism of the CLC, and as well in reaction to the domination by American unions over the greater part of the unions affiliated to the CLC. In certain respects the CCU is close to the NDP and even more so to the Waffle, particularly on the question of the attitude in relation to American domination of Canada. One of the central elements of the CCU's position is the Canadianization of the unions. The present leaders of this union central said in 1973 that if the CLC would adopt this point in its program, the CCU would have to strive for the unity of Canadian unions, undoubtedly from within the CLC. The struggle of the CCU is also reflected in the CLC, where unions formerly affiliated with American unions took back their autonomy. This mo-

vement was tied to the nationalism of the NDP particularly in the period when the influence of the Waffle was quite considerable.

In Quebec the contradictions within the union movement are visibly moving towards the struggle between the supporters of the PQ, and the more radical elements identified with the Marxist-Leninists by the reformists "à la Gérin-Lajoie" who are not noticeably disturbed by the use of the worst demagoguery. The "old style" social democrats see in the PQ the type of government with which the most complete collaboration is fully justified. All those who oppose this in one way or another are thrown into the camp of the "Leftists" - idealists and dreamers who are enchanted by Marxist theory but who are devoid of all political "realism".

Phenomena such as the following must be kept in mind when analysing the contradictions of the Canadian union movement. Although the CLC supported the NDP even when the latter denounced the American "corporate welfare bums" - those foreign monopolies which profit from subsidies from the Canadian state, - it by no means opposed American domination over a large proportion of the unions affiliated to it. While the steelworkers in Quebec, headed by Gérin-Lajoie and Théo Gagné, support the PQ with all their might, they are totally opposed to the Canadianization of their union, but rather have nothing against American investments here. Such contradictions can clarify for us the interests of the labour aristocracy, the union bosses and the petty-bourgeoisie...

* * *

Bill C-73 and the other crisis measures of the Canadian state fully illustrate the desire on the part of the bourgeoisie to accentuate its control over the workers movement, to assure itself the necessary margin of manoeuvre to guarantee its interests in the present crisis situation. This crisis is not only economic, but also political. It arises not only through the sharpening of contradictions between labour and capital, but also involves contradictions in the very heart of the bourgeoisie, which tend to disunite the country and even to break it up. For these reasons we see the bourgeoisie competing for the support of the workers movement.

It's no accident that while Trudeau increases his meetings with the union bosses and representatives of big business, Levesque organized his "economic summit" for the end of May. Trudeau wants to sell them Canadian unity; Levesque, Quebec sovereignty. Trudeau wants to maintain a market for the Canadian bourgeoisie; that's why he has the complete support of Davis, who is the Premier of the province where monopoly capital is mainly concentrated. Levesque wants to show the American investors that Quebec independence would in no way mean "anarchy" in labour relations. On the contrary it would mean the blunting of

class contradictions to the benefit of the "independence" of the whole nation.

Trudeau and Levesque, not to mention other capitalist politicians like Davis and Lougheed, who take divergent positions, seem to be poles apart. However there's one point where they're all in marvellous agreement: Canadian workers are going to have to tighten their belts, whether they like it or not. According to Levesque, Quebecers will have to tighten their belts to achieve independence; according to Trudeau, Canadians would have to do the same to assure the country's unity. In short, there is pressure today on Canadian and Quebec working people to make sacrifices for various fractions of the bourgeoisie. To do this, the bourgeoisie indulges in a shameless horse-dealing with the corrupted union bosses; and if the workers movement refused to be led down this garden path, the bourgeoisie brandishes the threat of a fiercer repression.

The Canadian proletariat shouldn't tighten its belt in order to play the game of one or another fraction of the bourgeoisie. If it did this it would be collaborating in its own exploitation. The Canadian proletariat should rather link arms and say no to the manoeuvres and threats of the bourgeoisie, no to betrayal by the corrupted union bosses.

Chapter 3

FOR THE UNITY OF THE CANADIAN PROLETARIAT

In the midst of a situation characterized on the one hand by the sharpening of contradictions within the bourgeoisie and on the other hand by a clear tendency towards greater class collaboration between the union bosses and the bourgeois state, what are the interests of the Canadian proletariat? What are the tasks of communists (ML) wishing to serve the interests of the proletariat?

One thing is for sure. The unity of the proletariat is not just a long-term objective which can be put off till later when the communist (ML) party is formed and consolidated. Right now we're faced with the development of the forces of division, due to the sharp contradictions which the crisis of imperialism provokes within the bourgeoisie, and due also to the activity of the agents of the bourgeoisie in the very ranks of the workers' movement. The struggle for the unity of the Canadian proletariat - the struggle against social democratic reformism, against revisionism and Trotskyism, the struggle against bourgeois nationalism and big nation chauvinism - should be found at the heart of the present activities of the Canadian workers' movement. Communists have the duty to resolutely lead this struggle, if they want to be consistent with the Marxist-Leninist strategic line which places the principal contradiction between the entire Canadian proletariat and the Canadian bourgeoisie.

The Quebec proletariat must realize that it has nothing to gain by flirting with the Quebec independence movement whose fundamental interests are anti-working class. The Quebec proletariat should fully realize that its future lies in socialist revolution and that this is impossible without the unity of the working class and popular forces of all Canada against all the

combined forces of all the fractions of the bourgeoisie, irrespective of nationality, whose only goal is to maintain and develop capitalist exploitation.

As for the proletariat of English Canada, it must recognize, without deviations or reservations, the right to self-determination of the Quebec nation and the national rights of the other minorities without which socialist revolution will be inevitably compromised in our country. The proletariat of Quebec and of the national minorities could not actively take up the struggle beside the English proletariat if it weren't convinced that a socialist Canada will fully recognize the ability to exercise their national rights.

On this question, as on many others, it's only the communists (ML) whose interests are consistent with the struggle for socialism in Canada. The reformists, revisionists, Trotskyists, and other opportunists have acted like chameleons for the past fifteen years: wherever they are, they take up the most popular position; in other words, they play the game of the bourgeoisie in maintaining division in the workers' movement.

The Canadian bourgeoisie is full of contradictions and divisions; this is an advantage for our struggle. Unfortunately, equally important divisions exist within the Canadian proletariat and masses; this is a major handicap in developing a revolutionary struggle.

The new-born unity between communists (ML) from Quebec and from English Canada is an historic advance, in light of the fact that within the CP (even before its total degeneration) this unity was always precarious; in the light of the fact that big nation chauvinism was most often dominant in it. But let's not pretend that all our difficulties are resolved. On the contrary, we still find too many Quebec communists (ML) who haven't grasped the importance in practice of forming an all-Canadian organization, an organization which unites the communists of the whole country. By the same token we find communists (ML) from English Canada who accept either poorly or not at all that at this time the leadership of the movement is coming from Quebec.

The new-born unity of the communists (ML) of the country is a precious yet fragile achievement, just as are the few tangible manifestations of unity which the proletariat of the two nations have accomplished in the course of the last few years. This fact allows of great hope, on the condition that the movement takes up the struggle fully conscious of the difficulties. For the division of the proletariat in our country is as old as the country itself. The history of the union movement, like the history of parties like the CCF, the CP and the NDP, goes to prove it.

The fact that the Canadian proletariat remains divided today is not due to its interests being fundamentally different,

nor because the proletarians of this country don't aspire to unity. Rather it's because up till now the bourgeoisie has generally succeeded in bribing the leaders of the workers' movement and of the organizations, unions and parties in which it placed its confidence. That is why the struggle for the unity of the Canadian proletariat and people involves a most resolute and tenacious struggle against all the agents of the bourgeoisie who have infiltrated into the workers' movement - against all those traitors to the revolutionary cause whom we know as social democrats, revisionists, Trotskyists and nationalists.

In so far as we have become convinced that the path which we advance in order to achieve socialism in our country is the only correct one, we are duty-bound to undertake a resolute struggle to achieve the unity of revolutionary forces in the whole country. Of course this means the unity of communists (ML) without which a true Canadian communist party could not exist; but it also means the unity of the proletariat, of the workers' movement, of the union movement and of the Canadian masses as a whole. This question of the unity of the popular forces gets thrown into relief in the present situation and in the developments which we can foresee coming out of this situation. We've seen that the contradictions within the bourgeoisie threaten to escalate. In such a situation the various tendencies within the bourgeoisie will try to use the masses in their own interests. The PQ is going to try by every means to convince the masses of Quebec to choose independence; the national chauvinists of English Canada are inevitably going to let anti-Quebec sentiments flow freely in the rest of the country; immigrant workers are going to be held for ransom even more between the federalists and the separatists. Such a situation will create a favourable atmosphere for all sorts of reformist 'theories' - all directed towards class collaboration with imperialism and thus opposed to the workers' interests - to flourish.

It's up to the communists (ML) to resolutely take the initiative in building the unity of the Canadian proletariat and people on a correct revolutionary basis which upholds the necessity for socialist revolution on the scale of the whole country, and which upholds with the same energy and consistency the right to self-determination of the Quebec nation. Otherwise durable unity is impossible.

But, need we say, it's not enough to demonstrate the correctness of our strategic line in our propaganda alone. It's neither useless nor incorrect, quite the contrary, it's totally indispensable, and we must accentuate our efforts in this way in our newspaper, our journal, our performances, our songs, our records, our pamphlets, in tracts, in our conversations with workers, in the workers' circles, and in the readers' circles. We must everywhere and at all times demonstrate that the unity of the Canadian proletariat and people is the only possible path

to socialism in our country; we must demonstrate the correctness of recognizing the right to self-determination of Quebec without which the unity of the Canadian proletariat is unthinkable.

But this is not enough. Thus we approach at this point our central theme: establishing the basis of our tactical line for the present stage of the struggle. In order to succeed in demonstrating the correctness of our line, it must be proven in practice. It's in these terms that we must pose the question of tactics at this time in the Marxist-Leninist movement: what immediate goals, what activities and forms of organization are we going to advance in order to encourage the unity of the Canadian people, the unity of the proletariat, and the unity of the communists (ML), and thus advance the struggle against the Canadian bourgeoisie, its American ally, and the reactionary imperialist forces of the whole world which exploit and oppress the world's peoples and are preparing a new war for the division of the world?

Let's be as clear as possible. Up till now, with the exception of the CSLO from November of 1973 to the winter of 1975, and of the campaign against Bill C-73 from November of 1975 up till now, we have thought of tactics mainly, and sometimes solely, as coming out of the answer to the question "How are we going to intervene in the workers' struggle?" This question is indeed a question of tactics, and it ought to be posed. In fact, we posed it very clearly in AGAINST ECONOMISM in September 1975. But we have to take account of the fact that if we remain fixed on this question, we are in great danger of reducing tactics to only one of its aspects, and we are opening the door to localism and economism.

Actually, when this is the only question posed when attempting to establish a correct tactic, it leads very often to the following attitude: one searches out workers to meet, to find out what's happening in their factories and unions: with this more or less known (for the investigation is often limited and rests on little evidence) one sets out to determine what to do in the situation which has been discovered. Undoubtedly this situation could reveal things about the situation of the working class as a whole, but it could just as easily lay bare very particular contradictions, or ones which are quite secondary although general, in relation to the sum of contradictions which are present at a given moment within the Canadian proletariat as a whole. We can therefore see how deviations can creep into our tactics: rather than conceiving of them in terms of the interests of the Canadian working class, we conceive them in terms of the interests of one or another group of workers. For sure, this cannot be the right path to take to establish the basis, the main orientation of our tactics at a given moment. It could only serve to establish our tactics for penetrating into one or another sector... It is thus only one aspect of our tactics. We

shouldn't sum up the totality of our tactics with that aspect which is defined as follows: the particular means to set in motion in order to take up and develop the winning over politically of a certain number or category of workers. And we should keep in mind that our tactics, seen as a whole, should provide us with the means to win over the entire working class. To act in any other fashion is to head down the path of opportunism.

In establishing our tactics we are faced with a second important question. If we rest content with studying the situation, analyzing a relation of forces, and passively accepting the conclusions which arise, we're still on the wrong path. Analysis of the conjuncture does not in and of itself automatically produce tactics; ON THE BASES OF STRATEGIC LINE we must go on to establish the means for transforming this situation in the direction of developing a revolutionary struggle. Let's take an example: in analyzing the relation of forces, we could come to the conclusion that Quebec separatism constitutes at this moment a very grave threat and an important brake on the struggle for socialism in Canada as a whole. Based on this alone, we could decide that our present tactics should be centred on the struggle against separatism, seen in a simplistic fashion as the struggle against the PQ. That would be an enormous tactical error, in the sense that leading the struggle mainly in these terms could lead us to cut ourselves off from the working masses of Quebec, a large portion of which place some hope, although possibly limited, but hope none the less, in the PQ. In this case as in every other, we should develop our tactics out of our strategic line, which in this case means out of the objective of the unity of the Canadian proletariat and people as a necessary condition for the victory of socialism.

What does this mean in practice? It means that our tactics should be conceived of in such a manner as to prove, theoretically - through propaganda mainly - and practically - i.e., in the struggle - the necessity of the unity of the whole proletariat and of the whole Canadian people in order to truly transform present conditions and in the end to overthrow bourgeois power in our country. In order to do this, our tactics should include proposals, appeals, and immediate goals which particularly lead to the practical unity of the proletariat of the whole country. These proposals, appeals and immediate goals should, in addition, be such as to bring the struggle of the united Canadian proletariat up against its true enemies, against its MAIN ENEMIES.

Does this mean that we should completely reduce to second place the Quebec national question, on the pretext that we should address ourselves to the Canadian proletariat as a whole? Not at all: that would be a second very serious tactical error consisting this time in developing one's tactics by deducing them directly from strategy and in neglecting in a leftist fas-

hion (the first tactical error mentioned above being of an opportunist type) to take account of concrete conditions. Our struggle for the unity of the Canadian proletariat and people in the struggle for socialism involves at this moment the struggle against the main obstacles blocking the road to unity. Now precisely at this moment the Quebec national question is ONE of the main obstacles to unity, perhaps even THE main obstacle. To not take account of this would be to make a profound error, completely leftist. We should take account of it not only when we meet nationalist workers in Quebec or national chauvinist workers in English Canada. Our propaganda and agitation should take up this problem directly and openly and should make clear the communist (ML) position in this area.

But our tactics should not set for themselves as their central objective the struggle against separatism; in other words, it would not be correct to launch a campaign of denunciation of the PQ or to work to form working class and people's committees to struggle against the separatist project. Such tactics could not lead to the unity of the whole Canadian proletariat. They would indicate that in practice we are mixing up contradictions to be found within the Quebec workers' movement with contradictions in the Canadian workers' movement. However, we're not saying that we won't eventually have to systematically organize a developed means to inform people on the causes of the Quebec independence movement, on the dangers that it represents for the proletarian revolution in Canada, and on the correct means of taking up this question and resolving it in the interests of the proletariat.

* * *

Some people think that economism in Quebec died with the dissolution of the CSLO in 1975; others think that it died in English Canada when study groups took up analyzing the history of capitalism in our country. Without denying the positive character of these events for the development of the Marxist-Leninist movement, we have to recognize that economism and right opportunism are still very much present in our ranks. And it's very often in the area of tactics that these deviations come out. Once again, having an essentially correct strategic line is not enough in order to serve the interests of the revolution. It's also necessary that this line guide our tactics in all circumstances and in this regard it's necessary to develop a scientific analysis of the conjuncture in order to determine on what basis and in what way it will be possible to advance down the path of the revolution.

Having said this, we can only be astonished to see communists (ML) who put forward that the main enemy of the revolution in our country is the Canadian bourgeoisie, advocating tactics which make the main enemies either the superpowers, or

the union bosses, or even the leaders of popular community groups, tactics where support for the Canadian bourgeoisie sometimes appears... a bourgeoisie which would make moves that are favourable to the revolution! Such tactics, we must say directly, are CLEAR manifestations of right opportunism, tactics which are guided solely by immediate and passing considerations and which make light of the Marxist-Leninist strategic line.

We can only be astonished as well to see the same communists (ML) giving first place to the radicalization of mass organizations and unions to the detriment of developing the forms of organization which would best advance the building of the party, i.e., forms of organization mainly directed toward communist education of the working class vanguard which will constitute the first proletarian nucleus of the party of the proletariat. This also constitutes a CLEAR manifestation of right opportunism.

Meanwhile, other communists (ML) - at least that's what they call themselves - prefer to keep their distance from the immediate struggles which are, in the perspective of these people's fervor (which has become overheated by the massive consumption of the works of Lenin), only "vulgar economic struggles" having nothing to do with the revolution, even less at the stage of party-building when only the "advanced workers" are of any interest to them! The politics of these "leftist" dogmatists are as well definitively right opportunist, consisting in leaving the masses to themselves, under the domination of the reformist elements who direct their struggles in complete tranquility, sheltered from these "Marxist-Leninists" who always have time to spew forth paragraphs and paragraphs taken directly from the works of Lenin in virtual literary rivers, which are Marxist-Leninist in appearance only.

The right and "left" opportunists don't have a clue about tactics, because they have a one-sided view of things. Either, as good dogmatists, they keep on repeating the same general principles without the slightest concern for concrete analysis of the situation in which these principles are to be applied in a living manner. Their line is clear and pure; in what way does this help them analyze reality? Or else, at other times, generally after a period of acute dogmatism, their attention is fixed on the occasions which present themselves to grab onto the workers' movement by jumping on the bandwagon of the most popular struggles, those which "occupy" the masses the most, without the slightest concern for really advancing the communist point of view, the communist analysis, communist tactics, communist forms of organization, and most importantly, the organization of the communist party. In practice, they throw aside their strategic line, however CLEAR it is, being completely occupied with winning immediate victories, occupied with discovering the area of intervention where these victories will be easiest...

This is not serving the interests of the proletariat. Communists (ML) aren't free to act according to their own interests; their duty is to always act according to the long-term interests of the proletariat within the framework provided by the reality of class struggle at each moment, i.e., within the framework of the immediate struggles of the proletariat and the masses. For communists (ML) the problem of tactics resides entirely in the question of intervening in a given situation, in the immediate struggles, in such a way as to advance the struggle for socialism following the Marxist-Leninist political line.

In the present situation, Canadian communists (ML) should be very much concerned with working for the unity of the Canadian proletariat. This unity can only come about through the consciousness within the workers' movement that the Canadian bourgeoisie is its main enemy, the enemy against which it must unite all its forces (otherwise victory would be impossible). As well, this unity can only come about through the consciousness that American imperialism is a very close ally of the Canadian bourgeoisie, an ally which not only threatens the independence of the country, but is directly engaged in the exploitation of the proletariat and in this way is fundamentally opposed to socialist revolution in Canada.

The Canadian masses should not let themselves be fooled by those Marxist-Leninists for whom tactics means producing incoherent and inconsistent slogans according to the circumstances, circumstances which set their imagination going. For a year now we've seen the League throw out slogans with unbridled frivolity: "forge our party"; "against the inevitable war" (if it's really inevitable...); "for class struggle food co-ops"; "against the counter-revolutionaries in the peoples' organizations"; "for the general strike"; "for a class struggle QUARTIER LATIN" (student newspaper at University of Montreal); "against the union bosses"; "for the League, with a clear line and against the opportunists and the 'confused elements'"; "for the 'good moves' of the Canadian bourgeoisie"; "against the 'bad moves' of the Canadian bourgeoisie"; "against racism"...

We aren't saying that the League has no tactics, but rather that its tactics are opportunist. For it buries the main thing under the avalanche of slogans which it throws out every week. It buries the revolutionary struggle of the united Canadian proletariat against the State power of the Canadian bourgeoisie, a struggle at the heart of which should be found the building of the party. Tactics which spurn strategy are destined to lead to complete opportunism. The League's opportunist tactics, as changing as the Canadian climate, follow directly from its inability to analyze concretely the present concrete situation in the light of the demands of the socialist revolution. In place of concrete analysis it substitutes the endless

repetition of a certain number of general principles which it very quickly transforms into total clichés.

We find in its tactics concerning the unity of Marxist-Leninists the same weaknesses and errors. It hasn't understood the STRATEGIC importance of the unity of the Canadian proletariat, just as it hasn't learned from the nationalist and national chauvinist errors of the CP and the progressive groups of the sixties and seventies such as the RCT and the PWM. Thus it allows itself, with monstrous conceit, to expell from the Marxist-Leninist movement all of those in English Canada who do not share their "correct line", rather than taking up the struggle frankly and in a spirit of unity against what it considers are their errors. If these sectarian tactics are a prelude to the efforts which the League is going to deploy in order to unite the proletariat of the two nations, we shouldn't count on it too much to produce victories over Quebec nationalism and English Canadian national chauvinism. Rather we should watch out that it doesn't become a new divisive factor. The League's tactics in the struggle for unity can be summed up as follows: on the one hand, to assert that IN STRUGGLE! is opportunist; on the other hand, to keep totally silent on the other trends within the movement. If this is what they call educating the masses, the word "education" no longer has any meaning.

The masses are never long-term victims of these opportunist manoeuvres, of these tacticians with no overall plans whose slogans have the sole aim of making them appear like experienced leaders. The CPC(ML) played that card for a few years. Over a period of several years, they advanced every imaginable slogan (depending on the circumstances) in order to always give the impression of being in the vanguard. We know where that led them: to being their own vanguard, the vanguard of a few dozen people still dominated by the fiery rhetoric of their "Chairman". But the Canadian masses don't give a hoot about the chairman and his servants!

It wasn't the "Chairman" who killed CPC(ML), but right opportunism disguised in the most dogmatic language. And it's opportunism which will kill those Marxist-Leninists who today still speculate and bargain with the objectives of the revolution, and are heading towards class collaboration because they do not keep the struggle against the Canadian bourgeoisie - the main enemy of the revolution - at the centre of their tactics.

The Canadian masses will also reject those other opportunists, for whom quotes from WHAT IS TO BE DONE take the place of political line, while they know of nothing better to do than to stick like leeches to those which they classify as inveterate right opportunists in order to sell their trash. These people have nothing but principles on their lips but are devoid of principles in practice. We saw them come to the Second Conference of Marxist-Leninists, called by IN STRUGGLE!, and declare first

of all that IN STRUGGLE!'s conferences were opportunist, but that they were still very willing to take part in the Third Conference, which will take place in July!

We have to understand these people: IS's conferences are very nearly the only means for them to hawk their merchandise before a public gathering which goes beyond their small circle. These people are the Bolshevik Union; and since we've been told to translate their name, we will do so: these people are the UNION MENCHEVIQUE (Menshevik Union)! They are a union of right opportunists who disguise themselves with a "left" vocabulary. They aren't the only ones to stick to IN STRUGGLE! when it suits their purpose. We've seen comrades from the League acting in the same way in the West, and propose public debates between IN STRUGGLE! and the League, for the simple reason that in the West the League's meetings would not attract crowds, not even two or three notorious Trotskyists whom the League could throw out MANU M-LITARI... in order to enlighten the masses on the dangers of Trotskyism. Everyone knows that the police only mistreat crooks and that communists (ML) only rough up Trotskyists and revisionists! And this is how the masses are to be educated to tell good from bad!

CONCLUSION

The proletarian revolution in Canada has many enemies - this explains why the struggle must be waged in many areas at once. The Canadian revolution has both internal and external enemies - this explains why the struggle must take account of the international situation, all the more so because the Canadian revolution cannot be dissociated from the world revolution.

But if we go on from there to advance any old slogan, on the pretext that every struggle is important, we are forgetting that all struggles are not equally important from the point of view of the proletarian revolution in Canada. In the prevailing conditions at this time, conditions which can't be reduced to saying that Canada is a country of the "second world", it's of central importance to take up the struggle on the front of the unity of the Canadian proletariat. This is the only consistent means to correctly translate strategic line into a tactical orientation, the only way to direct all the revolutionary forces against their main enemy, the Canadian bourgeoisie, and its ally, American imperialism. Any tactic which strays from this terrain can only lead to opportunism, to diverting the struggle of the proletariat from its central objective.

The particular importance of the unity of Marxist-Leninists all across Canada can really be appreciated in this context and in this context alone. This is what too many communists (ML) in our country - those who reduce the question to a mechanical application of the principles of Leninism on the leading centre, to the correct and clear line - haven't understood. These comrades should reflect on the fact that Lenin never put forward that the Russian Communist Party could be built from a leading centre of Ukrainian or Georgian communists who would then deploy their forces throughout all of Russia. Those who think that they could create a Montreal Communist Party and then set out to conquer Canada are making a dangerous mistake!

Those who think that in order to create the party, it's necessary to decree that the Marxist-Leninist movement is corrupted by opportunism, that it's thus necessary to divide it in order to separate the Marxist-Leninists from the opportunists, are poles apart from Leninism. Lenin never said that it was ne-

cessary to split in order to unite. He said that it was necessary to demarcate with the aim of uniting on the basis of a communist line! The one who said that it was necessary to split, to create factions and schisms incessantly, wasn't Lenin, comrades of the "Menshevik Union", but rather Trotsky! who was precisely a Menshevik...

These erroneous positions on the unity of Marxist-Leninists can be criticized in and of themselves. They are even more open to criticism when we consider them as the transposition of erroneous positions on the tasks of Marxist-Leninists among the Canadian masses. The first error consists of taking advantage of events as they crop up in order to promote one's clear tactics without taking account of the requirements of the strategic line. They therefore present themselves among the masses as horse-traders who have a different horse to sell every day. The second error consists in remaining aloof from the masses, from their immediate struggles, since the masses are backward and it's a matter of economism to be interested in their struggles.

On the ideological level, these two errors are the result of a one-sided view of things, which is unable to establish a correct relationship between the immediate struggles of the proletariat and the long-term struggle for socialism. As for BU, they share the erroneous viewpoint according to which every intervention in immediate struggles is economist, although in fact the struggle for socialism always develops through immediate struggles. BU doesn't understand that the line of demarcation between the economist and proletarian viewpoints is the objective being pursued with the intervention in the immediate struggles, and not the fact of intervention itself.

As for the League, it holds to the equally one-sided and erroneous view that we must intervene in struggles - any struggles - in order to take over the leadership, irrespective of the political basis on which we do so. The League forgets the revolutionary objective which ought to guide every communist intervention; and the result is its class struggle platforms which are in no way communist and which take the place of program for it.

The communist viewpoint on the immediate struggles should take account of two aspects. On one hand the immediate struggles are the terrain on which communists intervene. On the other hand an intervention in the immediate struggles is not communist unless it advances the revolutionary struggle, unless it raises the level of consciousness of the masses, unless it un-masks false solutions, unless it educates the masses on their true immediate and long-term interests.

In order to do this, communists must adopt a tactical orientation articulated on an analysis of the conjuncture which allows them to unravel the main contradictions, the ones which

at a given moment and sometimes for quite long periods of time, block the development of the struggle.

As for us, we say that the obstacle which we must defeat at this time is the division reigning within the Canadian proletariat, which holds back the growth of the struggle against its main enemy, the Canadian bourgeoisie and against its ally, US imperialism. So long as the proletariat and the Canadian masses do not undertake to put an end to the divisions which the bourgeoisie maintains in their ranks, the revolutionary struggle won't be able to develop on the scale of the whole country. The revisionists, social democrats, and nationalists will continue to have a field day continuing their undermining efforts to the benefit of the bourgeoisie, retarding the growth of the revolution.

The future of the proletarian revolution in Canada rests in the fighting unity of the proletariat and masses of the whole country. One of the main tasks of Canadian communists (ML) is working for this unity, fully conscious that their own unity is an essential factor in the unity of the proletariat and people.

IN STRUGGLE!

Here is a list of addresses for contacting IN STRUGGLE!
across the country:

Halifax: P.O. Box 7099, Halifax North, Nova Scotia

Montreal: 4933 De Grand Pré, Montreal, Quebec, (514) 844-0756

Quebec: 290 de la Couronne, Quebec, Quebec, (418) 522-2186

Rouyn-Noranda: P.O. Box 441, Noranda, Quebec

Toronto: 2749 Dundas Street West, Toronto
Ontario, (416) 763-4413

Regina: P.O. Box 676, Regina, Saskatchewan

Vancouver: P.O. Box 1027, Station "A", Vancouver, BC

Hull— P.O. Box 1055, Succ. B., Hull

To write us or to take out a subscription:

4933, de Grand Pré, Montréal — (514) 844-0756

(Check payable to EN LUTTE!)

SUBSCRIBE NOW!

to subscribe to IN STRUGGLE!

regular one year \$7.00

support subscription \$10.00 and more

to subscribe to PROLETARIAN UNITY:

regular 10 issues \$15.00

support subscription \$25.00 or more

Name

Address

Occupation

Workplace

Librairie l'Étincelle

4933, de Grand Pré.

Montréal, tél. (514) 844-0756

(one block west of St-Denis, corner of St-Joseph,
Laurier metro, south exit on St-Joseph)

Hours:

Monday Tuesday Wednesday 10h. to 18h.

Thursday Friday 10h. to 21h.

Saturday 10h. to 17h.

THE SPARK

2749 Dundas Street West, Toronto

P.O. Box 841, Station "A",

Scarborough, Ontario

Tel. (416) 763-4413

(½ mile north of Bloor)

Thursday: 2PM-7PM

Friday: 4PM-9PM

Saturday: 12PM-5PM

Librairie populaire de Québec

290, de la Couronne, Québec

C.P. 3308, St-Roch tél. (418) 522-2186

Monday

Tuesday 12h. to 17h.

Wednesday

Thursday

Friday 12h. to 21h.