

Summing Up Our Revolutionary Development And Looking Towards 1980

A speech delivered by a representative of the Alive Production Collective on New Year's Day, 1980

The task at hand is to make the 1980 New Year's Day speech of the Alive Production Collective. This is only the second New Year's Day speech that the Alive Production Collective has ever made. The first one was a year ago on January 1, 1979. Making New Year's Day speeches, of course, is a broader tradition than just with our organization. The bourgeoisie makes them. Politicians, religious leaders and so on all make them. Revolutionaries all over the world make them; we haven't allowed the bourgeoisie to keep this tradition all to themselves. Some of the most important statements from socialist countries come on New Year's Day. People who support the socialist countries always look forward to these statements. New Year's Day speeches from socialist countries often contain policy statements, projections for the next year, as well as sum-ups of the last year. Many revolutionary organizations in countries which aren't socialist make New Year's Day speeches. Again, the supporters eagerly await to either hear the speech or read it in published form. So, in our own humble way, we try to emulate this and now we're making New Year's Day speeches, too. Two years in a row, it's getting to be a tradition. We should keep it up.

Generally, the purpose of a New Year's Day speech can be summed up in two words. One is *reflection*. The other is *projection*. *Reflection* to revolutionaries, who are so hard-hearted and have such a tough outlook, sounds awfully demure. So, we call it *summing-up*. (Laughter) Actually, it's a much more accurate word.

Generally, the spirit of a New Year's Day speech is supposed to be the same as the spirit of these things called New Year's Day resolutions. Hopefully, it's more real than New Year's Day resolutions, which as everybody knows are supposed to be broken. Same spirit, a better reality, hopefully. The spirit of a New Year's Day speech is optimism, putting past ills behind and doing better in future.

Generally, what is the significance of a New Year's Day speech? Well, if Joe Clark makes one, there is no significance whatsoever. (Laughter) If the Queen of England or the Pope makes one, there is no significance. (Laughter) They usually make their speeches on Christmas Day. We won't take that tradition from them. Hopefully, with regards to our speeches, there is significance, though. Judging the significance of a New Year's Day speech is quite simple. It comes down to the question: how closely does the speech approximate reality? It should closely reflect reality both in the sum-up, how we assess our past work, and in its projection, how we predict what we will achieve in the next year.

We can give more depth to this question of how closely does a speech approximate reality. Last year, we gave our first New Year's Day speech, so we can review that and see in hindsight exactly how well it approximated the reality.

That speech was a long one — two and a half hours; it was a real marathon session. Mainly, we reflected on world affairs in that speech. We gave our interpretation of events which were then current. We touched on two general themes in world events. In the first theme, we went deeply into the whole question of China, which was a very topical subject at the time in terms of the split in the world revolutionary movement around Chairman Mao's three worlds theory. Normalization of diplomatic relations between China and the U.S. had just taken place, in fact, it became official on New Year's Day, 1979. Deng Xiaoping was due to visit the U.S. at the end of the month. Mao Zedong Thought itself, aside from just the three worlds theory, was a big point of controversy in the world

revolutionary movement. The second theme was closely related to this, it was the world revolutionary movement itself. We gave an in-depth interpretation of the splits and the unity trends amongst revolutionaries on the international scale. We gave special stress to this second theme.

In that speech of last January First, we spoke very little on the specifics of our own work, of our own organization, etc. This is mainly because we hadn't yet made public the fact that in the previous six months, we had been involved in a struggle internal to our group. We hadn't yet made public the overthrow of a faction in our organization, a faction which was led by somebody who was previously the leading member of our organization. We were faced with a tough decision on whether or not to use the January First speech to make all that public. We chose not to do so. As a result, we ended up talking about our own work very little. We kept just to general politics. We gave people the benefit of our political analysis but not the benefit of information about our political organization.

The speech made on January 1, 1979 was never published, as many of our other speeches have been. Thus, many of you will be totally unfamiliar with it. Even those who were here may be unfamiliar with it. (Laughter) As mentioned, it was long. After about an hour everybody was probably fast asleep. (Laughter)

One of the advantages of publishing speeches that we make is that people who have the opportunity to become familiar with the material by hearing the speeches delivered, can re-familiarize or more deeply familiarize themselves with it through reading. With regards to this speech, that subsequent reading couldn't happen.

For people's reference, we'd like to read an excerpt from that speech. It'll take five or six minutes to read aloud. It's the concluding portion of last year's speech. It's the only portion of the speech where we did talk about our own work. In this way, people can be reminded of what we said last year. They can hear some of the interesting promises we made.

This is the excerpt of the concluding portion of last year's January First speech, so, of course, all the references are to 1978 and '79, rather than to 1979 and '80, as it is this year: "In terms of summing up 1978 and our own work, we have to address a couple of concrete questions. One concrete issue is: we're supposed to be putting out a weekly magazine called *Alive* and we're not. We haven't put it out since the beginning of August. It's not exactly on a weekly schedule at the moment. In fact, if we put out the next issue immediately that'll mean the magazine is on a four-monthly schedule.

"*Alive Magazine* will be coming out again shortly. It will be coming out in January. After that it will be coming out on a weekly basis.

"*Alive* hasn't been coming out because we've been involved in a polemic internal to the Alive Production Collective. Our own polemic is tied in a certain very direct sense to the polemic in the world revolutionary movement. It also involves much that is specific to us.

"In 1978 we put out a weekly magazine for about five months and for the other seven months of the year, we were involved in this internal polemic. For two months at the beginning of the year (as well as the last month of 1977) and for the last months of 1978, we were in this polemic. When we resumed the weekly publication of *Alive* in March 1978, the polemic was not completed. The polemic is now finished, however. The next issue of *Alive* is going to explain the specifics of the polemic in quite a bit of detail. Anybody who is interested in all the details just has to wait for that issue and read it.

If the individual can read it all when it comes, that is — it's a really big issue!

"This polemic is completed and has been successfully waged as far as we are concerned. The members of the Alive Production Collective have very concretely achieved a new level of unity which has come out of this internal polemic.

"We believe that, because this polemic is in the main behind us now, we can make January First 1979 a very definite turning point in our work. We have been producing Alive Magazine for nine years. Alive started in December 1969. December 1979 will mark ten years of Alive. That's quite significant. We intend to make our tenth year something special. Besides marking the ten year anniversary of Alive, 1979 will also mark the thirty year anniversary of the existence of the People's Republic of China, which country we have spoken a lot about as a beacon in this speech. That is very significant.

"The successful internal polemic just completed in our organization means we are more free to move forward. Now, certain things that have been holding our work back for years are out of the way. Developing our program is a much more possible thing. We can make promises now that we can keep.

"In the life of Alive, the years up to and including 1978 have been a process of breaking ground for real construction yet to come; the years since May 1971 have been, at least in part, a process of developing an organization: the Alive Production Collective. That process has produced a group that has internal unity, that is able to study world affairs and speak on them, that can come to know the Canadian situation and speak on it, and that is capable of making a contribution to anti-imperialist revolution in Canada.

"In 1979, we can begin to prove those things. We can begin to pursue those things with a determined spirit. At the same time that we can say we will make this beginning of sorts, we must also say: It's true, the most important touchstone is practice. We say to all our friends and supporters: Just watch our practice, if our promises don't turn out to be true, toss us into the dustbin of history. We think our promises will turn out to be true. We think our work is going to develop in a very, very concrete fashion in the year 1979.

"1979 will be an excellent year to develop a strong anti-imperialist political thrust in local society. We want to develop our ideological base. We want to come to know Canadian history in more depth, as we've already been doing.

"We want to give solidarity to revolutionaries in Canada. We want to show solidarity with revolutionaries all across the world. We know that the best way we can show solidarity with the revolution in other countries is by developing revolution ourselves in our own country.

"We want to organize people for revolution in Canada.

"The internal polemic we have now completed is not such a pervasive thing that it wipes out our years of experience. The nine years of production of Alive Magazine and the seven-and-a-half years of the Alive Production Collective have seen the development of many revolutionary things which we consider to be models for our future work. The models actually touch a lot of different bases. We know how to do a lot of different things as a result of developing these models. A problem is that these revolutionary things which have existed have only existed for a short time. They have gone out of existence, leaving us just to learn from the experiences, rather than continue to develop them, just to sum the experiences up, record the lessons and use them as a base to teach other people.

"People who have followed our development over the years know about the Progressive Cultural Club, the Guelph Committee for Working Class Rule in Canada, the Wellington County Canada-China Friendship Society, which the Bainzites destroyed, and a lot more things. A promise we're making for 1979 is that some of these models are going to be developed into permanent thrusts during the year. Not all, but some, perhaps a lot of these previous models will be given a practice again, a practice in a protracted frame. We have learned many lessons that are necessary to learn. Our practical thrusts should no longer have to go out of existence so

that we can sum them up. We will try to develop thrusts that will be summed up, but summed up as they go. They will develop into greater and greater things as they go.

"In short, the promise that we make is that on January First 1980, there will be a lot more people sitting in the room. We won't be able to hold our meeting in this room — it'll be too small." (Laughter)

"That's what we have to project for 1979; it will be a good year to develop things and we intend to develop them."

That's what we said about our own work exactly one year ago today. Obviously, everybody likes that last promise. Here you all are. (Laughter) Personally, I'd like to get the guy who made that speech. (Laughter) Committing us like that! (Laughter) Actually, I was the one who made that speech. In fact, I did more than make the promise in the speech. Afterwards some members of the Collective lightly challenged me and said, "We're not sure about that promise. Can we do it? Can we keep the promise? Should we be making promises we can't keep?" I actually responded, "If we can't keep that promise next January First I'll eat my shirt!" (Laughter) Many people here today look sick and ill because they've been out drinking alcohol last night. Me? I look sick because I've been eating cloth all day. (Laughter) It was a nice shirt... (Laughter) Oh, well.

The actual reason we read the excerpt from last year's speech was not to make me look a fool. (Laughter) It was so that we could address the question of how closely did that speech approximate reality. We can answer this now that we can look back on the year. Where did that speech fall down? Why did it fall down on those points it did?

One big thing that actually explains why some of the projections of our work went off track is that the summing-up of this struggle against the misleadership which we had overthrown was not yet completed. The struggle was complete but the summing-up of the struggle wasn't yet completed. We went on to complete that summing-up after making the New Year's Day speech. It was only after completing that summing-up of that struggle that we did our long term planning.

Our long term planning for the year 1979 did not actually come at the end of the year 1978, rather it came at the end of the month of January, 1979. Thus, where that speech given on New Year's Day 1979 fell down was that it tried to give a specific painting where only a sketch in very broad strokes could be made. We did know in general where we were headed, so the speech was in general on the mark. However, too many of the specific promises in it turned out to be not true. The mistake that was made was in rendering the general too specific before specific plans were formulated and agreed to within our organization.

When the agreements on a long term plan were made at the end of that same month, they definitely enveloped the same general direction as outlined in that speech but a lot of the specifics slotted to a later time would have had to be slotted sooner in order to fulfill the promises made last January First.

What were the promises that actually fell down? There were a couple of them. One was right at the beginning of the portion of the speech, where we said the next issue of Alive would "be coming out in January." It didn't. It actually came out at the beginning of February. It could have come out in January but, as mentioned, we were doing our long term planning. We decided not to put out issue 125 and then break the publishing schedule again because we had to stop to do the long term planning. That's a promise that was made which shouldn't have been rendered so specific. It would have been better left as "Alive will be coming out again shortly."

Another thing we said that was off the mark, which we hope people don't hold us to exactly, was: "If our promises don't turn out to be true, toss us into the dustbin of history." (Laughter) At least we'd hope people interpret that as: If we don't make seventy-five percent of our promises... (Laughter)

We said: "We want to organize people for revolution in Canada." This promise wasn't tied to specific time spans or the like. However, it did give indication that we were heading in a specific direction of a big organizing thrust in 1979. As it developed in our long term planning, this wasn't the case. We will go into this in

more detail later in this speech, in our formal sum-up of the year. Suffice to say the organizing thrust was to come later than in 1979.

This also relates to that last promise, the promise that "on January First 1980, there will be a lot more people sitting in the room." This promise, too, was rendered too specific. The general idea of the promise was good and true. It still is good and true; we intend to have an organizing upsurge. However, the organizing upsurge that would have been necessary in 1979 in order to fulfil that promise was just never attempted during the past year. People should understand that it is the promise which was false, not the attempt at an upsurge which was a failure. As of the end of the same month that the promise was made, by the end of January, we had decided not to attempt to make that upsurge in 1979. We decided it would be a misassessment to say we could do so because our attention had to be focussed elsewhere. We will go into that, too, in more depth later in today's speech.

That's a look at some of the promises which fell down. Now, just to prove that over seventy-five percent of the promises did turn out to be true, we'll now look at which promises made in last year's speech did closely approximate the reality of 1979 as it played itself out.

We said simple things like, "Alive Magazine will be coming out again shortly." It did. The more important thing was that we said it would "be coming out on a weekly basis" thereafter. It did do that quite successfully.

We said that the next issue of Alive was going to be "a really big issue". It was. That was Alive 125. It was close to three hundred pages.

We said that our polemic was completed. It was. We said that our assessment of it was that it had been successfully waged. Actually the events of 1979 prove quite categorically that the polemic had been successfully waged, in that it never reared its head again.

We announced that we had "achieved a new level of unity" inside our organization. This was proved to be true in practice. Throughout the year such a level of unity was necessary to get us through a lot of very intensive work and very good work.

We said that because the polemic had been successfully waged we

could "make January First 1979 a very definite turning point in our work". We did. The exact turn towards a big upsurge in organizing which was predicted in the speech did not occur. It was a turning point nonetheless. A lot of things which had taken certain directions over the years in our work actually turned around after January 1979. Our work took different directions. Our work had a better foundation.

We said we intended "to make our tenth year something special." We have done that. We said we could "make promises now that we can keep." We certainly made that a habit from the point just after our January First speech. We said that in 1979 we could begin to prove some of our potential. We talked in terms of making a beginning. We have certainly done that.

We announced that we intended to encourage all our supporters to apply on a consistent basis to us the touchstone of practice, to assess us on our practice. We are willing to stand or fall on the basis of our practice. We have been encouraging our supporters to do that. Our supporters have done that. We have, in the main, stood not fallen in face of these assessments.

We talked about our work developing "in a very, very concrete fashion in the year 1979." These concrete developments did take place. Our work has developed in 1979 to what we consider to be a very satisfactory extent.

We talked about some of the models which we have developed over the years coming back into existence with a more permanent thrust, in a more permanent form. This has happened. This is a good thing.

At the end of that speech last year, we made the general assessment that "1979 would be a good year to develop things and we intend to develop them." It did turn out to be such a year and we did develop our work significantly.

Those are all good promises.

We said the first big thing that made some of the promises go off track was that our long term planning did not actually take place until after we made the speech. In making the speech we were flying by the seat of our pants, as they say. A second big thing that threw some of the assessments off was that, even after the long term planning was completed, we had to keep going back to planning all through the year. Basically this was because we are inexperienced at long term planning. We had to keep going back until we got it right.

During May, 1979, there was a break in the publishing schedule of Alive Magazine. These breaks always give a little extra time and energy in certain ranks of our organization. That break was unplanned and, basically, the reasons why it took place are pretty insignificant. However, when the opportunity came up, we took the extra time and energy made available so as to go back to long term planning for the duration of the publishing break. During that assessment of our long term plan made in January some quite significant things developed. One of these things was a major self-criticism on the part of the leadership of our organization. The self-criticism was for a mechanical application of the plan set in January. *Mechanical application* meant the letter of the plan was being adhered to but the spirit was being broken. After this major self-criticism, matters were actually turned around. Our work developed better after May.

We had another publishing break in November, at which time, we again took up the on-going assessment of our long term plan. We were looking into the various questions facing our organization going into 1980, seeing that it was getting near the end of the year. At that time, we decided to go back to work at the end of the publishing break with the understanding that we would make a planned break at the end of the year. We decided to give ourselves a few weeks to actually go into depth in our assessment of the long term plan again.

Thus, the second big thing is that we are not very good at long term planning. Under the misleadership that our Collective had for so many years long term planning wasn't at all a reality. So, when it became a reality a year and a half ago, when it became part of the life of our organization, we just weren't very good at it. We don't have much experience with it. A lot of the things we project don't

TRAITOR

Joan Stevenson

Traitor.

Listen.

As you loll lazily on the
velvet upholstered seat of your
shiny silver grey limosine,
do you not hear that sound?
As you carelessly sign away,
on sealed and embossed paper,
the rights of your people,
do you not hear that rumble?

Echoing around the sun-baked
valleys of Zimbabwe,
the rumble is growing
into a thunderous roar;
the roar of an angry people,
wronged, betrayed, sold out.
The roar of resistance and might.

Traitor.

Listen.

Hear that quiet tick,
measuring the borrowed seconds
of your remaining life.
Hear its relentless
rythmn of promised revenge.
Your days are numbered.

happen. We intend to get better at long term planning. We intend to sketch plans that will actually work. However, these are some of the difficulties we've been in during this past year.

One of the statements that was made in last year's January First speech has been misinterpreted. We have repeated this statement in print a couple of times. This statement has been interpreted as a promise. We thought we'd clear that up a bit. The statement was: "Our practical thrusts should no longer have to go out of existence so that we can sum them up. We will try to develop thrusts that will be summed up but summed up as they go." A lot of people interpreted this to mean there wouldn't be any more publishing breaks in Alive Magazine's schedule, that the Alive Production Collective wouldn't keep up this habit which it has developed over the years of disappearing from public view for weeks on end while it sorts out its internal life. This is actually a misinterpretation. It was definitely our strongest intention to do this. It still is our strongest intention to do this. Nonetheless, it is actually true to say that back in January 1979 we were not such idealists as to think we could do this in a single moment or that we could do it simply by wishing it. Even such an idealist as the person making the speech proved himself to be with some of his promises, was not that much of an idealist. Nobody in our organization thought there would actually be such an immediate end to these breaks.

The break in the Alive Magazine publishing schedule which we have made this time is not the same as the previous breaks. Certain differences that have manifested themselves are that it was predicted, that it was planned, that it was announced, that its length is specified. We have announced exactly when we plan to be back to work, whereas implied in the fact that in the past we've disappeared without any announcement is the fact that we've never announced when we intended to be back on the scene. In terms of the focus of our discussions during this break, it's not the same. In terms of the purpose of the break, it's not the same.

We know that even when we take what are breaks that are essentially different than our previous breaks, there is a large element of seeming the same to our readers, to our friends and to our supporters. That's a problem. That's a difficulty we face. We can only keep repeating, for the time being, that it is not the same. We can also tell people that it is our serious intention to make this current break the last break in the publishing schedule of the periodicals we put out. This will be the last time the Alive Production Collective disappears in terms of its public profile.

These breaks, though, have been necessary. We have known that as long as the necessity for them is felt, we should keep doing them. We hope this break is the last but nobody should hold us to that next year on New Year's Day, it's not a promise. (Laughter)

In this year's speech ... one thing we'll try to do is make less promises that we won't keep. (Laughter) In this year's speech we'll be taking a different focus than we took last year. We'll be touching only very quickly on world affairs. We're not going to dwell extensively on the current events of the year 1979. We're not going to get in on the fad, which is big in the bourgeois newspapers at the moment, of summing up the decade. We won't be identifying what the significance of the '70's is. We won't be putting our finger on the resolution to the debate: Will "Disco" or "Rock" be known as the sound of the '70's in history? (Laughter) We haven't formulated a political line on this important issue.

Neither are we going to dwell extensively on summing up the past decade of Alive, the ten years which is the whole of its history. The 1970's and Alive's whole history exactly coincide with each other. We're not going to spend extensive time on the eight and one half years history of our organization, the Alive Production Collective.

Our main theme is to sum up the past year in terms of our organization's work, not in terms of world events. We're not going to be summing up a year specifically, we're going to allow ourselves a bit of liberty and extend the year to a year and a half. A year would just be an arbitrary measurement, whereas a year and a half is a much more realistic measurement in terms of our work. It was a year and a half ago that we overthrew the misleadership in our organization. So, to assess the actual development of our work we

should take the whole year and a half into account.

We will be projecting the year 1980 in our work. Some promises will be involved. We will be looking at the unit of a decade a bit, not looking at the past decade but looking at the future decade, the 1980's. We'll be giving a small part of our assessment of the development of world affairs in the 1980's. In other words, because our specific promises didn't work out too well last year, this year we intend to make grandiose ones. (Laughter)

To start, we'd like to quickly go over a bit of where Alive came from and a bit of Alive's history. In the 1960's, people are conscious that there was a general upsurge in the world. This was broadly identified as an upsurge of "youth consciousness", an upsurge of "anti-war consciousness", an upsurge of opposition to U.S. imperialism in Viet Nam with the anti-war movement. This developed all through the 1960's. Alive was not a part of that general upsurge but it definitely came out of that upsurge. Alive was a product of that upsurge. Alive came into being when that upsurge was generally tapering off. Many of the people who are in our organization were a part of that motion broadly called "youth consciousness".

The world revolutionary movement has definitely moved to a new stage from this upsurge of "youth consciousness" — the "counter-culture", the "alternate" culture which was not really much of an alternative to the mainstream imperialist culture, which was actually simply "youth" anarchism. A lot of activists were recruited from the ranks of "youth consciousness", through the more politicized "anti-war movement", into the new revolutionary movement across the world. A lot of the Marxist-Leninist Parties and revolutionary organizations around the world have a lot of

TRUST BORN OF STRUGGLE

This work gives life, hope anew
Revolutionary optimism grows
Out of a barrel ... out of seeing
Revolutionary principles applied, take root, flower
Life's tests demand resolutions
Contradictions come up each day
And demand struggle
Fears and hesitations are real
Perceptions cannot be denied
Yet once the process is embraced
Once the principles we know are applied
When we decide to be honest
Forthright and above-board
Contradictions can be tackled
Clarity can be found
Negative, turned into positive becomes
The driving force for transformation
This active process of struggle, however difficult
Is what gives me hope that revolution is possible
Problems can be solved
If we look deeply
Over a period of time

Yet there is much to learn
To apply materialist thinking, a principled approach
To all facets of the work, our lives
We cannot deny our experience
Trust is deepened, developed in practice
Comradeship stands the tests
Of ordinary everyday trials
This firm process, this trust
Convinces me that struggle is correct
That right attitudes can be learned
That transformation is necessary
We must trust our own experience
Trust in comrades is a most precious thing

Jean Emery

very young members, which is a concrete expression of this whole 1960's trend. However, the world revolutionary movement has grown more sophisticated than just this movement would allow.

We, too, in the Alive Production Collective have grown more sophisticated. Believe us. *(Laughter)* Perhaps we haven't kept pace with the rest of the world — we're often called childish by other Leftists but that's more sophisticated than we were before. *(Laughter)* Guess you could say we used to be babyish. *(Laughter)*

For any materialist the following is obvious, almost a tautological statement, but it is important to see that Alive's history is a process integrated with world history. If that sounds too high-flying, it certainly is a process integrated with Canadian society. The development of our magazine, of the organization that puts out the magazine, can't be separated from the on-going process of Canadian society. Even if we wanted it to be separated, it couldn't be. However, we don't want it to be separate. We think that the process of integration with the material reality of the broad society is one of our great strengths.

In the early 1970's in Canadian society there was an upsurge in popular sentiment, actual widespread sentiment, of Canadian nationalism. Our anti-imperialist political line reflects this. Anti-imperialism quite often unconsciously masqueraded under the name of nationalism at that time.

There was a broad democratic sentiment coming out strongly in the early 1970's. This was for a very good reason. In the year 1970, the War Measures Act was invoked by the government. This opened a lot of people's eyes to the speed with which fascism could be imposed in Canada. It opened our eyes to this danger. As a protesting counter-measure to this fascism of the War Measures Act, there was a large upsurge in democratic sentiment amongst the Canadian people. A lot of broad democratic organizations were founded and flourished in the early '70's.

At that time Alive paralleled the motion in the society by taking on the self-description and form of "a democratic, open forum." In other words, our publication became a forum for the exchange of ideas, almost any ideas, a very broad spectrum, although it excluded from the outset certain trends of ideas — fascism and racism. What constituted fascism and racism was fairly well defined so that censorship couldn't just be imposed by loosely branding an argument fascist or racist. Other than these excluded trends, Alive was very open. Many people who look back on those issues of Alive are surprised at how open it was. We were often accused of putting out an eclectic mix at the time. It wasn't a particularly false accusation; the problem we had with the charge was that the accusers usually didn't understand our purpose in presenting that eclectic mix. It wasn't because we ourselves were eclectic, as many of the charges implied. It was, in simple terms, because the magazine had to be, and strove to be, a reflection of the society.

It is important to emphasize the fact of this recent invoking of the War Measures Act because ours is one of the few Left groups in the country which hasn't forgotten that. We haven't hesitated to keep reminding people about that all through the decade. It really opened our eyes. With some other organizations, it seemed to open their eyes for five or ten minutes but when it was gone, they closed their eyes again. Now, they organize fully in the open for the state to see. We think this is a serious mistake. People can see that we keep our eyes open to growth of fascism in the state machine. We publish a lot of articles in our magazine which focus on the general temperament of the RCMP and other cops at any given time, the general level of the small Nazi groups that exist in Canada, like the Western Guard, the general integration of the army with other sections of the public sector and with the private sector, etc.

In the middle '70's, the proletariat in Canada developed once again quite a high militant profile. This was because of changes in economic conditions. Unemployment and inflation were on the rise, etc. We could go into the economy in much more depth but we won't in this speech. As a result of the proletariat taking a higher and a more militant profile, Alive paid *closer* attention to the working people. We actually developed the strong sentiment that the democratic open forum was not any longer a good form for Alive. It's important to emphasize "any longer". We never made an

assessment that it was not good for the time that we carried it.

As soon as we made the assessment that it was not good any longer, we began to change the magazine. We weeded petty-bourgeois and bourgeois influences from the magazine and put the publication more and more wholly to work for the working people. We worked more and more in a way that directly reflected the sentiment of the proletariat.

Alive developed a self-description that said it should *consciously* adapt itself to the needs and wishes of the Canadian people. That is, both the educational material identified as Alive and also the organization itself developed this consciousness. Some members had long had this consciousness as individuals. As well the organization and the magazine had been so adapting themselves *unconsciously* all along. However, from the mid-70's the organization took up in a very real and conscious way the slogan, "serve the people." We still strive to do this. It is probably what we strive to do most of all.

We have changed over the years. We have seen the necessity for change in the society and we have seen the necessity for our organization to adapt to changing conditions in the society. We think we have achieved that to a certain degree. We don't think we have achieved it to the degree that would have been best at all times.

We emphasize that our magazine and our organization have a history that is integrated with the process of Canadian society to show that the insights that we have are material. These insights come from objective reality. The insights in our magazine come from sources not synonymous with the organization that produces the magazine; our publication is *not* what it has often been accused of being, an inward turning organism. We don't emphasize that our insights come from objective, material reality so as to blow our own horn or beat our breasts. We emphasize it because we know many, many others have seen the same reality. Other Left groupings in Canada have seen the same reality and have taken up similar orientation to ours — nobody has taken up exactly the same orientation but there are a lot of similarities.

The fact that material analysis of material reality is our foundation is a really important point here because it means we can organize people, we can organize an upsurge among people. We see this organizing of people in our future. If we came to have the political insights that we do by merit of the objective material reality then others can come to the same views too. It doesn't mean that we have to be brilliant teachers. It doesn't mean we have to be gurus on a mountain top. It means material reality will convince people of the truth of what we're saying. Material reality will convince people of what we're saying *if* what we're saying is true; if it is not true, they shouldn't be convinced anyway and, certainly material reality will sharply contradict what we say.

We have passed through many stages in the development of our work. One of the most notorious stages we passed through, of course, was the stage of joint work with a counter-revolutionary band known as the Bainzites but who call themselves CPC(M-L). We have analyzed that in our magazine. We have exposed them at great length. All this, if we are to believe some of our critics, by way of trying to atone for this terrible sin that we made. We won't do penance at great length here today. *(Laughter)*

That association with the Bainzites began at a low level in the summer of 1971. It was maintained at that low level until October and November of 1974, at which time relations were stepped up. The high level of joint work between us and the Bainzites lasted only a year until we broke off all relations with them, publicly denouncing them in the process, during October, 1975. The important thing about that whole association was that we came to uphold Mao Zedong Thought after we began to associate with the Bainzites. At the time, they falsely promoted Mao Zedong Thought. It's a fact that it was this that taught us to pay attention to Mao Zedong Thought. When we state this some purists' skins crawl and they say, "Oh, don't tell me that!" We don't deny because it's true: they told us to pay attention to Mao Zedong Thought. These days we can laugh because they no longer support

Mao Zedong Thought, even as a false front, a facade. They also accuse us of being the most active proponents of Mao Zedong Thought in Canada today. It's ironic that they had a part in anyway of setting us on that path. Even before the Bainzites decided to trash Mao Zedong Thought, our assessment was that it turned out to be to their disadvantage that they told us, "Take a look at the classics of Marxism-Leninism-Mao Zedong Thought." We did! Further, when we did we began to see through them, to see them as counter-revolutionaries. It's obvious that most of the people they give this advice to don't take it up. (Laughter) If you've ever met any of them, you'll know they have no grasp whatsoever of what's in the Marxist-Leninist classics.

We do support Mao Zedong Thought. We do support Marxism-Leninism-Mao Zedong Thought. We do guide our revolutionary political work according to the principles of Marxism-Leninism-Mao Zedong Thought as much as we can. Our assessment of ourselves on this is: We're not very good at it.

We do also have our own set of principles, additional principles which come from our own specific struggles. Principles are the sum of past struggles. Principles are things that mean one doesn't have to constantly repeat past struggles, which the individual has been through directly or which other people have been through and which are learned by indirect experience. We, of the Alive Production Collective, do learn by indirect experience. This is where our study of Marxism-Leninism-Mao Zedong Thought comes into play in a big way. However, we also learn from our own direct experience ... slowly, but we learn. (Laughter)

We can't go over all the principles we have in terms of approaching the Canadian revolution. That would take a long speech, even longer than the one we're making. We have gone over some of these things already in other speeches during the year. We've covered a lot of ground. We've gone into depth on certain questions, such as the United Front. People can refer to that material if they want to come to know these principles.

For many years we have been criticized for adopting principles which run counter to the bourgeois ideology. Specifically, the thing we are most often encouraged to do and which we have been encouraged to do since early times in our work, is to take up "positive" principles not principles that negate existing phenomenon. Perhaps, this does not express the idea properly — that's difficult for us to do since we don't think this way ourselves. "Why is Alive always so negative? Why is it always running counter to the bourgeois ideology? Why can't you just present a positive alternative?" These are the words that are actually used.

There are two points in our response to that. One, it takes brilliant geniuses to formulate a complete system to present as a positive alternative. We have one or two brilliant geniuses in our organization but we can't get them to work hard enough. (Laughter) Seriously, it's not easy to put forward a positive alternative. We think that even if we did have a full-blown positive alternative, we would criticize and run counter to the bourgeois ideology nonetheless. It's a two-fold process. If one denies this half then the other half is pretty much useless. We are developing the positive alternative in line with positive principles. However, as we develop that and even if it becomes complete — even if we have that alternative in hand — we will still criticize and run counter to the bourgeois ideology. That is also important in our set of principles. We don't intend to give that criticism up. We've developed it well so far — we have incisive wit and we take apart the bourgeoisie with great glee. (Laughter)

In summing up our actual development over the years the central theme is: Why are we still a small group? We outlined this theme in our most recent series of editorials in Alive. We've been dwelling on this quite deeply. First of all this theme makes an admission and then it is a question. The admission is that we are small, we have a small organization, we have a small circle of supporters and friends. The question is why is it that after eight and one half years of existence our organization is still a small group. This is a central theme in our discussions now. We're looking at the theme deeply.

Entailed in this admission that we are small, and as well as in

certain other admissions we make from time to time, is a general admission that we are not the greatest thing in the world, maybe the second greatest but not *the* greatest. (Laughter) We often make this admission and many of our constant critics take up the admission with great glee. We actually have quite a humble approach to our own achievements. We're not even one of the greatest things in the world, by any means. However, what bothers us about the way our critics take up our admission is that they tend to turn it into something it's not. They put forward that we aren't a thing at all. We do believe we are a thing. We're just not the greatest thing, that's all.

The fact that we are a thing is important to emphasize. Our educational work is a material reality. Our organization is a material reality. These realities are hard fought for. In terms of summing up ten years of Alive Magazine or eight and one half years of our organization it is important to emphasize this for one very simple reason: That material reality is a glimmer of hope as far as we're concerned. This glimmer illuminates a little the direction we're going to take in the next ten years. If people come to see where the little glimmer of light originates from, it'll be possible for them to hot-foot it down that path. We hope they do.

We said we'd go over world politics quickly. We have one very simple theme for this. It seems disastrous to try to go over this theme quickly. People might think we're trying to gloss things over. We're not. We've done in-depth presentation of this theme elsewhere. Again, people can refer to our general educational work and we can also have extensive discussion with people about it after the meeting and in the future. Basically, in world politics all our members, all our supporters, all our friends should pay attention to one theme for the 1980's. The theme is: We are moving to the brink of a third world war; the USSR is pushing for a third world war. We quite seriously believe this, we're not being alarmists. We think anybody who pays attention to current affairs in the least can see this possibility. We don't think it's a possibility, we think it's a definite thing. It's going to happen. The only question materialists should allow themselves to ask is: Will it happen sooner or later?

We can put off the outbreak of world war to later if the world's people organize an effective opposition to war, to the hegemonic expansion of the USSR's influence. The government of the People's Republic of China and the Chinese Communist Party have been saying for quite some time that world war is coming. Recently, they have been speaking in quite specific terms, saying world war is coming by the mid-1980's. They're convinced of it. They're preparing for it. We should also prepare for it. Judging by the extent to which the Soviet Union has proved itself willing to play brinksmanship in recent days, the only thing we doubt in what the Chinese leadership is saying is whether it'll be as long as the mid-1980's. It may happen sooner than that. The invasion of Afghanistan marks the third country the USSR has overrun and occupied since the second world war.

The inflammatory material of world war is there. People shouldn't deny this concrete fact. However, people should also note that when we sound this alarm, we're not saying there is a cause for pessimism. The whole concept of world war is a very frightening one; there is no doubt about that. It's not a concept we talk about lightly, just trying to say, "Hey! Here I've got a concept that'll shake up your emotions." It's a very real thing. It's a material danger. However, it is not a cause for pessimism. It is very definitely a cause for realism, for getting down to doing the real work to analyse world affairs and then to develop an actual practice to counter the dangerous direction of world affairs.

People should pay attention in their analysis to "hotspots" in the world. Today, on this very day, January 1, 1980, the hotspot is Afghanistan, of course, where the USSR has sent thirty thousand of its troops. The U.S. has warned that it considers this a threat to the peace of the world — this adds to the inflammatory nature of the material. China has warned the Soviet Union that it considers the invasion a threat to its internal security because of the proximity of China to Afghanistan.

Another point people should pay attention to is the situation in

Iran which is in the news every day. People should try to analyze that. We find it has been difficult to analyze. There was an encouraging development there just today. A large anti-Soviet demonstration took place. This demonstration was not organized by the people who are making news every day in Iran. It was a very positive demonstration in that it was large, it was effective, it worked and it was also an armed protest. This is very good. The demonstration was organized by Afghan people in Iran and supported, according to the news, by the Revolutionary Organization of Iran. It is good if the Revolutionary Organization is armed and is leading opposition to Soviet social-imperialism.

For some time now we have had the analysis that somewhere in the shadows behind the figures in the Iranian events are the KGB, the USSR influence. The reasons that we have that analysis are multifold but if people want to see one simple manifestation of it, look at any reports coming from Iran and note that there are all kinds of denunciations of one superpower but not of the other. At

Smash Subjectivity

When you're down and troubled
Wallowing in self-pity.
And you're thinking that nothing is going right.
Open your eyes and look around,
And soon you will see
That your one-sided view isn't really reality.

Smash your subjectivity.
Look around you and see
Objective reality
In all its complexity.

Dry your eyes and take a stand.
There is no such thing as "can't".
And resolve to make a change — You're not unique.

If the sky above you seems to fall on top of your head
Just because a criticism is made.
Don't avoid the struggle — Meet it face to face.
Unresolved problems mount up to enormity.

Smash your subjectivity.
Look around you and see,
Take off your blinkers
You've only your chains to lose.

Winter, spring, summer and fall
The process of change evolves
And so does the daily oppression...

Well don't you think it's true
That people are the most precious thing in this world
It's the suffering under this system
That we must fight to abolish
Out of selfless giving.

Smash the bourgeoisie
Fight for liberty
Build the United Front
To end U.S. aggression!

Regardless of you or me
Revolution gathers speed
And the sooner you transform
The more help you'll be.
Revolution's possible
Revolution's happening. Can't you see?
History progresses — to victory.

JEAN EMERY

the beginning of the period after the overthrow of the Shah, which was an excellent development, there were statements of opposition to any influence in Iran by either superpower. Now, in the official ruling circles, there are denunciations of one superpower, the one furthest from Iran geographically, and no mentions of the other superpower, the one most threatening in terms of world war and in terms of the Gulf region with events in Afghanistan.

The Revolutionary Organization in Iran denounces both superpowers and is warning against the USSR getting influence in the country by moving through the shadows created when all the light is focussed on the U.S. Neither we nor others warning against the USSR in Iran speak to let the U.S. off the hook. We're not giving our blessing to Jimmy Carter. We're not saying CIA spies should be allowed to operate in Iran or any other country. Basically, we don't care whether Carter or any of his CIA embassy staff are on the hotseat and feel uncomfortable. We don't care to take as our role easing their discomfort. We do care about the growth of the USSR's sphere of influence and the growth of the danger of world war.

In criticizing our analysis, people have told us, "Why don't you pay attention to what the Iranian revolutionaries are saying? You're saying the opposite. Don't they know their own country best?" Of course, what is called a "revolutionary" in the bourgeois press is not necessarily a revolutionary. People should pay attention to that. The actual organization in Iran which supports Marxism-Leninism-Mao Zedong Thought is the group we've been referring to in this speech, the Revolutionary Organization. This group doesn't support Khomeini, doesn't support the present embassy hostage incident — sees it as inflammatory material for world war — and, doesn't let its opposition to Soviet social-imperialism go by the board. At the same time it doesn't let its opposition to U.S. imperialism go by the board, doesn't let its support for the anti-Shah movement wane, and, doesn't forget to support the oppressed nationalities such as the Kurdish people. As far as we are concerned, all that constitutes a correct line.

In analyzing current events people should also pay close attention to Kampuchea. This is the hotspot which has been knocked out of the consciousness of people who follow current events by the information on Iran and on Afghanistan. The Kampuchean struggle goes on, however. It is a much more telling situation than the one in Iran, in that the suppression there is against revolutionaries who had seized state power in their country. It is the direct suppression of a revolutionary government by a clearcut agent of Soviet social-imperialism. It is clearly the expansion of the sphere of influence of the USSR. It is clearly proved that Viet Nam is acting as a "cat's paw" for the Soviet Union. People should pay attention to Kampuchea. It is not a struggle that is going away just because it is not on the front pages of the bourgeois press any more. In fact, it is probable that the less an issue is played up by the established press, the more pressing an issue it is in the material world.

People should pay attention to developments in Western Europe, especially in terms of the specific warnings that if a new world war is to come, it will break out in Western Europe. People should also pay attention to threats against China. We don't say this just because we are so friendly to China but because China is the leading spokesman against the threat of world war. It is the most responsible spokesman. It is the country in the world giving this clarion call. It is very likely that in a backbiting manoeuvre, the USSR will launch aggression against China. People should oppose aggression against China. People should analyze world events with this danger in mind.

In the next year, we have duties in terms of revolution in Canada and we also have a duty as internationalists. We will promote China as a beacon of world revolution, as a leading element in the analysis of world developments. We will continue to support the Kampuchean people in their struggle against Vietnamese aggression and the USSR's expansionism. We will continue to educate people on the threat of world war and the role of the Soviet Union as the greatest threat for a new world war. We will continue to give solidarity to the revolutionary movements we have been giving

support, in the Philippines, Palestine, Ireland, Zimbabwe, Azania, and so on. We will pay attention to places where we haven't given enough support to revolutionary movements deserving of support, such as Eritrea. We will give solidarity to these struggles elsewhere in the Third World. We will continue to analyze carefully any major world events, such as the situation in Iran and the situation in Nicaragua during this past week. We won't be taking our eyes off events just because the bourgeois press takes its eyes off the events, for example Cuba's presence in Africa, changes in government in the Caribbean, etc.

At the same time that we recognize our duty as internationalists to promote solidarity with revolutionaries in other countries and to do educational work in this realm, we also reaffirm the statement from our New Year's Day speech of last year: the best way any group of revolutionaries can give support to and show solidarity with revolutionaries in other parts of the world is to make revolution in their own country.

Now, we want to look at the past year and a half in our own political work. Quite often, when we analyze our own work, people who read our magazine, people who are supporters of our organization, find it hard to understand why we lay emphasis on certain phenomena and not on others. People find it hard to understand why we constantly sound the refrain of the importance of the struggle against misleadership inside our organization. Despite this difficulty on others' part, we do dwell on that a little today.

The importance of the struggle against our misleadership is manifest to anybody who was involved in it most of all. That's important to say. If people simply relate to its importance in terms of the people who are doing revolutionary work in Guelph now who were involved in that struggle then, there is significance in that alone. It is significant that these people are still doing revolutionary work. It's significant that these people are still communicating and interacting with you as revolutionaries. It's significant that there is still an organization intact. All this is the real significance. It's what you can see.

Of course, an awful lot of other lessons were learned along the way which have been applied since and which will be applied in future. Perhaps those seem a little vague, certainly, they are harder to see.

The very fact that an organization still exists, that revolutionary work has still been going on in Guelph under the banner of the Alive Production Collective is the basic significance of our struggle against misleadership. What we mean by that is that we could have faltered in the struggle. We didn't. We consider that a matter of pride. Being involved in the struggle, we see great significance in that. Some other people don't see great significance in it. Without being too full of ourselves, without stepping out of humility too far, perhaps we can say that's because people just take for granted what's there. While we're here, people take us for granted, if we weren't, people would miss us — at least a little bit.

We don't like to dwell on that. We don't like to sit on our laurels, saying, "Yeah, a year and a half ago, we did a really good job." The most important aspect is that we turned a bad thing into a good thing. We had a bad situation. For a number of years in our organization the situation was, at worst, very close to *all* bad, and, at best, partially bad. We had, at least, something rotten going on at any given moment all during the initial years of our development. This gives us a very definite disadvantage in the revolutionary work we want to do. When you communicate to someone the idea that this organization has been around for eight and a half years, this revolutionary publication has been coming out for ten years, it gives rise to certain expectations in people's minds. That's normal. It gives rise to certain expectations in our own minds when we hear the same about other organizations. In terms of our organization, though, we readily admit we have not fulfilled these expectations. We're not proud to say that. However, it is a material reality.

We are proud to say that situation has been changed in the last year and a half. We have been turning the situation around. No longer is everything we do tinged with this rotten trend. The bad

trend has been summed up extensively in Alive. That bad trend has involved attitudes of sectarianism towards other Left groups and towards individuals with revolutionary sentiment, contempt for the masses, laziness in fulfilling revolutionary duties and more.

We did in practice turn a bad thing into a good thing. We also did an in-depth assessment of what was good and what was bad. This is good for the future but already this assessment has had a unifying effect on our organization. The organization as it exists now is more unified than the organization as it existed previously. We don't at all underestimate what a good thing that is. However, the effects of the struggle will be good in the future as well. This is because we know the ins and outs of the struggle we were involved in very well, we know the material of the struggle very well. We have not publicized the majority of the information from our in-depth assessment, despite accusations that Alive 125 gave overblown play to every minute detail. We can pass on the lessons to other people we organize, though.

In this sense, where we have a disadvantage vis-a-vis some other groups who have existed the same length of time we have or even

REVOLUTIONARY MADRIGAL

Like the sure-footed mountain cat
leaping from silence to sound,
a simple chord is struck,
ushering in a new beginning.
Fingers fret over vibrant strings
as individual notes mesh,
building the melodic strains needed
to call out the singers' voices.
Pulsating, regenerative,
ebbing and flowing in time,
each voice reverberates
through a series of changes,
new tones entwining the senses.
This harmony, created as theory
and ensured through long practice,
captivates the waiting audiences,
awakening the conscience to action.

Our work, a vibrant new chord,
remains clear and distinct,
builds softly and surely
from silence to sound,
striking always at truth.
Individual ideas mesh,
dissonance is methodically erased.
Each voice reverberates agreement
through a series of motions.
Harmony, product of understanding
and necessity,
reveals the will of many,
provides a melodic strain that
calls workers to action in time,
breathes new life into the people,
moves like waves on a sandy beach
over the minds and senses
of attentive, eager listeners.

This revolutionary song of new life
will continue to play on without aging.
Our work, endless chords of true meaning.
We rise to the challenge of
serving the people in unison.

John Gilliam

some groups who have existed for a shorter period of time than we have, we also have an advantage. A lot of the groups who haven't come through a struggle which is at least similar don't know the lessons that we've learned at such cost. In fact, when we communicate the lessons to them, they treat us with contempt, treat us off handedly. They slough off the lessons which we know to the marrow of our bones are very, very important.

We also know the lessons are material. Though they slough them off easily while we're standing in front of them, these lessons will come back and haunt us. If the forum of revolution is equated with a poultry yard, these lessons are the chickens that come home to roost.

We have a disadvantage in our negative experience over the years but we have an advantage coming out of our struggle against the root cause of that disadvantage. People can see our application of some of these lessons. Previously, Alive in its public posture generally denied the need for investigation. It was not our official policy but it was the policy in practice that any old public pronouncement would do. Mainly, these were public pronouncements made in the name of this misleadership. This denial of the need for investigated opinions was not so much in play in the internal life of our group. In the last year we have actually turned this around in terms of our public posture also. Any public statements we make are on a much more carefully assessed basis than ever before. This is very important.

Previously, there was misidentification of what the Alive Production Collective was. We've turned this around. It had become so bad at times in the past that our revolutionary organization was considered to be little more than a business operation. This is not what the Alive Production Collective is or ever has been. However, at certain times this wrong consciousness was foisted on members of the organization. In the last year and a half, the Alive Production Collective has been developing more and more concretely as an advanced revolutionary organization.

We consider this document known as Alive 125 to be a big contribution. It presents a part, but just a part, of the assessment that we made, which was mentioned earlier. We produced this document with some humility. That may be surprising. Our idea was, "Well, maybe some others can learn from the lessons." A number of individuals have learned from our experience conveyed in Alive 125. However, in certain quarters where we thought the lessons could be well taken, they haven't been taken at all. Certain organizations which we thought could benefit from certain lessons, such as faltering in objective revolutionary duties or having arrogance towards other Left groups, don't seem to have read Alive 125. *(Laughter)*

Alive 125 has been accused of being a petty document — surprising given its volume. *(Laughter)* If you ever carry thirty copies of it around, you'll realize it's no petty document! *(Laughter)* Of course, they mean petty in content. We don't think it's petty. We think it's scientific. We know a lot of the matters it deals with are petty but that's more to do with the content of what's being criticized than to do with the criticism or the way the criticism is being made. A lot of the things that used to go on in our organization were petty. However, it is not petty that we were honest enough to admit that. It would do a lot of good for the same to be admitted by others if the same exists with them. The same does exist elsewhere.

We've been accused of being sectarian in Alive 125. This is humorous because one of the main thrusts of the struggle was against sectarianism. This is the assessment of people who look at Alive 125 rather than read it; they put it on a table then cross to the other side of the room to look at it from afar. *(Laughter)*

Alive 125, this big, historic document, has been accused of being totally false. The charge is that we made it all up! *(Laughter)* Again, the charge is humorous. The accusers must think that we're geniuses of the literary epic to make all that up. The only way we could ever come up with those things is if they actually happened. If they didn't actually happen, who would ever conceive of them? Not us, that's for sure. *(Laughter)*

In the main, these charges have been made in secret. They've been passed onto us second hand. The "official" or "formal" response to Alive 125 has been the bourgeoisie's oldest trick — a conspiracy of silence — though this has not been on all parts. The conspiracy of silence, of course, extends to our whole organization and the whole of its work. We find this quite an exciting response. *(Laughter)* All through the year we have been making calls for unity with other Left groups. It's hard to forge unity in the course of struggle, joint work and debate if they won't even speak to you. *(Laughter)* However, we aren't dispirited; we will persist.

Besides Alive 125, other things came out of our struggle against misleadership. We now dare to do long term planning as mentioned earlier. We never did long term planning before. It is an element in our work now, although it is just developing — it's not that good yet. We have long been known for having a methodical style in certain areas of our work. This methodical style is growing in our work as a result of our struggle.

It is important to understand that there is a mistake of ours indicated by this question we have outlined about our group still being small, however the error is often misrepresented. We object to the misrepresentation of the mistake because it slanders as weak an area where we are actually strong. At the same time it glosses over an area where we are weak. The misrepresentation is that we are still a small group because we failed at organizing, because we have tried to grow and failed. The mistake has not been a failure in our attempt to grow. It has been a laziness — we haven't made the attempt to grow.

To project the future a little, people can take this speech as the announcement of our attempt to grow. We're going to try to expand the scope of our organization. We're going to try to expand the influence of our political line. Thus, if people see that after the next couple of years we are still a small organization, that we haven't broken out of this syndrome which has plagued us for years, then it can be said we tried but failed. We haven't tried yet, so we haven't failed. Our mistake has been that we haven't tried.

The reason we emphasize this is that the style we have developed in the struggle against misleadership has really strengthened us and it points to the fact that we can organize. The rate of our growth has changed in the last one and a half years. Our group, isn't as small now as it was then. This growth has happened without putting a big push on our organizing thrust. Compared to all previous years, our rate of growth is much better in the past year and a half and especially since last January First. In certain areas of our political work, the growth is at a phenomenally better rate. In other areas, it is only a slightly better rate. However, in all areas the rate of growth has changed in a positive direction. This is a most important development.

Something we are very rich in, coming out of that struggle a year and a half ago, is the great strength of our group's internal structure. We have strong internal unity. We have strong forms internal to the organization to keep it going. This is important for people in the group, of course, and it is important for future members but it has a broader relevance than that. We know the material of organizational dynamics well. We can apply these keys to internal harmony elsewhere. Our members do actually work with other groups than our own organization. The excerpt of last year's speech that was read aloud mentioned the PCC and the GCWCRC. These were groups that we worked with, which weren't synonymous with or even a part of the Alive Production Collective. These were important experiments or models. Similar groups exist in Guelph today. One of the points we can pass on to these groups is the rich experience we have in solidifying internal organizational structures. We will pass it on.

To speak on the last year in terms of time beyond Alive 125 and our struggle against misleadership, 1979 was definitely a year of change for the Alive Production Collective. Somebody made the joke that it was a time of firm change, we weren't involved in "loose change". *(Laughter)* In other words, we weren't in somebody's pocket. *(Laughter)* 1979 was nickel and dime stuff for us.

There is a lot about our organization that isn't known to non-

members. This is especially so in the past year and a half. This is very positive. A tendency in the past was, "Every time somebody blows their nose, publish it in the magazine." (*Laughter*) This is no longer the case. Most of what we do is not publicly proclaimed. It used to be the case that most of what we did was publicly known — every time we had a minor success here or there, it was popularized.

The theoretical level of our organization has developed during 1979 in a very significant way. Some of the theoretical development has been popularized in our magazine. Some tenets of the rich internal unity have been generalized and presented in the "Some Lessons" column. We have been talking, as a part of the discussions we have going on at the moment, about broadening this public expression of our development of theory.

Another thrust that people can see, which shows that we have a more deep going ideological grasp, is the polemics we're developing both with certain other groups calling themselves "Leftists" and with the bourgeoisie. We are able to handle these polemics well. Something that is known from revolutionary history is that polemics can't be handled well without a good ideological grounding.

Our organization has organized successful long-term internal study groups for the first time. Previous to the overthrow of this misleadership there were study groups but none of them were held on a protracted basis, none of them managed to do in-depth study, none of them did persistent study. Study groups were always "on and off" sorts of things previously but, literally, at the moment this misleadership was overthrown one of the very first points for attention was the establishing of groups to study the Marxist-Leninist classics. These have continued without weakening right up to date. Rather than a weakening trend, it has been a growing trend. One of the things we now pay jealous attention to is our own theoretical development and deepening our knowledge of the Marxist-Leninist classics. Members of our organization have a better depth of theory than ever before. This is very important as long as the theory is applied, of course, we don't want to become abstract theoretical experts.

We can speak a little more specifically in terms of the polemics that have developed. In 1979, a group in Canada which calls itself a Left group which we don't consider a Left group — we consider it a police group — started public attacks against our organization. This group, "Bolshevik Union", has also stopped public attacks against our organization. (*Laughter*) We responded to the attacks in polemical form and they seem to have gotten scared and run off.

Other polemics have been developing, too. Some people will be aware of some of these trends. The Bainzites, since October 1975, all the time we have been criticizing them publicly, extensively and consistently have only ever responded twice to us directly in print. Lots of innuendo and slights by implication have been printed, of course. Putting those aside, we have two outstanding polemics with them. They have lots of outstanding points to respond to with us. One of the two we have outstanding is a series of leaflets they issued in the summer of 1978. This was right in the course of our struggle against misleadership, so we never had a chance to respond. They seem to have mastered the style of attacking us when they feel it would be hard for us to respond. As soon as we stopped publication this December, they issued a second series of leaflets against us. These are only the second in history, which is interesting. We can respond to both these polemics. We have more than proved that we are able to take on the Bainzites.

Some of our friends and supporters are viewing with great interest the physical rather than polemical interaction between us and the Bainzites because the tone in their leaflets seems to indicate a feud more than polemics. Either we are foolish or we're wise but the fact is we're less concerned about this than our friends and supporters are. We know the Bainzites as a pack of cowards. An interesting point to note is that the big heavy tone and thuggish overtures that they made in print in December didn't actually come to anything in subsequent weeks. On the other hand we intend to continue to keep our guard up as is our general habit. We don't intend

to let ourselves, nor our supporters nor our friends be knocked about like rag dolls. Our organization has made this warning loud and clear to the Bainzites. We are good for this warning. The Alive Production Collective has abilities in the sphere of backing up such warnings. We have a highly developed military organization. (*Laughter*) At least, developed highly enough to take on clowns like that. (*Laughter*)

Another attack that showed itself a little bit in the pages of Alive was from an outfit called En Lutte. They had been making noise about Alive behind the scenes for quite a while. This surfaced when we published a letter they sent us in our magazine. Their ideas about us are more extensive than that. Their members have actually slandered us a lot "off the record".

This behind the scenes cattiness is troublesome. We have been speaking about another organization somewhat positively in print. Their members have also found lots of slander to speak about us behind the scenes. Slanders have even been spread internationally. All unofficial, you understand? Thus, it's hard to know if this is the work of some renegade members or of loyal members expressing group policy. It's impossible to know with one hundred percent certainty because never an "official" word is spoken about Alive — the official policy is the conspiracy of silence. We don't consider that a good method of work, we don't intend to take it up ourselves. We continue to express our warmth to this group's positive points in public because we think it is objectively correct to do so. Equally objective is this poor style of work amongst at least some of their members.

Another polemic which shows the effect Alive is having in the past year, a polemic people here probably won't know about at all, came just in the last month when a character, well-known as a youth anarchist in the late 1960's, published quite an extensive denunciation of Alive 125, taking the part of poor little Eddy who lost his dream child — Alive Magazine — to a group of fanatical *pro-Albanian*(!) dogmatists. It was anarchist! — very hard to follow. (*Laughter*)

We point to these things for their interest in terms of the conspiracy of silence, which is being broken a little. This will prove positive. Alive's political work should be given notice by others. Honest Left groups should do a critique of Alive for their members. We do critiques of other groups' work for our members and supporters. They should do the same. Nobody's going to go very far as dialectical-materialists by pretending Alive doesn't exist. We don't say other groups must print statements saying, "Alive is the best innovation we've seen since sliced bread." We only say they should make official and make known their unofficial negative or positive acknowledgements of our existence. We're not saying they owe to us — they owe to their own circles. That's why we make our opinions known — because of our duty to our circles.

Although these few polemics of 1979 begin to point in a direction where our existence will be acknowledged — how gracious! — it is troublesome that all the polemics are with those in the realm of the police and the pseudo-Left thus far. (*Laughter*) It's a poor situation when the ones we call honest Leftists are the ones slandering us behind our backs.

There are other developments which probably are not a big point in the consciousness of people viewing our work as supporters or friends because they are internal developments. They are important nonetheless. As we point them out, you'll probably see more significance in some signs you have seen. The production team that works on our educational material, Alive Magazine and so on, has become much more collectivized. It used to be a group of individuals, each highly skilled in one area. Now, that team is a place where skills are being shared more. That's good. That is the reason we have put out a good number of magazines this year compared to previous years.

Our whole internal organizational structure has been reorganized. We announced this in Alive 125. This reorganization was complete as of the publication of Alive 125. For a while after that, though, some things were not completely on track. The new structure wasn't strong as soon as it was born. We're proud to

announce that it is very strong now. Things are going well.

One of the big efforts in our organization after the overthrow of the misleadership was, obviously, to develop a good leadership. We took as our goal the development of a collectivized leadership group. This was hard to do. It has been achieved. We no longer have an individual identified as *the* leader in our organization, rather our leadership group is *the* leader in the true sense.

The fact of the existence of this collectivized leadership group has given rise to more streamlined patterns of work inside the organization, which has been expressed in additional strength in our work outside the organization.

We have strengthened centralism in our organization as a part of democratic-centralism. We have done this under the general slogan: What we want is centralism, not woodenness. We didn't want our political work to be less streamlined or to stop. We emphasize centralism in order to streamline our work.

Perhaps this sounds contradictory, however we'll say it anyway; at the same time as there is more centralism, there is more democracy in our organization than ever before. Anybody who knows democratic-centralism knows this situation is not contradictory.

We could go into all this in more depth. If we did the speechmaker would probably be thrown out of the organization for breaching its security. So, more detail won't be given. (*Laughter*)

There is another strong internal thrust we have taken which has shown signs to people outside the organization. In the past we haven't been at all good at doing a number of things at one time. This was referred to in last year's speech in terms of us giving rise to positive political activities and then putting them out of existence. We've actually stemmed that trend very strongly and we've developed an opposite trend under the slogan: We should learn to run two engines at the same time. We no longer consider it acceptable to shut down one "engine" so as to start up another "engine".

The current break in *Alive Magazine's* publishing schedule shows we haven't been entirely successful in this yet. We should be able to run the "engine" of magazine production and the "engine" of internal organizational discussion at the same time. We can't yet. We have been successful in this in a number of other areas and we will achieve this in this particular area also. We have more closely specified the interrelationship of different trends of our work. For example, members who work in our organizing work and members who work in our educational work have had their realms clearly distinguished. Often in the past when educational work faltered, organizing work also faltered. Even yet, this is too much the case. The trend of running "engines" at the same time has been established but the clear distinction that they are *two* "engines" has not been in play. The two were too closely interrelated. We have been making the various "engines" separate. We have to do this more. It is not acceptable if some branch of our work faltering means another branch falters also. They must be separate but related — it's not the work of two organizations but two fields of work of one organization.

In terms of the long term plan which we did set in January, a couple of secrets can be revealed so that you can see what parts of the plan actually came into being during the year. As mentioned earlier, at the time of the last New Year's Days speech, we knew there were a couple of big areas we needed to tackle. One was to create an upsurge of organizing revolutionaries. Another was to complete and set working our internal reorganization, to put things where the internal strength had a direct influence on a proper footing. At the time of that speech, we didn't know in what order those two things were to be done. We hadn't figured out whether they could both be done at once, or, if one had to be done first and then the other, or, if the other should be done first and then the one. This is where the specific promise that was made actually went off track. That promise expressed enthusiasm for the organizing upsurge but the long term plan placed that second and the other task first. This is why that organizing thrust wasn't a part of our work in the past year.

Those components of our work that we wanted to get into place during the year according to our long term plan have been set into place well. For example, a successful weekly schedule for *Alive*

Magazine was one of those components. There are other things we've proved we can do well also.

The organizing thrust, which was to come second to all this, will come, then, in the upcoming period. We can't specify for reasons of the same difficulty as with last year's January First speech. All the specific decisions for this year haven't yet been made. The process of discussion is still going on. It hasn't reached a decision-making stage. Again, although we don't have specifics to popularize, we do know the broad outline of what we're going to be doing.

A success in organizing, even though we didn't seek a big upsurge, is that we have explored new ways of uniting new members in our organization. We have tried to break out of a petty sectarian type of attitude in terms of who is able to join the group and by what criteria do they join. We have developed new means. The specifics can't be given but the new means have been successful. As a result of these new means, things that we didn't think we would do, we have done. In our long term planning of January 1979, we did put forward a growth projection for our organization and we have kept to that projection exactly thus far. That is positive but perhaps not completely as positive as it sounds since we think we will have difficulty living up to the projection from hereon in.

We mentioned in one of our most recent series of *Editorials* in *Alive* that we were failing in deepening our international relations and broadening our contacts with people in Canada by means of correspondence. We just let this whole area of our work go. We intend to build it up again. The reason we let it go is because that time and energy has had to be devoted to other activities. Again, the two "engines" slogan comes into play here.

We have had a much stronger success than we projected we would have in terms of our contacts in Guelph. We have developed very firm links with workers in various workplaces in the city. The number of such links has been surprising to us, they are exceeding our expectations of one year ago by far. We have a *lot* more new contacts in Guelph than we expected to have.

Our political meetings, such as this very meeting, are misleading in this regard. We've mentioned this in other speeches. The fact that a consistently small number of people come to these meetings gives the impression that the number of contacts we have isn't growing. That impression is an empirical error. Our work isn't growing judging by the increase in the number of people we can mobilize to meetings but the number of people we can mobilize to do a number of other things has grown far in excess of our expectations. One particular success has been at a factory where we have done highly effective handouts to a large number of workers. According to our own sum-up but, more importantly, according to the assessment of the contacts we have working there, we have *actually raised the consciousness* of a broad section of that factory's workers. That's exactly what our educational work should do. We intend to generalize that specific experience in the future.

Another success has been these political meetings. We hadn't had these meetings for a long time previous to our struggle a year and a half ago. We began to have the meetings again on December 26, 1978. The meeting last January First was our second. A number more have been held through the year and they've been very good. As a tool of political education, they've been valuable. They also give people something to do. (*Laughter*) The speeches we've made at these meetings have been used to advantage as broader educational tools as items published in *Alive*. That way they have an effect with far more people than are actually in attendance and actually hear the speeches delivered. In fact, many of these polemics and attacks have come in response to material put forward in our speeches. Our supporters who can't attend these meetings also get to know our political line better by reading the speeches. Friends and supporters who do attend the meetings can also get to know the speeches better by reading them in print.

A consistent theme in our speeches during the past year has been our call for unity on the Left. We consider these to be correct calls. We also consider them to be unreciprocated. That's not a matter of our choice, not a matter of our success or failure — it's simply a matter of harsh reality. The polemics with these other groups,

combined with the fact that the groups which aren't openly polemicalizing against us aren't very warm, would be very distressing given the calls we've made, except for one thing. That one thing is, as mentioned earlier, our contact with the masses is growing. The Left unity is perhaps below our expectations. The unity with our contacts amongst the common people is definitely far in excess of our expectations. We'll admit it: we actually expected to get more response to our calls for Left unity. We got next to no response and that's rotten response. However, we've had good response to our work in the local area amongst people who aren't starting out with a particular political line or organizational commitment. We consider that to be very good.

There have been good developments at our political meetings, not specifically by us but by our supporters. One has been the singing group. They're really what the Bainzites call us — a bunch of opportunists, wherever they can get an audience, they'll sing. (Laughter) Another good development is the exciting thrust in theatre. People are excited about these animated short stories which have been performed. Again, a bunch of crazies — I'm only glad I'm not involved. (Laughter) More like gymnastics than theatre but anyway it's a thrust. (Laughter)

We've developed original art in the magazine. This form has actually developed from a low level to a higher level in a very practical way. We've developed poetry on a new footing. Even before our struggle a year and a half ago, we had a strong thrust of revolutionary poetry. That has been developed even more over the last year. The thrust of creative prose has developed well, too. We considered all these to be successes.

We can do some self-criticism on these things. We haven't developed as broad a base as we would have liked for input into these cultural forms. The reason for that is we simply haven't put the work into it; many of our contacts, friends and supporters don't realize we want them to write poetry, short stories and so on. A lot of people think they can't write in these cultural forms. We haven't brought them to realize they can participate in the development of forms like poetry and short stories. As well more people can participate in developing this music trend or this theatre trend. We haven't encouraged people enough to take part so they haven't taken part. In the future we would like all this cultural work to have a broader base and we will be encouraging that.

There are areas of work we have involvement in that don't have that shortcoming, that we have developed a broader base. We have worked with people outside our organization on the *Guelph News Service Bulletin*. The joint work between our members and other people on the writing is good. The distribution is now done entirely by people other than our members. That's good. Other people are starting to do organizing around the *GNS Bulletin*, with discussion groups and groups of readers in factories. This is a very good success. This is one place where we have deepened our contacts. Anybody who works with *GNS* has increased their contacts and deepened their knowledge of the local area. This is all very good. It is broad based work. It should be continued.

The Understanding China Society in the city is another thrust that some of our members participate in. It is very broad based. Anybody who attends that society's meetings will see the expression of its broad based appeal. That there is such a popular sentiment for China, we find very encouraging.

Those are two activities which don't have that shortcoming of not being broad based. Of course, they have room to get more broad based. They should do that more and more. We're not trying to limit the scope of their activities by any means.

Something we imagine people would like to hear a lot about is the current process of discussion going on inside our organization. Of special interest are any projections of what will come out of those discussions. We can talk on this a little. We can't talk about it in depth. We can re-emphasize some of what we said in the series of *Editorials* announcing the process of discussion.

We're trying to get a better balance between our educational thrust and our organizing thrust. That means we'll be doing more organizing. People know that the standard response to our slogans

for last year was to call out, "Unity!" People can see that the response for this meeting is "Organize!" That doesn't mean we're giving up on the unity thrust by any means. Both express our sentiment for the coming year. These are both very important slogans. We'll be continuing to put both forward. There is no reason to think we're dumping "Unity!" The important thing is that we're drawing in the slogan "Organize!" We intend to make it more than just a slogan.

We are trying to chart a new course. We have identified in our previous speeches and in our general educational work something we have become sharply aware of: It's very difficult to build something new when there are no plans to follow, it's difficult to chart a course when there are no maps to follow. One of the advantages that other revolutionaries have, that we don't at all have, is they have veteran revolutionaries they can call on for advice. They can learn more by indirect experience through these veterans. We don't have this veteran experience. We have some books of dubious value on the charting of a course for revolution. We don't have anybody who was directly involved in the struggle in Canada in the '30's and so on. It would be invaluable if we did. We don't. We try to get by without the veteran consultants but the fact of the matter is, it makes things very hard.

Our route is fraught with failures. There are a lot of little failures on the way to every success. This is a character of our work. We have to pay attention to that characteristic when we say we want to organize people. Mobilize people for what? We know what for but the people we're mobilizing quite often don't know. This is a failure of ours. We've been lazy in this area. We have done general educational work, we haven't done specific educational work.

We haven't solved the problem of how to mobilize the many for revolution. We've proved ourselves able to mobilize the many for a specific event if we work hard at it. However, we haven't proved ourselves able to mobilize many people on a consistent basis for revolution. We haven't even paid very close attention to it or put much effort into it. We intend to from here on in.

Something that is always irritating to those not in the discussions, eliciting a response of, "What are you doing wasting your time on that?" is the effort under the slogan, "To do better we must be better ourselves." We don't consider it a waste of time. It is a fairly big thing in the current process. As an organization we need to tighten our unity even yet. As individuals, our members need to tighten our revolutionary commitment even yet. We're concentrating on this. There has been a lot of development of the organization over the last year and a half. Now there is a focus on the development of individuals as professional revolutionaries, individuals who are already committed to the organization, that is. Our members see the necessity for change, otherwise they wouldn't be members, but quite often individuals lose sight of the fact that the change demanded in the society is also demanded to some degree in the individuals brought up in the society. That we're concentrating on this a lot should make some reluctant people's hair stand on end. (Laughter)

We're bringing our members to see the relevance of such Leninist organizational norms as "the individual is subordinate to the organization." This emphasizes the centralist structure. We've had a very democratic organization for the past year and a half but to streamline our work we are applying centralism more. In order to expand our focus in certain areas, we have to take energy from other areas. We get energy from other areas without crippling them by streamlining. We streamline by applying centralism to a greater degree.

The only problem applying centralism is that if people aren't well versed in it, don't actually uphold it, one achieves less than without it. At present we're teaching the theories throughout the organization. We're not just asking our members to change without giving them the base for change through education.

Our present process of discussion, then, is a rectification of sorts and a study movement of sorts.

It's very difficult to project the outcome of the discussions. Much that I've said so far has been identified as goals already. We must be more methodical. We must build our organization further. We have

to solve some of the problems that make people hesitant about our political work and we have to do specific educational work to build our organization, rather than just general educational work.

We have to make our general educational work more effective. There is no use in throwing lots of energy into educational work that doesn't mobilize anyone because we don't have any energy left to organize those receiving our educational material. Perhaps there is so little energy left we can't even bring the material to people's attention.

In other areas, we're asking ourselves significant questions. We've asked: What does it mean to be an advanced revolutionary organization?

We have smashed a consciousness inside our organization, which is also popular outside the organization.

Back in the early to middle 1970's there was a consciousness that our organization was a commune, that a collectivized living unit was the implication of the word Collective in our name. The organization has never been that. We do know where people get that consciousness. For a while, it was in part a collectivized living unit. That consciousness has generally been smashed. Some people still hold on to it, though it was formalized that the Alive Production Collective was not a collectivized living unit in January, 1975 and even then, that was formalizing something that had been a reality for some time.

Another erroneous consciousness, which has lasted longer, is being smashed in the current process. It says that our organization is nothing more than a production team. Given the name of the organization it is easy to see where that misinterpretation comes from. However, it is important to emphasize that now, and for a lot longer in the past than just a year and a half, the Alive Production Collective has been more than just a production team. It's been an advanced revolutionary organization. It's done extensive revolutionary work beyond the realm of producing Alive Magazine.

There are, of course, people outside the organization who have this erroneous consciousness. There are also members of the organization who don't have the correct consciousness on a day to day basis. Thus, we are educating our members on this. That doesn't mean teaching people to parrot the phrase, "Oh yes, we're an advanced revolutionary organization." Rather we're teaching what it actually means in terms of responsibilities to our supporters, to our friends, to our contacts and to the people.

If that education is successful we project that the creativity and initiative of our members will be released even further than has already been the case. It has been extensively done already in the past year and a half with this upsurge of democracy in our group. Releasing the creativity and initiative of those already organized will be the solution to organizing more people. The deeper theoretical grounding of all our members will also be a material base for organizing new members.

The process of educating our members about our organization and deepening our theoretical grasp will be achieved to a degree at the end of our current process but they will also be continued in the context, again, of our two "engines" slogan. We won't have to stop our political work temporarily in order to do this.

We are aware of some pitfalls in organizing work that other Left groups have fallen into. We have described one before in some of our speeches. This pitfall comes when you organize revolution the same way you blow up a balloon — you just make your organization as big as you can, as quick as you can. Like a balloon, it gets bigger and bigger and bigger to a point where you put one more breath in and it explodes. Organizations explode like that if their members haven't been consolidated politically as they go along. To illustrate, think of a fully expanded balloon resting on the floor and a steel ball bearing the same size sitting beside it; you can burst the balloon very easily but you can't bust up the steel ball bearing very easily. Even if the balloon is twelve inches in diameter, and the steel ball bearing is only an inch in diameter, the smaller is still, by far, the more solid.

We want to create the Canadian "Steel Ball Bearing" Organization.

The blowing up a balloon syndrome is also called snowballing. It

is a pattern we don't want to get into. We've criticized it for a long time. One of the things about that criticism is that it's easy to be a sideline critic, anybody knows that. We have seemed like sideline critics for a while. Now, we are embarking on an "on-field" pattern. The question is: Can we be something other than sideline critics, can we actually avoid the pitfalls? Well, we'll all see.

Much of this speech has covered ground that, although it may be of interest to people, won't be grasped as well as we who are going through the discussions grasp it. As a result of not grasping it well, some might think that it is not at all important or, at least, not as important as we say.

Another danger for people taking this speech in is that they think these calls for "more centralism" and "an upsurge in organizing" sound a bit abstract and cold or heartless. The danger is of people thinking we're not talking about people but about vague concepts — alien types of things. This can happen when one talks constantly in pat phrases meaningful to us but having less content for those not versed in them — "theoretical depth", "educational thrust", "propaganda", "agitation", etc. People can start to say, "Yeah, but where do the people fit in?"

Thus, it is important to emphasize that our overall slogan for the whole of our current process is Mao Zedong's axiom: "Of all things in this world, people are the most precious."

We have this slogan in mind in terms of any criticisms of individual members. This criticism should be done in the framework of consolidating people, not of driving people to ground, of grinding people down. Any organizing work that is to be done will be done in the framework of this slogan also. We won't be taking up the mentality of whipping people into shape like boot camp recruits under a drill sergeant, or herding them like cattle. A revolutionary political organization is not a corral that you just put more and more cattle into.

We are actually looking at giving people the political education they need to find their bearings independently within the organization. We don't want people to operate as revolutionaries just because there are other revolutionaries around to "police" them. Hence, we're actually paying caring attention to people.

We will build our organization according to the brain and according to the heart. Some see us organizing according to the brain only, see us as a heartless group of organizers. We are most often accused of not paying attention to people's actual needs as human beings. On the other hand, we are most often counselled to organize with the heart only, to not take the brain into account. We must take into account the material processes, the actual process of assessment. We must operate on the material basis of the brain's assessment not on the spontaneous basis of emotion.

Wherever the criticism that we are operating according to the brain only is just, we will try to root that out. Wherever the counsel to operate according to the heart alone is given, we'll reject it. We do know these criticisms and counsels are given to our group in friendship and we appreciate that.

There is an axiom from Marx, reiterated by Mao Zedong, that says, "Freedom is the recognition of necessity." To some this is no more than an obscure philosophical phrase. It can be interpreted to mean *freedom* is the spirit of the heart and *recognition of necessity* is the spirit of the brain. We combine the spirit of the heart and of the brain according to this axiom. Material reality must be the guiding force in our political work. Where we have feelings and emotions which go counter to material reality, we must go with the dictate of material reality not with the dictate of emotion. Otherwise reality will be a very harsh disciplinarian on you.

In terms of the spirit of the heart, in terms of having real emotions, in terms of being human beings, we emphasize that revolutionaries aren't special people. This has been a theme of previous speeches. If we can be revolutionaries, any one of you can. If the strange crew we have can do it, any fool can do it. (Laughter) Revolutionaries are ordinary people. We like to stress the commonness in people involved in revolution. People come to revolution by a number of different paths but once they come to revolution they have a very definite commonness, a unified drive.

US ORGANIZING UNITY WITH YOU, COMRADES

It's each one of you, comrades.
 It's each one of you I'm talking to.
 It's you that I'm talking about being in our organization.
 It's you that will make our revolutionary organization, comrades.

It's us, comrades.
 It's us that you see
 when you put our revolutionary organization
 — just developing —
 and you, revolutionary consciousness
 just developing,
 together. Put us and you together,
 put us and *all* of you together,
 put yourself together with us,
 make us a part of you,
 make yourself a part of us,
 and you've got unity!

Unity, comrades.
 Unity is what we see.
 Unity is what will make our revolution, comrades.
 Unity is what we should embrace.

Embrace you, comrades? We will.
 Embrace us? Will you?
 When you approach our organization
 — very cautious —
 (and though we, not wanting to scare you, are
 very cautious)

unity's embrace is what you see. If we work with you,
 if we and *all* of you work for revolution,
 if 'we' can be those who are us now and those who are you now,
 if you organize us to see your individual felt needs,
 if you organize yourself and many to serve the people,
 we'll have a new society!

It's you, comrades.
 It's you that I see.
 It's you that I see making the revolution in Canada.
 It's you that will make our revolution, comrades.

Pat McLellan

This is very important. However, equally important is that they have a commonness before they come to revolution as well, even though people each come by a path of somewhat unique life's experience. The commonness is the thing that people are asking that we pay attention to when they recommend operating according to "the heart". People have similar emotions, people have similar personal problems — everybody has personal problems. We do take all this into account. When we say individual friends of our organization, individual supporters can be revolutionaries, we are taking this into account. We're saying people can have personal emotions and personal problems and still be revolutionaries. Those of us who already consider ourselves revolutionary, who operate in the context of a revolutionary organization, have personal emotions. We have personal problems. Some do anyway, I understand. *(Laughter)*

In our future work we will operate with the spirit of the heart and of the brain. We will operate the two according to the axiom, "Freedom is the recognition of necessity." Where the two spirits come into contradiction, the dictate of the brain takes the lead. Where the two do not come into contradiction, there is no reason why the heart can't be in play.

Perhaps it is an obscure January First speech if one can't say exactly

when things are coming, exactly how many people are involved, exactly where things will take place. There are no police here this year, if there were, we could use them as an excuse: "That's why we can't speak details." We're not saying because we don't know. *(Laughter)* However, the constant critics shouldn't jump on that as meaning we're not going to know. We're not going to do anything without first knowing. We are in the process of coming to know, just as when we made our January First speech last year we were only coming to know. People can actually see how closely last year's January First speech approximated the subsequent reality of 1979. There were definite successes in 1979, successes that we consider important.

The sum of the direction we took last year was actually the standard response our audience gave to our slogans: "Unity!" We wanted unity with other groups. We achieved great internal unity in our own group and with individuals outside our group. The desire for unity will continue to be a theme and a trend with us.

For 1980, we can say the direction of our work is actually summed-up in the standard response you'll be calling out to these slogans:

Our anti-imperialist task!
 Organize!
Our revolutionary task!
 Organize!
Our central task!
 Organize!
Our immediate task!
 Organize!
 (Applause)

RAUZITE MEETING
 Buy of DRUGS for you!
 Meditation
 TROT MEETING "NO!" to Mao
 REPEL
 NEO TROT MEETING
 REVOLTING ROCK CONCERT
 Ball game
 NDP
 NDP
 NDP
 Reform
 This That AND... the other thing.

SUPPORT THE NEW DEVELOPMENTS IN ANTI-IMPERIALIST REVOLUTIONARY WORK COMING FROM ALIVE'S HISTORY!