

**CHAPTER I**  
**Where does the League come from?**

The Canadian Communist League (Marxist-Leninist) was formed in October 1975. The first issue of *The Forge*, central organ of the League, shouted it from the rooftops, qualifying the League's creation as a "*big step towards the party*":

*"The establishment of the CCL(M-L) marks a turning point in the development of the revolutionary struggle in Canada" (1).*

But, what in fact, is hidden behind this pompous proclamation by the CCL(M-L)? And just what exactly is meant by "turning point" and "big step forward"? Before undertaking the analysis of this group's political line, it is worth recalling some of the salient points from its short history. In particular, there is its very formation — a scant three years ago — which it likes to present as being untarnished and, as earth-shattering as a revelation from heaven above.

The League's self-proclamation as the Canadian organization of struggle for the party had all the appearances of spontaneous creation, given that it was done behind the backs of the young Canadian Marxist-Leninist movement. However, it quickly became clear that the League's repeated lies about the real history of the Marxist-Leninist forces in Canada had but one goal, and that was to justify after the fact the existence of its own organization and its so-called correct line. This "correct line", whose revelation in Canada was almost as sudden as the creation of the League itself, was based on a then recent formulation of a "new" theory, which the Chinese leader, Teng Hsiao-ping had just elaborated before the UN and which we today have come to call the "three worlds theory".

### **The League's founding groups**

The League was created from the merger of three groups which claimed to be Marxist-Leninist, and whose activities were limited to Quebec, more specifically to the Montreal region. These groups were the **Cellule militante ouvrière** (CMO — Militant Workers Cell), the **Cellule ouvrière révolutionnaire** (COR — Revolutionary Workers Cell), formed respectively in February and April 1974, and the **Mouvement révolutionnaire des étudiants du Québec** (MREQ — Revolutionary

Movement of Quebec Students) created in January 1972, following a split within the CPC(M-L) (\*). These groups, of course, were not the only ones wearing the mantle of Marxist-Leninism in Quebec — nor in English Canada, where several loosely structured collectives were active, but still principally under the influence of the line of the old Progressive Workers Movement (PWM). (PWM was active in the sixties in British Columbia. It was the first attempt to group together genuine Marxist-Leninist forces.)

But more than that, for over a year before the League's self-proclamation, the struggle to unify the young Canadian Marxist-Leninist movement around the central objective of rebuilding a communist party had acted as an impetus in broadening to the country-wide scale the struggle against economist deviations. This economist line, which gave priority to trade-union work limited strictly to reformism and the radicalization of immediate struggles, and to support to the economic struggles of the working class, in practice, sabotaged the struggle to build a vanguard workers party united around a revolutionary program drawing clear lines of demarcation with reformism and revisionism. In 1974-75, several events sharpened this struggle against economism. In 1974, IN STRUGGLE! published a supplement to its newspaper calling for the creation of a Marxist-Leninist organization of struggle for the party. The MREQ also published a pamphlet with a similar call. And in 1975, the journal **Canadian Revolution** appeared, and played a catalytic role across English Canada in the struggle against right opportunism and for the unity of Marxist-Leninists of the two nations. These publications, polemics and debates, both private and public, between the Marxist-Leninist groups and collectives sharpened the ideological struggle and laid the bases for an intense Canada-wide struggle against right opportunism and revisionism, particularly around the question of the need for and the nature of the proletarian party and the tasks necessary for its construction.

So, in this context of broadened ideological struggle, three Montreal groups, with the greatest contempt for the Marxist-Leninist movement from Halifax to Vancouver, carried on eight months of meetings behind closed doors and then announced to the working class and the Marxist-Leninist movement its act of self-proclamation as "*the Marxist-Leninist organization*" (2), the Canadian organization which constituted "*a big step forward for unity of Marxist-Leninists*" (3). And in the same breath, this organization affirmed categorically that it had given birth to the "correct line" and that all that was left to do was to

join with it and build the CCL(M-L) to create the Marxist-Leninist party in Canada. But, what about public polemic? And what about the debates on political line among the masses? For, at that particular time, only these debates could have provided the political foundation for the creation of an organization which would have really been a step forward for the unity of Marxist-Leninists. And what about the struggle for the party, what happened to it? Could you find it in the Partisan, the MREQ's student newspaper? No! In the Etoile rouge (Red Star), the single-issue newspaper which the COR published a month before the creation of the League? No! In the non-existent newspaper of the CMO, perhaps? Obviously not! No, you certainly weren't going to look for the public debates among the masses in the handbills published by the League's founding groups. For this, you had to look in the newspaper IN STRUGGLE! which published for the movement, including the League's founding groups, a series of articles on the tasks of Canadian Marxist-Leninists. The League later had no choice but to adopt the content of the articles — without attribution, of course — to give the **image** of being in the vanguard.

The polemic could also be found in the journal **Canadian Revolution** which appeared regularly for several issues.

In short, it was everywhere, everywhere that is, except within the founding groups of the CCL(ML)! So, the League, that "*big step forward*", was not formed in the heart of the line debate but on the fringe of it. It was the work of opportunists and tailists who collect bits and pieces of a line, here and there, and then present themselves with great pomp and ceremony, in order to better deceive the masses, like our MP's on the eve of an election. So the Canadian Marxist-Leninist movement, including the Group IN STRUGGLE! which had been engaged in the struggle against economism and revisionism on the question of party building for three years, learnt by reading the new newspaper The Forge, that the slogan "*Forward for the creation of the Marxist-Leninist organization*" (4), had become "*Build the Canadian Communist League (Marxist-Leninist)!*" and "*Forward to the creation of the Canadian Communist Party in Canada!*" (5).

But the fact that "*a great leap forward towards the creation of a Marxist-Leninist party in Canada*" (6) had been accomplished without the knowledge of Canadian Marxist-Leninists, was not the only surprise awaiting them. They were also surprised to learn that the three Montreal groups who were the artisans of this "*great leap forward*" were none other than the groups which, a few months earlier, had been the most valiant defenders of economism and the revisionist conception of party building. The CMO, for example, was founded by several militants who came from the same original grouping as those

(\*) See the pamphlet *The CPC(M-L), a revisionist organization of agent-provocateurs*, IN STRUGGLE!, Montreal 1978, p. 142

who created the Regroupement des comités de travailleurs (RCT — Federation of Workers Committees), an economist and even openly revisionist organization of petty-bourgeois elements, implanted in factories to better deceive the workers. Until its demise, the CMO was a major target of IN STRUGGLE!'s criticisms. The RCT's practice consisted of forming workers committees to democratize unions and getting its members elected to union executives while being very careful not to do any communist work. It is interesting to note that another favoured practice was to oppose any attempt by IN STRUGGLE! to do communist propaganda among "their" workers. They said IN STRUGGLE! militants were "intellectuals cut off from the masses", and they denigrated them, and even used physical constraints against them. For, as everybody knows, given that the League has taken up the RCT's old refrain, spreading communist propaganda leads to confusion among the workers who, in contrast to IN STRUGGLE!'s "armchair intellectuals" cannot understand complicated and "frightening" information on proletarian revolution and the dictatorship of the proletariat. We should also point out that just a month before the creation of the League, the CMO's pamphlet *De quelques questions brûlantes sur la ligne tactique* (Some Burning Questions on Tactics) underwent a scathing criticism by IN STRUGGLE! which published the pamphlet *Against Economism*(\*) in September 1975. This sharp attack was key in discrediting the revisionist conception of party building both in Quebec and across the country. *Against Economism* directly criticized the MREQ's line, which opposed the dissolution of the *Comité de solidarité avec les luttes ouvrières* (CSLO — Committee of Solidarity with Workers Struggles), the group which had become the symbol of the liquidation of communist agitation and propaganda work.

Here, perhaps, it is interesting to recall the judgement we made of the "historic contribution" of the CMO to the line debate just a few months before "the big step towards the party" announced with the creation of the League:

(\*) *Concerning the Comité de solidarité avec les luttes ouvrières (CSLO), Against Economism, IN STRUGGLE!, September 1975.* The CSLO was first formed to support an important struggle by workers at the Firestone Co. in Joliette, near Montreal. Besides militant meetings which served as a symbol of unity and combativity for thousands of workers and progressive individuals, one of the forms of support was the organization of a boycott of the places selling Firestone tires. The strike ended in an overwhelming success which was very influential. But the positive aspects of this first period of the CSLO were transformed into their opposite when the Marxist-Leninist groups, including IN STRUGGLE! at the time, decided to institutionalize the CSLO and turn it into a permanent organization around a so-called "minimal" line, that is, a reformist line, which would be devoted to the support of "exemplary struggles". Having rectified its own errors of conciliation with economism, IN STRUGGLE!, through the publication of this pamphlet, undertook to unmask the opportunist line. The League's founding groups were the most ardent supporters of this line.

*"For that matter, the pamphlet of the CMO, De quelques questions brûlantes sur la ligne tactique, published last June, is liable to be very useful to Quebecois Marxist-Leninist to the extent that it is the clearest synthesis of the various forms taken up by the opportunist trend within the Marxist-Leninist movement in the last year. Moreover, it develops the economist and opportunist deviations to a level never reached before, with the exception of the Regroupement des comités de travailleurs (RCT) and its semi-official press organ, the Bulletin Populaire, and the group of the Librairie Progressiste publishing the journal Mobilisation which carries an identical line, as to the substance, with that of the RCT"(7). (Ed. note: all of these groups are today part of the League)*

It is strange that the founding groups of the League and the great majority of those which afterwards rallied to it, particularly the "family of five" (\*), always defined themselves in opposition to IN STRUGGLE!, which unceasingly waged ideological struggle against their economism. Clearly, the League's "turning point" was something much closer to an 180 degree about face, the type only opportunists are capable of. It really is quite hard to imagine that all those groups which were always in the right-wing of the movement and which, like the RCT, even stooped to near counter-revolutionary methods to try and get rid of the "intellectuals of IN STRUGGLE!", that these very groups had just, or so it seemed, given birth to the "correct line"!

To justify its "self-proclamation", the newly created League had to resort to rewriting history in an attempt to make it seem that it had constituted itself as the Canadian organization of struggle for the party because IN STRUGGLE! didn't want unity with the founding groups! So in doing their summation of "the struggle to create a Marxist-Leninist organization" (8), the League's founding groups wrote:

*"However, the immediate obstacle to the resolution of these political divergences, and the reason why unity between us and EN LUTTE! in the near future is impossible, is because of the erroneous attitude EN LUTTE! has adopted towards other Marxist-leninist groups" (9)*

And so, the League, self-proclaimed behind the backs of what then constituted the Canadian Marxist-Leninist movement, implicitly admits that its emergence around the supposed "correct line", was not based on a broad polemic which alone could draw lines of demarcation between the correct line and erroneous positions. No, no, it was in reac-

(\*) Five groups, all direct or indirect offshoots of the RCT; see further on in the text.

tion to the so-called erroneous "attitude" of the Group IN STRUGGLE!

And just what was this erroneous attitude of IN STRUGGLE!?

*"EN LUTTE!'s constant insistence on demarcation was a position of all-struggle, no unity" (10)*

It was this constant insistence on identifying and discussing political differences which led the League to say that *"EN LUTTE! showed itself unwilling to discuss the major questions of political line" (11)...*

So when you talk about political differences, you're not talking about "the major questions of political line"! This astonishing revelation says a lot about the conception which the League had, and still has, of political line: petty-bourgeois doctrinarism, tailism and eclecticism, which reduce political line to a collection of quotes, to evoking a few great names, especially Mao Tse-tung's, as a substitution for the systematic struggle against revisionist positions on the path of revolution in Canada. That's how the League goes about standing reality on its head, to making it believe that IN STRUGGLE! backed down from public polemic. In fact, it was the founding groups of the League which tried to remain on the sidelines during this polemic, to avoid having their political positions unmasked.

It is important to outline these events: the same logic which was the basis for the League's self-proclamation was also the basis for its split-tist activities on a national and international scale. The history of the communist movement, and particularly Khrushchev's manoeuvring against China and Albania in the sixties, and the same reactionary act by the new Chinese leaders against socialist Albania, shows that revisionists are essentially splitters who cannot hope to impose their line of capitulation to the bourgeoisie on the communist movement in any other way than by manoeuvring against the genuine defenders of proletarian revolution.

### **Splitting and wrecking: a face-mask for opportunism**

But the League's self-proclamation, its manoeuvring to try and impose a revisionist line with a new "vanguard" look, in no way smothered the struggle for the unity of real Marxist-Leninists within a Marxist-Leninist organization of struggle for the party, an organization established in the heat of the struggle within the masses to demarcate the proletariat from the bourgeois line. Taking the initiative to propose specific organizational forms to raise the political debate to a higher level, IN STRUGGLE! proposed in the first issue of its theoretical journal that a series of public conferences be held to debate the main questions of political line. Strangely enough, the League,

whose founding groups had accused IN STRUGGLE! of not insisting enough on demarcation and of neglecting political line, this time accused our Group of insisting too much on unity and neglecting — you guessed it — political line!

First the League, continuing with its total contempt for the whole Canadian Marxist-Leninist movement, (which at the time was composed of, besides IN STRUGGLE! and the League, many small groups and collectives) fervently objected to these "pipsqueak groups" or, as it called them, these "confused groups" coming especially from English Canada, participating in the conferences. For that would, so it seems, spread confusion.

It seems that, for the League, the struggle over the decisive questions of the communist program had to be reduced to private debates or rhetorical exchanges between the League and IN STRUGGLE! Once again, resorting to the type of lies and falsifications which it used to justify its self-proclamation, the League undertook to sabotage the conferences. It even went so far as to use an excerpt from an internal IN STRUGGLE! document to misrepresent our project for the unity struggle. In answer to these lies, in July 1976, IN STRUGGLE! published **Towards the unity of Canadian Marxist-Leninists, fight the sectarianism of the CCL(M-L)**.

Was this extreme sectarianism, this contempt for the concrete reality of the Canadian Marxist-Leninist movement, this, at times, counter-revolutionary conduct all a manifestation of desire to have Marxism-Leninism win out over revisionism? Or was it rather the conduct of revisionists, who resort to splitting, lies and conspiracies to stop ideological struggle from unmasking them? The events which followed in fact showed whether it was IN STRUGGLE! or the League, which held the struggle over questions of program in contempt.

The First Conference of Canadian Marxist-Leninists focused on the political positions concerning the struggle for the unity of Marxist-Leninists. It brought together for the first time since the degeneration of the Communist Party of Canada all the forces presenting themselves as Marxist-Leninist and as part of the struggle against revisionism, both in Quebec and the rest of the country. The League condescended to send a few delegates, although it prevented its own militants from attending, for fear that its lies be unmasked. Before the conference was over, the League began to try and ridicule the 1200 participants and 13 groups present by qualifying the conference as a "show"!

When a second conference, this one on the path of revolution in Canada, was announced, the League announced that it would organize a boycott campaign to sabotage the conference. The League even went as far as to organize a parallel conference in Vancouver for late March,

barely two weeks before the conference organized by IN STRUGGLE! in Montreal! In fact, the letter inviting IN STRUGGLE! to organize the Vancouver conference in collaboration with the League was dated March 10, 1977 — a scant two weeks before it was to take place and four weeks before the Montreal conference, which had been planned months in advance! So, first the League accuses IN STRUGGLE! of base opportunism because it organized a conference (the First Conference) to discuss the call for the unity of Marxist-Leninists. Holding such a conference, it appears, amounts to subordinating debate on political line. Then, the very same League turns around and organizes a conference, a bogus conference if ever there was — precisely on the question of unity, while the preparation for the Second Conference of Marxist-Leninists organized by IN STRUGGLE!, which dealt with a central political question, the path of revolution in Canada, was underway. But such strange things might seem somewhat less strange, if we keep in mind that one of the major questions discussed at the Second Conference was the criticism of bourgeois nationalist positions which either denied, or minimized the imperialist nature of Canada... We should also keep in mind that in issue 2 (\*) of its theoretical journal PROLETARIAN UNITY, published in December 1976, IN STRUGGLE! had begun a criticism of the League's social-chauvinism and its support for alliance with the Canadian bourgeoisie on the pretext of struggling for Canada's independence.

Despite this obvious hoax of the League's phoney conference, despite its provocation and boycott campaign of the Montreal conference, IN STRUGGLE! and the Vancouver Marxist-Leninist groups participated in the League's conference and transformed it into a forum for the systematic denunciation of the League's first and last conference for the unity of Canadian Marxist-Leninists. Need we add that the League continued to boycott the conferences of Canadian Marxist-Leninists, including the third, which dealt with the international situation and marked the beginning of a principled struggle to repudiate the revisionist and counter-revolutionary "three worlds theory".

---

(\*) PROLETARIAN UNITY No. 2 (Dec. 76): *The international situation and the struggle against imperialism and the two superpowers*. At the time of the publication of this article, we still had not totally broken with the "three worlds theory" and our criticism dealt specifically with the "erroneous application" of this theory by some people. It is in this context that we began the principled struggle against the social-chauvinism of the League as well as some other groups outside Canada, including the PC(M-L)F in France and October League, which later proclaimed the "Communist Party (Marxist-Leninist)" in the U.S.

In No. 3 of PROLETARIAN UNITY (Feb. 77), in an article entitled, *The path of the Canadian revolution*, we once again denounced the League's conciliation with the Canadian bourgeoisie and the negation, in practice, of the reactionary Canadian alliance with U.S. imperialism.

And at the same time that the League condemned the First Conference of Canadian Marxist-Leninists on unity on the false pretext that IN STRUGGLE!'s project minimized political debate; at the same time that the League boycotted the Second Conference on the path of revolution, this time on the pretext that the participating groups included opportunists; at the same time that the League improvised a phoney conference on unity in Vancouver; at the same time that it turned a deaf ear to public criticisms of its revisionist positions, such as the criticisms formulated by IN STRUGGLE! in its newspaper and journal; at the same time that it launched a campaign to denigrate and lie about IN STRUGGLE!; all this time, the League manoeuvred to swallow up the splintered collectives left after the break-up of the old Regroupement des Comités des Travailleurs, the group whose historical legacy the League inherited. The five Quebec groups, the Family of Five to use the League's own expression are the Regroupement des Comités des Travailleurs, the Agence de presse libre du Québec, Mobilisation, the Cercle communiste (Marxiste-Léniniste), and the Groupe d'action socialiste.

The Five — as we shall call them — or at least what remained of them, had been quite shaken up by the growth of the Marxist-Leninist movement and the growing struggle against revisionism which increasingly focused on the fundamental questions of the Marxist-Leninist program. That is why, even within these groups, there was a move in the direction of Marxism-Leninism. But a rectification like this, if it is to be something more than a camouflage attempt, has to be made on the basis of a real self-criticism and conscious adherence to the correct positions in the Marxist-Leninist polemic. In particular for us, this meant that these groups had to take clear positions on the differences between IN STRUGGLE!'s line and that of the League. IN STRUGGLE! invited them to participate in the public conferences, and also made itself available for private meetings in order to deepen the criticism of their erroneous and even blatantly revisionist positions. All this, of course, on the basis of the demonstration of the correctness of IN STRUGGLE!'s line.

It's easy to understand how this materialist position did not please the League, which boycotted public polemic to make sure that its supposedly correct line was not tarnished. So, profiting from the historical and personal ties between the League's founding groups and the "Five", the CCL(M-L) put forward the completely idealist and metaphysical thesis that since these groups were "100% opportunist", they couldn't take a position in the line debate among Marxist-Leninists! Consequently, they had but one solution if they didn't want

to wallow in complete decay: to disband and to ask a Marxist-Leninist organization to "re-educate" them.

Perhaps, at this point your common sense might have come to the fore and a perfectly logical question might have sprung to mind: how are our "100% opportunist" "Five" going to go about choosing the Marxist-Leninist group which will "re-educate" them, since they cannot get involved in the line debate because they are too opportunist to understand it? But the League's logic takes a twist which only opportunists can follow. The key to the puzzle is that it's necessary to rally to the League! Why? Because the League, which holds high the banner of liquidation, demonstrates obvious firmness, and as everyone knows, in the League, firmness is on the side of the "correct line". And besides, IN STRUGGLE!'s position, which proposes the more difficult path of political debate, conciliates with opportunism because it allows for debate with opportunist groups... So it's "obvious" that these rotten elements couldn't find a better master to cure them of their rottenness than the group which most firmly upholds that there is no possible cure.

Unfortunately, this satire is not even a caricature! "

*Given that:*

1. *The CC(M-L) has always been an opportunist group;*
2. *To undertake our process of self-criticism and re-education we need the leadership of a Marxist-Leninist organization which wages relentless struggle against right opportunism;*

*The last general meeting of the CC(M-L) proposes:*

1. *To dissolve the CC(M-L)*
2. *To call on all the militants and sympathizers of the Cercle to place themselves under the leadership of the CC(M-L) for the task of self-criticism."* (12)

This is how the Canadian Marxist-Leninist movement learned about the "unity struggle" between the League and the Cercle Communiste. This is also how the members of the Cercle themselves learned about their surprise liquidation, for, as later became known(\*), all of the League's wheeling and dealing was done without the knowledge of the rank-and-file members of the Cercle. In fact, the League was only able to impose this liquidation in the absence of any political debate by playing on the internal contradictions within the Cercle's leadership, which was dominated by opportunism. So it was through splitting and wrecking, and by creating factions that the League was able to attain its objective. It broke up this group before it even had a chance to take a posi-

(\*) See IS! Nos. 90 and 91 for a statement from ex-members of the Cercle: 100% opportunism, an argument to justify opportunism

tion on the different lines of other groups, including IN STRUGGLE!'s. Of course, with its opportunist logic, the League's conscience is still clear. The Cercle, after all, was 100% opportunist and since, according to the League's "principles", it's opportunist to discuss with opportunists, you can cast all principles to the wind when it comes to destroying such a group. This same "principle" was later invoked by the League as justification whith its campaign to destroy the Group IN STRUGGLE!, claiming it was revisionist. Counter-revolutionary actions and police manoeuvres became "revolutionary action" as part of this campaign! But it would be wrong to think that this typically saboteur reasoning was discovered by the League. All you have to do is read a few pages of IN STRUGGLE!'s pamphlet on the CPC(M-L) to see what school the League went to. The same opportunist tactic used in the case of CC(M-L) was used again for the group Mobilisation which swallowed down the League's magic potion of liquidation re-education, while all the while claiming to have major line divergences with the League on, precisely, the question of the unity of Marxist-Leninists!

### **Splitting and wrecking, opportunist rallying and a nationalist program: a new bourgeois party in the making**

With the League busy "smashing" the "Family of Five opportunist groups" in Quebec, it might have seemed that the Marxist-Leninist line for building the proletarian party had definitely won out over the economist and revisionist line. After all, wasn't everybody talking about the party, especially the League, which claimed with more and more volume it was working to achieve the conditions for the party's creation on its own.

The three conditions for rebuilding a new party of the proletariat are: 1) the formulation of a political **program** which clearly demarcates from revisionism; 2) the **unity** of Marxist-Leninists around this program; and 3) the **rallying** of the most advanced workers to communism and to the revolutionary program. With the creation of the League, yesterday's economists formally recognized these central tasks. Reality, however, proves this recognition was formal at best. For if the defenders of the "correct line" (these same people who advocated collaboration with Canadian imperialism), talked abundantly about the party, unity, the program, and rallying, they gave these terms very special meanings. Avid readers of The Forge have undoubtedly noticed, over the months, a series of fleeting "programs" called "class struggle programs". Programs for class struggle unions, class struggle daycare centres, programs against the national oppression of Quebec, etc.

Strangely, however, the League has not yet presented its program for proletarian revolution in Canada. This "strange" fact can perhaps be better understood if we keep in mind that just after IN STRUGGLE! published its Draft Program for the proletarian party, The Forge justified labelling this program revisionist with the following argument:

*"This is how IS tries to prevent the working class from seeing its arch enemies, the superpowers." (13)*

Perhaps that's the type of political position which the League is still shy about clearly writing into its program for the so-called party whose imminent self-proclamation has been promised! It's true that the League has talked about the unity of Marxist-Leninists, but it's hard not to notice the striking resemblance between the strange "liquidation-rallyings" without real political debate or materialist self-criticisms, and the way the League's founding groups went about, or so it seems, breaking with their revisionist positions, so as to be able to subsequently defend the "correct line" by boycotting the public conferences of Marxist-Leninists, convoking phoney conferences, and falsifying IN STRUGGLE!'s positions to avoid a real polemic... And it did all this while keeping almost completely mum on the fundamental questions of program. Undoubtedly, this is how the so-called Communist League, repeating its history of self-proclamation, is preparing the self-proclamation of a new party which will have nothing communist about it but the name.

Finally, as we will see further on, if the League has succeeded in rallying, or should we say deceiving some workers, this has always been on the basis of particular platforms for immediate struggles and by demagogically recuperating the prestige of the Chinese revolution. By keeping the masses on the sidelines of the debate and the political struggle — as is its wont — the League has been able to convince certain combative strata of the petty bourgeoisie and the working class to jump onto its bandwagon of bourgeois nationalism. The League represents a consolidated opportunist trend whose mission is to try and deviate the working class from active and immediate preparation of proletarian revolution. This is particularly true of its role in Quebec where the reactionary nationalist movement is increasingly trying to give itself a "left-wing aura" as the anti-worker character of the Parti Quebecois government becomes clearer, underlying the true nature of the nationalist movement.

The January 20, 1977 issue of the Forge marked a milestone in the League's splitting and wrecking campaign, with the announcement of the boycott of the conferences of Canadian Marxist-Leninists. In the same issue, the League undertook its campaign to prove IN STRUG-

GLE!'s so-called revisionism. But this strange coincidence of events, which meant that the League's fraudulent proof would never be subject to debate — and exposure — was not the only "coincidence" revealed in this issue of the Forge. Discreetly tucked away under a subtitle, modestly called "*let's correct our errors*", there is the recognition of certain "excesses"...

*"The positions of the League on the Canadian bourgeoisie, its state and army have always been in the main correct... Nevertheless certain articles in The Forge, while advancing a generally correct line on the Canadian army, have implied that it is positive that the Canadian bourgeoisie strengthen its defensive capacity in order to defend the country from possible aggression from one of the two superpowers" (14).*

Perhaps a few examples would help us grasp just what the League means by a line which is "in the main correct". In an article, whose title alone is very revealing **We can't depend on the bourgeoisie**, The Forge writes:

*"It (the Canadian bourgeoisie — ed. note) can make some correct decisions which we must support — like increasing the defence potential of the country, extending Canada's jurisdiction to 200 sea miles. But only the Canadian proletariat is determined to defend the interests of the people to the end" (15).*

So it seems that the Canadian bourgeoisie defends the interests of the people! However, it goes without saying that the proletariat, or rather the League, which claims to represent it, will defend them much better than Trudeau. In this same article, the League, deploring the "insufficiencies" of the Canadian naval power, adds as a caption to a touching photo of destroyers:

*"Despite the weakness which the Canadian bourgeoisie imposes upon it, the Canadian navy makes an effort to defend our coasts. The photo shows a Canadian destroyer closely following a Soviet trawler." (16)*

And in the editorial of a subsequent issue, the League adds:

*"Here in Canada, the people must start right away to reinforce and defend the independence of the country. The Canadian bourgeoisie can only defend Canada's national independence in a mitigated and hesitant way. Contemporary events have proven this. At times it undertakes positive actions which contribute to isolating the superpowers, getting closer to third world countries (McEachen's trip to the Middle East) and reinforcing its unity*



*with second world countries (ties with the European Common Market). It builds up military defence potential (see the article in this issue) but only against one superpower. For it capitulates to American imperialism, and this is the tendency which dominates at the moment. We must take up the task of denouncing any capitulation and encourage all gestures of demarcation with the two superpowers.” (17)*

And the League wants to make us believe that this is a line which is “in the main correct”! This outrage merits closer examination, especially when the League takes the effort to specify...

*“They (the mistakes of supporting the Canadian army — ed. note) clearly contradicted the general line of the League. But the articles where they appeared contained mainly correct positions.” (18)*

So that’s the gist of the opportunist reasoning of the League: while struggling for revolution and the overthrow of the Canadian bourgeoisie, our **main** enemy, we can support the so-called positive acts of this same Canadian bourgeoisie! In short, what the League says is that we should encourage “our” national bourgeoisie when it defends its imperialist interests on a world scale. The call to support the Canadian army is ultimately nothing but the most extreme and blatantly reactionary form of a general call to collaborate with “one’s own” national imperialist bourgeoisie, a class which is reactionary in every way. In class interest terms, there is **no** difference between reinforcing the repressive apparatus of the bourgeois State, and reinforcing its economic or political activities. Affirming, as does the League’s “rectification”, that it’s erroneous to support the military activities of Canadian imperialism, but that it is all right to support its economic and political activities, on the pretext of weakening the hegemonic position of the two superpowers, is a demagogic manoeuvre to try and make the Canadian proletariat swallow a revisionist and social chauvinist (socialist in words, chauvinist in practice) line. The League criticisms of the Canadian bourgeoisie are not formulated as a call to weaken and overthrow it. Instead, the League criticizes it for not having a “good” imperialist policy! To tell Trudeau that he takes “positive action” but that he doesn’t go far enough, that he “capitulates” and that the League, which says it represents the working class, could do much better than he does in safeguarding the independence of imperialist Canada — because that’s the Canada we’re talking about — is to want to submit the proletariat to the most aggressive and chauvinist whims of imperialism. The crux of the League’s

“revolutionary strategy” is to sharpen imperialist rivalries in order to “neutralize” “the most aggressive superpower” (that’s how the defenders of the “three worlds theory” designate the USSR). Despite pretensions to the contrary, this “strategy” actually fits nicely into the imperialist logic of the “balance” of power through the games of rivalry, zones of influence, and multiple and apparently contradictory imperialist alliances. It’s quite logical that this strategy called “three worlds” has led the League to advocate an openly militarist policy, even if the manoeuvring of these opportunists is embarrassing to them, given that they have to so openly let the cat out of the bag. In fact, that’s why the League tried to quietly bury these “excesses”. But even though it slips into a phoney self-criticism, which even then it tries to hide by making demagogic and divisive attacks on the so-called revisionism of IN STRUGGLE! and the Party of Labour of Albania, the “three “worlds theory” inevitably leads the League to support the **imperialist** policy of the “hawks” against the **imperialist** policy of “detente”. So, in the end, that’s the reality of the “revolutionarism” of the League and the international social-chauvinist trend to which it belongs.

Yes, the League likes to talk about “the struggle for the party”. But its struggle is the struggle to sabotage the construction of a real revolutionary party defending the independent policy of the proletariat. It’s the struggle to create a new bourgeois party, a party which will be all the more dangerous since it will try to mask its pro-imperialist and chauvinist line behind the denunciation of **one** imperialist State, the USSR. And the League’s counter-revolutionary mission is precisely to pass off this denunciation of the most important revisionist bourgeois State as a denunciation of revisionism itself, when in fact, revisionism is the theory of class collaboration with the bourgeoisie and imperialism, starting, of course, with “one’s own” imperialist bourgeoisie! Under the banner of “anti-Soviet revisionism”, the League is getting ready to create a new revisionist bourgeois party whose historical mission will be to try and sabotage active preparation for proletarian revolution in Canada by mobilizing the masses onto the bandwagon of bourgeois politics: reinforcing the independence of imperialist Canada, supporting the USA’s aggressive anti-USSR policies, and finally supporting the revisionist Chinese leaders who are increasingly playing the game of world imperialist rivalries and direct collaboration with a series of imperialist States, including the Canada of Pierre Elliot Trudeau and Power Corporation.

( 1 ) *The Forge*, November, 1975, p.1

( 2 ) *The Struggle for the Creation of the Canadian Communist League (Marxist-Leninist), a big step forward towards the unity of Marxist-Leninists and the creation of the party.* p. 40

- ( 3) *Statement of Political Agreement for the Creation of the Canadian Communist League (Marixist-Leninist)*, p. 5
- ( 4) *En avant pour la création de l'organisation marxiste-léniniste*, MREQ, October, 1974, our translation
- ( 5) *The Forge*, November, 1975, p. 1
- ( 6) *The Struggle for...*op. cit., p. 48
- ( 7) *Concerning the Comité de solidarité avec les luttes ouvrières (CSLO). Against economism*, IN STRUGGLE!, September, 1975, p. 6
- ( 8) *The Struggle for ...op. cit.*, p. 2
- ( 9) *Ibid.*, p. 12
- (10) *Ibid.*, p. 13
- (11) *Ibid.*, p. 13
- (12) *Le Cercle Communiste (m.-l.) est dissous*, leaflet, February, 1977, our translation
- (13) *The Forge*, 6-1-78, p. 15
- (14) *The Forge*, 20-1-77, p. 10
- (15) *The Forge*, 6-5-76, p. 5
- (16) *Ibid.*, p. 5
- (17) *The Forge*, 3-6-76, p. 3, our emphasis, our translation from the French.
- (18) *The Forge*, 20-1-77, p. 10