

**CHAPTER II**  
**A fundamentally erroneous line**

Eager to cover up its openly militarist admonishments, the League continues to declare to all who'll listen that it has, and always has had, the "correct line"... This untiringly repeated pretension has even become a trademark for the League, since it's in such blatant opposition with this organization's systematic refusal to justify and demonstrate these claims. For example, it has never replied to the many criticisms addressed to it during the conferences which it was so careful to boycott. But today, after three years of intense ideological struggle against nationalist and economist positions in Canada and on a world scale, it is clear that the so-called "correct line" of the League is in reality **fundamentally** erroneous, and has been such right from the very beginning!

### One, two, three...

No sooner had it been formed than the League took up the task of revealing the "correct line" to the world, a correct line which the three founding groups had elaborated for eight months in the quiet comfort of their private meetings. Starting with the first regular issue of *The Forge*, there was a series of three articles on the international situation. The first, entitled **Superpower rivalry intensifies**, was almost entirely devoted to an analysis of the balance of political and military might between the two superpowers. The conclusion: "*the balance of forces (between the two superpowers — ed. note) now favours the Soviet Union*" which is "*the most dangerous power on a world scale*" (1). There follows a general exhortation: "*The countries and people of the world must join together in a united front to counter the attempts at hegemony by the superpowers*" (2).

In its second issue, *The Forge*, central organ of the CCL(M-L), reveals a second aspect of its analysis of the world situation: **The Third world: A great revolutionary force**. Here we learn that: "*The third world has thus become the main revolutionary force moving history forward*" (3) and that it is "*the vanguard in the anti-imperialist struggle on all fronts*" (4). And, to a certain extent, the League draws the general portrait of revolution in the so-called third world countries for us.

*"Basically these countries are all faced with the same task: to struggle for their liberation and development, for their independence and sovereignty. Above all they are moved by the necessity to struggle against the oppression which they have suffered for years on end, which still affects them greatly". (5)*

The candour of this statement is quite astonishing. And all this time we thought that the Leninist theory of **proletarian** revolution in the colonized countries consisted of taking up the revolutionary struggle against foreign imperialism, and defeating it as rapidly as possible, so as to go on to the stage of building socialism in the particular conditions of economic backwardness, under the leadership of the proletariat and its party. But what do you know but our "innovators" of Marxism and great discoverers of the "correct line", reveal that all the "third world" countries are today confronted with the **same** task, which has nothing to do with transforming the national revolution into socialist revolution, but has much to do with stopping the revolutionary process at its first stage, as if the definitive victory over foreign imperialist oppression could be accomplished outside of the struggle against the conditions for this imperialist penetration, that is, capitalism and the national bourgeoisie. Here is the pretext invoked for justifying repudiating proletarian revolution in the so-called "third world", composed for the most part of newly independent capitalist countries:

*"Today, the intense rivalry between the United States and the Soviet Union for world hegemony is the greatest obstacle to the development of the third world". (6)*

This means that, for the League, the struggle against the foreign enemy, reduced to the two superpowers, and sometimes just one superpower, is the priority. It is "above all". This means that there's absolutely no distinction between the revolutionary path of countries which suffer under colonialism, and the path of revolution in countries which have acquired their independence and where the bourgeoisie, while linking itself with one or the other of the foreign imperialist powers exercises bourgeois dictatorship for itself, often in its bloodiest and most fascist forms. Following the same logic, which eliminates differences between the varying social regimes and the classes in power in third world countries, The Forge adds:

*"The contradictions which oppose them (the third world countries — ed. note) to imperialism and social-imperialism lay the basis for their growing unity, which is far greater than the differences which could separate them". (7)*

But this means advocating an illusory consolidation of national in-

dependence in countries which are dominated by a bourgeoisie. It means advocating an alliance with the bourgeoisies in power on the pretext that the struggle against the superpowers is "above all". It also shows how the League's "correct line" is a revision of the Marxist-Leninist strategy of the transition from the national and democratic revolution to socialist revolution. But the second issue of The Forge contains other "revelations", for already we see the League applying its "three worlds theory" to the Canadian situation.

Obviously, The Forge cannot deny that Canada "actively participates in the economic division of the world" (8). However...

*"Canada sometimes defends positions which favour the third world... and prefers discussions rather than confrontations with these countries". (9)*

*"The example of the third (world) shows us the way to strengthen the world-wide united front against imperialism and hegemonism in particular. We must learn from these struggles to develop our own fight to safeguard the national independence of Canada, threatened by the two superpowers, especially U.S. imperialism". (10)*

As we can see, it seems that the "stage" of consolidating national independence doesn't only concern the third world. We too, we, the "Canadian people" should rise up in defence of the independence of **imperialist** Canada. And these new fighters for the "national independence of Canada" moan (again!) about the weakness of the Canadian army:

*"These jaloopies (the Voodoo planes which the Canadian State began replacing to the tune of billions of dollars shortly after the League's lamentations — ed. note) are so old — 20 years! — that only 44 are in flying condition. Some can be repaired, but others are hopeless cases: the parts needed to repair them don't exist anymore..." (11)*

And why this "lamentable" state of "our" Canadian army of "national defence"? Why, it's the fault of the superpowers of course!

*"Thanks to the Canadian bourgeoisie's capitulationist policy in national defence, the U.S. has the means to quickly gain military control over our country". (12)*

So it seems that our "poor" bourgeoisie is so "weak" and "miserable" that it must give in to a "capitulationist policy". Luckily for "our" nation and the independence of "our" imperialist Canada, the League proposes to the Canadian working class that it take up this

noble patriotic mission, which “our” “capitulationist” bourgeoisie has so unfortunately abandoned.

*“In the ‘inevitable’ conflicts to come between Canada and U.S. imperialism, it is only the Canadian people, led by the working class — and not Trudeau and the bourgeoisie — who can assume the role of the most consistent opponents of American domination and defenders of our national independence”.* (13)

And then we were treated to the third issue of The Forge, in January of 1976. Commenting on a new patriotic move by the Canadian bourgeoisie, the League firmly maintained that we mustn’t rely on the bourgeoisie, not because it’s imperialist, reactionary in everything it does and fundamentally belligerent, but because it is weak and capitulationist. Even if it’s more aggressive in the face of the USSR — a source of joy for the League — it is still too “soft” with regard to the USA; “our” bourgeoisie, less inclined towards patriotism than the League, refuses to give Canada a powerful and autonomous army!

*“A greater firmness towards the aggressiveness of the two superpowers is a good thing. But the problem is that, towards American imperialism, the Canadian bourgeoisie, on the military level, capitulates all down the line!”* (14)

Because, it eliminates the possibility of

*“an autonomous military defence which would be a positive gesture on the part of the ruling class!”* (15)

Finally, so that the theoretical basis of its “correct line” be understood, the League continues its “revelations” in an article devoted to “the three worlds”: **Second world: Unite together and ally with the third world against the superpowers.** Yes, The Forge tells us, it’s deplorable that the “second world” (Canada, Europe, Japan, etc.) still has “colonial and imperialist practices” which are “in decline although still existent” (16). Also, “the peoples of the world must struggle against all these forms of imperialism and colonialism”. (17)

In short, Lenin’s scientific statement that imperialist countries — all imperialist countries — are essentially reactionary by nature, must, it seems, be revised in order to “educate” the working class on the fact that it’s possible to attack the “nasty practices” and “bad forms” of imperialism — and you don’t even have to overthrow it to do so. No, it’s overthrow is no longer necessary since the third world is now capable of reasoning with the countries of the “second world”.

*“This kind of unequal economics is no longer tolerated by the*

*countries and people of the third world. The second world is being forced to treat the third world countries more and more as equals”.* (18)

Speaking of the “progressive moves” (19) of the imperialist countries of the “second world”, The Forge adds:

*“One can see the development of two new tendencies in the second world countries: allying the third world and uniting to oppose hegemonism. These two tendencies favour the development of the struggle of the peoples of the world. We must encourage these tendencies”.* (20)

In other words, even though the imperialist powers of the “second world” are taking advantage of the fact that the two superpowers, especially the USA, are falling out of favour around the world to accentuate their imperialist penetration of the less-developed countries by setting up new imperialist blocs like the European Common Market; and even though this does not prevent them from at the same time pursuing a policy of consolidating their alliance with one or the other of the superpowers, as shown by the continually increased participation in the aggressive blocs of NATO and the Warsaw Pact, all this should be encouraged! So now we have the real political content of that “big leap forward” and that “turning point” which were announced by the League with its self-proclamation: “To try and pass inter-imperialist rivalries off as opposition to imperialism and to try and pass off the essentially reactionary manoeuvres of imperialism for “progressive moves”!

*“To the extent that an alliance aims at decreasing or opposing superpower control, Marxist-Leninists should support these moves”.* (21)

That’s the theoretical foundation for the “correct line” which the League gave birth to, after avoiding the polemic struggle against revisionism in the new Canadian Marxist-Leninist movement. It is a line of alliance and class collaboration with “our own” imperialist bourgeoisie and world reactionary forces in order to safeguard the imperialist interests of Canada, threatened by more powerful imperialist powers. And the whole thing is presented as a struggle against foreign enemies who threaten, or will eventually threaten, “our” independence. So, holding high the banner of the revisionist Communist Party of Canada and of its caricaturized shadow, the CPC(M-L), the League has undertaken to place itself in the vanguard of revisionism and transform itself into the mouthpiece for social-chauvinism in Canada.

“A positive step: Canada and the third world: links tighten” announced the front page headlines of the fourth issue of *The Forge*. With this, the League wallowed, drowned in, vindication of the Canadian bourgeoisie and its alliance with Canadian imperialism, an integral link in the world reactionary chain. Despite certain pirouettes to try and exonerate itself, the League has never extricated itself from this swamp.

*“The recent trips by Prime Minister Trudeau and External Affairs Minister Alan MacEachen to Latin America and the Middle East mark a positive development in Canada’s foreign policy. The signing of agreements of cooperation with third world countries and declarations on the necessity to establish a ‘new world economic order’ were some of the good results”.* (22)

*“These new developments in the foreign relations of our country are positive. They are the result of a militant struggle by the third world... Canada’s revolutionary proletariat supports and encourages these initiatives. But it knows that the bourgeoisie does not follow through with asserting the country’s independence... Only the Canadian people, headed by the proletariat and its party, can be the resolute defenders of national independence”.* (23)

Some of the League’s militants, deceived by its demagoguery, are sure that their organization has never advocated an alliance with the Canadian bourgeoisie. After all, what more proof do you want than what you find in the last three lines of this series of articles where it is clearly stated that we must **also** struggle against the Canadian bourgeoisie because it exploits workers and isn’t “consistent”? The end of these articles **also** repeat that only the proletariat, and the party which the League wants to form, will be able to defend independence, which Trudeau is too “capitulationist” to defend in a consistent manner. Well, those who believe that to make an alliance with the bourgeoisie you have to go to Ottawa and sign a pact with Trudeau, are pretty naive! In point of fact, when the League asks the working class to encourage Canada’s **imperialist activities** — because when you’re talking about the Canadian monopoly bourgeoisie, its activities can’t be any other kind — and when it objects to the bourgeoisie’s policies for being weak on the very question of defending imperialist Canada’s independence, well it’s doing nothing else but allying with Canadian imperialism and trying to pin the proletariat to imperialism’s donkey-tail!

We could continue picking over each issue of *The Forge* one by one, for a long time. But it’s like a rosary, the verses end up reciting the same thing...

## The Statement of Agreement: a revisionist credo

This ominous “three worlds theory”, which the Chinese leader Teng Hsiao-ping presented to the United Nations in 1974, was taken up to varying degrees by a great number of groups in Canada, as well as on the world scale. For, after all, this “theory of the three worlds” was sanctioned by the great Communist Party of China which had won prestige in the principled struggle it had waged against Khrushchevite revisionism, and this prestige had swelled in the course of the Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution, which, by the way, had brought about the dismissal of Teng Hsiao-ping. The group IN STRUGGLE! itself echoed this reactionary theory to a certain extent.

In the public document which presented the conclusions of our first congress, we correctly stated that:

*“The current international situation is characterized by a sharpening of the four fundamental contradictions of the contemporary world:*

- 1) The contradiction between the dominated nations and peoples on the one hand, and imperialism and social-imperialism on the other.*
- 2) The contradiction between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie in the capitalist and revisionist countries.*
- 3) The contradiction between imperialism and social-imperialism, and between imperialist countries.*
- 4) The contradiction between the socialist countries on the one hand and the imperialist and social-imperialist countries on the other.*

*All of these contradictions are founded on the very existence of imperialism, the final stage of capitalism; the existence of a handful of rich countries dominating the great majority of poor and weaker countries; and the domination on a world scale by a small, parasitic and decadent class — the monopoly bourgeoisie — over the innumerable masses of workers and peasants.*

*It is therefore only by destroying the very foundations of imperialism and capitalism i.e. private ownership of the means of production and exchange, and the State of bourgeois dictatorship; which is supposedly democratic, that the proletariat and the working masses of the dominated nations and peoples will attain freedom. Only the socialist revolution of the proletariat and the masses of the people can fully secure this liberation”.* (24)

In this document we also presented some of Teng Hsiao-ping's positions with a warming which, in fact, constituted an initial line of demarcation between Marxism and revisionism, between IN STRUGGLE! and the organization which one year later was to be set up on the very basis of the revisionist line which we had begun to criticize:

*"Although the existence of three worlds or three principal parts defines the present world situation, the four contradictions mentioned above remain the moving force of contemporary history". (25)*

*"The analysis of our Chinese comrades seem to be the following: in the struggle for world hegemony, the key strategic question is whether or not the "second world" countries, that is the capitalist and imperialist powers of second importance, will side with the third world (which the Chinese comrades consider themselves to be part of) or with one or the other of the imperialisms (ed. note: superpowers). This explains China's attitude towards the capitalist countries of second importance. It is true that the world proletarian revolution must count on all factors which weaken the two superpowers, for the more we can limit their hegemonic drives, the more favourable are the conditions for revolution. For Marxist-Leninists of the capitalist and imperialist countries of the second world, this conception of strategy on the world level poses certain problems of which we must absolutely be aware". (26)*

What we then referred to as one of the "problems" is precisely the abandonment of the independent point of view of the proletariat in favour of bourgeois nationalism and "alignment" with the imperialist aims of one's own bourgeoisie.

*"The central problem for Marxist-Leninists of secondary capitalist and imperialist countries is not a matter of knowing whether or not the non-monopoly bourgeoisie (\*) of these countries will resist one or the other of the 'superpowers', but rather one of preparing the revolutionary forces in each country. Furthermore the revolutionary forces assemble and form themselves in struggle with the immediate enemy, the internal enemy, which is precisely the main social prop of imperialism in each country. (...) The "nationalism" of this bourgeoisie is reactionary nationalism. If we do not destroy the social base of*

*imperialism in each country (i.e. the fraction of the local bourgeoisie which props up imperialism) it is impossible to complete revolution". (27)*

Today we would add that in certain cases in dependent countries, it may still be possible to win over or neutralize certain bourgeois factions in the struggle against foreign imperialism, in the case of countries like Canada, where the national bourgeoisie is itself imperialist, there is absolutely no "positive" or progressive aspect in the bourgeoisie's desire to compete with other imperialist powers to win for itself a larger part of the booty of capitalist exploitation and plunder. So, while it echoed the "three worlds theory", IN STRUGGLE! had, from the very start, defended the independent point of view of the proletariat and of the uncompromising struggle against the Canadian bourgeoisie. Nevertheless, the compromise we made with the revisionist "three worlds theory" made it more difficult for us to denounce the fundamentally incorrect line the Communist League was formed around from the very start.

After loudly proclaiming in the first chapter of the Statement of Political Agreement that: *"At the present time, the principal danger for the international communist movement is modern revisionism"* (28), the League proceeds to engage in the "struggle" against modern revisionism by exposing the basis of its line, that is, the division of the world into three parts. In fact, the League presents us with what we could call a "generalized three worlds theory"! Indeed, the Statement of Political Agreement explains not only that the present world is divided into three parts but that this has, in a way, always been so!

*"After 1917, the world was made up of three types of countries — capitalist and imperialist countries, the colonial and dependent countries, and finally the USSR of Lenin and Stalin. After World War II, the development of the fundamental contradictions gave rise to a new division of the world into three parts, three worlds.*

*The war weakened certain imperialist powers and permitted the triumph of socialism in several countries of Europe and Asia, most notably, China. A powerful socialist camp, with the Soviet Union at its head was thus formed (as the second world). This camp faced the capitalist countries, headed by the U.S. (the first world). At the same time, the Third World emerged, formed by countries having achieved or struggling for national independence in Asia, Africa, and Latin America...*

*Great changes, however, came about towards the end of the 50's and especially, in the early 60's which led to a radical alteration of the division of the world...*

(\*) We should note that an important confusion slipped into the 1974 text, in which we spoke of "non-monopoly bourgeoisie" which made it totally incomprehensible.

*Thus, since the beginning of the 60's, the socialist camp ceased to exist... Today, we no longer speak of a socialist camp but of the existing socialist countries such as China and Albania...*

*Rivalry between the declining American giant and the other imperialist powers of the western world broke up the imperialist camp. U.S. imperialism began to decline...*

*Thus, there now exist three worlds which are interconnected and, at the same time, in contradiction to one another. The United States and the Soviet Union form the first world; the developing countries of Asia, Africa and Latin America and other regions make up the Third World, and the developed countries between the two make up the second world". (29)*

From the "three worlds theory" we have moved to the theory of three! For there is no common denominator between the League's historical pontifications and the real development of history presented to us by Marxism-Leninism. We can of course always divide the world into various groups of countries to emphasize the balance of power which exists at one time or another as a result of the constant inter-imperialist rivalries for the division and re-division of the world. However, this analysis of the **conjunctural** division of the **capitalist and imperialist** world, which, by the way, does not always turn out to make up "three" worlds as the League claims, is precisely, the analysis of the **capitalist** world. Although this conjunctural analysis may be very important, it has no significance if taken apart from the **fundamental** division of the world into the old capitalist, imperialist, and even feudal world, and the new socialist world, where the working class is the ruling class and is leading humanity to one of the greatest revolutions of its history, communism, which is the elimination of the division of society into social classes once and for all. This is the historical importance of the Great 1917 October Revolution. To minimize the historical importance of the October Revolution, like the League does, by presenting it as a mere redivision of the world, another fluctuation in the balance of power between capitalist and imperialist countries, is to reason like bourgeois historians or full-fledged political scientists of the bourgeoisie who see history as nothing more than a perpetual game of conquests between countries. To be silent on the surge forward of the camp of revolution and socialism, in the manner of the League, and to speak simply of the rivalries and divisions between countries, is to adopt a revisionist point of view on matters of strategy. It reflects an over-estimation of the enemy on the strategic level, which leads inevitably to the conclusion that revolution is nothing but a long term guide and not a problem ripe for solution right away.

No, gentlemen! The October Revolution represented more than a sudden turn in the constantly changing division of the capitalist and imperialist world. It still represents more today. It was the birth of a **new world**, the world of socialism, the world of the revolutionary proletariat. In Russia in 1917, the proletariat was victorious. It destroyed the old State and established a new type of State, the dictatorship of the proletariat, a transitional step towards the disappearance of the State as the instrument of domination of one class over another. This was the beginning of the new socialist world and the beginning of the end for the old bourgeois world. Henceforth, the world proletariat, and the peoples of the world oppressed by imperialism and feudalism would support this new world, this new social system.

Far from altering this fundamental division of the world into two irreversibly opposed camps — the camp of socialism, the proletariat and the oppressed peoples on one side, and the camp of imperialism and reaction on the other — the events which have taken place, from then until now, have simply confirmed the fact that imperialism has entered a generalized crisis, and that its grave-digger, the world proletariat, leading the peoples of the world in struggle against imperialism, has begun its victorious march towards socialism and communism. The imperialist powers went to war in the vain hope of resolving the contradictions which they were facing; they strengthened their great repressive forces, but they were completely unable to hold back the forward march of the proletarian revolution. So, the proletariat of many European countries, including small Albania, took advantage of the war to overthrow their own bourgeoisie, and swung over into the camp of the socialist countries. Peoples in struggle against imperialism and feudalism, led by a Communist Party, were also victorious over the reactionary forces, and they took up, in the situation of victory of proletarian power, the long, difficult and arduous struggle to destroy the very roots of the old bourgeois society. For the first time, the peoples of the world colonized by imperialism, took the path of liberation and of the direct passage to socialism without going through a stage of consolidation of capitalism and of oppressive bourgeois power.

But the road from capitalism to communism is cluttered with obstacles. The ousted bourgeoisie and the new bourgeois elements which develop among the remnants of the old society, ceaselessly attempt to regain power and to turn the wheel of history backwards. Thus in the Soviet Union and in other previously socialist countries, the bourgeois line defeated the proletarian line within the very Communist Parties whose historical mission is to lead the masses in the struggle to put an end to the bourgeoisie. It was not the first time that so-called com-

munists betrayed communism, and revised Marxism-Leninism. Nor was this a chance occurrence, or the result of plots or coups d'Etat. For, while the cause of socialism has millions of devoted fighters, among this number there are some who adhere to Marxist theory only superficially, and who move from hesitation to compromise and finally advocate open collaboration with imperialism and reactionary forces by "revising" Marxism-Leninism. This did not only happen in the Soviet Union when Khrushchev came to power. It happened in many other countries. In Canada, the Communist Party, supported the "positive action" of the Liberal government of Mackenzie King, before and at the beginning of the Second World War, then abandoned the path of proletarian revolution once and for all, and advocated the reform of capitalism, so as to "liberate" imperialist Canada from the monopolies which were to the hegemonic aims of U.S. imperialism. However, the betrayal of the Communist Parties and the passage of the USSR and of a certain number of socialist countries into the camp of imperialism did not do away with the camp of socialism, as the League claims. For though the capitalist world became temporarily stronger, the fundamental division between the camp of imperialism and reactionary forces, and the camp of socialism and revolution still exists, as each new day confirms. Today, there are people trying to have us buy the line that to struggle against imperialism and reactionary forces, we must rely on imperialism. These reactionary forces are revisionists. Like the Communist Party of the forties, these people are agents of the bourgeoisie who have infiltrated the ranks of the communist movement. So today like yesterday, and perhaps even more than yesterday, we must follow Lenin's almost prophetic maxim that the struggle against imperialism is nothing but empty words if we did not at the same time fight against the opportunism which corrupts the working class movement and undermines its struggle against imperialism.

### **A line of collaboration with imperialism**

After completing the history of the twentieth century, on the tune of the "theory of three", the Statement of Agreement of the League draws the following conclusions:

*"The balance of power between the two (Ed. note: superpowers) is evolving in favour of the Soviet Union. (...) In short, social-imperialism is on the offensive. (...) Strategically, the US has been put on the defensive. (...) In the last few years, the Soviet Union has more or less gained the upper hand over the NATO forces. (...) The peoples of all Third World countries from the*

*large and populous to the small and weak ones... have become steeled in struggle and determined to overthrow imperialism and the remnants of colonialism."* (30)

While the two superpowers try to outdo each other in aggressiveness, cunning, and conspiracies; while they ceaselessly attempt to win various capitalist countries to their influence; and while they constantly work to corrupt the bourgeois political regimes of the so-called "third world", without mentioning the innumerable military and fascist regimes which are put in place by imperialism, especially U.S. imperialism — the League seems to find nothing better to do than to speculate on the respective military strengths of the two superpowers and the supposed "weakening" of U.S. imperialism! The League finds nothing better to do than to have people believe, in spite of all concrete analysis, that all the regimes of the so-called "third world" are authentic anti-imperialist and anti-colonial forces!

Of course the League adds the word "people" beside the word "country" but this should not fool anybody for it is clear that the League is not talking of the revolutionary struggle of the people of the world but rather of the "new international economic order", "new organizations of resource-producing countries", the tightening of "control over transnational companies", "economic co-operation between the developing countries" and "numerous conferences of Third World countries". (31) The League has leapt head first into an apology for the countries of the third world and the bourgeoisies which hold State power in these countries, rather than examining the concrete reality hidden behind these proclamations, rather than recognizing that these reformist actions can, at best, if they are not undermined from within by countries in the hip pocket of imperialist powers, only limit the voraciousness of the imperialist powers without ever attacking the existence of imperialism. For, as the Chinese and other revolutions have proven, only proletarian revolution can put an end to imperialism. But the League prefers to replace the revolutionary struggle of the peoples of the world led by the proletariat, with reformism, class collaboration, and the sacred union of the proletariat and of the bourgeoisie in a supposed struggle against the "residual forces of colonialism". The League fully adopts the revisionist theory of the peaceful transition to socialism and of "the non-capitalist path of development" on this question. It upholds that proletarian revolution is no longer necessary to free the peoples of the world from imperialist domination or, rather, to keep up appearances, it upholds that proletarian revolution itself depends on collaboration with imperialism! For the "great tacticians" of the League, what matters most of all is the unity of all third world



countries, whether or not they are on the imperialist payroll, and, of course, the unity of the “third world” and of the “second world” against the two superpowers, and especially the Soviet Union.

*“By opposing hegemonism, by uniting together, and by joining with the Third World, the second world countries are contributing, again to varying degrees, to the isolation of the two superpowers, and thus to their ultimate defeat and to the overthrow of the world imperialist system.” (32)*

Good Lord! Let us hope that the bourgeoisie has not yet read, will never read, this document of the League: if it discovered that with the “three worlds theory” it in fact took part in its own overthrow and in the overthrow of the world imperialist system, it might begin oppressing the “third world” instead of “collaborating” with it! You see, imperialist powers form political and economic cartels, like the European Common Market — which the League applauds. But while the member countries of the Common Market agree on this alliance, they remain deeply involved in the aggressive NATO pact, dominated by U.S. imperialism. At the same time, they are trying to take advantage of their newly acquired prestige to spread their neo-colonial tentacles into their former colonies, on the pretext, of course, of aid and mutual benefits between... the wolf and the sheep. This is apparently what is going to contribute to *“the overthrow of the world imperialist system”!* Unfortunately, these revisionist mystifications have resulted in years of oppression and the loss of many thousands of lives in all the countries where the agents of the bourgeoisie have succeeded in infiltrating the ranks of the communist movement.

Some may wonder what Canada’s role is in this ominous scenario.

*“Canada, as a second world country, has so far played an ambiguous, back-seat role. On the one hand, Canada opposed the plunder perpetrated by the superpowers (limitation of oil and natural gas exports to the US, struggle for the 200 nautical mile-limit, temporary closing of the Atlantic ports to the Soviet fishing fleet), seeks to co-operate with the Third World and is trying to develop relations with the European Economic Community. On the other hand, Canada is hesitant to speak in support of the Third World at international conferences and at the UN and is trying to increase its exploitation of the Third World. Moreover, Canada doesn’t really have an autonomous defense system, but is linked militarily to the United States by the NATO and NORAD Treaties.” (33)*

The attentive reader will probably remember the League’s solemn

declarations (see Chapter 1) to the effect that the strengthening of the Canadian army is in total contradiction with the League’s general line. Really, the League has problems! For, though it does not seem to see any contradiction between supporting the “progressive” actions of the reactionary Canadian bourgeoisie and seeing the struggle against this bourgeoisie as its principal task, it does seem to see a big contradiction between deploring the absence “of an autonomous military defense system” and rejoicing when “our” bourgeoisie responds to the League’s call and decides to strengthen “our” national defence. Once again, the League will probably say that we are not very good at understanding subtleties, and we must, indeed, admit that we do not quite understand these subtleties!

Finally, we are supposed to lament the fact that “we” Canadians do not have a bourgeoisie which is as “firm” and “autonomous” as that of our European counterparts. For it seems that the main problem with “our” bourgeoisie is that it is “hesitant”, and that it prefers to try *“to increase its exploitation of the Third World”* instead of seeking *“to co-operate with the Third World”*. Although we cannot benefit from a truly *“autonomous defense system”*, we should feel comforted by the thought that Canada has no qualms about limiting the export of oil and gas to the U.S. and firmly closing down Atlantic harbours to Soviet ships on a temporary basis. It would be almost ridiculous to answer such nonsensical reasoning. Does the Canadian bourgeoisie “hesitate” to exploit the peoples of the third world as much as it can? Does it “hesitate” to ally with a superpower and all other imperialists to exploit the proletariat and plunder the peoples of the world? Would Trudeau hesitate to phone his big friend Carter to remind him that Canada is fully prepared to stand right behind yankee imperialism, as long, of course, as Canada doesn’t lose its position as an imperialist bandit in the process... In spite of the League’s scolding of the Canadian bourgeoisie for its “capitulationist” line, we must recognize that this line has not served “our” bourgeoisie too badly. We should say “thank you” since “our” country has succeeded, in spite of a small population and great transportation problems, in winning a “respectable” place for itself in world imperialist rivalries. Even though the NDP, the CPC, and the League do not always agree with the strategy of the dominant monopoly faction of the Canadian bourgeoisie, it is crystal clear that when it comes to defending its interests as an imperialist bandit, the Canadian bourgeoisie does not hesitate at all! Is our “poor” bourgeoisie “cowardly”, treacherous, and “not aggressive enough” with the superpowers? It would be more accurate to say that it is more “enlightened” than the League and that since the military defeat of the patriot’s rebellion in 1837 (\*), it has learned to use the less glorious

“art” of compromise and reform. But this did not prevent it from forgetting all “hesitations” and lack of aggressiveness to call on “our” military defence system, as unautonomous as it may be, to bloodily repress the revolt of the people. It is true, ladies and gentlemen of the League, that when it comes to pointing out the (utterly reactionary) Canadian bourgeoisie’s “positive actions” you have a very selective memory as to what really happened in history. But don’t worry, ladies and gentlemen, we will take care of refreshing your memory for you!

### **A principal contradiction which is not very principal...**

Revisionism would not be revisionism if, at the same time that it advocated collaboration with imperialism, it didn’t also keep up the facade of calling for the overthrow of imperialism. The revisionists wave the red flag to better trample it underfoot. Such a “two-faced line” is typical of the League. When IN STRUGGLE!’s criticisms became more pressing, it quickly tacked a few high-sounding declarations against Canadian imperialism on the list of “positive actions” of the Canadian bourgeoisie. At the center of this charade, is the statement, repeated over and over, that the League’s correct line is the result of the clear identification of the principal contradiction in Canada as between the Canadian bourgeoisie and the Canadian proletariat. Furthermore, this statement was the main theme of the denunciation of IN STRUGGLE!’s “right opportunism”. In the 1974 document, IN STRUGGLE! had stated:

*“Therefore the principal contradiction in Canada, including Quebec, is between the Canadian proletariat, on the one hand, and the Canadian bourgeoisie and American imperialism, on the other hand.”(34)*

However, the same document added that:

*“Canada is not a colony of the United States, any more than Quebec is a colony of Canada (...) the exercise of political power falls directly here to the Canadian bourgeoisie. It is therefore the latter that the proletariat will have to attack first in its struggle for political power, and this will remain true as long as the Canadian bourgeoisie retains state power.” (35)*

As can be seen, IN STRUGGLE!’s position on the path of revolution

---

(\*) After the Patriots’ Rebellion of 1837 in Upper and Lower Canada, the Canadian bourgeoisie laid down its arms and engaged in a long reformist process for the negotiation of its political independence from British imperialism.

in Canada clearly demarcated from the line “Canada — a colony of the U.S.”, upheld by the CPC(M-L) of Hardial Bains, among others. Nevertheless, the mention of U.S. imperialism in the formulation of the main contradiction in Canada reflected vestiges of nationalism, for it confused and lumped together the internal enemy and the external enemy of Canadian revolution. So, the League’s criticism may seem entirely justified. However, as we will show later, the point of view behind the League’s criticism was basically erroneous and deeply marked by bourgeois nationalism.

Meanwhile, IN STRUGGLE!, working to deepen the break with the vestiges of bourgeois nationalism, rectified this erroneous formulation of the main contradiction in Canada at its Second Congress held in 1976. We then stated that the main contradiction in Canada was between the Canadian proletariat and the Canadian bourgeoisie. The Canadian bourgeoisie holds State power and it is the main enemy of socialist revolution in Canada.

But socialist revolution will have to face not only the internal enemy — the Canadian bourgeoisie led by the monopoly faction — but also world imperialism and reaction, the sworn enemies of socialism. More specifically, since U.S. imperialism participates massively in the exploitation of the Canadian working class, and has vital economic, political, and military interests in Canada, and since the Canadian bourgeoisie would not hesitate to call on it to hold back the rise of revolution in Canada, U.S., imperialism must be seen as the second most important enemy of the socialist revolution in Canada.

As well, the orientation laid down at our Second Congress also upheld that the Canadian proletariat, leading the oppressed masses of our country and relying on the indefectible support of the world proletariat and the revolutionary struggle of the peoples and nations oppressed by imperialism, will also have to face the rest of the camp of imperialism and reaction, in particular the other superpower, the USSR. This superpower tries to use its socialist facade to come in the back door every time yankee imperialism is chased out the front door. In those countries where the USSR already plays a predominant role, Jimmy Carter, the great Don Quixote of “Human rights” tries to smash down the side door. In brief, our analysis was based on Marxism-Leninism and the irreconcilable opposition between the camp of socialism and revolution, and the camp of imperialism and reaction.

Yet, strangely enough, the print of the communiqué from our Second Congress was not even dry before the League began criticizing IN STRUGGLE!’s position!

*“IS (Ed. note: IN STRUGGLE!) changes the ‘formulation’ of*

*the principal contradiction in a purely mechanical fashion, maintains the same incorrect position and in guise of an explanation of the change-over, it presents us with nothing but a caricature of a self-criticism.” (36)*

No, ladies and gentlemen of the League, we have not changed our analysis. What we have done, however, is deepen the proletarian point of view in the uncompromising struggle against capitalism, imperialism, and all reactionary forces, thus rectifying a position which did not correspond to this point of view. This is precisely why the League was so taken aback. For the League, the formulation of the principal contradiction had been nothing but a Trojan horse to hide a basically bourgeois nationalist analysis. Let us just take a look at the Statement of Agreement:

*“The bourgeoisie is in antagonistic contradiction to the proletariat. This contradiction can only be resolved through socialist revolution and the setting up of a state of the dictatorship of the proletariat.” (37)*

This is a truth with which it is impossible to disagree. But we must look at the rest of the reasoning to see what is behind the League’s “dialectics”.

*“When foreign imperialism oppresses a country, it enters into an antagonistic contradiction not only with the proletariat, but also with all classes, strata and social groups of people (except for a handful of agents and traitors to the nation). (...) US imperialism, as a foreign superpower is opposed to the entire Canadian people which is composed of other social classes and strata besides the proletariat. (...) To counter the threat and control of the two superpowers in Canada, we have to get the whole Canadian people to oppose the foreign enemies. It is in the interests of the whole people, except for a handful of agents and traitors, to fight against the two superpowers; (...) The contradiction between the Canadian people and the two superpowers, particularly American imperialism... is of an antagonistic nature and must be resolved through the struggle of the people to preserve and reinforce Canada’s national independence in the economic, political, military, and ideological-cultural spheres.” (38)*

Finally, the League is careful to add:

*“This struggle against the political hegemony of the two superpowers... is an integral part of the proletarian revolution in Canada.” (39)*

The League has always claimed to be a great professor of dialectics. We have to specify however that what they are speaking of is idealist dialectics, and not materialist and Marxist dialectics. For what is the point of speaking of the principal contradiction, if not to identify the type of revolution we have to wage and thus determine, on the basis of a class analysis and an analysis of the various social contradictions, which forces are liable to be in the camp of the people and of revolution, and which ones will line up in the camp of imperialism and reaction? To state that in Canada, an independent imperialist country, the principal contradiction is between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie, is to state very precisely that the bourgeoisie is not in the camp of the people, for it is imperialist and 100% reactionary.

But instead of analysing reality from a materialist, class viewpoint, the “dialecticians” of the League examine contradictions as things in and of themselves, which exist in an abstract and ideal world. Their abstract and eclectic analysis takes the place of class analysis. So, after “settling” the question of the principal contradiction, after stating to the gallery that it opposed the main enemy, the Canadian bourgeoisie, the League then goes on to state that the bourgeoisie, “with the exception of a handful of agents and traitors”, is part of the camp of the people! For you see, **when it is necessary to oppose external enemies, enemies identified as secondary, the bourgeoisie then becomes an ally.** For, you see, when it comes to solving the contradiction between the “people” — which includes the bourgeoisie, except for a few traitors — and the superpowers, there is no question of course of socialist revolution. Rather, it then becomes a “struggle” hand-in-hand with the bourgeoisie “to preserve and reinforce the national independence of Canada”, imperialist Canada, in all domains, including the military! It is this “struggle”, this collaboration with the Canadian imperialist bourgeoisie which is “an integral part of the proletarian revolution in Canada” (40)! This is the position of the supposedly Communist League on the “principal contradiction”... We will have a better understanding of the League’s so-called principal contradiction if we look at how it defines the “most important secondary contradiction”.

*“The contradiction between the Canadian people and the two superpowers, in particular American imperialism is the most important secondary contradiction because it is the most likely to bring about a change in the principal contradiction. This change can occur in certain particular conditions: for example, a military invasion by one or even both of the two superpowers could occur during a world war, or when the superpowers see their interests*

*threatened by the possibility of the overthrow of the Canadian bourgeoisie by the proletariat.”(41)*

Moving around contradictions, like a card player moves around his winning cards, the League has already predicted a situation in which the principal contradiction has changed and the League can finally wage the national liberation struggle of imperialist Canada openly. Let there be one gunshot against our “imperialist homeland”, let there be one Soviet tank on Canadian soil (we will not mention U.S. tanks because they are already present on Canadian territory through NORAD and NATO) and the League will throw the struggle against the bourgeoisie overboard. Furthermore, the League not only promises to burn down the flag of revolution in collaboration with the Canadian bourgeoisie, but it goes on to add that if the proletariat takes up the revolutionary struggle to overthrow the Canadian bourgeoisie, and if one or the other of the superpowers came to the rescue of the Canadian bourgeoisie in distress, then once again, we would have to forget about socialist revolution and the dictatorship of the proletariat for a time, so as to enlist in the struggle for the defence of our “homeland”.

Add to this the fact that the League considers that,

*“The rivalry between the United States and the Soviet Union will inevitably lead to a world war.”*

For,

*“It’s clear that in the short term, revolution cannot break out in either of the first world countries, and especially not in the Soviet Union. It cannot prevent the start of a third world war.(...) War is inevitable in the sense that revolution cannot prevent it from breaking out.” (42)*

Furthermore,

*“Even if Europe were to be the principal theatre of a possible war between the two superpowers, Canada would not be spared. Moreover, Canada has practically no autonomous military defence capacity.” (43)*

If we add all this up, it becomes clear that the League’s principal contradiction is not principal at all since a world war will inevitably break out, since Canada will inevitably be a victim of it, since the so-called secondary contradiction will inevitably be principal, and the Canadian proletariat will inevitably have to trade off socialist revolution and the uncompromising struggle against the Canadian bourgeoisie, to wage the national liberation struggle, side by side with its “own” bourgeoisie, instead. For even today,

*“Our task is to develop a united front of the Canadian people for the defence of the national independence of the country against the two superpowers.” (44)*

In other words, for the League, the statement that: *“the principal contradiction (is) between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie;” (45)* is a monumental hoax, an enormous fraud! Furthermore, as we will see in another chapter, the supposed principal struggle against the Canadian bourgeoisie boils down, in fact, to the struggle against employers in strictly economic struggle. To give itself a radical appearance, the League has taken to calling these struggles “class against class”, while it works to sabotage the political fightback of the working class and acts as the loud-speaker for the bourgeois reformist and nationalist line.

Once it has been established that the League’s strategic line is the struggle against the two superpowers as the pre-condition for an eventual struggle to overthrow the Canadian bourgeoisie it is easier to understand the logic which has led the League to mistake the Canadian bourgeoisie for Chang Kai-chek’s Kuomintang. The only difference here is that the struggle would not be directed against imperialism, but only against two, or even one, particular imperialist State. And that it wouldn’t be a struggle to regain lost independence, but rather to protect the country from any threats to its independence.

*“Soviet-American rivalry, extending to the four corners of the Globe, represents a very serious threat for the national independence of Canada (\*).”*

*The fact that Canada is a second world country subject to the interference of the two superpowers, especially the US is reflected in the two tendencies within the bourgeoisie. One tendency wants to assert the country’s economic and political independence while the other is willing to bow (even capitulate) to US imperialism. Particularly because of the international situation, the first tendency tends to be asserting itself more and more. But this does not rule out the possibility that in war-time the whole Canadian monopoly bourgeoisie will capitulate to the US.*

*The struggle between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie will greatly influence the attitude of the latter in the case of another world war (\*). Left on its own, the Canadian bourgeoisie will probably side with US imperialism in a new world war.” (46)*

In short, the League seems to have discovered a new type of national

---

(\*) Translator’s note: The two sentences followed by asteriks were translated from the French version by IN STRUGGLE! Neither sentence appears in the League’s English version.

liberation struggle: the struggle of imperialist and independent capitalist countries against the superpowers. The “*struggle for national independence*”, the “*struggle for economic independence*” of imperialist powers which aspire to become superpowers is, of course, “... *an integral part of the proletarian revolution*” (47). So, in the stage of the preparation of the proletarian revolution, the Canadian monopoly bourgeoisie must be seen as an ally — an inconsistent one, yes, but an ally nevertheless. The League acts as if there was the same split within the Canadian monopolist, imperialist bourgeoisie as might exist in the bourgeoisie of a colonized country, where there is both a compradore bourgeoisie and a national bourgeoisie. According to the League’s reasoning, there are on one side, the “patriots”, who stand up for the independence of the country. They make up the most important faction. On the other side, there are the traitors, who are working to submit the country to foreign influence and even to capitulate to it. So, in order to encourage the “progressive” tendency within the Canadian monopoly bourgeoisie, the proletariat should take up the bourgeoisie’s struggle to strengthen the independence of imperialist Canada and its “positive” international policies. It should intensify its struggle against the capitulationist policies of the bourgeoisie, and encourage a more aggressive policy against the two superpowers, and especially the more dangerous one, the USSR. The League feels it is its duty to fight with the bourgeoisie over the leadership of the united front, or rather to put pressure on the bourgeoisie so that it will not when “*left on its own... side with US imperialism*”. Since the League struggles for socialism in the long term, it feels that it is in a position to advise the Canadian bourgeoisie on questions of national independence, and consequently, it points out to the bourgeoisie which of its imperialist policies best protect the independence of our country. For example, it criticizes the Auto Pact and other measures which attempt to have the Canadian people bear the brunt of the U.S. crisis, thus taking a position for one faction of the bourgeoisie against another. The League also criticizes plans for free trade with the USA, put forward by one monopoly faction of the bourgeoisie. According to the League, free trade would be a blow to the balance of Canadian economy. Denouncing those “leftists” who refuse to unite all who can be united, the “new communist party” of the League, speaking in the name of the proletariat and using the “three worlds theory”, applies the same line to all regimes of the world, including Mobutu in Zaire, Shah Pahlavi in Iran, and Tito in Yugoslavia, while firmly denouncing such an “ungrateful” country as Albania. So once we have peeled off the solemn declarations to the effect that it **also** struggles for socialism, we are finally left with the true line of the League exposed.

- 
- ( 1) *The Forge*, December, 1975, p. 9
  - ( 2) *Ibid.*
  - ( 3) *The Forge*, January 1976, p. 11
  - ( 4) *Ibid.*
  - ( 5) *Ibid.*
  - ( 6) *Ibid.*
  - ( 7) *Ibid.*
  - ( 8) *Ibid.*
  - ( 9) *Ibid.*
  - (10) *Ibid.*
  - (11) *The Forge*, January, 1976, p. 8, “*The superpowers prey on Canada*”
  - (12) *Ibid.*, p. 8
  - (13) *The Forge*, January, 1976, p. 8, “*US-Canada relations, The contradictions sharpen*”
  - (14) *The Forge*, January 29, 1976, p. 6
  - (15) *Ibid.*, p. 6
  - (16) *The Forge*, January 29, 1976, p. 9 (our emphasis) **Translator’s note: this is our translation from the French. The English version contains a subtitle “Second World: colonial and imperialist practices.” As far as the “indecline” goes, a sentence under the subtitle in question speaks of “some of the second world countries today still maintain colonies... although this is a declining phenomenon.”**
  - (17) *Ibid.*, p. 9
  - (18) *Ibid.*, p. 9
  - (19) *Ibid.*, p. 9
  - (20) *Ibid.*, p. 9, **Translator’s note: Again, this is our translation from the French, as the entire quote is missing in English.**
  - (21) *Ibid.*, p. 9
  - (22) *The Forge*, February 12, 1976, p. 1 (emphasis *The Forge*)
  - (23) *Ibid.*, p. 9
  - (24) **Create the Marxist-Leninist Organization of Struggle for the Party, (originally published in French in EN LUTTE!, Dec. 12, 1974, p. 6 of supplement), translated and reprinted by Western Voice, Nov. 76, p. 37**
  - (25) *Ibid.*, p. 37
  - (26) *Ibid.*, p. 37
  - (27) *Ibid.*, p. 38
  - (28) **Statement of Political Agreement for the Creation of the Canadian Communist League (Marxist-Leninist), p. 12**
  - (29) *Ibid.*, p. 16-17
  - (30) *Ibid.*, p. 18, 19, 20
  - (31) *Ibid.*, p. 20-21
  - (32), *Ibid.*, p. 22
  - (33) *Ibid.*, p. 22
  - (34) **Create the Marxist-Leninist Organization of Struggle for the Party, in Western Voice, Nov. 76, p. 40**
  - (35) *Ibid.*, p. 41
  - (36) *October*, Volume 1977, p. 25
  - (37) **Statement of Political Agreement, p. 53**
  - (38) *Ibid.*, p. 52, 53, 54
  - (39) *Ibid.*, p. 54
  - (40) *Ibid.*, p. 54
  - (41) *Ibid.*, p. 43
  - (42) *The Forge*, Vol. 1, No. 18, Sept. 23, 1976, p. 8
  - (43) **Statement of Political Agreement, op. cit., p. 44**
  - (44) *Ibid.*, p. 48
  - (45) *Ibid.*, p. 27
  - (46) *Ibid.*, p. 47. (our emphasis)
  - (47) *Ibid.*, p. 47