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

**Reference material published at the request made by Party activists in Montreal at the Rally organized by the Party to usher in the Year of Stalin**

*PCDN is continuing the reference material published at the request made by Party activists in Montreal. For previous portions, see Vol. 9 Nos. 12, 15, 16, 17 and 18, dated January 13, 17, 18, 19 and 20, 1979.*

The self-appointed opportunists took up the mission to oppose the resistance struggle from within the ranks of the strike itself. They became the experts in building the "united front", that is collaborating with the revisionist-social-democratic labour aristocracy to keep the strike "responsible" and "law abiding". When this rightist stand could not be sustained some elements posturing as revolutionaries took up verbally the slogan, "On Strike, Shut It Down!", the call of active resistance which came from the ranks of the strikers themselves. CPC(M-L) issued a leaflet on November 14, 1973 entitled: "On Strike, Shut It Down".

The leaflet reads: "Call of the Metro Toronto Committee of the Communist Party of Canada (Marxist-Leninist) to strikers, trade unionists, students and democratic people to demonstrate at the Artistic plant on Wednesday, November 14, 1973.

"On Monday, November 12, the united force of strikers, trade unionists, students and democratic people waged a spirited struggle against the police and scabs on the Artistic picket line. This united force and the militancy of the struggle to defend the picket line must be brought to a higher level. The Metro Toronto Committee of the **Communist Party of Canada (Marxist-Leninist)** fully supports the slogan of the strikers and their supporters, **On Strike, Shut It Down!**

"Workers have every right to organize themselves. Workers have every right to strike. The **Communist Party of Canada (Marxist-Leninist)** holds that these are the basic democratic rights of the workers. At no time must we give up this basic right. The capitalists have no right to take away this right by the force of their capitalist state machine. The workers have every right to resist the attempts by the capitalists to smash the basic rights of the workers to organize themselves and to strike. Without the right to strike, the workers have nothing.

"The struggle of the Artistic workers is the struggle of the entire Canadian working class. The cause of the Artistic strikers must be taken up as the cause of all the workers, especially in Toronto, and the students and democratic people must fully support this struggle of the workers.

"We must aim for a **victory** in the Artistic strike. The only way to achieve any victory in this strike is to shut the plant down. The only method to shut the plant down is to **stop the scabs. By fighting hard and not fearing any sacrifice** for the just cause of the basic right of the workers to strike, the **Artistic plant can be shut down!** By maintaining and developing the unity of the workers and their supporters and closing our ranks against the capitalists, the attempt of the Artistic capitalists to take away the right of workers to strike will be smashed.

**LONG LIVE THE FIGHTING SPIRIT OF THE ARTISTIC STRIKERS AND THEIR SUPPORTERS!**

**ON STRIKE, SHUT IT DOWN!"**

In addition to mobilizing support for the strike with its propaganda and links with the revolutionaries, CPC(M-L) members and supporters were the most staunch in revolutionary actions, in deeds, to put this line into effect. It was CPC(M-L) supporters who broke through the police lines and threw themselves at the scabs and their cars. It was CPC(M-L) members and supporters who set an example, a model for the fighting workers in how to deal with the judges and laws of the bourgeoisie used to smash and impoverish the proletarians.

What was the response of the opportunists who are posing, like Dave Patterson, as "genuine Marxist-Leninists", etc., these days? This opportunist was posing as a "trade union leader" and was the main element to divert the Strike Support Committee from the Leninist tactics advanced by CPC(M-L) against the police and scabs. Through his left-sounding demagogy and sophistry he was able to accomplish what the social-democratic and revisionist labour aristocrats were unable to accomplish, namely to liquidate the resistance struggles of the striking Artistic workers and divert them from Leninist tactics to capitulationism and legalism. Just two years later this same "trade unionist" adopted the posture of being a "genuine Marxist-Leninist" and wrote an hysterical attack in the magazine, *Canadian Revolution* against CPC(M-L) calling on the state to "banish it" and "reduce it to ashes". Since then this die-hard anti-communist has become a supporter of In Struggle!.

This is no surprise because In Struggle! followed the path of development in opposition to Leninism identical to Patterson. In 1972, Gagnon issued his call for "ideological struggle" to divert the revolutionaries from building the Leninist Party. When there was an upsurge in the workers' strike movement they helped establish together with other opportunists an organization called Comité de Solidarité avec les Luttes ouvrières for the explicit purpose of diverting the workers *away* from Leninism, away from building the Leninist Party and its mass organizations directed by Leninist tactics to advance the proletarian class struggle on the economic front.

In practical terms this meant diverting the workers away from the politics of CPC(M-L) which they did in the name of "solidarity" with the workers' strikes just as Dave Patterson did in the Artistic strike, with exactly the same results. Then in 1975, after the Party advanced Leninist solutions to the anarcho-syndicalist confusion-mongering and liquidationism promoted by the opportunists in the workers' movement. In Struggle! did an about-face and denounced their participation in CSLO as "opportunist". But their self-criticism was only to the effect that they had not succeded in liquidating the influence of CPC(M-L) amongst the workers. Therefore to continue their anti-Leninist diversions they beat their breast, like Dave Patterson did, published a string of lies and abuse against CPC(M-L) in their press in the summer of 1975, proclaimed themselves "genuine Marxist-Leninists" and promoted the Chinese revisionist "three world theory". Then from this posture they attacked the resistance struggles of the workers and students from yet another angle. This time they denounced their mass struggles against the big bourgeoisie and its state as being "economist". In this manner they bent their efforts to liquidate the Leninist political line and organizational forms advanced by CPC(M-L) to divert the upsurge of the students and workers away from the influence of the social democrats and revisionists towards the Leninist revolutionary line of class struggle and building the Party and its organizations in the course of that struggle. Thus, whether In Struggle! attacked Leninist organization and politics from the posture of being a "solidarity" committee trailing behind the spontaneous workers' movement and diverting it away from CPC(M-L), or whether it adopted the posture of being "genuine Marxist-Leninist" and tried to liquidate the upsurge of the mass movement in order to liquidate the influence of CPC(M-L) in it, their mission remains the same: oppose Leninist forms of organization and Leninist politics.

No matter how much they wriggle and squirm at every juncture of the class struggle their features as petty bourgeois liquidationists and die-hard anti-Leninists are as clear as day. In the late 1960s they appear in the guise of New Leftists preaching the U.S. imperialist theory that "ideology is dead", and promoting anarchist-terrorist politics in the student movement. When they were defeated by the Internationalists who gave the call for the revolutionary students to take up the ideological-political line of Marxism-Leninism and build the political Party of the proletariat in opposition to revisionism and opportunism, the New Leftists changed their posture. The took up the line of "implantation" into the working class movement and became trade union reformists. Gagnon, himself a former FLQ terrorist, became a reformist official in the trade union centre in Quebec founded by the Jesuits. From this posture these anti-Leninists promoted the line that now is not the time to build the Party, and they organized their so-called "pre-Party collectives" in order to promote their trade union reformist politics against CPC(M-L). Once again they were defeated by the Leninist organizational and political principles advanced for the workers' movement by CPC(M-L) and these opportunists were faced with political bankruptcy. They were rescued from their fate temporarily by the efforts of the Chinese social-imperialists who desperately needed propagandists to attack Leninism head-on, having failed in their mission to liquidate the Party and its influence across Canada. Thus, in 1974-75 In Struggle! adopted yet another posture. This time they feigned interest in "uniting Marxist-Leninists" and conspired with their long-time cronies to put on their charade of "isolating CPC(M-L) and founding a "genuine Marxist-Leninist Party" under the hoax that "there is no Party in Canada". From this posture of being "genuine Marxist-Leninists" with their "organization to struggle for the Party" they continued their history of opposing the Leninist organizational forms and politics advanced by CPC(M-L). Throughout each and every posture assumed by these opportunist crooks they have been coached by their champ, the 45 year veteran "Marxist-Leninist" Jack Scott, the man with a "passport to China" which, as fate decided, did not include passage for In Struggle! to Peking, as it did for their allies of yesterday, the Communist League. But throughout all the twists and turns of class struggle, nationally and internationally, all these opportunists have, first in one pose, then in another, attacked Leninism and the Leninist Party, CPC(M-L), and that alone is what united them yesterday and today.

Let us come back to our question about what is the difference between Jack Scott's CCU movement (which he helped organize and direct through his PWM) and the CLC trade union aristocracy. On the issue of resistance to the Canadian state both capitulate; both failed to implement the line "On Strike, Shut It Down!"; both mobilized the opportunist front to ensure the appearance of "resistance" and even "militancy" was given in order to cover for the utter impotency in tactics and weakness of will, cowardliness in the face of the state, that characterizes opportunism and revisionism of all hues. Thus it is altogether an embellishment of Jack Scott to say, as the opportunist agency, the alleged critic of Scott, says, namely, he had a "fetish for trade union work to the exclusion of building a party". Quite the contrary. Like themselves he has a "fetish" to oppose Leninism. He opposed Leninist theory and practice on building the Party as well as Leninist Party tactics in leading the workers' movement of resistance against the capitalists. The opportunist agency is his pupil and is part of the sectarian dogfight between factions of revisionism and opportunism. Just as Soviet social-imperialism and Chinese social-imperialism are at each other's throats, so are their agents around the world. The squabble between the U.S. imperialist opportunist agency, In Struggle!, the League, Jack Scott is in the nature of an inter-imperialist squabble. In their class war against the proletariat, against CPC(M-L) they are one, as are their masters in Washington, Moscow and Peking. Thus, the lies they tell about the communists as well as about each other are to **1)** abuse and slander the communists, **2)** fight each other but gloss over and hide the real essence of each other's character.

Let us review briefly then the salient features of the PWM pamphlet, *Independence and Socialism*, written in 1970. **1)** It completely distorts the nature of the historical epoch and opposes the Leninist theory of imperialism that the class at the centre of our epoch is the modern industrial proletariat, and imperialism is the eve of the social revolution of the proletariat in all countries, and the road to proletarian revolution and dictatorship of the proletariat is the road charted by the Great October Socialist Revolution, a road made possible by Leninist strategy and tactics obligatory for the proletariat of all countries. In short it upholds a variant of modern revisionism. **2)** It completely distorts the history of Canada and the nature of the socio-economic system in this country, misrepresents the nature of the state structure of the country, promotes the colonialist-revisionist thesis that there are "two founding cultures" or "two nations" in Canada, and embellishes Anglo-Canadian colonialism and the state of the dictatorship of monopoly capitalism and U.S. imperialism which rules over the people at the present time; **3)** It completely mystifies the class nature of all political parties and states, distorts the history of the social-democratic party, the NDP, in order to embellish it, distorts the glorious history of the founding of the Communist Party in 1921 in order to embellish anarcho-syndicalism, the twin brother of social democracy, and to negate the historical necessity for the proletariat to give rise to a Leninist monolithic Party guided by the most advanced theory and linked to the masses of the proletariat and people; **4)** mystifies the nature of the Canadian economy and promotes the counter-revolutionary method of speculative philosophy in place of materialist science; it promotes a one-sided, metaphysical view of the economy in order to direct the proletarian movement into the camp of clerical obscurantism (i.e. revisionism) and promotes social democracy (Watkins Manifesto), concluding that there is only an external and not also a ferocious internal enemy which must be overthrown; reduces the question of U.S. imperialist aggression to a matter of mere economic significance and is unable and unwilling to analyze the essence of this ideology which dominates the cultural-ideological life of Canada, i.e. American pragmatism; **5)** promotes anarcho-syndicalism in the working class and opposes Leninist Party organization of the workers' struggle; **6)** promotes the politics of pluralism in the proletariat, advocating the creation of an "independentist" party with "socialists" and "non-socialists" and advocates pinning the proletarian revolutionaries to the coattails of social democracy; advocates splitting the workers' movement on anarcho-syndicalist, social chauvinist basis; acts as an agent-provocateur with regard to the genuine Marxist-Leninist communists, abusing and slandering them in the interest of "proving" in a sycophantish manner to the bourgeoisie that they are actually enemies of the communists and not their allies, thus bringing solace and comfort to the main enemy of the working class people; **7)** introduces and promotes in a big way the worst features of sectarian politics, the ideology of self-righteous rationalization of opportunist activity, splittism, etc.

All of these features can be analyzed in Jack Scott's pamphlet, and all these features are very deliberately glossed over by the U.S. imperialist opportunist agency. Furthermore, the opportunists have taken up the ideology of lies in such a big way that they have posited all the sins of their own opportunist past onto their common enemy, CPC(M-L). This is also one of the tasks taken up by this opportunist agency — "analysis" of Jack Scott's pamphlet. Finally, in this pamphlet we can see crystallized many of the salient features of the opportunist front mobilized by the Chinese "three world" opportunists, and the various sects which have, at the bidding of the state security apparatus, broken off from this front in an effort to create the false impression that they are "friends of Albania". In fact, in essence they are the same as Jack Scott; they are complete slaves to imperialism and reveal one of the essential characteristics of this social system; parasitism. They feed off the proletarian class not only for food, clothing and shelter, but also for ideas, for analysis, which they take up from CPC(M-L) to distort and use as weapons against the proletariat. These opportunists, as the history of PWM showed after it published *Independence and Socialism*, also share another characteristic of imperialism: they are moribund — they are all dying and on the verge of death. It is up to the proletariat, to the genuine revolutionaries, led by CPC(M-L), to put them out of their deathbed into their grave, just as the Internationalists and CPC(M-L) did to the moribund PWM in 1970. A third feature these opportunists share with imperialism, as the pamphlet *Independence and Socialism* before them exhibited, is decadence. The lines promoted by Jack Scott are decayed versions of anarcho-syndicalism and social democracy, there is the rotting smell of decay about them because they arose in opposition to Marxism and Leninism and they were buried once. Now they smell of the grave. How much more so these new renegades, as the class brothers of the opportunists purged out of CPC(M-L) style themselves, of the "three world" bloc, reek of decay, of decadence. All that is fresh and ever young is the doctrine of Marx and Lenin, a doctrine which is ever more broadly and deeply grasped and applied to the practical motion of class struggle in Canada by CPC(M-L). It was this ever-young doctrine which sent PWM shrieking to the grave in 1970; it is this same doctrine, a thousand-fold more concentrated and profound, which is sending the opportunists shrieking to the grave once more.

The central fight between CPC(M-L) and the "three world theory" bloc, as well as all the other opportunists, inevitably comes down to a class battle between the proletarian politics and opportunist-imperialist politics. We showed in detail how Jack Scott falsified Canadian history, deviated from the Marxist historical materialist method, in order to rationalize his opportunist politics of alliance with social-democracy, revisionism and terrorism. To this end, as we showed, he consistently opposed Leninist organizational forms in order to advance his class-collaborationist political content. This is why he advised the youth to organize a pluralistic "anti-imperialist movement" with all sorts of tendencies, debates, etc. He wanted to oppose building a Leninist political Party and to perpetuate opportunist sect politics.

The Internationalists, however, defeated Jack Scott in this period. The revolutionary youth and students undertook the task of building a Leninist proletarian Party and coming under the discipline of Party norms. Thus the Political Report of the Communist Party of Canada (Marxist-Leninist) (April 1970) notes that at the Regina Conference in May 1969 the battle between Jack Scott's opportunist line for building the organization and the Marxist-Leninist line of the Internationalists was decided in favour of the latter. The representatives of Jack Scott's line tried as the Congress report says, "to destroy the form of the conference. This was because once the revolutionary form is destroyed, the elimination of the revolutionary content comes easily. Lenin explained the existence of *'the struggle of content with form and conversely'* and pointed out that with the *'throwing off of the form'* comes the *transformation of the content'."* Lenin himself waged a big political-ideological battle at the time of the formation of the Bolshevik Party to defend proletarian organizational form against the *"aristocratic anarchism"* of the bourgeois intellectuals who had attached themselves to the Marxist movement in Russia.

Thus it is not surprising that when the efforts of the Chinese social-imperialists through their agent, Jack Scott, failed to liquidate the Internationalists and prevent the formation of CPC(M-L), they should continue their efforts through mobilizing "aristocratic anarchists" within the Party itself and use these backward intellectuals (professors, students, etc) to oppose Leninist Party norms, and do everything possible to violate democratic centralism in order to float their reactionary political content, a content that, was an embryonic version of the "three world theory" meant to justify China's collaboration with U.S. imperialism. The head of this anti-Party clique, Daya Varma, made his complaint that there was "too much criticism" in CPC(M-L) and there was on the other hand no "freedom of criticism". In short those who violated the Party's organizational norms and political line were criticized, while the very same culprits were prevented from "criticizing" Marxism-Leninism. This conflict resulted in the "left-sloganeering front of Khrushchovite revisionism" being expelled from CPC(M-L). These anti-Party elements floated various sects which emerged in 1974 as the standard-bearers of the "three world theory", as agents of Chinese social-imperialism. Thus, we can see clearly that those who cried out against the "dictatorship" of the Party's Leninist form did so precisely because they wanted to convert CPC(M-L) from a Leninist Party, a Party of proletarian revolution, into a sect promoting the social-imperialist interests of the Peking revisionists, into a counter-revolutionary and opportunist organization. Hence the cry against form is again an effort to change content.

Just as today the renegades and the U.S. imperialist opportunist agency are trying desperately to cover up their tracks and posit onto others, namely CPC(M-L), their own opportunist sins, so too in 1975, the Daya Varma anti-Party clique wrote their abusive tract against CPC(M-L) for the same purpose: to cover their tracks and blame others for their own crimes. Thus, they begin their slanderous abuse of CPC(M-L) by stating: "a large number of people have been abused by this organization". Now how does this matter of "abuse" come up in a revolutionary Leninist Party. It comes up when members violate the organizational forms precisely to oppose the Marxist-Leninist content of the Party's line. Daya Varma, the chief advisor for the MREQ "inside story" of CPC(M-L), feels abused because he was expelled from CPC(M-L) and denounced as being the head of a "left-sloganeering front of Khrushchovite revisionism", a "front" which crystallized in 1974-75 as the "three world theory" bloc of opportunists sponsored by Peking. But if we analyze his history in CPC(M-L) what we find is a consistent abuse of Leninist organizational form to float opportunist and liquidationist political content.

For example, in the fall of 1970, this renegade was one of the architects of a terrorist line during the October Crisis which almost liquidated the Party. He participated in an illegal meeting on November 23, 1970 which expelled illegally a leading comrade and which adopted a line for the "violent overthrow of the Trudeau government", a line playing directly into the hands of the police organizers of the FLQ drama. Thus we can see that the "abuse" of Party norms, under the guise that in a crisis Party norms are not necessary, is designed to "abuse" the content of the Marxist-Leninist political line and substitute for it the anarchistic politics of hot-heads unwilling and unable to link themselves with the working class and lead them in revolutionary struggle against the main enemy.

The Party, under its elected leader, Hardial Bains, who was not at the illegal meeting of the Party, called a meeting of the National Executive Committee of the Party and publicly issued a statement repudiating this counter-revolutionary line and calling upon members and supporters to expel those who persisted in the terrorist line. The class struggle in the Party at this time was very fierce and members and friends were compelled to uphold Leninism or opt for terrorism and bourgeois individualism.

Daya Varma, while offering insincere support for the National Executive Committee, was in reality, as events and his deeds showed, committed to splitting and liquidating if possible the Party and its mass organizations.

In his activities he was incited by a line promoted by the Communist Party of China in an article entitled: "Long Live the Victory of the Dictatorship of the Proletariat", published in March, 1971. This article presents the anti-Leninist view as follows: "The mainstream of the revolutionary mass movement is always good and always conforms to the development of society. In the mass movement various trends of thought exert their influence, various factions emerge and various kinds of people take part. This is only natural. Nothing on earth is absolutely pure. Through their practice in struggle and repeated comparison, the broad masses of the people will eventually distinguish between what is correct and what is erroneous; they will eventually cast aside revisionism and all that is erroneous and accept and grasp the revolutionary truth of Marxism-Leninism. A proletarian Party must go deep among the masses and work patiently, painstakingly and for a long time so as constantly to raise their political consciousness and lead the mass movement forward along the correct road.

"The question of first importance for the revolution is to distinguish between enemies and friends, to unite with our real friends and attack our real enemies. The development of the revolutionary mass movement calls for the constant strengthening of unity within the revolutionary forces and the smashing of the plots to split and sabotage hatched by the imperialists, revisionists and reactionaries. The people, who constitute over 90 percent of the population — the workers, peasants, students and all those who refuse to be oppressed by imperialism — invariably want to make revolution. In order to defeat U.S. imperialism and all its running dogs, it is imperative to form a broad united front, unite with all forces that can be united, the enemy excepted, and carry out arduous struggle." This amounts to nothing more than the actual source of ideas promoted by Jack Scott for many years in PWM that "differing groups" should have "ideological struggle" and "contend for members", etc., etc., a line in fact presented by Mao Tsetung's liberal-bourgeois line of "let a hundreds schools of thought contend". In addition to being incited by this article, Varma was also directly coached and encouraged by the Chinese embassy. This was made particularly clear by his actions after March 1971. These activities have been chronicled by the Party in what are extremely important historical documents.

"1. He attended the eighth anniversary of the Internationalists celebration in March 1971 and attempted to gain some support against the basis Marxist-Leninist political line of the Internationalists, He was opposed there and he went into hiding again, conspiring and intriguing instead of openly raising the issue in the Party circles.

"2. He assisted the organization of the May 20th demonstration in 1971 with a clear plan for terrorist acts. When opposed, he again withdrew to wait for the right opportunity." *(Note: this statement was issued on February 2, 1973 by CPC(ML).)*

In June 1975, MREQ, under the direct tutelage of Daya Varma, wrote in gleeful manner, "the continual arrest of their members has caused a lot of ups and downs in the consistency of their work. The most notable example of this is the practical liquidation of their work in Montreal for several months after everyone got arrested at a demonstration on May 20, 1971." Now it is fair to ask, how does MREQ know so well that many people were arrested and that the Party's work suffered a set-back in Montreal after this adventurous action? The reason is that the authors of the pamphlet include precisely those elements who organized the event itself in opposition to the Party's central leadership. In short, Varma effected in Montreal a federalist party organizational principle violating Leninist forms of democratic centralism. By violating the Leninist form of organization he was able to push through his opportunist politics; the politics of "street confrontation" which bore his stamp of anarchistic terrorism, political impotency and adventurism: all features of his "left-sloganeering front of Khrushchovite revisionism". Thus these anti-Leninist elements first organize their agent-provocateur activity, then they run from the Party and four years later turn around and point the finger at CPC(M-L) for "provoking police". In this manner they: **1)** try to cover up their own responsibility for taking an adventurist stance in 1971, **2)** try to justify their rightist collaborationist and capitulationist stance with respect to the state in 1974-75 when they come out openly as "three world theorist" agents of Chinese social-imperialism. Thus whether they adopt a "left" or a "right" posture they are liquidationists, provocateurs and anti-Leninists. Further we can note here that in August 1976, this same provocateur Varma, by this time a hardened agent of the state and Chinese social-imperialism, organized a provocation in Vancouver to liquidate the resistance struggles of the East Indian community, led by the Indian Workers' Movement, and assist the police attempts to liquidate the Marxist-Leninist leadership of this movement. Every opportunist sect in the "three world bloc" joined in to denounce CPC(M-L) and support Varma's liquidationist IPANA. The shamelessness of the opportunists is such that even though they denounce one another of being counter-revolutionaries, when it comes to supporting the counter-revolutionary conspiracies and provocations against CPC(M-L), they stand together. Again the point can be made that when it comes to opposing Leninist forms of organization these opportunists are united; when it comes to the practical political movement the unity shows itself again in their common front against the Leninist politics of CPC(M-L). Thus, those who organized and carried through the May 20, 1971 demonstration in Montreal against the advice of the Party leadership, have come up to abuse the Party for having

See page 4: DOWN WITH REVISIONISM!

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

undertaken it.

"3. In June and July, he began open propaganda against the Party and to sound out individuals to join his clique. He approached all the members and supporters who were being severely criticized for their mistakes; began mobilizing them and calling upon them to attack the Party. By July, he already had gotten some support.

"4. Responsible comrades inside the Party approached him on July 30, and called upon him to present his criticism to the Party. He promised to bring up the criticism two weeks later but then went against his word and informally told the comrade responsible 'I had written criticism but I am clear now and have no more criticism.' Further he stated that whenever he thinks something is wrong with the Party he will communicate it to the leading comrade. In this way, he wriggled out of his responsibility to justify his criticism in full view of the membership, second, he again refused to have self-criticism and third, he attempted to get a special position for himself in the Party. This line of Mr. Varma was also opposed. *(Note: Jack Scott behaved in an identical manner from a position outside the Party.)* For all his talk about 'ideological struggle' he never formulated his positions against the analysis of the Internationalists or CPC(M-L); he never had the courage and integrity to put his views in a principled manner before the leading members of the Party in order to thrash out a just and scientific position to advance the proletariat. Always his method has been to hide serious difference of opinion when the time is to present them; and when backs are turned to lie and slander in a criminal and abusive manner in order to discredit as opposed to defeating the political-ideological line of the Party. Similarly in the summer and fall of 1974 CPC(M-L) engaged in discussions with In Struggle! and in its private letter to In Struggle! wrote that 'We, once again, affirm our determination to continue discussions with En Lutte! and make a contribution in uniting the Marxist-Leninists. We propose that with this summation, the two responsible individuals (one from each side) begin discussions and prepare two documents on the two issues mentioned, one entitled: *View of CPC(M-L) on Various Questions of Party Building and Unity of the Marxist-Leninists*, and the other entitled: *View of En Lutte! on Various Questions of Party Building and Unity of the Marxist-Leninists*. In the course of writing these documents, similarities and divergencies of points of view will become clear, both individuals will have the opportunity to ask questions, present views of the two organizations on various matters, engage in thorough clarification of issues so that there is no basis for confusion, and thus prepare material conditions for further action.' But En Lutte! wanted nothing to do with these Leninist norms. Instead they went back on their word, refused to give their views privately to the Party, and instead took up the revisionist method of splitism by denouncing CPC(M-L) in their press on December 12, 1974. But why did they violate Leninist forms of bilateral discussion? Precisely in order to advance anti-Leninist political content. Not by accident the same December 12, 1974 issue of In Struggle! contains their first declaration in support of the 'three world theory' and their politics of conciliation with Chinese revisionism continues to date despite all their 'self-criticism' for adopting the 'three world theory'. We can point as well to the renegacy of the latest chorus in 1978 denouncing CPC(M-L)'s Leninist forms of Party discipline. These renegades were even delegates at the Party Congress where they had every opportunity and obligation to correct any defects if they thought there were some in the Party's programme, constitution, resolutions on various questions, etc. But they did not do so. Instead they violated Leninist norms, took up the road of communalist intrigue and conspiracy, violated their promises to uphold Party discipline and when they were finally expelled, they screamed that CPC(M-L) is 'fascist'. Efforts to destroy the Party's form, however, are once again tied to the question of content. These super-leftists have now come out with their full-blown trotskyite theories which have already been analyzed at length as nothing more than a "left" variant of the "three world theory" and "Mao Tsetung Thought".

"5. With his active cooperation and plan, the conspiracy against the Party began showing its ugly face in the open. The bookshop of the Party was taken over by nazis who used it to begin propaganda against the Party and Comrade Bains. Mr. Varma, like a nice liberal, stated that this was 'wrong' but that he wouldn't openly oppose the nazi gang. He attempted to put on the mask of 'neutrality' and it was later clearly exposed that,in fact, he was the architect of this conspiracy to split and dismember the Party.

"6. In August and September, Mr. Varma also launched an anti-communist attack on the Party's official journal *Mass Line*, supported the national and social chauvinism of the Black Panthers, and certain lumpen elements from Iran with whom he had formed the conspiratorial clique." We note here that the whole opportunist bloc which lined up in the 1974-75 period around the "three world theory" of Chinese social-imperialism against CPC(M-L) and Marxism-Leninism has common political histories. For example, Varma represented one clique which promoted the social-chauvinist-and terrorist lines of the Black Panther Party.' Another clique organized in Montreal in the 1969-70 period was *Alive Magazine* which also took up the social chauvinist and terrorist lines of the Black Panthers, FLQ, McGill Francais, etc. In the 1972-73 period, on the verge of political bankruptcy, and under the pressure of the genuine revolutionaries in their organization, the leaders feigned support for Marxism-Leninism and CPC(M-L). But in fact they were seeking social-imperialist sponsorship in opportunist fashion and the magazine split into three trends: one went with Soviet social-imperialism, another took up Chinese social-imperialism and the third upheld the banner of Marxism-Leninism and participated in building CPC(M-L). Then we can trace Charles Gagnon back to the politics of the FLQ, and from there to the "theory of three worlds". Then we have the state these days mobilizing the "exiled" FLQ terrorists and we find that one section of them are children of an activist in Arcand's Quebec fascist party in the 1930's. The common thread through all these perfidious elements is their die-hard social chauvinism, their rejection of all Leninist organizational forms, and their political-ideological line of reformism and terrorism. Thus there is nothing accidental about this trend finding itself, despite sectional rivalries and sectarian squabbles amongst themselves to be united as one against the Leninist form and content of CPC(M-L). The identity and merging of the open fascist and social-fascist forces into social-chauvinist political action, culminating with the state-provoked FLQ terrorism can thus be seen clearly for what it was: a conspiracy to terrorize the masses of revolutionary people and hijack that most precious product of the proletarian class struggle in Canada, namely the Leninist political Party, CPC(M-L). Today all these same forces who were the terrorists, social chauvinists, populist and anarchist disruptors of the revolutionary youth and student movement in the 1960s, true sons and daughters of the Khrushchovites and Arcands, are the most abusive opponents of the Internationalists and CPC(M-L). They abused the Internationalists and CPC(M-L) as "CIA agents", a rumour we already showed traced itself to Washington, Moscow and Peking, the holy cities of imperialist and social-imperialist intrigue and conspiracy against revolution. Then we see these same elements re-emerge in new garb in 1974-75 with a new set of abuses against CPC(M-L), that it is "neo-revisionist" etc., while ostentatiously decking themselves out in a new "three world" suit made in Peking. This shows that indeed reformism and terrorism are twins.

Only CPC(M-L), the organization abused as being "copy cat town criers", "pseudo-Marxist psychologists", etc., was able to analyze the extremely complicated situation in Canada and Quebec in the aftermath of the October Crisis, kept its feet in the practical motion in the society and guided by its Leninist theory steered the vanguard out of the terrible dangers set to destroy it by the state and its counter-revolutionary agents posing as "New Left", "creative Marxists", revisionists, trotskyites, Castroites, etc. including those within the Party ranks who incited in a sinister and conscious manner others to take up the line of terrorism, so acting as the cats paws of the state to liquidate CPC(M-L). Precisely because CPC(M-L)'s leadership is dialectical materialist in outlook, it foresaw the great danger and ruthlessly fought against it in a Leninist manner, winning to the Party's Marxist-Leninist line the honest elements MLs and expelling those who were persisting on their liquidationist course. It is no wonder that those who are regrouping themselves in such a hurry against the Party are so desperate to enshroud the past ten years in a fog of lies, calumnies and slanders against CPC(M-L) and Hardial Bains. 1) Charles Gagnon, Castroite, terrorist, social chauvinist of the late 1960s who opposed Marxism-Leninism and the criticism of modern revisionism tooth and nail; now he has given rise to In Struggle! which since 1972 has been opposed to building CPC(M-L) and in December 1974 emerged as a banner-carrier for the "three world theory" which they called "conjunctural", the word best used to describe their whole pragmatic political activity, a policy determined by circumstances, a policy of expedient opportunism, without principle or theoretical guidance, a policy of the moment which ends in proponents crying forever with nose out of joint against their wretched fate. 2) Daya Varma, godfather of MREQ and the League, a dyed-in-the-wool Khrushchovite revisionist, academic, promoted political policies dictated by opportunist and liquidationist interests, and in justifying these, advocated splittist, narrow-minded sectarian politics based on communalist cliques, devoid of principle. He covered his activity with outright lies and slanders under the belief that there are no honest men and women in this world, no one motivated to find out the truth and stick up for revolution and principles, no class of proletarian wage-slaves who aspire to emancipate themselves and no oppressed humanity who seek honest political leaders and parties which crystallize their own aspirations, make them politically conscious with Marxist-Leninist principles and science. 3) Edward Pickersgill who first promoted terrorism and then in the face of state attacks runs and hides promoting pornography and philistinism in place of politics. The he re-emerges with schemes to convert CPC(M-L)'s publishing house into his private business, converting political activists as well as his communalist clique into his wage-slaves, and when expelled for violating Leninist Party norms becomes a renegade, a propagandist for Chinese social-imperialism and police spy before "retiring" from politics. 4) Jack Scott, a hard-ened revisionist and social chauvinist, anarcho-syndicalist and communalist who since 1964, through his connections, (his "passport") to China has been an extremely useful tool of reaction in promotion of sectarian politics, anti-Leninist propaganda against Party building and proletarian principles and discipline, a philistine sentimentalist whose self-righteous cant has cloaked the most vile imperialist corruption of the youth through sex, drugs, alcohol, leading potential young fighters into a dissipated, dissolute and meaningless life ending in wretchedness and early death. These are the champions, and there are of course others, who with enthusiasm for parasitism and decay gathered their paltry forces of reaction around one banner of "three worlds". Nothing could be more fitting than the scene of Charles Gagnon bending over to kiss the backside of Jack Scott in public on October 9, 1976 when this gang of ruffian chieftains and their misled stood clapping for their self-proclaimed 45 year veteran Marxist-Leninist communist Jack Scott. A communist militant is truly inspired to have such offal from the history of ten years of class struggle in Canada regrouping itself as the opponent of CPC(M-L) and drawing its clear line of demarcation from our Party. Their abuse against CPC(M-L) is a abuse against Leninism—its organizational forms and its political-ideological content. It is an attack of the petty bourgeois opportunists against the political Party of the proletariat.

"7. In October 1971, he published a statement in *Solidarity*, the journal of the Afro-Asian-Latin American People's Solidarity Movement, which clearly exposed that he was hatching the Khrushchovite revisionist line on various international problems as well as for Canada. He was informed by Comrade Bains that this particular statement was erroneous and that the *Solidarity* issue should be withdrawn. Instead of withdrawing that issue, he circulated it in large numbers and accused the Party of interfering with the AALAPSM, a trick he used to split and divide the Afro-Asians. Comrade Bains was the Chairman of the Afro-Asian-Latin American People's Solidarity Movement and he had every right to call upon Mr. Varma to correct the erroneous statement through vigorous mass democratic discussion and debate but Mr. Varma went on his reckless path and conspired further." After the Party firmly rebuffed the efforts of Varma to introduce Chinese revisionism into CPC(M-L), the Chinese embassy embarked on a consistent policy of interference in the political affairs of the Canadian proletariat and people, propping up and encouraging all sorts of outright nazis, revisionists and hardened opportunists to liquidate the Party of communists and thus be of big assistance to the Canadian state, the monopoly capitalists and U.S. imperialists. Events have shown in clear relief what the "price" of this monstrous betrayal of socialism, its perfidious attack against the People's Socialist Republic of Albania and the International Marxist-Leninist Communist Movement has been — exposure as shameless alliance with U.S. imperialism, throwing open with wild abandon the doors and windows, even the roof, of China to U.S. and international finance capital, delivering to the most rapacious slave masters human history has ever known the 900 million Chinese people who have shed such torrents of blood to emancipate themselves from exploitation and imperialist slavery. It is to the glory of CPC(M-L) that those who in a venal manner tried to import into the political Party of the proletariat a counter-revolutionary political-ideological line at the dictate of a foreign embassy, should four years later, hurl the impotent abuse that CPC(M-L) is a "copy cat town crier". CPC(M-L) which relies on its own efforts to apply the teachings of Marx, Engels, Lenin and Stalin to the actual life and politics of Canada and succeed in politically-ideologically defeating those who tried to liquidate the communists, who hoped to break the steel-like bond that unites the communist militants together around their Central Committee, headed by Hardial Bains — is abused as "copy cats". While those who hurl such abuse have themselves imported into Canada every possible opportunist trend from foreign imperialist and social-imperialist countries and have time after time yelled the slogans of international reaction without a jot of analysis of the implications of their words or deeds to the fate of the Canadian revolution. And of course all of these anti-Leninists consider themselves the most "original thinkers", some of them like the U.S. imperialist opportunist agency and the renegades even bragging to heaven how they were the very first in the "Marxist-Leninist movement" to introduce Bukharinism into Canada!

"8. On November 13, 1971, the Indian Progressive Study Group held a function where Comrade Bains made an important speech. Lumpen elements from Iran arrogantly walked out of the meeting. The Indian Progressive Study Group strongly objected to this anti-Indian activity. Mr. Varma, hypocritically and treacherously, gave the ultra-'left' position that the Indian comrades should ask the AALAPSM to expel the lumpen elements from Iran from the organization, thus precipitating a split (which Mr. Varma had desired all along). Comrade Bains and other comrades in the Indian Progressive Study Group refused to propose such action. For the sake of unity, they tolerated the insult to their leader by the lumpen elements and only proposed to the organization that IPSG resolutely protest this anti-Indian provocation and that from now on none of the guilty lumpen elements would be permitted to come to IPSG meetings until they have had self-criticism. Mr. Varma's trick of splitting the organization did not succeed in the face of the principled stand of unity and solidarity amongst the Afro-Asians and other progressive people taken by Comrade Bains and the IPSG." This form of politics, organizing splits and intrigues, is the standard method of the opportunists. They look at everything from the class angle of the bourgeoisie. What is in it for themselves? How do we stand to profit or lose. But the angle of the proletariat is opposite, it is the angle of a social class which has nothing to lose but its chains and a whole world to win. The opportunists think that the labour aristocracy, that not inconsiderable section of strata of workers, officials, etc., who are corrupted by monopoly profits, are not part of the bourgeoisie, are not bonded by interest and outlook to the capitalist class and hence do not see things from the selfish class angle of the capitalists. An example of this is exposed in the criticism of In Struggle! presented to them by CPC(M-L) in October 1974.

In Struggle! was feigning interest in uniting the Marxist-Leninists across Canada. Actually, the Marxist-Leninists had begun the trend for unity in October 1972 when the Partisan Organization in Vancouver joined forces with CPC(M-L) and this trend lasted through 1974, when various groups and individuals joined together to build CPC(M-L) as the political Party of the Canadian proletariat. In Struggle! took up the mission of going against that trend, and instead for reasons to be found deeply rooted in the subjective-idealist thinking of the leaders of this organization, they took up the "three world theory" and served the Sino-American interests in creating some political credibility for this monstrous counter-revolutionary ideology and politics. Then In Struggle! had to have a "self-criticism" in order to maintain any credibility in the eyes of their followers or to be in any sort of position at all to pursue their subjective politics of spite against CPC(M-L) and its leader, Hardial Bains. Thus in 1974, when the leadership of CPC(M-L) gave their views privately to In Struggle! as mutually agreed, the Party frankly criticized the bourgeois angle from which In Struggle! looked at politics. CPC(M-L) said, "You write, 'Should it be necessary to add that if your organization shows itself to be incapable of seeing through its commitments, we will be obliged to draw conclusions from this which will not be to your advantage.' This sort of talk does not behoove Marxist-Leninists, and we protest very strongly your writing this to us. Our Party fulfills its responsibilities and if you wish to draw some conclusions, that is your prerogative, but we refuse to come down to the level of exchanging such threats!

"When we say **Unite on the basis of Marxist-Leninist-Mao Tsetung Thought**, En Lutte! seems to have a great deal of trouble grasping this. For you, to be Marxist-Leninist is one thing and to unite on the basis of Marxism-Leninism-Mao Tsetung Thought is another thing." *(Note: ironically this proves to be the case, for what In Struggle! actually does unite on is "Mao Tsetung Thought", i.e pragmatism, in opposition to Marxism-Leninism, but the content of the phrase here as throughout the Party's literature is the mistaken assumption that Mao Tsetung was a consistent and leading Marxist-Leninist in the International Marxist-Leninist Communist Movement)* "This also leads you into erroneous methods of 'uniting the Marxist-Leninists'. If various groups in Quebec and elsewhere in Canada are Marxist-Leninist, then why are these groups not uniting? Lack of communication with one another? We do not think so. En Lutte! writes: 'In this regard, we wish to note that, like many, if not all Quebec and Canadian Marxist-Leninist groups, we have sometimes given in to the "disease of sects" (groupuscules) in the past. That is, *we have often been inclined to "jealously sit on (incubate) our correct line" and broadly criticize groups as though there were nothing good about them, these criticisms moreover being based often on rumours, prejudices and secondary points.* We intend to struggle resolutely in our own ranks against this spirit of "sect" which bears witness to a certain dogmatism and leads straight to sectarianism and to isolation if it is not fought through the constant self-criticism of the group and criticism of members who exhibit its symptoms." This is an entirely wrong explanation as to why the "disease of sects" exists.

"First of all, it has to be recognized that 'disease of sects' is not a disease of the Marxist-Leninist groups but of opportunist groups; but En Lutte! unwittingly says that 'many if not all Quebec and Canadian Marxist-Leninist groups' (including their own which has sometimes given into the 'disease of sects') are opportunist groups. We use the word 'unwittingly' because all (many with some exceptions) the groups that En Lutte! actually associates with and has connections with are opportunist groups. We are not one of the groups with which En Lutte! has any associations. So instead of analyzing the class basis of this opportunism and taking action against it, En Lutte! weds opportunism to Marxism-Leninism and thereby completely obscures this problem.

"Further, En Lutte, acknowledges that: 'these criticisms moreover being based often on rumours, prejudices and secondary points', which again is not the case with the Marxist-Leninist groups but which is the case with the opportunist, non-Marxist-Leninist and anti-Marxist-Leninist groups.

"And in the end, En Lutte! promises to struggle resolutely against this in their own ranks which, in fact, is a declaration that they will consolidate their sect but on the basis of struggling against it. This is altogether wrong as well.

"Let us provide you with our explanation. Talking about rumours and the pernicious influence they have, Comrade Enver Hoxha correctly points out that: 'Just as in all its daily political and ideological work, in what appears in the press and in the reports submitted to it, our Party comes up against rumours and gossip' . . . 'Rumours and gossip are typical of the petty bourgeoisie, they have a petty bourgeois character; they are therefore, manifestations of the bourgeois ideology. Gossip is the product of subjectivism and has nothing in common with sound, realistic and constructive criticism . . . We sometimes console ourselves by saying "they are not of a political character". We are mistaken in making this assessment. They are of a political and ideological character precisely because they cause disputes and splits in the organization . . .'

"So you can see that Comrade Enver first establishes the class basis of rumours and gossip, and then shows that 'they are of a political and ideological character'. The petty bourgeoisie, incapable of fighting the proletariat, and being an intermediate and disintegrating class, always puts up all sorts of airs and takes the method of rumours and gossip as a method of struggling against the proletariat. You made no such distinction, and you actually accused the Marxist-Leninists of doing what the petty bourgeoisie normally do.

"You yourselves accuse others on the basis of rumours and gossip. Your *reminder* and *second reminder* are both full of this. You are definitely aware that there are all sorts of rumours and gossip which are spread against us by our enemies. It is their way of fighting us. But, En Lutte! must know that there is a cure for this, and that cure is *opposing these rumours and gossip* not just in one's group but as a general campaign against them amongst the people in the manner we carry out in the form of mass democracy meetings, etc. But, most importantly and decisively, we would like to communicate to you that rumours and gossip spread because of lack of historical analysis and failure to adhere to Marxist-Leninist theory and political line. Once Marxism-Leninism is thrown into the dust bin then everything else follows. En Lutte! should think over this matter seriously."

Let us quote further and somewhat extensively so that we can show clearly the correlation in method, ideological-political line and result between that practised by Varma in 1971-72 which gave rise to MREQ-CCL, and Gagnon's In Struggle!, then the U.S. imperialist opportunist agency and now the renegades to show the class basis for their attacks against CPC(M-L), their momentary "unity" around the "three worlds theory" and now their falling out with one another except for their unity in opposition against CPC(M-L).

"The class basis of disruption of unity of the Marxist-Leninists is infiltration of the ranks of the Marxist-Leninists by the petty bourgeoisie. During the current campaign to support the struggle of the Anishinabe people, the petty bourgeois revolutionists repeated every slander issued by the RCMP in order to liquidate the developing unity between the Native people and the working class. Hundreds of examples can be given whereby those individuals who call themselves 'Marxist-Leninists' are actually the ones doing the maximum damage to the cause of the Marxist-Leninists, that is, to the cause of the working and oppressed people. Not to grasp how the RCMP operates is objectively to go over to the side of the enemy.

"It is our firm belief that the entire propaganda that *there is no Party* originates from the police. It is the same propaganda, in new garb, of the line propagated in the 1960s that *there is no need for Party*. Currently, we have seen some tracts which have come out to say that *we have to build a 'Party'*. All these lines are erroneous and originate from the RCMP. Let us explain to you why. A revolutionary Party of the proletariat based on revolutionary theory is not the private property of anyone and does not come into being as a result of the wishes of a few individuals. It is the outcome of the historical process. After the rise of modern revisionism in Canada, several people attempted to organize a Marxist-Leninist Party. These people made the attempts by calling upon all Marxist-Leninists to unite. When the Progressive Workers' Movement was founded in 1964, it issued a general call. We were supporters of PWM for several years. After PWM died, we contacted Marxist-Leninists all across Canada and Quebec and called upon them to form the Party. Many responded and joined in the founding. Many joined later. And those who degenerated or lost faith in Marxism-Leninism left and sank into obscurity. But the key point is that there was a general call given and the Marxist-Leninists responded to it. It is only petty bourgeois revolutionists who — instead of uniting into one Marxist-Leninist organization — stick to the line of private property and conspiracy, form their cliques and never issue their calls to everyone, and never strive to unite with others on the basis of Marxist-Leninist theory and Marxist-Leninist political line. Such petty bourgeois revolutionists must be opposed and they must not be permitted to carry on with their nefarious activities of causing splits and confusion among the Marxist-Leninists.

"Let us give you an example which illustrates how a lack of vigilance and proper investigation leads to a set-back or causes harm to the revolutionary movement. This concerns our own campaign this summer to further unite the Marxist-Leninists. The comrade responsible for this task did not carry out the work properly. He did not carry on preparing public opinion against the erroneous line through our press and he did not provide us with correct information as to what was going on in Montreal. This meant that our propaganda against the pernicious line that *there is no Party in Quebec* was checked while those who advocated this line continued their work without any opposition. To concretize further: the specific information given to us was that we should stop any public or private criticism of En Lutte! in order to create an atmosphere of mutual trust and confidence and begin discussions in an atmosphere of unity and solidarity of the Marxist-Leninists. This attitude and proposal of the comrade concerned is correct but he did not explain to us that there is another organization, MREQ, which, on certain questions, says the same thing as En Lutte! and that En Lutte! has some connections with it. So when we stopped our criticism of En Lutte! this meant we also stopped our opposition to this opportunist organization, MREQ. As a result, MREQ operated on its anti-Party tirade while we were stopped from opposing them under the hoax that the attack on such and such lines in public would also mean an attack on En Lutte! On its part, En Lutte! of course carried on its relations (which it has no reason to stop) and we suffered a setback on this front. Now the Party has decided to carry a vigorous attack on the wrong MREQ lines internally and also externally if need be and if En Lutte! feels that it is also being attacked then it is its responsibility to draw clear lines between itself and MREQ. We reiterate here that we won't criticize En Lutte! externally for the entire period of discussions with them and it is up to En Lutte! to tell its members and supporters that this is the policy of CPC(M-L), so that its membership is not confused.

"We found out that En Lutte! and MREQ had some relations when a poster appeared with the names of the two organizations sponsoring a function in September. It is very interesting to note that while En Lutte! was having discussion with us it sponsored a programme with a host of other organizations, some of which (the majority of which are opportunist organizations — most of these can not even be called organizations as they are mere sects based on opposition to the Party, as their main plank) are extremely hostile to the Party. When the leading comrades came to know this they were extremely puzzled by this development. So we communicated to En Lutte! our concern. But En Lutte! again, instead of going into the heart of the matter, sent us a temper tantrum in 'reply': 'the surprise demonstrated by CPC(M-L) regarding the absence of an invitation to participate in the Ad-Hoc Committee in Support of the Struggle of the People of Zimbabwe, let En Lutte! to question the good faith of CPC(M-L) or at least its appreciation of the present relations between the two groups . . . For En Lutte! it is altogether premature to envisage forms of practical collaboration or to propose any action giving the impression of a political rapprochement with CPC(M-L)', etc.

"This is confounding everything right and wrong. En Lutte! is on the record as being in favour of unity of the Marxist-Leninists. And throughout its documents it talks about having 'debates' which lead to 'collaboration' and then to 'fusion'. But CPC(M-L) never proposed such a thing! Look into all our documents, statements, etc.; we never suggested that we are having 'debates' for the purpose of collaboration or fusion. And of course, when we write to them they dismiss our spirit and draw incorrect conclusions. If you had not noticed before on your own, let us mention to you that we believe *that there is a revolutionary Party in Canada and Quebec which is based on revolutionary theory* and this Party engages other groups and individuals in discussions purely for the purposes of finding out whether or not the other groups and individuals are Marxist-Leninists and whether or not they will follow the Marxist-Leninist line that in a country there should be one Party. We are having discussions for this purpose only and for us there is no such thing as 'collaboration' or 'fusion'. We never mentioned it. You have been talking about it all the time. When we raise an important question as regards your co-sponsoring a programme with other organizations, instead of analyzing it, you get on your high horse and draw conclusions, which reflects your own motivations and intentions and you are imposing these on us.

"Let us explain to you why we showed 'surprise'. It is because, you, who profess that you are for the 'unity of Marxist-Leninists' put your name on a list of organizations sponsoring a programme which is normally a united front issue and deliberately told the whole world that in Montreal a split exists amongst Marxist-Leninists. You objectively declared a split to the whole world while you were claiming that you are working for the unity of the Marxist-Leninists." "Now when you declare to the whole world that an alliance of sorts exists between you and other organizations; and that you have obviously gone along with this split in the revolutionary forces, your intentions must also be questioned. We ask: Are you for a permanent split amongst the Marxist-Leninists or are you for unity! You tell us by deeds and not by words. We have heard enough of these kinds of words from opportunists before and we still feel you are a revolutionary organization and that you should take the course of unity of Marxist-Leninists instead of splitting them. You can see why we showed surprise. We are working very hard to muster enough force in order to attack the enemy. But you seem to be on a wrong course."

TO BE CONTINUED