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 portion see Vol. 9 No. 12, Jan. 13, 1979.

Examine the internal inconsistency of the line presented by PWM in 1969-70 (after the Regina Conference). It says on the one hand, Quebec is an oppressed nation. Then it says, "English Canada has had a relatively very brief history as a unified nation. The original act of Confederation took place a mere hundred years ago." In other words, Confederation "unified" the "English-Canadian nation". This is a complete falsification of history. Historical fact is that feudal France, feudal Spain and capitalist England colonized North America (Holland and others played minor roles but were squeezed out). These European "colonies proper" massacred and enslaved the Native nations and tribes, forcing others into enclaves and generally pursuing a policy of genocide which continues to date. Colonial policy, based on racism, aggression, war, robbery and slavery, especially the chattel slavery of the African people, was a "hot house" for capitalist development in Europe. The opportunist embellishment of imperialism in the 20th century is repeated in its image of English colonialism. These authors claim to be Marxists, so let us cite a few things Marx has to say about colonialism in the new world:

"The discovery of gold and silver in America, the extirpation, enslavement and entombment in mines of the aboriginal population, the beginning of the conquest and looting of the East Indies, the turning of Africa into a warren for the commercial hunting of black-skins, signalized the rosy dawn of the era of capitalist production. These idyllic proceedings are the chief momenta of primitive accumulation. On their heels treads the commercial war of the European nations, with the globe for a theatre. It begins with the revolt of the Netherlands from Spain, assumes giant dimensions in England's Anti-Jacobin War, and is still going in the opium wars against China, &c.

"The different momenta of primitive accumulation distribute themselves now, more or less in chronological order, particularly over Spain, Portugal, Holland, France and England. In England at the end of the 17th century (i.e. 60 years before the conquest of Quebec — Ed.) they arrive at a systematical combination, embracing the colonies, the national debt, the modern mode of taxation, and the protectionist system. These methods depend in part on brute force, e.g., the colonial system. But they all employ the power of the state, the concentrated and organized force of society, to 'hasten, hot-house fashion, the process of transformation of the feudal mode of production into the capitalist mode, and to shorten the transition. Force is the midwife of every old society pregnant with a new one. It is itself an economic power.

"Of the Christian colonial system, W. Howitt, a man who makes a specialty of Christianity, says, the barbarities and desperate outrages of the so-called Christian race, throughout every region of the world, and upon every people they have been able to subdue, are not to be paralleled by those of any other race, however fierce, however untaught, and however reckless of mercy and of shame, in any age of the earth. (William Howitt: "Colonization and Christianity: a Popular History of the Treatment of the Natives by the Europeans in all Their Colonies", London, 1838, p. 9. On the treatment of the slaves there is a good compilation in Charles Comte, "Traite de la Legislation" 3me ed., Bruxelles, 1837. This subject one must study in detail, to see what the bourgeoisie makes of itself and of the labourer, wherever it can, without restraint, model the world after its own image.") The history of the colonial administration of Holland — and Holland was the head capitalistic nation of the 17th century — is one of the most extraordinary relations of treachery, bribery, massacre, and meanness.' (Tomas Stamfor Raffles, late Lieut. Gov. of that island: 'The History of Java,' London, 1817) . . .

"The English East India Company, as is well known, obtained, besides the political rule in India, the exclusive monopoly of the tea-trade, as well as of the Chinese trade in general, and of the transport of goods to land from Europe. But the coasting trade of India and between the islands, as well as the internal trade of India, were the monopoly of the higher employees of the company. The monopolies of salt, opium, betel and other commodities, were inexhaustible mines of wealth. . The employees themselves fixed the price and plundered at will the unhappy Hindus. The Governor-General took part in this private traffic. His favourites received contracts under conditions whereby they, cleverer than the alchemists, made gold out of nothing. Great fortunes sprang up like mushrooms in a day; primitive accumulation went on without the advance of a shilling . . .

The treatment of the aborigines was, naturally, most frightful in plantation-colonies destined for export trade only, such as the West Indies, and in rich and well-populated countries, such as Mexico and India, that were given over to plunder. But even in the colonies properly so called, the Christian character of primitive accumulation did not belie itself. Those sober virtuosi of Protestantism, the Puritans of New England, in 1703, by decrees of their assembly set a premium of L40 on every Indian scalp and every captured red-skin: in 1720 a premium of L100 on every scalp; in 1744, after Massachusetts-Bay had proclaimed a certain tribe as rebels, the following prices: for a male scalp of 12 years and upwards L100 (new currency), for a male prisoner L105, for women and children prisoners L50, for scalps of women and children L50. Some decades later, the colonial system took its revenge on the descendants of the pious pilgrim fathers, who had grown seditious in the meantime. At English instigation and for English pay they were tomahawked by red-skins. The British Parliament proclaimed blood-hounds and scalping as 'means that God and Nature had given into its hand.'

"The colonial system ripened, like a hot-house, trade and navigation. The 'societies Monopolia' of Luther were powerful levers for concentration of capital. The colonies secured a market for the budding manufactures, and through the monopoly of the market, an increased accumulation. The treasures captured outside Europe by undisguised looting, enslavement and murder, floated back to the mother-country and were then turned into capital. Holland, which first fully developed the colonial system, in 1648 stood already in the acme of its commercial greatness. It was 'in almost exclusive possession of the East Indian trade and the commerce between the south-east and north-west of Europe. Its fisheries, marine, manufactures, surpassed those of any other country. The total capital of the Republic was probably more important than that of all the rest of Europe put together.' Gulich forgets to add that by 1648, the people of Holland were more over-worked, poorer and more brutally oppressed than those of all the rest of Europe put together.

"Today industrial supremacy implies commercial supremacy. In the period of manufacture properly so called, it is, on the other hand, the commercial supremacy that gives industrial predominance. Hence the preponderant role that the colonial system plays at that time. It was 'the strange God' who perched system plays at that time. It was 'the strange God' who perched himself on the altar cheek by jowl with the old Gods of Europe, himself on the altar cheek by jowl with the old Gods of Europe, himself on the altar cheek by jowl with the old Gods of Europe, and one fine day with a shove and a kick chucked them all of a and one fine day with a shove and a kick chucked them all of a heap. It proclaimed surplus-value making as the sole end and aim heap. It proclaimed surplus-value making as the sole end and aim of humanity . . .

"Colonial system, public debts, heavy taxes, protection, commercial wars, etc., these children of the true manufacturing period, increase gigantically during the infancy of Modern Industry. The birth of the latter is heralded by a great slaughter of the innocents. Like the royal navy, the factories were recruited by means of the press-gang . . .

"Whilst the cotton industry introduced child-slavery in England, it gave in the United States a stimulus to the transformation of the earlier, more or less patriarchal slavery, into a system of commercial exploitation. In fact, the veiled slavery of the wage-workers in Europe needed, for its pedestal, slavery pure and simple in the new world.

"Tantae molis erat, to establish the 'eternal laws of Nature of the capitalist mode of production, to complete the process of separation between labourers and conditions of labour, 'to transform, at one pole, the social means of production and subsistence into capital, at the opposite pole, the mass of the population into wage-labourers, into 'free labouring poor', that artificial product of modern society. If money, according to Augier, 'comes into the world with a congenital blood-stain on one cheek', capital comes dripping from head to foot, from every pore, with blood and dirt." (Capital, Vol. I, pp. 751-760).

When we speak of Anglo-Canadian colonialism we are speaking of a particular aspect of the process Marx analyzes in part above. It has nothing to do with "founding a nation", it has to do with scattering nations to the wind, of proclaiming *"surplus-value making as the sole end and aim of humanity"*. The colonial settlers thrown out of the United States after the War of Independence were re-settled in England's North American colonies. They became the social base for the establishment of Anglo-Canadian colonialism. Their state structure was established by the Constitutional Act of 1791. Upper Canada, with York as its centre of power, was the first English colony established without direct access to a sea-port and was so established as to be the gendarme, the oppressor state, which together with the Anglo-French capitalist elite (Chateau clique) ruled in Montreal over Quebec and continued to plunder the wealth of the Quebec masses and Native people. When the peasant masses in Quebec rose up in revolt in 1837, joined by some sections of the poorer settlers of Upper Canada, the Anglo-Canadian colonial ruling class together with the English army crushed the uprising with fire and sword, the hangman, prison and penal colony.

The transformation of the state structure in Canada leading to Confederation was not in any manner of means a "concession" by the English and Anglo-Canadian ruling class to the popular revolutionary sentiment of the masses. Marx explains clearly, *"Today* (1867 — *Capital* was published the same year as Confederation) *industrial supremacy implies commercial supremacy. In the period of manufacture properly so called, it is, on the other hand, the commercial supremacy that gives industrial predominance.* **Hence the preponderant role that the colonial system plays at that time.***" (Capital, I,* p. 754) Confederation took place in the period of capitalist history when *"industrial supremacy implies commercial supremacy"*. Lenin elaborates further this analysis by Marx: *"In the most flourishing period of free competition in Great Britain, i.e., between 1840 and 1860, the leading British bourgeois politicians were* opposed *to colonial policy and were of the opinion that the liberation of the colonies, their complete separation from Britain, was inevitable and desirable. M. Beer, in an article, 'Modern British Imperialism', published in 1898, shows that in 1852* (two years before the Reciprocity Treaty between Canada and the United States engineered by the British Colonial Office and the Governor-General, Lord Elgin — Ed.), *Disraeli, a statesman who was generally inclined towards imperialism, declared: 'The colonies are millstones round our necks.' But at the end of the nineteenth century the cry of the hour in England were Cecil Rhodes and Joseph Chamberlain, who openly advocated imperialism and applied the imperialist policy in the most cynical manner!"*

Thus, the issue of the evolution of Dominion self-government and the 1867 British North America Act is not at all as analyzed by the PWM apologists for Anglo-Canadian colonialism. They say, "Although Britain defeated the 1837 rebellion, she could not, without further endangering her rule, ignore the lessons of the American Revolution. It was only after 1837 that Britain began to institute the measures to grant greater local 'autonomy' that eventually culminated in the BNA Act and Confederation." What an idyllic proceeding, according to these social chauvinists. The central issue is ignored, namely the revolution of English capitalism from its mercantile stage to its industrial stage. Further, what is ignored is that Confederation meant tightening the noose around the neck of the Quebec nation, retarding its economy, to the enrichment of the English colony and driving its half-starved peasant sons and daughters as hapless emigrants to toil as wage slaves in the New England cotton mills. Further it meant preparing conditions for the expansion of Anglo-Canadian colonial capitalism with the blessing and financial support of English bankers to rob and plunder the homelands of the Métis and Native Indian nations on the Great Plains, and with the treachery and violence of the colonial system already described above by Marx, set these people to the winds, reducing them to marginal, half-starved, impoverished and backward conditions, a real "showcase" for the "progressive nation building" of the "English Canadian nation".

When CPC(M-L) crossed swords with the opportunists' lifeless apologia for Anglo-Canadian colonialism in 1975 we tried to arouse the revolutionary activists with some burning hatred against the whole Anglo-Canadian colonial system. We tried with some success to imbue some sense of shame that this evil socio-economic system still remains to be overthrown. When we showed how much suffering and pain, such humiliation and oppression to the thousands-year-old Native nations, to the Quebec nation, to the Métis nation of Riel, to the impoverished and abused people of Newfoundland and the Maritimes, to the hundreds of thousands of families uprooted from their homes in over a hundred countries to serve as wretched wage-slaves for the Anglo-Canadian monopoly capitalists and U.S. imperialist plunderers, our opportunist detractors became very puffed up and arrogant. For example, MREQ, the precursor of Canadian Communist League, with its burning ambition to defend the "sovereignty" of the Anglo-Canadian colonial state, hissed at us: "This rendering of Canadian history is truly incredible — according to CPC(M-L) '. . . a prairie settlement less than 70 years old and another settlement of similar age in British Columbia. . .' So settlement of Western Canada dates from 1905! As any elementary school textbook could tell us, there were trades who settled in Western Canada in the late 18th century and in the early 19th century whole colonies were established. By 1871 the population of Western Canada was over 75,000."

CPC(M-L) was criticizing the view that there is an "English Canadian nation", and was upholding the analysis which it still holds that Confederation is the constitutional framework of Anglo-Canadian colonialism whereby the nation of Quebec, the Native nations, Métis and Inuit as well as the working masses settled by monopoly capitalism, especially since the rise of international finance capital on the world market at the turn of the 20th century, are together oppressed and held in wage-slavery and subjection by this political power, this oppressor colonial and colonializing state called Canada. Now the opportunists let slip that they read Canadian history from "elementary school textbooks". Which is why they portray the history of their alleged "English Canadian nation" in such dulcet tones so pleasing to Canadian ruling circles. But we ask the opportunist "defenders" of Trudeau's "sovereignty" who comprised this population of "75,000" in Western Canada in 1871? Was this the humble beginnings of the English Canadian nation there? Or did these masses comprise the Métis nation and the Native nations? Did their "elementary textbook" describe how these peoples rose up with guns to oppose the encroachment and theft of their lands by the "Canadian" colonizers? How the government of John A. Macdonald, the "father of Confederation"; lied and betrayed his promises to Riel? How he sent an army of Anglo-Canadian mercenaries to "avenge" the Anglo-Canadian agent-provocateur, Thomas Scott? How the priests from Quebec in the service of Anglo-Canadian colonialism duped the Métis and Native peoples and are celebrated by the CPR for doing so? The Rebellion of 1885 is less than a century past. The Native and Métis leaders were hanged for fighting for their homelands. Their lands were stolen from them, occupied by colonizers, sent not only from Canada, but from around the world. These lands became a great escape valve for British capitalism.

Lenin cites Cecil Rhodes in 1895, just ten years after the bloody conquest of the Métis-Native lands of the "Canadian" west, a conquest only made possible by the almost complete CPR financed by British finance capital. Rhodes, who we remind our opportunist detractors lest their elementary school textbooks fail to mention, is the namesake of the colonial settler state, Rhodesia, said: "I was in the East End of London" (working class quarter) "yesterday and attended a meeting of the unemployed. I listened to the wild speeches, which were just a cry for 'bread, bread ' and on my way home I pondered over the scene and I became more than ever convinced of the importance of imperialism . . . . My cherished idea is a solution for the social problem, i.e., in order to save the 40,000,000 inhabitants of the United Kingdom from a bloody civil war, *we colonial statesmen must acquire new lands* to settle the surplus population, to provide new markets for the goods produced in the factories and mines. The Empire, as I have always said, is a bread and butter question. If you want to avoid civil war, you must become imperialists." If the opportunists will re-check their history books they will find that the colonial settlement of the "new lands" acquired in the "Canadian" west was acquired by typically English colonial methods: soldiers, priests, hangmen, starvation, smallpox-infected blankets, broken promises, alcohol and drugs) began in earnest in the boom of 1889-90, and then with great speed in the period of massive finance capital investment in the period 1903-13.

Thus, from one side one gang of social chauvinists takes up the PWM line of embellishing Anglo-Canadian colonialism. Then from another side the clique of American agents-provocateurs make a big display about being the "defenders" of the Native nations. They argue that there is an inherent antagonism between the working class and democratic masses who live on the Prairies and elsewhere and the Native, Métis and Inuit people. Their line, copied from the racist-fascist regime of South Africa is to establish some "Bantustan homeland" for the Native people in the name of "national self-determination". Both sides of the "three world" opportunist trend oppose the political Party of the proletariat leading the Native people, linking their struggles with the revolutionary class aspirations of the Canadian working class, joining all the struggles of the masses in one wave of revolutionary struggle after another against the common enemy in order to create conditions for the violent overthrow of the whole rotten monopoly capitalist socio-economic system and its political-ideological superstructure.

Do the practical politics of the summer of 1974 not expose precisely this fact? Did not CPC(M-L) link the just struggle of the Anishinabe people in Kenora to the working class movement? Did it not assist the organization and motion of the Anishinabe people's Native Caravan? The CPC(M-L) militants of their own wish, because they are communist revolutionaries, worked extremely hard to lead this struggle and provide every assistance to it. Why is this? Because CPC(M-L) has bourgeois class hatred of the Anglo-Canadian state. It is our mortal enemy, the enemy of our class and of all the oppressed peoples in Canada. We directed the Anishinabe struggle against this enemy, and we continue to work toward setting all the just struggles of the Native, Inuit and Métis peoples against this enemy, because facts of life show that this common enemy, the state of the monopoly capitalists and U.S. imperialists, props up the wage-slave system, the colonial plunder of the Native peoples' lands and brings such poverty, misery and humiliation to the oppressed masses. Who else but the modern proletariat as a social class led by its political Party can inspire and organize the oppressed, the impoverished, the youth, etc. against the main enemy?

But when we review the politics of the summer of 1974 we see a most revealing alignment against CPC(M-L) and its leadership of the Anishinabe movement. First we have the outright hangmen, the special riot squad of the RCMP, used for the first time, not surprisingly, against a militant demonstration of Native people and Canadian revolutionaries at Parliament Hill. This fascist police force, about which a few more sordid facts are known regarding its methods of operation, was actually established by the Anglo-Canadian state to occupy the North-West Territories (then including all of Saskatchewan, Alberta, and most of Manitoba as well as the present NWT) after the first Métis Rebellion in 1870. Thus the role of the RCMP as hangmen and assassins for the Canadian monopoly capitalist class, as the colonial oppressors of the Native peoples, has not changed nor will it change until it has been smashed in a revolutionary civil war. The monopoly press together with the high government officials then turned the whole affair around, blaming those who were attacked for the violence and taking the spotlight off the burning issue of the day, namely the hereditary rights of the Native people in Canada. Thus Judd Buchanan, then Minister of Indian Affairs, "attached much of the blame for the violence which marred the normally sedate opening of a new parliamentary session to a group of Communist Party of Canada (Marxist-Leninist) agitators." *(Montreal Star,* October 2, 1974)

But most significantly, the so-called "genuine Marxist-Leninists" of the day took up the same hue and cry against CPC(M-L) and they carry on to this day denouncing the Party's role in leading this just struggle of the Native people. The opportunist paper, *Western Voice,* which has since self-criticized itself out of existence for being an opportunist rag, made a big issue about "problems of support" because of the presence of CPC(M-L) and the slogan "Hail the armed struggle. . . ." Of course there were many "put off" by these slogans and more particularly by the mass motion and just demands of the Anishinabe people. These included the Mayor of Kenora, the Minister of Indian Affairs, a reactionary revisionist alderman in Vancouver, and of course the *Western Voice.* The bond between opportunism and imperialism could not be seen more clearly. It was the opportunist front, especially the Chinese revisionist front posing as "Marxist-Leninist" who exerted themselves to the maximum to liquidate the links between our Party and the revolutionary activists in the Native movement at that time. One of the most outspoken opponents of CPC(M-L) within the Native Caravan later exposed himself as an FBI agent sent through a Native organization to carry out anti-Party activity and liquidate the Native struggle. For without proletarian consciousness, organization, discipline, the spontaneous motion of the people is diffused, dissipated, giving the enemy time to regroup its ranks and counter-attack. This is the role the opportunists of all hues play in practical politics. Thus it is not just a matter of the "three world" front embellishing Anglo-Canadian colonialism in their propaganda with their social-chauvinism about "English-Canadian nation". In their practical politics they behave as Lenin says, as the social prop of imperialism; they carry its ideological line and spread pessimism and defeat, liquidating struggles and blunting the attacks of the masses against the state, activity justified by its slogan and raison d'etre, "Isolate CPC(M-L)", "Ban CPC(M-L)", etc. This is the reactionary banner the Chinese revisionist front has raised on behalf of Canadian monopoly capitalism and U.S. imperialism.

The reactionary chorus to mystify the correct line of the Party is joined by renegades, one of whom just returned from Italy where he went in the summer ostensibly to organize "revolution" there and the other one who had a peculiar sickness and for this reason could not attend all the proceedings of the Special Congress. Further, following the typical method of opportunists and police socialists, the renegades put forward as the Party's line something which it is not and then they repudiate their own concoction and present their trotskyite line as Marxism-Leninism. In this case, they equate the Party's line that independence is one of the banners of the proletarian revolution in Canada with the line of the trotskyist Maurice Spector and Jack Scott, who advocated that the struggle for independence was a separate stage to be organized before the proletarian revolution could be organized. In an article in the *Communist International* of 1929, the line of Maurice Spector is characterized as: "That we must struggle against colonial exploitation, regard the Canadian bourgeoisie as an oppressed colonial bourgeoisie, and support for their fight for independence!" This line was also correctly characterized in the Political Resolution of the Third Congress of CPC(M-L) as follows: "Jack Scott, echoing the analysis of the trotskyist Maurice Spector, who, in the 1920s, was the first to advance this erroneous thesis, calls Canada an oppressed nation and the struggle for independence the main struggle." Jack Scott's line advocated not the formation of a Marxist-Leninist Communist Party but the formation of an independentist party which would lead the struggle for independence and then would come the time to form the Marxist-Leninist communist Party and to organize the proletarian revolution. That is, the line of Spector and of Jack Scott was that Canada should become independent before the proletarian revolution, to have an independent capitalist Canada which could only be brought about by supporting the bourgeoisie. This these renegades try to mystify is our line when we raise the question of U.S. imperialist domination of Canada and thus they precisely cover up that it is the big bourgeoisie which is selling out the country and that it is only with the overthrow of the big bourgeoisie through the proletarian revolution that genuine independence can be achieved in Canada. Both negate the hegemonic role of the proletariat in the struggle against the U.S. imperialist domination of Canada, one by saying that there can be genuine independence under the dictatorship of the bourgeoisie and the other by negating that U.S. imperialism is part of the main enemy of the proletarian revolution in Canada. This brings us to the next point.

These renegades, having no sense of shame, actually pose the struggle for genuine independence in opposition to the struggle for proletarian revolution. For example they write: "Concerning the concrete conditions in Canada, the struggle for 'independence' is opportunist because a proletarian revolution can never be abandoned for the defence of the homeland", and in a note at the bottom of the previous page, after quoting Enver Hoxha, they turn around and write: "In Canada this is what the struggle for independence means: it means reinforcing Canadian imperialism's position with the aim of keeping markets and zones of influence." According to this twisted logic the monopoly bourgeoisie is the force which stands for Canadian independence as they equate the struggle for independence with the struggle for markets and zones of influence: in other words to fight for genuine independence, they say, is to fight for markets and zones of influence, as if this is the basis for independence. Arguing in this manner they negate both the U.S. imperialist domination of Canada and the role of the reactionary bourgeoisie as the social base for this domination. That the reactionary bourgeoisie has its own interests does not negate the fact that these interests are served precisely by selling out the country to U.S. imperialism. Every day the propaganda organs of the bourgeoisie go on and on about how we need more U.S. investment. The bourgeoisie gives hundreds of millions of dollars to the U.S. imperialists to plunder our country. It is well known that the federal and Ontario governments agreed to give Ford $68 million to build a plant in Ontario and the federal and Quebec governments have made a similar offer to General Motors to build a plant in Quebec. Stalin very clearly pointed out the nature of the bourgeoisie in this era in his closing remarks to the 19th Congress of the CPSU in 1952 where he stated: *"The bourgeoisie used to be regarded as the head of the nation; it championed the rights and independence of the nations, placing them 'above all'. Now not a trace remains of the 'national principle'. Now the bourgeoisie sells the nation's rights and independence for dollars. The banner of national independence and national sovereignty has been cast overboard."* He continued to say that there *"is no doubt that it is up to you, the representatives of the Communist and democratic parties, to lift this banner and carry it forward if you wish to become the leading force of the nation. There is nobody else to lift it."* All their talk about Canada being imperialist is to obscure this.

The reactionary bourgeoisie has sold out this country to the extent that there is more U.S. imperialist investment in this country than in any other country in the world and Canada is the largest debtor country in the world. The renegades want us to believe that it is possible for us to organize the proletarian revolution in Canada without opposing the U.S. imperialist domination of Canada. They say that there is only an internal enemy to the proletarian revolution and negate the existence of an external enemy as well. Somehow, U.S. imperialism for whom the domination of Canada is more important than any other country will be a disinterested spectator when the proletarian revolution is organized in Canada. This is besides the fact that U.S. imperialism is also part of the internal enemy of the proletarian revolution, as the reactionary bourgeoisie is composed of that section which is merely an extension of U.S. imperialism in Canada as well as those who are Canadian. Commenting on the relation between the internal and external oppressors, Comrade Enver Hoxha states in his Report Submitted to the Seventh Congress of the PLA: "The imperialists and social-imperialists have as their close allies the reactionary bourgeoisie of each country where they exercise their influence. They use these allies to do their dirty work and wield the whip on their behalf, so they feed and arm them to have them ready as a striking force in a world conflagration and against peoples who rise in revolution against their internal and external oppressors. Therefore these

See page 4: DOWN WITH REVISIONISM!

DOWN WITH REVISIONISM . . . from page 3

forces cannot be separated from one another. Without combatting the one, you cannot combat the other, without combatting the internal reactionary force until you have overthrown it, you cannot combat the external enemy, you cannot prevent war. You must destroy every kind of base the superpowers have established and created in a given country, for in this way you weaken and destroy the world influence and strength they have based on the enslavement of peoples and countries."

These renegades make a feeble attempt to cover their tracks on this point, pretending that they oppose the other opportunists who negate that U.S. imperialism is part of the main enemy, by stating that "they refuse to consider U.S. imperialism as an internal enemy of the proletarian revolution in Canada" and elsewhere "that the revolution in Canada is a proletarian revolution and it is directed against all the Canadian bourgeoisie as well as against the sectors of U.S. imperialism which operate in Canada." In doing this they only show that they are unprincipled eclectics and shameless tricksters who can write pages on end against the struggle for genuine independence against U.S. imperialist domination and then turn around and say the revolution is also "against the sectors of U.S. imperialism which operate in Canada".

But in doing this they further expose that they are anti-Leninists who regard the proletarian revolution exclusively as the result of the internal development in Canada for they talk about U.S. imperialism only in the sense that it is part of the internal enemy and thus they still negate that it is also the main external enemy. Their entire approach to the question of the proletarian revolution in Canada opposes the very foundations of Leninism. They speak of the proletarian revolution in Canada as a separate and self-sufficient entity opposing a separate national front of capital, in their words — "all the Canadian bourgeoisie as well as against the sectors of U.S. imperialism which operate in Canada". They do not look at the proletarian revolution in Canada as an integral part of the world proletarian revolution, primarily resulting from the development of the contradictions within the world system of imperialism. Their formulation that the revolution is against *all* the Canadian bourgeoisie, etc. brings us to the next point.

They refuse to make any distinction between the monopoly and non-monopoly bourgeoisie and argue that because we do make this distinction that we are giving the call for a two-stage revolution in which the first stage is the struggle for independence and the second stage is the struggle for proletarian revolution. They write: "The CPC(M-L) has absolutely and persistently refuses that in the era of imperialism, in a country like Canada, that is in an imperialist country, the whole bourgeoisie is reactionary and cannot play a progressive role." In their conclusion to this section they write: ". . . they establish an antagonistic contradiction only with the 'compradors', the 'lackeys', and other formulations which imply the same thing, 'monopoly capitalist class', and the 'reactionary bourgeoisie'. All these formulations contain conciliation between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie. They show themselves ready to conciliate with a so-called bourgeoisie which is 'national', 'weak', 'anti-imperialist', or whatever. Imperialism is reaction all along the line and the role of the bourgeoisie can no longer be progressive: *it is reaction all along the line.*"

This refusal on their part to recognize the distinction between the monopoly and non-monopoly bourgeoisie is characteristic of Kautsky's theoretical critique of imperialism and when it is connected with the question of the revolution in Canada proceeding through stages it is characteristic of trotskyism. Lenin wrote: *"Kautsky's theoretical critique of imperialism has nothing in common with Marxism and serves only as a preamble to propaganda for peace and unity with the opportunists and social-chauvinists, precisely for the reason that it evades and obscures the very profound and fundamental contradictions of imperialism: the contradictions between monopoly and free competion which exists side by side with it, between the gigantic 'operations' (and gigantic profits) of finance capital and 'honest' trade in the free market, the contradiction between cartels and trusts, on the one hand, and non-cartelized industry, on the other, etc."*

This they also do when they take Lenin's statement that imperialism is reaction all along the line and then say that "it", referring to the entire bourgeoisie, "is reaction all along the line", because the very point Lenin makes on this question is that monopoly in politics is monopoly in economics but they confuse and mystify the entire issue. Lenin writes: *"Economically, imperialism is monopoly capitalism. To acquire full monopoly, all competition must be eliminated, and not only on the home market (of the given state), but also on foreign markets, in the whole world. Is it* **economically** *possible, 'in the era of finance capital', to eliminate competition even in a foreign state? Certainly it is. It is done through a rival's financial dependence and acquisition of his sources of raw materials and eventually of all his enterprises.*

"The American trusts are the supreme expression of the economics of imperialism or monopoly capitalism. They do not confine themselves to economic means of eliminating rivals, but constantly resort to political, even criminal, methods. It would be the greatest mistake, however, to believe that the trusts cannot establish their monopoly by purely economic methods. Reality provides ample proof that this is 'achievable': the trusts undermine their rivals' credit through the bankes (the owners of the trusts become the owners of the banks: buying up shares); their supply of materials (the owners of the trusts become the owners of the railways: buying up shares); for a certain time the trusts sell below cost, spending millions on this in order to ruin a competitor and then **buy up** *his enterprises, his sources of raw materials (mines, land, etc.).*

"There you have a purely economic analysis of the power of the trusts and their expansion. There you have the purely economic path to expansion: **buying up** *mills and factories, sources of raw materials.*

"Big finance capital of one country can always buy up competitors in another, politically independent country and constantly does so. Economically, this is fully achievable. Economic 'annexation' is fully 'achievable' without political annexation and is widely practised. In the literature on imperialism you will constantly come across indications that Argentina, for example, is in reality a 'trade colony' of Britain, or that Portugal is in reality a 'vassal' of Britain, etc. And that is actually so: economic dependence upon British banks, indebtedness to Britain, British acquisition of their railways, mines, land, etc., enable Britain to 'annex' these countries economically without violating their political independence.

"National self-determination means political independence. Imperialism seeks to violate such independence because political annexation often makes economic annexation easier, cheaper (easier to bribe officials, secure concessions, put through advantageous legislation, etc.), more convenient, less troublesome — just as imperialism seeks to replace democracy generally by oligarchy. But to speak of the economic 'unachievability' of self-determination under imperialism is sheer nonsense."

Under the guise of not conciliating with the bourgeoisie, they obscure the nature of the contradictions and then present their trotskyist theories on one-stage revolution. Directly following the passage quoted above ending "reactionary all along the line", they write: "This line of CPC(M-L) is in accordance with the strategy of the revolution in two stages; a first, anti-imperialist stage, against 'the American imperialists and their lackeys' and a second stage (when the first stage will be completely finished!) that is when the contradiction between the bourgeoisie and the proletariat becomes primary." Here there is a grain of truth in wha. they are saying, i.e., the stages of the revolution depend on the determination of the main blow of the proletariat. However, in the dichotomy which they have set up between one-stage and two-stage revolution, they have completely mystified the Leninst concept on the stages of the revolution, and this they share in common with all the other opportunists whether they are the opportunists who, like them, advocate the trotskyist one-stage revolution or who advocate two-stage revolution. The theory of two-stage revolution whereby the first stage you establish an independent Canada without establishing the dictatorship of the proletariat is nonsense as in this era of imperialism and the proletarian revolution, where the net of financial capital has covered the globe, the bourgeoisie is incapable of defending the independence of the nation. If this theory is used to imply that there can be an independent Canada which has an intermediate form of state between the dictatorship of the bourgeoisie and the dictatorship of the proletariat, no such form of state can exist as the contradiction between the proletariat and bourgeoisie is irreconcilable and the state exists precisely because of the irreconcilability of the exploiting and exploited classes.

The opportunists who advocate the trotskyist one-stage revolution further confuse the issue. Our Party, following the Leninist thesis, does advocate that the revolution advances stepwise through stages as it is a thoroughgoing protracted revolution. In *Foundations of Leninism*, Stalin clearly writes:

"2) **Stages of the revolution, and strategy.** *Strategy is the determination of the main blow of the proletariat at a given stage of the revolution, the elaboration of a corresponding plan for the disposition of the revolutionary forces (main and secondary reserves), the fight to carry out this plan throughout the given stage of the revolution."*

Stalin then goes on to point out that the Russian revolution had already entered its *third* stage. Now, when these opportunists advocate one-stage revolution it is not a question that they simply didn't know how the term stages of the revolution was used by Lenin and Stalin, because like Trotsky, they oppose the development of the revolution in a stepwise manner through stages in essence. This is the central thing in all their ranting and raving, that there is one-stage proletarian revolution against all the bourgeoisie at once, and clamouring that making any distinction between the monopoly and non-monopoly sections of the bourgeoisie is to advocate conciliation with the bourgeoisie. They are playing at the seizure of state power. On the one hand, they detach the struggle for genuine independence against U.S. imperialist domination and thereby detach the Canadian revolution from the world revolution and *"negate that the proletarian revolution must be regarded primarily as the result of the development of the contradictions within the world system of imperialism, as the result of the breaking of the chain of the world imperialist front in one country or another."* On the other hand they advocate that in one stroke the proletariat will eliminate the monopoly and the non-monopoly bourgeoisie, including small producers of town and country, and establish the socialist system, thus creating harmful illusions about the nature of struggle and the target of revolution. Thus, they negate that the main target of the revolution at this stage has to be U.S. imperialism and the reactionary bourgeoisie who dominate all aspects of the life of the country. They deny the *"very profound and fundamental contradictions" "between monopoly and free competition which exists side by side with it"*. They are opposed to singling out the main enemy at the given stage of the revolution and of mobilizing the maximum forces to hit at it, and of neutralizing the other forces which are not the main enemy at that point but who cannot be mobilized. They underrate the importance of the direct reserves of the revolution, such as the small farmers and fishermen and the revolutionary movement of the colonies and the dependent countries, and they pay no attention to the indirect reserves of the revolution which at times can be of prime importance for the advance of the revolution and which include *"the contradictions and conflicts among the non-proletarian classes within the country, which can be utilized by the proletariat to weaken the enemy and to strengthen its own reserves."* This is the characteristic of Trotsky's theory of permanent revolution which placed the reserves of the proletariat in the camp of the enemy. This is anti-Leninist ignoring of the necessity of mobilizing all the possible forces to hit at the main enemy even if the forces be only temporary and vacillating allies. The contradiction with the non-monopoly bourgeoisie is irreconcilable and the dictatorship of the proletariat will be used to regulate and eliminate them. But the state power, as well as the economy, military, culture, etc. is not controlled by them but by the U.S. imperialists and the reactionary bourgeoisie who thus constitute the main enemy. In fact, while the contradiction between the non-monopoly bourgeoisie and the U.S. imperialists and the reactionary bourgeoisie is fundamentally a contradiction in the camp of the enemy, it does not negate the fact that their contradictions with them are fundamental, that the non-monopoly bourgeoisie are at the mercy of and are subordinated to the monopolies and trusts and that it may be possible to mobilize sections of them as tactical reserves under the hegemony of the proletariat in the struggle against the main enemy.

They accuse CPC(M-L) of "suffering from a disgusting social-chauvinism". While this contains their distortions about Canada's role in the world and their nonsense about "the colony of Native Indians", the prime feature is that it completely falsifies what the Party's attitude is towards the Canadian oppressor state and its participation in the world imperialist system of states. As to the Party's attitude towards the Native Indians, the Party has always vigorously and militantly denounced the genocide and all the state attacks against the Native people and has provided the Native people with material as well as propaganda support in their struggles in defence of their land and hereditary rights, in defence of their way of life. As to Canada's role internationally, it is well-known that it has always opposed Canada's participation in the attacks on the world's people, whether it is its participation in NATO and NORAD, in the UN "peacekeeping forces", in the ICC in Vietnam, its support for reactionary and fascist regimes, etc., etc. The Party has done extensive propaganda against Canada's preparation for imperialist war to redivide the world on the side of U.S. imperialism. As to jumping up and down and shouting a word learned by rote, "imperialism", every time some opportunist finds out that some "Canadian" bank has a branch in another country, while overlooking the peculiarities of strategic and political relationships, this we will gladly leave to the domain of the opportunists.

Despite all their talk about doing concrete analysis of concrete conditions, they present no concrete analysis of Canada at all. The only thing which even resembles a concrete analysis of concrete conditions is a quotation of three short paragraphs from the theoretical organ of the CPUSA from August 1930. While 1978 is not 1930 (just as it is also not 1902) and while concrete analysis of concrete condtions is not done by quoting from another Party's organ (unless you are analyzing the conditions in that country), even then these quotes are taken out of context. While they quote that "during the past seven years it exported $800 million of capital", they conveniently do not give the information from the chart which follows which shows that more than 50 percent of the export of capital in 1930 was to the USA. Also in quoting they conveniently leave out that "American capital continues to pour into Canada; averages during the last five years show a rate of $186,000,000 a year." So much for *their* concrete analysis of concrete conditions!

The whole argument on the national question in Qúebec is based on their concoction that there is an English Canadian nation, and because the Party does not recognize the existence of this mythical nation, it means that it is an English-chauvinist organization. It is not necessary to prove this because "this is a fact admitted by all including Lenin." This follows from what they write at the beginning of this section: "In Volume 39 of his works, Lenin differentiates, the *English Canadians*, the *French Canadians* and the *Indians*." So, comrades, we investigated Volume 39 which is comprised of Lenin's notebooks on imperialism and is over 800 pages long. In this volume there are about 30 references directly to Canada, and more by implication, but nowhere does Lenin refer to the existence of three nations in Canada. (As a secondary point here, one should remember that Lenin supposedly made a mistake in writing that Canada was a colony in *Imperialism, the Highest Stage of Capitalism* because that was the commonly accepted view in Europe of Canada at that time; and this they write after they have looked into Volume 39, which has all this information on Canada based on the systematic and critical study of hundreds of books, essays and articles from a multitude of different sources. . .) In this Volume there is one reference to Canada on p. 714 of the English and on p. 754 in the French edition, where Lenin has notes on the breakdown of the population in the various colonies and where beside Canada he has written in his notebook 54 percent Britons, 28.5 percent French and 1.5 percent Indians, with the term Anglo-Saxons being used in the French edition where Britons is used in the English edition, and the sum of all this makes 84 percent, which means Lenin left a "nation" out of his analysis! In this section it is very clear that Lenin is giving a breakdown of the population, unless these opportunists want to argue that in Nicaragua, where is one nation of Indians, Negroes, etc., and a second nation of Europeans or that in Argentina there is the Argentinian nation and the nation of French, Spanish and Italians. As to their "fact admitted by all including Lenin" we have shown that this is not the case. So who is it that they are referring to when they say that the existence of the English-Canadian nation is admitted by all? Stanely Ryerson, a leading revisionist ideologue, wrote a whole book to show that there were two nations. En Lutte! and the League give this propaganda and so does the Canadian government. But the opportunists based on their lies about Volume 39 went on to write: "If Bains does not agree he should prove that everyone is wrong except himself." We hope that these renegades will not be too disappointed, if we, instead of Comrade Bains, prove them and the bourgeoisie and their other agents wrong, and show that they are completely ignorant of the Marxist-Leninist definition of a nation.

In the immortal classic, *Marxism and the National Question*, Stalin wrote: *"A nation is a historically evolved, stable community of people, formed on the basis of a common language, territory, economic life, and psychological make-up manifested in a common culture."* Further on, he emphasizes: *"It is only when all these characteristics are present that we have a nation."* Stalin also points out that Russia and Austria are not considered nations and makes a distinction between a national community and a political community, a state. He points out that while both are stable communities, a state is conceivable without a common language while a nation is not. The English Canadian nation which they are talking about which they say excludes Quebec does not have a common territory and to the extent it has a common economic life that economic life includes Quebec. So much for their English Canadian nation. Further, the Party has explained the historical development of the oppression of the Quebec nation and the development of the Anglo-Canadian oppressor state. Here for example, we refer to articles in the June 25, 28 and 30, 1977 issues of *People's Canada Daily News*. We are sure that these opportunists are aware of such articles, but being unable to refute them, they acted like ostriches sticking their heads in the sand and hoped that their lie about Lenin and the "convincing" argument that the existence of the English Canadian nation was "admitted by all", would save them. Here we would also like to point out a fine example of what could only be described as police-socialist logic. On the one hand, they implied that Lenin was wrong in saying that Canada was a colony in 1916 and that his *mistake* was that he had based himself on "the generally widespread and accepted view in Europe at that time". In other words, mistakes can be made if you base yourself on the 'generally widespread and accepted view' and then they turn around and say that the *proof* that there are two nations is that this thesis is "accepted by all". What is consistent is that they follow the logic of imperialism, pragmatism, that truth is what works. So, if they can prove their argument by saying Lenin was a charlatan who made the mistake of basing his arguments simply on a generally accepted view, then they will argue in that fashion; then. on another occasion if it serves their interest they will present the "generally accepted" view as proof! The point here is that an honest individual may be genuinely confused and present wrong arguments or reach wrong conclusions. But a serious individual will not lie about the facts and say Lenin said something which he didn't say and he won't argue in one way one minute and turn around and argue the opposite way the next minute just to prove his point.

Further, this is not just a wrong conclusion which they are reaching in mid-air, but a conclusion which serves as the basis for saying that the English-speaking Canadians are the source of the oppression of Quebec. They write: "According to him, the oppression of the Quebec nation is the oppressor *state* and not the oppressive English-Canadian nation." They have violently taken up the propaganda of the reactionary bourgeoisie, of the revisionists and opportunists of all hues, to try to implicate the masses of the people in the oppression of the nation of Quebec by ascribing to the oppressor state, which was established by the British colonialists and is today dominated by the U.S. imperialists, the name "English Canadian nation". In fact, with their "three nations" theory, which is merely an embellishment on the "two nations" theory, they assist the reactionary bourgeoisie by telling the Quebec people that their enemy is not the reactionary bourgeoisie and its oppressor state and that in order to win national liberation, this oppressor state must be destroyed, but rather their enemy is the "English Canadian nation". This propaganda is also that the English-speaking proletariat has a stake in the suppression of Quebec which is none other than a refurbished version of Trudeau's line that it is in the interests of the Canadian people to maintain the subjugation of the nation of Quebec. They completely obscure in this manner that the Canadian state is not only the enemy of the Quebec nation and of the Native people but also of the proletariat and the broad masses of the people throughout Canada. On the contrary they are carrying out the most insidious propaganda that the English-speaking proletariat and people have common cause with the state which not only oppresses the Quebec nation but also oppresses them. This propaganda of theirs concretely fosters narrow nationalism in Quebec which seeks to divide the proletariat by portraying the proletariat outside of Quebec as the oppressor of Quebec. At the same time, it foments social chauvinism in the rest of Canada by saying that the proletariat in the rest of Canada has common interest with the Canadian oppressor state.

Turning truth on its head, these renegades denounce the Party as being chauvinist, annexationist and racist for pointing out the state as the instrument of the foreign imperialists and the reactionary bourgeoisie for subjugating Quebec. But it doesn't matter how many terrifying names they call the Party, they cannot hide what is historical fact; that it is the Party which concretely analyzed the concrete features of the national question and their historical development in Canada, and that it is the Party which has vigorously done propaganda for genuine national liberation for Quebec and against the national and social chauvinist theory of two nations and against the "unity fraud" of Trudeau and the "independence fraud" of Lévesque and all the other attempts to mobilize the people for a reactionary civil war. Lenin and Stalin repeatedly emphasize the need to look at the national question as it is concretely manifested in each country and in the context of the historical period which the country is passing through. Lenin wrote: *"The categorical requirement of Marxist theory in investigating any social question is that it be examined within definite historical limits, and, if it refers to a particular country (e.g., the national programme for a given country), that account be taken of the specific features distinguishing that country from others in the same historical epoch."* And Stalin writes: *"It is possible that a specific solution to the problem will be required for each nation. If a dialectical approach to a question is required anywhere it is required here, in the national question."* But they present absolutely no analysis of the historical development and the present state of the national question in Canada. They have not a word to say against the massive propaganda which is being done right in front of their noses for national and social chauvinism under the guise of the "unity" and "independence" frauds (except that they *support* the "two nations" theory on which much of this propaganda is based). Again, they simply jump up and down, repeat over and over again, words which they have learned by rote, "oppressed and oppressor nations" in order to oppose a serious Marxist analysis. This is truly a pathetic and despicable performance.

They write that there is a third nation in Canada, the nation of the Native people which is forming. Here they are confusing *nation*, which is an historical category, with *tribe*, which is an ethnographical category. Stalin writes; *"It is possible to conceive of people possessing a common 'national character', but they cannot be said to constitute a single nation if they are economically disunited, inhabit different territories, speak different languages, and so forth."* We realize that they say that the Native peoples' nation is in its formation, but they provide no indication of what are the signs of this; are they denying that the Native peoples speak different languages, are economically disunited, etc.? As to the attitude of the Party towards the Native people, they write: ". . . and all that the Third Congress found to say concerning the Native people is that it was 'extremely sympathetic to their cause'." This again is an outright lie. Referring to the reactionary bourgeoisie, the Third Congress wrote, among other things: "It has destroyed the livelihood of the Native people and is throwing them off their hereditary lands and smashing their traditional way of life;" and in listing the strategic aims of the Party, it included: "5) Restoration of the hereditary rights of the Native people." Through our practice we have concretely demonstrated our support for the actual struggles of the Native people, whether it was the armed occupation at Anishinabe Park, the Native Peoples' Caravan, demonstrations in support of the hereditary rights and against the genocidal policies of the rich and their state, production of literature, etc; while these opportunists are actually working to divert the actual concrete struggle of the Native people in defence of their hereditary rights by giving the line that their struggle is for a nation in the north. Further, here too, these opportunists aim their main guns not at the bourgeoisie and its state but at the people and the Party. They write: "The chauvinism which exists in the Quebec nation in relation to the Native people and the self-determination of their nation, including their right to secession, cannot be denied. This right should be defended in English Canada as well as in Quebec and foremost it should be defended before the 'Marxist-Leninists' who do nothing but peddle the chauvinism of the big bourgeoisie in regards to the nation of the Native people." As to the attitude of the Quebec nation to the Native people, history has proved that it is anything but chauvinist. The very existence of the Métis people is proof of this. Are they unaware, that in the rebellions of the Native and Métis peoples in the 1870s and 1880s, that they had the support of the settlers and for that reason the Anglo-Canadian state formed the North West Mounted Police to suppress their struggle, and that when the state hung Louis Riel there was an uprising in Quebec against this? This is the logic of police socialism: when the facts show that the proletariat and people support the real struggles of the Native peoples, then they impose some non-existent demand on the struggle, and then with a great hullaballoo and righteous "revolutionary outrage" they attack the Marxist-Leninists and the people for not supporting this non-existent demand and thus mystify the actual oppression and genocide by the rich and their state, screaming that the Marxist-Leninists are the agents of the bourgeoisie and that the masses of the people are the problem because they are afflicted by bourgeois ideology. While there is a grain of truth that bourgeois ideology does have its effects on the people, it is precisely these yellow renegades who help to spread it in the ranks of the people by opposing the real struggles of the people, fomenting national and social chauvinism and obscuring, even further, negating, who is the enemy.

They write: "Bains speaks of 'revolutionary nationalism of the proletariat'. Without doubt, he has read somewhere that proletarians do not have a homeland and that nationalism is part of bourgeois ideology, but even so this does not embarrass him anyway." Thus, according to these renegades, there is no People's Socialist Republic of Albania and there is no question of constructing socialism on the basis of the Marxist-Leninist principle of self-reliance because "proletarians do not have a homeland". This is what imperialism, social-imperialism and all reaction is preaching and these renegades are the willing tools of them. The utter shamelessness of these renegades is such that, on one hand, they complain about the origin of the leadership of the Party, at the same time when it comes to serving imperialism, social-imperialism and all reaction they complain under the hoax that the "proletarians have no homeland". Are they trying to tell us that because "proletarians do not have a homeland" that they do not exist in very definite countries and nations? In the oppressed nations in this era is there any other class whose interests represent the interests of the nation other than the proletariat? Is it not true that only the proletariat can lead the nations to throw off all oppression and at the same time not to seek any privileges as the bourgeois nationalists are interested in? For these simple-minded souls it must be very hard to understand the concept of "revolutionary nationalism" of the proletariat, which is opposed to all national oppression and stands for equality among nations as the necessary precondition to the unity of nations.

They also write that CPC(M-L) has been giving the incorrect slogan of "national liberation for Quebec" and that they "cannot recognize national liberation in the case of the Quebec nation because it is not the agrarian question which is the concern in Quebec. In Quebec there exists a large proletariat and the question presented is the proletarian revolution and that is all. The elimination of the oppression of the Quebec nation is part of the task of the proletarian revolution in Canada." Here, they confuse everything! Because it is not the agrarian question which is the concern in Quebec" are they seriously advocating that we should not call for the national liberation of the oppressed nation of Quebec. Or, perhaps in the eagerness to say the Party was "incorrect" they thought that we were using a wrong formulation and that they were going to "catch us" on it. But the call for national liberation of Quebec means precisely that Quebec must have the right to self-determination, including secession if the people of Quebec so desire and we have made this clear through our propaganda. This also a scientific formulation, so even on this basis their criticism has no validity. Lenin wrote: *"National self-determination is the same as the struggle for complete national liberation, for complete independence, against annexation, and socialists* **cannot** *— without ceasing to be socialists — reject* **such** *a struggle in whatever form, right down to an uprising or war."* That the question presented is the proletarian revolution and that is all" is also entirely wrong, but we will not go into this as there is almost no limit to the number of wrong things they say.

TO BE CONTINUED.

WORKERS OF ALL COUNTRIES, UNITE!

PEOPLE'S CANADA DAILY NEWS

Volume 9 Number 15 January 17, 1979

ORGAN OF THE CENTRAL COMMITTEE OF THE COMMUNIST PARTY OF CANADA (MARXIST-LENINIST)

ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

SUBSCRIPTION RATES

Telephone (416) 252 3553 (General)

* All editorial correspondence should be sent to: PCDNI

	Canada	International
Canada Postal Address: P.O. Box 917 Station "C" Toronto, Ontario	$ U.S.	
From Vendor	$ 0.15	$ 0.20
Via mail	0.25	0.30
Monthly	6.00	8.00
Quarterly	18.00	24.00
Half-Yearly	36.00	48.00
Yearly	66.00	96.00

All business correspondence should be sent to: National Publication Centre Box 727, Adelaide Stn. Toronto, Ontario, Canada

Daily — 6 days a week

Published by: CPC(M-L)

Printed by: People's Canada Publishing House

Distributed by: National Publication Centre

Please send all subscriptions to: NATIONAL PUBLICATION CENTRE Box 727, Adelaide Stn., Toronto, Ontario

Please make all cheques and money orders payable to National Publication Centre

PCDNI is also available daily in French as Le Quotidien du Canada Populaire

ISSN 0702-3249