

Coping with a Real Break

By Danny Goldstick, Toronto

Pro-Obama or anti-Obama? Both. Canadians did not have the chance to vote on his candidacy for President, but - like billions around the globe - we have got reason to be grateful to the American people for doing themselves a favour in the very probably history-making election of 2008, which has brought genuine promise of a more responsible environmental policy, less U.S. militarism and even, more democracy - because the Obama campaign managed to uncork people's forces that may well be making themselves increasingly felt in the years to come.

And yet. Obama is still the leader of United States imperialism, the strongest concentration still of anti-human activism in the world. It's hard to say how much we should be disappointed by Washington's recent reversals over Palestine and Honduras, for instance, and Washington's non-reversal over (say) the Cuban Five and (so far) Afghanistan - about which nothing positive ever was promised anyway. We have most likely yet to see the Obama Administration's new domestic and foreign policy line unfolded fully.

For a good many years now Washington has been solving its problems essentially by printing money that ended up in foreign private and state holdings - in effect

daring foreigners to start dumping their dollars and so impoverish themselves by cheapening the remainder that they possess, and pushing up the exchange rates of their own currencies so their exports would become more expensive. This is how U.S. global rampaging has been afforded lately. But led by China, foreigners are increasingly saying enough is enough - the U.S. industrial supremacy that underpinned Washington's world political dominance is largely in the past (exceptions: top-of-the-line computers, military materiel, entertainment).

Obama appears to be serious about nuclear disarmament. He appears to recognize, unlike the Cheney cowboys his team (mostly) replaced, that the time has come to pull back a bit internationally. Hence "multilateralist" sharing of imperialist global policing. This is not necessarily in itself anything for the world's progressive forces to celebrate, but it may open up possibilities for us that were less available when United States imperialism was strong enough to "run a tight ship" on its side of the global battle.

The worst danger ahead looks to be inter-imperialist rivalries that could erupt into a lethal nuclear conflict. Just think of the 1914 outbreak of world war, which likewise didn't really serve the interests of any of the imperial

powers engaged in the initial conflict. Then, even if World War III is avoided, continued global warming could deal a shattering blow to the human and other species.

Are the capitalist powers smart enough on their own to avoid the worst possibilities for worldwide disaster? Previous experience with them makes pretty clear that it will, on the contrary, take united, militant, prolonged struggle by people's forces around the planet to really save us now. ■

Issue No. 3 - December 2, 2009 CONTENTS

Coping with a Real Break / 1

**Dictatorship of the Proletariat
- Part Two / 2**

US Policy on Cuba / 2

Anti-imperialist solidarity / 4

Our position on China / 5

The most urgent task / 5

Comments from Burnaby / 6

Proposed amendment / 7

Contribution to discussion / 7

Pay the Climate Bill / 8

**DEADLINE FOR
BULLETIN #4:
Monday, Dec. 28**

Not Introducing the Dictatorship of the Proletariat?

Due to length restrictions, part one of this contribution by Stephen Von Sychowski of the Burnaby Club appeared in Discussion Bulletin #2. Here is the conclusion.

It is our duty as Communists to fight to overcome the propaganda of the bosses, to raise their class and political consciousness and to fight with them for socialism. We must be clear and straight forward to the people about our intentions and our beliefs if we aim to win their support and play the historic role that, as Leninists, we believe a Communist Party must fulfill for its class. We stand to gain nothing from hiding our identity or our goals behind names and phrases that do not truly represent us.

The term “dictatorship of the proletariat” has an ideological and historical significance which we cannot simply throw away. It reminds us first of all that the nature of every state is a class dictatorship. We do not entertain the social democratic dream of a third way in which the state serves everyone - both the workers, and their masters. We aim for a transfer of power from the absolute dictatorship of the bourgeoisie to the absolute dictatorship of the proletariat (working class). The term “dictatorship of the proletariat” was, and is, intended to succinctly sum up the nature of the state which exists behind the specifics of its various manifestations. It is a scientific phrase, free of liberalism and illusions, describing the historically required form of workers state power which must be established in order to usher in the higher phase of socialism; communism, a class-less, state-less

co-operative society. It is a historically required transitional period for the removal of all barriers to this transition and likewise the creation of the conditions for it. Marx and Lenin laid out the importance of the dictatorship of the proletariat in a number of works including those from which these important quotes are gleaned:

“Between capitalist and communist society there lies the period of the revolutionary transformation of the one into the other. Corresponding to this is also a political transition period in which the state can be nothing but the revolutionary dictatorship of the proletariat.” - Karl Marx, *Critique of the Gotha Program*

“The dictatorship of the proletariat, i.e., the organization of the vanguard of the oppressed as the ruling class for the purpose of suppressing the oppressors, cannot result merely in an expansion of democracy. Simultaneously with an immense expansion of democracy, which for the first time becomes democracy for the poor, democracy for the people, and not democracy for the money-bags, the dictatorship of the proletariat imposes a series of restrictions on the freedom of the

oppressors, the exploiters, the capitalists. We must suppress them in order to free humanity from wage slavery, their resistance must be crushed by force; it is clear that there is no freedom and no democracy where there is suppression and where there is violence.” - V.I. Lenin, *The State and Revolution*

If we are to advance the cause of socialism in Canada, we must ensure that our party always remains united around our scientific socialist theory and our Communist ideology. This Convention presents an opportunity to re-assert our Marxist-Leninist ideology and to stand clearly, openly, and boldly reject all forms of opportunism and revisionism. I hope that comrades will consider this in their discussions and decisions and, as the draft Political Resolution says, “...reiterate our conviction that the essence and strength of our Communist movement derives from its fidelity to Marxism-Leninism, both in theory and practice, including our collective responsibility to respond to, and struggle against, all manifestations of opportunism (both right and ‘left’), revisionism and reformism within our ranks.”■

U.S. policy on Cuba

From Ardis Harriman, Parkdale Club, Toronto

The following paragraph should be added to Section One, paragraph 25, after the sentence beginning “Some of the pronouncements of the new Administration...”:

President Obama has shown no political will to radically change

U.S. policy toward Cuba. Although he has eased some restrictions imposed by the Bush administration, he has stated unequivocally that the 50-year-old blockade against Cuba will not be lifted. In addition, Vice-President Joe Biden recently said that “The US will maintain the embargo as a tool to apply pressure on Cuba.”■

Who ever said anti-imperialist solidarity means solidarity with progressives only?

By Saleh Waziruddin

You can choose your friends but not family. You can't choose who your ruling class invades, yet you still owe them anti-imperialist solidarity. This is like how we can't choose who our boss attacks at work, it might be a Tory or someone bad at their job but we still have to defend their rights because if we let the boss win everyone else is next. This simple idea is Lenin's concept of anti-imperialist solidarity in "Imperialism: the Highest Stage of Capitalism," solidarity is NOT just with workers and progressives but with all forces targeted by imperialism abroad. Otherwise we and they will be a reserve for the boss in going after one and then the other. This is not because imperialism's targets are automatically progressive, but because of how imperialism works in pitting us against each other.

The Main Political Resolution (see Bulletin #1) is dogmatic about anti-imperialist solidarity, especially point #21 where it not only opposes solidarity with Iran's government just because it is targeted by imperialism (not reason enough!?) but puts words in the mouths of people like me saying we must think the Iranian government is pro-worker or progressive since we are calling for support with it, as if anti-imperialist solidarity is only for progressives! The Resolution rightfully declares solidarity with Latin American countries opposing imperialism, who themselves publicly support Iran's government, but conspicuously leaves out forces in Iraq and Afghanistan in hot battles with imperialism and giving it a run

for its money.

This confusion about imperialism is part of a growing divide in the communist and progressive movement. The Lebanese CP recognizes Hezbollah and the Palestine People's Party recognizes Hamas as part of the anti-imperialist resistance and give it armed support even though Hezbollah and Hamas are not progressive¹, and the Syrian CP² called the Iranian election a victory for anti-imperialist resistance³. Not just communists: the ALBA countries (Venezuela, Bolivia, Ecuador, Cuba, Honduras under Zelaya, Nicaragua, and three Caribbean countries) who the Political Resolution is in solidarity with, and Brazil, have publicly supported Ahmadinejad and the Iranian government for being in imperialism's cross-hairs⁴.

On the other hand, some other communist parties have called these anti-imperialist forces a threat to the working class⁵. Recently *People's Voice* carried an interview by *Junge Welt* with CC First Secretary of the Tudeh Party⁶ where he correctly pointed out it is dogmatic to criticize the Iranian opposition for not being purely working class, but why shouldn't the same anti-dogmatism not apply to the Iranian government's anti-imperialism? In the interview the Tudeh leader denigrates Iran's refusal to give in to imperialism by comparing it with the Taliban's combat against imperialism, without giving a reason for why this isn't anti-imperialism. Isn't it objectively anti-imperialist (and natural!) when you are actually fighting armies occupying your country, or are under threat of

invasion but hold on to sovereignty anyway? Yes, there are limitations to these forces, but who can deny that they are not surrendering to imperialism?

Iran's government and its President Ahmadinejad in particular are being viciously attacked in a propaganda campaign like the Iraq WMD claims. Even some communists have swallowed the lie that Ahmadinejad is a holocaust denier despite him protesting "I'm not saying it didn't happen",⁷ or that he has threatened Israel, even though leftists unsympathetic to Ahmadinejad such as professor Juan Cole have refuted the latter as groundless⁸. In the recent interview Tudeh's leader was asked point-blank about these accusations but he didn't refute them. Tudeh Party's 2005 statement repeats the canard that Ahmadinejad called for "wiping Israel off the map."⁹

At the Mexico-Canada-US Peace trilateral in October the Tudeh representative said that Iran wants to conquer the Islamic world. This is not something the Iranian government has said and simply doesn't have the means to do, although anyone concerned about someone conquering the Islamic world should look no further than the US which not only has the means but is occupying Iraq and Afghanistan, bombing Yemen, Somalia, and Pakistan, declaring Syria and Iran to be next, and threatened Pakistan's government with being "bombed into the stone age!"¹⁰ Let's get realistic about who is a threat to the Islamic world let alone the whole world.

In Canada we're not only subject

to anti-Iranian war propaganda that it's our duty to counter, but Canada has exceeded the UN's sanctions against Iran despite Iran's compliance with the nuclear non-proliferation treaty. Canada has banned direct air links with Iran and forbidden Iranian Cultural Centres¹¹, which has nothing to do with nuclear weapons but isolates our peoples from each other. As Leninists it's our duty to break open this blockade, instead of joining our ruling class in condemning Iran's government.

Anti-imperialist solidarity is being counter-posed to solidarity with workers. British labour unions backed out of a resolution for immediate withdrawal from Iraq, a turn-around they credited solely to

Abdullah Muhsin of the Iraqi Federation of Trade Unions who is also of the Iraqi CP, whose open letter said withdrawal would be "bad for my country, bad for emerging progress forces, a terrible blow for trade unionism..."¹². We should reject this kind of "solidarity".

I propose that we replace point 21 of the Main Political Resolution (see Bulletin #1) with:

"We also express our solidarity with Iran which is the target of a campaign of slander and misinformation portraying it as a threat to other countries, as well as under UN sanctions despite complying with international treaties, and additional sanctions by the Government of Canada that

make travel and contact between peoples of the two countries difficult.

We convey our revolutionary solidarity with the anti-imperialists in Iraq and Afghanistan resisting direct occupations by NATO countries including Canada, some of the most powerful and vicious military forces in human history. The successes of the resistance are a crisis for for the same ruling class we struggle against." ■

(Note from the editors: the author of this submission also supplied extensive footnotes, which take the contribution over the 1000-word limit. To receive the footnotes by email, contact us at pvoice@telus.net).

Clarify our position on China

**Barry Lord, Davenport Club,
Toronto**

In the Davenport Club discussion of the Convention Document, a couple of us agreed that it would be worth requesting a clear statement specifically on the Party's understanding of China and its role. I suggested that this could be approached in the context of identifying the principal contradiction and secondary contradictions in the world today. For instance:

- Many contemporary bourgeois journalists or commentators today would say that the principal contradiction in the world is between the United States and terrorism, or perhaps between the U.S. and Islamic extremism.

- Some - still bourgeois in outlook - might suggest that the underlying

primary contradiction is between the U.S. and China.

- We evidently see U.S. imperialism as on one side of the principal contradiction in the world today, but what do we see on the other side - it used to be socialism, but for the last 20 years this is no longer accurate. So is it now between U.S. Imperialism and the world's peoples? Or U.S. imperialism and the working class? It would seem to be worthwhile asserting what the primary contradiction is, as a basis for the Document.

There are also a number of secondary contradictions of importance. For example:

- the Document mentions inter-imperialist rivalries - the contradiction between U.S. imperialism and the E.U., for example.

- The Document also refers to the rise of China, but does not identify clearly what the understanding of China is. Clearly, the contradiction between U.S. imperialism and China does not come under the heading of inter-imperialist rivalries. Is it still meaningful to speak of the contradiction between U.S. imperialism and the remaining socialist states, so that China, like Cuba, Vietnam, Cambodia and Laos, might be seen as part of those remaining socialist states.

In brief, we think it is important to clarify the Party's understanding of China. Whether it is also of value to approach that question and others in the context of identifying and relating principal and secondary contradictions (as always used to be done in many M-L documents) I leave to you.

The Most Urgent Task

**Sean Currie, Vancouver East
Club CPC**

Since the constraints on submissions to the convention discussion are limited to 1000 words this submission cannot elaborate nor fully develop or defend the criticisms raised within.

Paragraph 4 of the Draft Main Political Resolution (MPR) is the clearest expression yet of the weakness and confusion in defining tactics, policies and revolutionary ideological content for the Party in the current period of imperialism in Canada.

Because of this ideological weakness the MPR provides a good “recap” of events leading to the current capitalist crisis but fails to articulate clearly a program, vision and path to socialism for the Canadian working class. It is a retreat into the faceless expanse of “coalition” work, subordinating revolutionary socialism and Marxism-Leninism to unity with undefined “left” forces. However the statement expresses what should be the revolutionary focus of the Party - winning state power.

The main political weakness of the MPR is that it fails to map the steps to power for the Canadian working class. It subordinates the leading role of the CPC and the Canadian working class to a “People’s Coalition” of undefined character, scope and role as an intermediate step to socialism. The MPR has failed to draw the full conclusion from recent discussions in the International Communist movement led by KKE that we are in the era of the last stage of

capitalism beyond which there is only socialism and the type of coalitions that we must struggle to build are those that are committed to overthrowing capitalism and winning and wielding political power in the interests of the Canadian working class - which Von Sychowski clearly points to.

Adding further to the confusion and ambiguity within the MPR is the criticism of organized labour for its alleged failure to mount any effective fightback, its many organizational failures, and failure to “move the struggle back into the streets”.

In the same breath there is an explicit call for a Party orientation to “mobilize and win defensive struggles” without defining which “defensive struggles” are being discussed. At the same time the MPR does not fully elaborate the objective conditions which organized labour have confronted in “defence” of jobs, pensions and wages. This places Communists in the “general” camp of anti-unionism.

Canadian workers will not understand these sweeping generalizations.

Lending further to the confusion within the MPR is the contradictory CC August 22 2009 statement of emphasis about political tactics, policies and ideology for the Party in the next 3 year period. The January 2009 CC Report called for the “pressing need” of the “highest priority” to “build and strengthen” Action Caucuses - the MPR does not even discuss this task. Has this priority changed in 7 months?

It is a continuation of the similar

confusion and contradictory statements within the Party’s peace policy which states that “growth of the world peace movement must be a top priority for the Communists everywhere” and advocates “stepping up peace actions through the CPA and local anti-war coalitions” while at the same time “recognising the decisive importance” of building the Canadian Peace Congress.

The MPR says the “most central and pressing task for our Party”, is the defeat the Harper Conservatives. How this is to be achieved and what is the special role of the Party in the defeat of Harper is not discussed. Yet the “People’s Coalition” is now supposed to replace the “Progressive Block of MPs” which was once advocated to halt the main Harper danger and where party members were advised to not vote strategically.

Further confusion states that to build a “bigger, stronger Communist Party is the most urgent task and decisive task” and that “all efforts in the next three years must be directed to accomplish this objective”.

The August 2008 CC adopted a call to make “make energy nationalization the material basis for a radical overhaul of the Canadian economy...” and central to the 2008 Federal elections where it is stated that “The outcome of this debate is central to the entire future of Canada and its sovereignty, and to the very future of our planet.”

Gaining control over Canada’s energy resources is absolutely correct and the basis for mobilizing labour and bringing it into sharp

confrontation with monopoly capital. The result of this correct conclusion however is weakened by the flawed and contradictory People's Energy Plan which objectively cannot "foster class unity".

Working class unity cannot be built by supporting calls for the wholesale destruction of industrial energy development in Canada while at the same time calling for the expansion of Canada's industrial base, "ensuring our country's sovereignty" and warning against policies that "jeopardize" Canada's industrial development". The MPR evades this obvious contradiction.

Subordinating workers' jobs and income and Canadian industrial development to advocating the "urgent need" for unity in a People's Coalition with "environmental

groups" without defining which "groups" and on what basis unity is to occur cannot lead to "genuine working class unity", and subordinates the leading role of Canadian workers to petty bourgeois opportunist, revisionist and leftist influences of which the MPR calls upon members combat.

Such a policy of "unity" must lead to the question of the inclusion, for example, of the Sierra Club of Canada in the "People's Coalition", since it provides "leadership" and enjoys "broad" support from other environmental and "left" groups such as the Council of Canadians and advocates for the market approach to environmental protection.

The MPR confuses the tasks confronting the Canadian working class and leaves the membership and Canadian workers scratching their

heads determining what is the "most urgent task" confronting the Party, its membership and Canadian workers; focusing on winning defensive battles, building a People's Coalition but don't vote strategically, building an international peace movement but work within the CPA although the CPCCon is of decisive importance, defeating Harper Conservatives but don't vote strategically, advancing and fighting for a People's Energy Plan yet advocate the halt to all industrial power sources, building unity with environmental groups or building a bigger Communist Party? ■

(Note from the editors: the author of this submission also supplied extensive footnotes, which take the contribution over the 1000-word limit. To receive the footnotes by email, contact us at pvoice@telus.net).

Comments from the Burnaby Club

The Burnaby Club met and discussed the draft resolution. We estimate that we are currently in the third or even the second worst crisis in the history of capitalism. If that is the case then the draft lacks urgency. It seems to be a business as usual approach and is bland to the point of irrelevance.

1. We feel that there needs to be a sharper analysis of the cause and effects of this crisis.

2. We feel that there needs to be analysis of the effect of the much weakened role of communist parties which has led to a loss of militancy of the labour movement and a lack of opposition to the Chicago School free marketeering prior to, and since the crisis.

3. It is our estimation that right opportunism[see below] is a much more significant danger. As right opportunism grows, labour militancy falters, workers become disillusioned, and union density drops. Workers when presented progressive leadership will rise to the occasion. U.A.W. Ford workers turned down their leadership's concessions. C.A.W. leadership at Ford made similar recommendations for concessions and for lack of militancy at the shop level these were accepted. Examples of right opportunism: 1) "Socialism of the 20th Century" which looks suspiciously like the Euro-communism of the 60's and 70's. 2) The abandonment of the

CONCEPT of the Dictatorship of the Proletariat.

4. China seems to be the likely engine of the capitalist system's recovery. The draft mentions China three times [ps 13, 14] but lacks a critique of whether China has socialism with a Chinese character or capitalism with a Chinese character.

5. Global warming is upon us. There is a growing segment of the population that are environmentally aware but who need to be shown the contradiction between a planet with limited resources and the capitalist law of a corporations need to expand or die. While the draft [ps 71 to 73] mentions the environment we think there needs to be an analysis of

“market” solutions such as quotas and cap and trade schemes.

6. The action plan [ps 81, 82] with the exceptions of withdrawal from Afghanistan and NAFTA is generally vague. This may well be addressed in a subsequent Plan of Work document or by further submissions.

We refer you all to Murray Dobbin’s article in the Autumn 2009 Canadian Perspective. It is much less comprehensive and analytical than our draft but it is a pithy call to action. eg “Indeed, nothing short of a cultural revolution in the developed world has any chance of saving the planet and humanity.”

Amendment to the Draft Political Resolution

Catherine Holliday, Alternate CC member

Add to the end of Section 30 regarding the CPC’s continuing adherence to Marxism-Leninism:

“The CPC will organize a Historical Research Commission to investigate the historical facts regarding Bolshevik history in the USSR under Stalin and Khrushchev.”

Reason: The demonization of Stalin in the capitalist media and

academia is

1) a falsification of history which profoundly damages the unity of the international communist movement, 2) a grave injustice to Comrade Joseph Stalin and his achievements as leader during the founding of the USSR and in the war against fascism and

3) the truth regarding Bolshevik history is essential knowledge to plan action based on Marxist-Leninist theory in the present crucial situation.

Contribution to the discussion

Paul Bjarnason, Burnaby Club

The Burnaby Club met and discussed the constitutional changes in bulletin No. 2 and felt that most were editorial in nature and harmless. The general feeling was one of incredulity - “watching the shuffle of deck chairs on the Titanic” was cited.

Items 2&4: The removal of the reference to wards for example brings to mind that our party was once big enough for this to have been relevant. Major cities have ward systems and we fight for one in Vancouver so why remove the language even if it is not currently used?

In BC, the Elections Act only requires “outside auditors” if receipts are over a certain limit, currently \$10,000. In some years this limit has been met but as we did not get financial statements at our recent Provincial Convention we do not know if those limits will be met this year. In 2008 receipts were \$126.00

over the limit but we have not seen an audit. It would seem, that for internal control of our members money, the language should remain. Furthermore there has been no internal audit report in BC for several years so we do not accept the reason for the change as stated. This applies to both BC CP and CPC (BC Provincial Committee)

There was a discussion of the effect of complying with the Elections Act(s). Audits, item 5, and the crediting of dues, item 15, are leading us away from our concept of a revolutionary party into a purely parliamentary one. We have had, in BC, members who would not pay by cheque precisely because there was a paper trail and their jobs were at risk. Some of those we know to have passed away. Others may have simply dropped out through non-payment of dues rather than explicitly quit. While we have to comply to remain a registered party we should be aware of the

consequences. Linda C may have more to say later.

On a personal note and not discussed by the club I point out two issues.

Item 8 is alright in the new language but there is a contradiction between the 1st and 4th paragraphs of the existing Article 7 Section 8. The first requires: “This election shall take place during the Convention, so that the election results shall be ratified by the Convention in a secret ballot.” The second provision allows the CC to change, by majority vote, the CEC at any time. Perhaps we could amend the first provision to read: This initial election shall take place...”

Item 13 If “suspension from membership for a specified period” is too broad, too vague” then lets make it specific: “...for a specified period not to exceed one year” thereby keeping suspension as an option of discipline short of expulsion.

Time to pay the climate bill

Resolution by the University of Toronto Club: to amend the Main Political Resolution by inserting the following between paragraphs 17-18.

Imperialism's efforts talks around United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change and the post-Kyoto Protocol negotiations deserve special attention. Imperialist countries have generated billions in profits from industrial production creating historic levels of green house gas (GHG) emissions in the last two

decades. GHG emissions are actually accelerating. But in what might be described as "carbon neo-colonialism" imperialism is trying to force the burden of climate change onto the working people and the Third-world, restricting development while refusing to fund sustainable and renewable energy technology. Reflect these efforts, a more marked shift in the public policy debate on climate change has arisen since our last convention.

Capital has generally replaced its tactic of denying human-caused global warming with efforts to co-

opt or hijack climate solutions.

For example, the European Union's Emission Trading System has revealed the cap and trade approach to be a polluter profits, not polluter pays solution. Similar approaches are being advanced in North America, with the Chicago Climate Exchange, Obama's model, and the Western Climate Initiative. Business is making profits selling offsets or Clean Development Mechanisms like planting trees, which is also ineffective. As the recent Delhi declaration of the Workers and Communist parties

Making Contributions to the *Discussion Bulletin*

This Bulletin continues the period of oral and written party-wide discussion leading up to the convening of the 36th Central Convention, which is the highest decision-making body of our Party. All documents and resolutions coming up for consideration at the Convention should receive the widest attention and debate throughout the Party. Discussion and debate involving all Party members, as well as efforts to solicit the views and contributions of our friends and supporters, will deepen and enrich our preparations for a successful Central Convention.

It is the democratic right and political responsibility of members to participate in these discussions. The debate will continue in clubs, in this Bulletin, at provincial, regional and Quebec National committee

meetings and conventions, and at the Central Convention itself.

We will publish further Discussion Bulletins before the Central Convention. **The deadline for contributions to Bulletin #4 is Monday, December 28, 2009.**

All members are encouraged to make submissions to this Bulletin. Submissions can be on topics relating to the political analysis and assessments contained in the Draft Political Resolution, issues concerning Party organization, policy, program, tactics, leadership, and so on. Amendments to the Draft Resolution, and other special resolutions and motions proposed by Party Clubs and/or other Party bodies will also be published.

Printed copies of the Bulletin will be distributed to all members. Electronic versions of the Bulletin will also be circulated in PDF format, and posted on the Party website,

www.comunist-party.ca.

Submissions should be sent to the Co-Editors of the Discussion Bulletin:

Kimball Cariou, 706 Clark Drive, Vancouver, BC, V5L 3J1, email <pvoice@telus.net>

Pierre Fontaine, email <bretfon@usa.net>

As stated in the Call, initial contributions should be limited to 1,000 words, with a further contribution up to 500 words in a subsequent issue of the Bulletin.

Please note that the final deadline for receiving amendments to the Draft Main Political Resolution is Monday, January 25, 2010.

For help in sending your submissions, please contact the Central office (416-469-2446), the National Committee of the Parti communiste du Quebec, or one of the provincial party offices.

Deadline for Discussion Bulletin #4 - Monday, Dec. 28, 2009

said, “Capitalism's proposal for restructuring in the name of climate change has little relation to the protection of the environment. Corporate inspired 'Green development' and [the] 'green economy' are sought to be used to impose new state monopoly regulations which support profit maximisation and impose new hardships on the people.”

Canada is the second-highest per-capita producer of Green House Gasses (GHG) in the world. The major contributions come not from the people but business, especially the Alberta Tar Sands, while the military is also a major GHG producer. Canada will also suffer severe consequences from rising temperatures including destruction of boreal forests and agriculture, coastal flooding, devastating impacts on water resources and fisheries, as well as transport and health; events internationally could be catastrophic. Hardest hit will be aboriginal, working class, poor and racialized communities. Despite the emergency situation, successive governments have blocked even

modest reforms. Liberal governments have supported intensity-based emission targets, for example; while the Harper Conservative's policies have been unabashedly been drafted by natural resource capital. Canada played a retro-grade role in negotiations leading up to the Copenhagen agreement, to replace Kyoto.

In fact, the effects that the Kyoto Protocol was supposed to prevent have already begun. That some warming will occur is now certain; Kyoto's goals must be far surpassed if a reduction in warming is to be made. But while some earnestly believe that global warming can be reversed if humanity is confronted with the dilemma “socialism or barbarity” we can not rely on people's fear of a climate Apocalypse as an ideology. A political solution is needed. The environmental struggle is part of the struggle against monopoly. The historic direction of this fight is for an approach based on social planning, and for a socialist system that puts nature before profits. The urgent, immediate need to stop and

reverse global warming calls for a bold emergency response.

It is time to “pay the climate bill” – the debt or reparations owed to the oppressed peoples, nations and countries of the world, a view supported by the UN Framework on Climate change – and make deep cuts to GHG emissions in imperialist countries. Mitigation efforts including climate change agreements must be strong, legally binding, comprehensive, and audacious, and be based on international solidarity, peace and respect for sovereignty, self-determination and democracy, as well as employment and social progress. So far there is no other alternative – unless we accept the nightmarish so-called “Plan B” responses that some military researchers as well as NASA and the British Royal Society are investigating in case other efforts fail: geo-engineering technologies like simulating a volcanic eruption, or use of nuclear bombs as stop-gap measures.■