

## Editorial

# The Working Class and People Must Fight for Their Own Agenda

The election of a minority Conservative government on January 23 is being claimed by Stephen Harper to represent a “mandate” from the Canadian people for real change. However, even ignoring the fact that Harper’s Conservatives received the support of less than 25 percent of registered voters and fell at least 21 seats short of achieving what is normally considered a mandate, the fact of the matter is that nothing changed on January 23. The capitalist ruling class changed its management team from a Liberal minority government to a Conservative minority government. The same anti-social agenda that has been implemented by the Liberals for the past 12 years will now be implemented by the Conservatives.

Despite all of the election campaign rhetoric, these elections were not held to sort out the problems facing the Canadian people. On the contrary, they were held to sort out various contradictions within the capitalist ruling class of Canada, and those contradictions will now be fought out within the context of a Conservative minority government rather than a Liberal minority government.

The elections were also held to convince the working class and people that they should not seek solutions outside of the existing parliamentary process. They were bombarded with propaganda that they could achieve an improvement in their living and working conditions by supporting one bourgeois

*See page 8: Working Class Agenda*

## Commentary

# Federal Election Results – The Crisis of Canada’s Political System Continues

Despite the declarations of their leaders that they were happy with the results of the January 23 federal election, the fact is that every party participating in the election suffered a setback. The Conservatives failed to achieve the majority or strong minority they were seeking. The Liberals failed to hang onto power. The NDP, while increasing its seat total, failed to achieve the status of holding the balance of power that it so desperately needed. The Bloc Quebecois not only failed to win more than 50 percent of the vote in Quebec, as it had predicted, but actually declined in popular support from the 2004 election. The Green Party also declined in its percentage of the vote, while the other small parties

failed to make any headway in ending their political marginalization.

At the same time, Canada’s ruling class managed to make some headway in overcoming one aspect of the disequilibrium that has gripped the Canadian political system since the collapse of the Mulroney Conservatives in 1993. As a result of the failure of first the Meech Lake Accord and then the Charlottetown Accord, the Progressive Conservative Party split into three factions – the Progressive Conservative Party, the Reform Party and the Bloc Quebecois – all of which were regional parties with no chance of forming a majority government. After a decade of abortive attempts to re-establish a viable opposition party, the

*See page 7: Crisis Continues*

## Commentary

# Hypocrisy and the Palestinian Elections

Despite predictions of a Hamas victory by virtually every commentator in Palestine and the Arab world, the Western media appeared stunned by the January 25 Palestinian election results. Headlines declared Hamas' win everything from an "upset victory" to a "stunning blow" to the prospects for peace in the Middle East. Western leaders and the Israeli government reacted quickly, with some hinting that they would not recognize a Palestinian government led by Hamas despite all evidence that the Palestinian elections were conducted freely and fairly. All demanded that Hamas renounce violence.

Israeli Prime Minister Ehud Olmert declared openly that Israel would never recognize Hamas. "If a government led by Hamas or in which Hamas is a coalition partner is established, the Palestinian Authority will turn into an authority that supports terror," he said. "Israel and the world will ignore it and make it irrelevant." Likud party leader and former Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu went a step further, likening Hamas' victory to a declaration of war against Israel by the Palestinians and describing the occupied territories and Gaza Strip as "Hamasastan".

U.S. President George Bush told reporters that Hamas would have to immediately renounce violence in order to be recognized by his regime. "I don't see how you can be a partner in peace if you advocate the destruction of a country as a part of your platform," he told a White House press conference. "And I know you can't be a partner in peace if your party has got an armed wing."

U.S. Secretary of State, Condoleezza Rice, told a press conference in Switzerland: "Anyone who wants to govern and do so with the support of the international community has got to be committed to a two-state solution and must be committed to the right of Israel to exist, must be committed to the renunciation of violence."

Canadian Prime Minister-designate Stephen Harper acknowledged that Hamas was elected democratically but added, "for a nation to be truly democratic that nation must renounce any use of terrorism."

British Prime Minister Tony Blair, speaking in Dublin, said: "Of course, we recognize the mandate for Hamas because the people have spoken in a particular way in the Palestinian Authority. But I think it is also important for Hamas to understand that there comes a point, and that point is now following that strong showing, where they have to decide between a path of democracy or a path of violence."

Benita Ferrero-Waldner, the European Union foreign affairs commissioner, said democracy "brings with it a responsibility to respect the rule of law, to end violence and commit to peace by peaceful means, through negotiations with Israel."

What is most striking about these reactions is the blatant double standard when it comes to violence and terror against civilians. Suicide bombings orchestrated by the military wing of Hamas have led to the death of an estimated 500 Israeli civilians over the past decade; the number of Palestinian civilians killed by Israeli Defence Force soldiers during that same period is 10 times that, according to figures from leading Israeli and Palestinian human rights groups. Yet not a single one of these leaders called on Israel to end its campaign of violence against Palestinian civilians for the good of peace prospects in the region. Not a single one of these leaders has threatened to withhold recognition of elected Israeli governments unless they renounce the use of state terrorism against the Palestinians. Over the years, this state terrorism has taken many forms including the expansion of illegal settlements within the West Bank, East Jerusalem and until August, the Gaza Strip, the collective punishment of the Palestinian people including the destruction of Palestinian homes and agricultural land, curfews, arbitrary arrests and detentions, torture and the use of extra-judicial assassinations.

President Bush's claim that a party with an armed wing cannot be a partner in peace obviously does not apply to the United States, Israel or any other nation friendly to U.S. imperialism. The armed wing of the U.S. government is reviled around the world for its disregard for civilian life, its use of torture and the prison camps it operates. The "armed wing" of

**See page 3: Hypocrisy**

# How Hamas Won

Despite the claims by some commentators that Hamas was elected on a platform of imposing Islamic law and the destruction of the state of Israel, Hamas' campaign for the Palestinian parliament was in many ways quite similar to the successful Conservative Party campaign here in Canada. Hamas campaigned on two main promises: ending corruption and improving social programs. Fatah, which has controlled the Palestinian Authority since it was established following the Oslo peace process, has been linked with the disappearance of foreign aid and the use of power to reward friends and family members of Fatah officials. Hamas promised it would end this corruption.

Hamas, which has operated schools, hospitals, communal kitchens and other community institutions in the occupied territories since its founding 20 years ago, was able to argue that it would do a better job than Fatah in establishing meaningful social programs. For Palestinians, the majority of whom live in poverty, this was critical. Hamas was also able to link the question of providing social programs to corruption,

arguing that Fatah was under-funding healthcare and education because officials were using funds intended to improve peoples' lives to line their own pockets.

Some Palestinian commentators have argued that a third factor contributed to the scale of the Hamas victory: Israel's separation wall. After making numerous concessions to Israel on almost every outstanding issue in peace talks, the Fatah-controlled Palestinian Authority was not able to deliver any tangible results for Palestinians in terms of creating a viable Palestinian state. Israel's unilateral withdrawal from the Gaza Strip and its construction of a separation wall which incorporates parts of the West Bank and East Jerusalem into Israel, has been widely seen as a redefinition of the future borders of a Palestinian state that will be anything but viable – small, scattered pockets of people cut off from each other by their former occupier. Voting for Hamas in parliamentary elections, these commentators have argued, was a way for Palestinians to declare to Israel: We have not surrendered.

---

## *Hypocrisy...from page 2*

Haganah, the Zionist paramilitary group which fought for the creation of the State of Israel and whose tactics included massacres in Palestinian villages and the bombing of the King David Hotel, was transformed into the Israeli Defence Forces. There is also the Israeli settler movement, closely linked to Likud and other right-wing parties, whose armed wings have been involved in planting bombs in Palestinian schools, hospitals and businesses, opening fire on unarmed civilians and destroying harvested olives, fruits and vegetables.

And Harper's musings on the need for any democracy to renounce the use of terrorism obviously do not apply to the U.S., whose soldiers routinely violate international law, massacre civilians and bomb civilian infrastructure, torture and brutalize POWs and other terrorist acts, all justified by the

Americans on the grounds that these are not individual acts of terrorism but "collateral damage". The U.S. has also provided support to terrorist groups around the world, including al-Queda in the 1980s, as a routine part of its foreign policy.

Responding to the calls for his party to renounce violence, Dr. Mahmoud Zahar, Hamas' senior leader in Gaza, pointed to Hamas' respect for the ceasefire agreement negotiated at an Israeli-Palestinian summit last year. He also said the Palestinian people could not give up their right to resist occupation, a right enshrined in international law. "We are under occupation. The Israelis continue aggression against our people: killing, detentions, demolitions. In order to stop this, we are entitled to self-defence by all means including using guns. If the Israelis stop their aggression, we will be committed to the quiet," he said.

# Iran Receives Widespread Support for its Stand in Defence of its National Rights

During the past week, all sides in the Iranian nuclear dispute have been staking their positions and preparing for the upcoming special meeting of the Board of Governors of the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) to be held in Vienna on February 2-3, 2006. On the one hand, Britain, France and Germany (the EU-3) and the United States who requested the special IAEA meeting have been trying to line up support for their efforts to have the issue of Iran's alleged violations of the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT) referred to the UN Security Council. At the same time, many other countries have been discussing the issue with Iranian representatives and stating their support for Iran's right to undertake research and develop nuclear power for peaceful purposes.

The United States and EU-3 have decided on a "division of labour" to lobby members of the Board of Governors of the IAEA to vote for whatever resolution they present to the Vienna meeting. The contents of a draft resolution have not been disclosed because the U.S. and EU-3 still do not have an agreement with Russia and China on the matter. U.S. Secretary of State Condoleezza Rice is scheduled to meet the foreign ministers of Britain, France, Germany, Russia and China in London on January 30 to discuss plans for the IAEA meeting.

Another major target of lobbying by the U.S. and EU-3 has been India which is also a member of the IAEA Board of Governors. On January 25, US Ambassador to India, David Mulford, warned that a deal giving India American nuclear technology could collapse if India does not back a UN motion against Iran. India's foreign ministry replied that the ambassador's comments were "inappropriate and not conducive" to U.S.-India relations.

The U.S. and EU-3 have also demanded that the General Director of the IAEA ignore the norms and procedures of the agency and present a report on Iran's nuclear activities for the February 2 meeting. Such a report is planned for the regularly scheduled meeting of the Board of Governors on March 6 and will contain the results of recent IAEA inspections of nuclear facilities in Iran that are not yet complete.

Also, during the past week, rumours were spread through newspapers in Germany and Turkey warning of an imminent NATO military attack on Iran. These stories were exposed as disinformation planted by the United States to increase its pressure on Iran

Meanwhile, the Iranian government has been holding discussions with other governments to explain its stand on the nuclear issue. Many countries have expressed support for the stand of the Iranian government and Iran's right to participate in nuclear research and develop nuclear technology for peaceful purposes based on the statutes of the Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT). They also support the Iranian stand that its case should be resolved within the framework of the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) and should not be referred to the UN Security Council. In addition they support the Iranian proposal to study the suggestions from other countries and to renew the talks that were cancelled by the EU-3. The Islamic Republic News Agency (IRNA) carried reports on some of these meetings, which are detailed below.

## South Korea

South Korean Foreign Minister Ban Ki-Moon said in Seoul on January 11 that Iran is entitled to peaceful use of nuclear technology. He further told the visiting Iranian Deputy Foreign Minister for Asia and the Pacific, Mehdi Safari, that Iran should be able to benefit from peaceful nuclear technology within the framework of the International Atomic Energy Agency's (IAEA) terms and regulations. Speaking of Tehran's confidence-building measures and its right to develop nuclear technology for peaceful purposes, he hoped for settlement of Iran's nuclear issue through diplomatic means, talks with the three European States and cooperation with the IAEA.

## South Africa

On January 18, South Africa's Deputy Foreign Minister, Aziz Pahad, and Iran's Acting Foreign Minister, Mehdi Mostafavi held discussions in Pretoria. South Africa is another member of the Board of Governors of the IAEA and has said that Iran has the right to use nuclear technology for peaceful purposes. In a statement following the meeting, the South African foreign ministry stated: "South Africa believes there is no alternative to continuing dialogue and negotiations to reach a long-term agreement that takes due consideration of the rights, obligations, concerns and aspirations of all." It also stated: "We appeal to all parties to refrain from any action that could further increase tension and confrontation."

**See page 5: Support for Iran**

# Canada is an Aggressor in Afghanistan

Earlier this month, Canadian Foreign Affairs Political Director Glyn Berry was killed in a bomb attack on a military convoy about one kilometre southeast of Canada's military base in Kandahar City in Afghanistan. Three Canadian soldiers were also wounded in this attack. The convoy was a joint American-Canadian one working under the command of the United States. Canadian Prime Minister Paul Martin stated that Mr. Berry gave his life for the "pursuit of peace and stability" and vowed that Canada "will continue our work in Afghanistan", while the news reports in the mass media characterized the bomb attack as the work of "terrorists".

Nobody wants Canadians to be killed in Afghanistan – either diplomats or soldiers. But it cannot be forgotten that Canada is playing the role of aggressor and occupier in Afghanistan. Canadian troops were sent to Afghanistan to put down the legitimate and just resistance of the Afghani people to the U.S.-led occupation of their country and to the puppet government installed by the United States and its allies. The suppression of this resistance is what Paul Martin calls "the pursuit of peace and stability".

Who are the real terrorists in the world? During the Second World War, in every single country that resisted German, Italian and Japanese aggression and occupation, the patriotic forces were called "terrorists" by the Nazis, fascists and militarists and their puppet regimes. The Canadian government is no different in this respect from the German Nazis, Italian fascists, and Japanese militarists.

Moreover, the Canadian government has a double standard. When the Soviet Union invaded and occupied Afghanistan in 1979, the Canadian government denounced this aggression and supported the resistance fighters. Canada even boycotted the 1980 Moscow Olympics over this issue. In other words, when the patriotic Afghani forces fought the Soviet Union they were "freedom fighters" but when they fight against the U.S., British and Canadian invaders they are "terrorists".

Canada should withdraw its troops from Afghanistan and recognize the right of the people of Afghanistan to sort out their problems without outside interference. The struggle of the Afghani people against foreign aggression and occupation is a just struggle.

---

## ***Support for Iran...from page 4***

### **Thailand**

On January 21, Thailand's Minister of Transport, Pongsak Ruktapongpisan, held discussions in Bangkok with the Iranian Ambassador to Thailand, Mohsen Pakain. The Thai minister said that peaceful nuclear activities are the key to the development and progress of every country. He declared his country's support for Iran's right to access nuclear technology for peaceful purposes. "Given the ascending trend of population growth, developing countries such as Iran have no alternative rather than using nuclear energy to achieve sustainable development," he said. The Thai minister referred to Iran as a bridge connecting Asia and Europe and underlined that access of the Association of South East Asian Nations (ASEAN) member states to the Central Asian states and Caucasus is of great importance.

### **Qatar**

On January 23, Qatar's First Deputy Prime Minister and Minister of Foreign Affairs Sheikh  
January 30, 2006

Hamad bin-Jassim ale-Thani, in a meeting with Iran's President Ahmadinejad, said, "Islamic Republic of Iran's declaration of its stands and logical argumentation to prove its legitimate right to have access to nuclear energy reminds us of the confrontation of Prophet Moses (PBUH) in his confrontation with Pharaoh."

### **Cuba**

On January 23, Iran's Ambassador to Cuba Ahmad Edrisian conferred with Cuba's Government Minister Gabrisas in Havana. Cuba is a member of the Board of Governors of the IAEA. The Iranian ambassador presented a report on bilateral economic ties, Iran's stand on its peaceful nuclear program, and President Mahmoud Ahmadinejad's recent proposal on status of observing the human rights in the West. The Cuban minister, who is in charge of the two countries' joint economic commission, expressed satisfaction with the improving economic and business relations between

***See page 6: Support for Iran***

the two countries that he said are now stronger than ever before. He also expressed his support for the moves initiated jointly by Iran and Cuba to boost the bilateral economic ties. The Cuban government minister also announced Havana's strong support for Tehran in its natural right to take advantage of nuclear power. He added: "Cuba's stands on human rights, too, are quite the same as Iran's, and Havana is ready for cooperation with Tehran at all international scenes."

### **Venezuela**

On the same day, Iran's Ambassador to Cuba also conferred with Venezuelan Foreign Minister Ali Rodriguez, who was visiting Havana, on the expansion of trilateral cooperation among Iran, Cuba and Venezuela. At the meeting, the Venezuelan foreign minister described current relations between Iran and Venezuela as 'excellent'. Joint economic cooperation, such as manufacturing of tractors and construction of a cement factory, indicates the depth of such friendly ties, he said. Welcoming trilateral cooperation among Iran, Venezuela and Cuba, he called for implementation of agreements signed earlier by the three countries. Supporting Iran's peaceful nuclear activities, Rodriguez said, "Countries which are capable of destroying life many times over are determined to hinder the development of developing countries." "We reject the hypocrisy of the West and call for nuclear disarmament throughout the world," he pointed out.

### **Yemen**

Yemen's Foreign Minister Abu Bakr al-Kurbi has called for settlement of Iran's nuclear case through diplomacy and dialogue. On January 23, al-Kurbi told Iran's Ambassador, Hossein Kamalian, that he hoped the issue will be solved in light of Iran's prudence and recognition of Tehran's right to peaceful use of nuclear energy. He said settlement of regional problems under present sensitive conditions calls for solidarity and constant consultations among officials of regional states. He called for continued consultations between Iran and Yemen in that connection. Providing the Yemeni minister with a first hand account of developments with Iran's peaceful nuclear activities, the Iranian diplomat elaborated on Iran's principled stances towards the inalienable rights of all countries, including Iran, for peaceful use of the nuclear technology. He stressed Iran's readiness for continued nuclear dialogue for settlement of the case.

### **Pakistan**

On January 23 the Foreign Office spokesperson of Pakistan, Tasneem Aslam, expressed her government's renewed opposition to any use of force against Iran over the country's nuclear program. She said that Islamabad wants a peaceful solution of the problem through dialogue. Pakistan is opposed to using force against Iran and it stands for the resolving the nuclear issue within the context of International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA). She also said that Pakistan acknowledges Iran's right to acquire peaceful nuclear technology. She said that the Organization of the Islamic Conference is also not in favor of using force against any of its member states. Furthermore, Pakistan is not in favor of taking the Iranian issue to the UN Security Council.

On January 26, Pakistan's Ambassador (designate) to Iran Shafqat Saeed said that his country was opposed to the issue making its way to the UN Security Council. In light of international conventions, resolutions and the law creating the International Atomic Energy Agency, he maintained Tehran had the right to continue its peaceful nuclear programs. "The three European countries and the IAEA should continue their negotiations to resolve the issue instead of taking it to the Security Council," he contended.

### **North Africa**

On January 23, Tunisian President Zein al-Abideen ben Ali held a meeting in Tunis with Iran's Vice President for Legal and Parliamentary Affairs Hojatoleslam Seyed Ahmad Moussavi. He underlined that all countries including Iran are entitled to nuclear research and activities. Ben Ali said that his country believes that all member states of the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) have the right to access nuclear technology for peaceful purposes in accordance with the nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty. He referred to the use of peaceful nuclear technology for economic purposes, including development and public welfare, as the inalienable right of all NPT members. Criticizing interference of foreign powers in the internal affairs of Middle East countries, he said that they always complicate the situation.

Before visiting Tunisia, Iran's Vice President for Legal and Parliamentary Affairs Hojatoleslam Seyed Ahmad Moussavi had visited Algeria, Libya and Egypt for meetings and talks. For their part, officials of all three countries stressed their support for Iran's right to access peaceful nuclear technology.

**See page 7: Support for Iran**

## ***Support for Iran...from page 6***

On January 25, Sudanese President Omar al-Bashir said that all countries, including Iran, have the right to pursue nuclear energy and that the Sudanese government and nation will defend Iran and their Iranian brothers in the exercise of this right. During a meeting with the visiting Iranian Vice-President for Legal and Parliamentary Affairs Ahmad Mousavi in Khartoum, the president noted that although "Israel has a nuclear arsenal it has never been subjected to inspections." He pointed out that the use of peaceful nuclear energy is an indisputable right of all countries along with the right to obtain nuclear technology in the interest of development and progress, but "superpowers want to have a monopoly in this field so that less developed countries would continue to be dependent on them."

## **Russia**

On January 24, Ali Larijani, secretary of Iran's Supreme National Security Council and Mehdi Safari, Iran's Deputy Foreign Minister for Asia and Pacific Affairs held discussions with Russian officials in Moscow. The Russian government has put forward a proposal to Iran to enrich its uranium on Russian territory. Ali Larijani said: "We positively evaluate this offer." He added that "this plan can be perfected" during further Russian-Iranian talks planned for February. The head of Russia's Federal Atomic Energy Agency Sergei Kiriyenko said that Moscow's proposal for an Iran-Russia joint uranium enrichment plan will be on his itinerary when he travels to Tehran.

## **Indonesia**

The Indonesian Foreign Minister Noer Hassan Wirajuda, during a meeting in Tehran on January 25 with Iran's President Mahmoud Ahmadinejad, said that as a Muslim country, Indonesia is proud of Iran's achievements in scientific and industrial fields, particularly in the field of peaceful nuclear technology. He said, "We have always stressed that the NPT members are entitled to take peaceful advantage of that technology". He added: "Accusing a country of having suspicious intentions in that respect is totally unacceptable." The Indonesia Foreign Minister denounced the rushed reference of Iran to the UN Security Council, saying, "Indonesia believes the Western countries should continue negotiations within the rules of the IAEA and the NPT with Iran." Wirajuda said that his country is glad that it has not been Iran that has blocked the path for the continuation of nuclear talks and sound logic.

## **China**

On January 26, Ali Larijani, secretary of Iran's Supreme National Security Council, held meetings in Beijing with Chinese Foreign Minister Li Zhaoxing and other senior Chinese officials. China has consistently advocated a policy of negotiations on the Iranian nuclear issue. Chinese Foreign Ministry spokesman Kong Quan said that the issue should be resolved within the governing laws and regulations of the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA). He said that the resolution of the issue requires efforts on the part of all sides in the case. Kong said his country prefers continued diplomacy and constructive negotiations as the best means of resolving Iran's nuclear case before the next IAEA meeting. Noting that his country, as a permanent member of the UN Security Council, has the right of veto in the council, Kong declared that China opposes the use of threats or force, including sanctions, to resolve issues. He cautioned all sides in Iran's nuclear case to exercise self-restraint and expand the period of talks. The Russian suggestion would be a good attempt to break the impasse and prepare the ground for further talks, the Chinese official reiterated. He underscored that China has always advocated diplomatic efforts over and above any other method of ending the standoff over Iran's nuclear programs.

---

## ***Crisis Continues...from page 1***

Canadian ruling elite is now on the verge of accomplishing that objective. During this election not only did the Conservatives make enough headway in Ontario to achieve a minority government, but they managed to pick up several seats in Quebec at the expense of the Bloc Quebecois.

However, re-establishing a viable opposition party - that is one which is capable of becoming the ruling party - is only half of the equation. The other half of the equation is the fact that the Bloc Quebecois has routinely won enough seats in Quebec to deprive either the Liberals or Conservatives of a majority government unless one or the other collapses in Ontario. Therefore, unless the ruling elite can succeed in marginalizing the Bloc Quebecois during the next few years, the crisis of Canada's political and electoral system will likely continue, with one minority government falling, only to be replaced by another

***See page 8: Crisis Continues***

### **Working Class Agenda...from page 1**

political party over another. In this respect, the head of the Canadian Autoworkers union, Buzz Hargrove, played a particularly nefarious role by embracing Paul Martin and the Liberal Party as the saviours of the Canadian working class, both from the dangers of the Conservatives, as well as from the effects of foreign competition. Jack Layton and the NDP echoed this position, presenting the NDP and Liberals as a progressive bloc united in opposition to the reactionary Conservatives. He openly appealed to Liberal supporters to “lend” the NDP their votes until the Liberal Party can get its house in order.

The illusion is thus created that the Conservatives represent the “right”, while the Liberals and NDP are on the “left”. The trade unions and various non-governmental agencies then work overtime to bind the working class and people hand and foot to the “left” wing of the bourgeoisie. Meanwhile, for the past two decades, both the “right” and “left” wings of the bourgeoisie have been implementing the same anti-social, neo-liberal agenda.

In the 2004 federal elections only 60.9 percent of registered voters cast a ballot. (The percentage of eligible voters would be somewhat lower due to the shoddy registration process now in place.) In this election the participation of registered voters went up slightly to 64.9 percent. This still means that well over one-third of eligible voters did not see fit to vote. The low voter turnout is a symptom of the deep disenchantment of Canadians with the political process and the “choices” presented to them by the ruling class. A very large segment of Canadian society simply does not believe that voting for any of those “choices” will assist them in solving the problems that confront them in their lives.

So long as the working class and people allow themselves to be diverted into supporting one or another wing of the bourgeoisie no real change will be accomplished. The working class and people must fight for their own, pro-social agenda. Such an agenda would include: the vesting of sovereignty in the people; the renewal of the economy on the basis of self-reliance and trade for mutual benefit; increased spending for social programs; electoral reform that places control of the electoral system in the hands of the electorate rather than in the hands of the political parties; and an end to Canada’s involvement in aggressive military actions against the peoples of other countries.

### **Crisis Continues...from page 7**

minority government. During this election Stephen Harper attempted to re-establish the Mulroney coalition with the conservative wing of the sovereignty movement by talking about decentralization and increased power for the provinces. Such attempts are likely to continue during the upcoming period.

It has also been suggested that the Canadian people emerged victorious in these elections by preventing a Harper majority. It is true that the weak minority government of the Harper Conservatives will find it extremely difficult, if not impossible, to implement any of its social conservative policies because none of the other parties can afford to support the Conservatives on those issues. Therefore, the Conservatives will be reduced to implementing the agenda of the Martin Liberals, on whom they will have to rely to prop them up. That is the agenda of deeper integration with the U.S., the gradual shift in military policy away from “peacekeeping” and towards an aggressive combat mode, as well as creeping neo-liberal domestic policies. In other words, even a weak Conservative minority will have no difficulty in implementing the anti-social, neo-liberal agenda of the Canadian ruling class.

## **Modern Communism**

**Bulletin of the Manitoba Regional Committee  
of the Communist Party of Canada  
(Marxist-Leninist)  
Editor: Ken Kalturnyk**

**To contact the Manitoba Branch of CPC(M-L):  
Fax: 477-6741  
Email: [mrc-cpcml@mts.net](mailto:mrc-cpcml@mts.net)  
Internet: [www.modern-communism.ca](http://www.modern-communism.ca)  
Produced by volunteer labour**