

## Standing Up for Communism Statement of the MRC of CPC(M-L) on the Occasion of the 36<sup>th</sup> Anniversary of the Founding of CPC(M-L)

The Communist Party of Canada (Marxist-Leninist) was founded on March 31, 1970, re-establishing a centre of revolutionary communism on Canadian soil. On this occasion, the Manitoba Regional Committee of CPC(M-L) hails all those who have contributed to the building of the Party over the past 36 years and all those communists who are still striving today to build and defend the revolutionary communist party of the Canadian working class.

In 1970, when CPC(M-L) was founded under the leadership of Comrade Hardial Bains, it set itself the task of preparing the subjective conditions for revolution in Canada. In practical terms, this meant building the Marxist-Leninist party and developing the theory and tactics of Canadian revolution. Today, when imperialism and reaction are threatening the peoples of the world with economic

ruin and cataclysmic wars and when every opportunist trend is working overtime to divert and block the people's struggles against imperialism and reaction, it is more important than ever for the revolutionary communists to unite to provide coherency and leadership to the movements of the people. The MRC of CPC(M-L) has worked continuously for the past 36 years to defend the revolutionary Marxist-Leninist line of CPC(M-L) and reaffirms its commitment to continue on this path today and in the future.

The MRC also takes this opportunity to send its warmest revolutionary greetings to the communists of all countries who have persisted in standing up for the principles of communism in the face of the most brutal assaults by imperialism and reaction. It is our firm belief that socialism and communism remain the future of all humankind.

## What Can Be Done about the Canadian Government's Warring Activity?

By making Afghanistan his first trip abroad as prime minister and by delivering a pro-war speech to Canadian troops in Kandahar on March 13, Prime Minister Steven Harper has sent a signal on behalf of the Canadian establishment that Canada's role as a mediator in international conflicts through "peacekeeping" has come to an end. He implied that a continuation of the "peacekeeping" role would demonstrate a failure of leadership by Canada - a sort of weakness, lack of resolve, and even cowardice. According to Steven Harper, "peacekeeping" has become the same as standing on the sidelines or sitting in the bleachers while others, namely the United States, provide real

leadership in the world. His message is that Canada should adopt the same warring spirit and war-making activity as the United States. And his message to Washington is that the Canadian establishment is ready to receive its marching orders and will not let the U.S. down again as it did in Iraq. This is what is behind Harper's statement: "You can't lead from the bleachers. I want Canada to be a leader...a country that really leads, not a country that just follows."

All of the member countries of the United Nations, including Canada, have sworn to defend international peace and security. However, over the years this high ideal has often been interpreted to mean whatever

***See page 2: Warring Activity***

### ***Warring Activity...from page 1***

suits the interests of one or another of the big powers at any given time, place and circumstance. This was the case during the Cold War and this is still the case today. This was not what was envisioned by the peoples of the world at the conclusion to World War II. The formation of the United Nations was supposed to usher in a new international order that forbade the use of military force by one country against another. If a country did not behave according to this standard, the United Nations was supposed to collectively come to the assistance of the victim of aggression if all other means of restoring the rights of the victim had been exhausted. The overriding principle in the new international order, however, was supposed to be that countries resolve their disputes by peaceful means. This was the essence of defending international peace and security as envisioned by the peoples of the world after 1945.

It was acknowledged in the UN Charter that international peace and security would be impossible to achieve without respecting the sovereignty and independence of all countries. It would be inconceivable to think that one could have international peace and security if one country could interfere in the internal affairs of another. It was also acknowledged in the UN Charter that international peace and security would be impossible if the world remained divided between conquerors and conquered. Therefore, it guaranteed the right of conquered peoples to establish their own independent states without the threat of military force being used against them by their former conquerors. Finally, it was acknowledged that international peace and security would be impossible if all countries were not equal before the law. Accordingly, the UN Charter recognized the equal rights of all countries and peoples, big or small, strong or weak. However, an exception was made for the victorious big powers of the United States, Soviet Union, Britain, France and China who were given collective control over matters of international peace and security through the Security Council and individual control through the right to veto any resolution.

This new international order never came into being. There was a striving for it. The formation of the United Nations was itself a reflection of this striving. The defeat of German Nazism, Italian fascism and Japanese militarism was a trend towards it. The emergence of people's democracies in Europe and Asia, and the decolonization of countries in Asia, Africa, Latin America and Oceania were also trends toward it. Today, there is still a striving for the kind of world envisioned in the founding principles of the UN Charter. The vast majority of people in the world still believe that the principles embodied in the UN Charter are valid - that they constitute the principles on which international peace and security can be built. This is one of the main reasons for the universal expression of shock, dismay and horror when the United States turned its back on the United Nations and invaded Iraq three years ago. It was not the first time that one of the big powers had violated the UN Charter and committed aggression against a smaller country. However, it was the first time that one of the big powers had so arrogantly and brazenly rejected the United Nations as irrelevant.

It is no exaggeration to say that the world is as far away from achieving international peace and security as ever. At the root of the problem lies the system of imperialism by which the most powerful countries and monopolies seek the domination of other countries for resources, markets and investments. Within the world system of imperialism, the United States is the biggest threat and obstacle to achieving international peace and security. It has its own vision for the world called the "Project for the New American Century". This vision vigorously rejects the idea that countries should resolve their disputes through peaceful methods. It rejects the idea that countries should respect each other's sovereignty and independence. It rejects the idea that all peoples and countries should be equal. There is a new world order that condones and glorifies the lawless activity of the big and mighty, just as Hitler did 70 years ago. There is an international order that demands of smaller countries that they accept orders of the big and

***See page 4: Warring Activity***

## A Unilateral Declaration of Annexation

On March 8, Israeli prime minister designate Ehud Olmert announced what amounted to a unilateral declaration of annexation by Israel of Palestinian lands in the West Bank and East Jerusalem. During a series of interviews with Israeli journalists, Olmert, who leads the Kadima party founded by Ariel Sharon prior to the March 28 Israeli elections, stated that by 2010, Israel would simply announce its new borders to the world.

“Israel will be disengaged from the vast majority of the Palestinian population, within new borders,” he said. The new border would be close to the current line of the separation wall Israeli is constructing through the West Bank and East Jerusalem, with “some adjustments”, Olmert said. Israel will determine the adjustments and its border on its own in “consultation” with the international community. “There may be cases in which we move the [wall] eastward [into the West Bank], there may be cases in which we move the [wall] westward, in line with what we agree upon.” The “we” he refers to, he made clear in the round of interviews, are the Israelis and the “international community” of its allies – primarily the United States.

Olmert told reporters he would evacuate isolated Israeli settlements within the West Bank, relocating those settlers to major settlement blocs. “We will solidify Israel as a Jewish state, one in which there is a solid and stable Jewish majority, a majority which is not in danger.” He hinted that those settlements outside the current route or planned route of the separation wall would be relocated. However, during a March 15 visit to the West Bank settlement of Ariel, located about 60 kilometres north of Jerusalem and just beyond the current planned route of the wall, Olmert declared, “the Ariel bloc will be an integral part of Israel, whatever happens. Ariel is Israel.” There are currently around 240,000 Jewish settlers living on illegally confiscated land in the West Bank, while the Palestinian population is around 2.5 million.

“I believe with my whole heart that we have a window of opportunity that we must utilize in the coming four years. We must carry out historic steps,” Olmert said. He also suggested that negotiations about borders with a Hamas-controlled Palestinian Authority would most likely not be an option. While he would give Hamas a set period of time to enter into negotiations, he said, he refused to specify how much, saying that Hamas does not represent a legitimate partner for peace negotiations. “The Palestinian Authority is one authority and the minute the dominant force in the PA is Hamas, then why meet?” he asked a reporter.

The Palestinian prime minister-elect Ismail Haniyeh responded to Olmert’s comments by reiterating that the Palestinians want a viable state established in all of the West Bank, Gaza Strip and Jerusalem. “Anything less than these rights will not be accepted by the Palestinian government.”

According to Israeli commentators, Olmert’s interviews were intended to shore up support for his party, which has been sluggish leading into the final weeks of the election campaign. His proposal builds on Israel’s unilateral disengagement from the Gaza Strip last August. Under Olmert’s unilateral declaration, Israel will be able to extricate itself from some of the problems it faces in maintaining its occupation while annexing lands seized in 1967 and effectively redrawing the country’s borders.

Israeli politicians have described one of the main challenges posed by the occupation as the “demographic time bomb” – a reference to the fact that within a generation, Palestinians living in the Gaza Strip, West Bank and East Jerusalem are expected to outnumber Jewish Israelis by two to one. The prospect of a Jewish minority ruling over a Palestinian majority is something that would become harder and harder to present as anything other than open apartheid, a fact of which Israel’s rulers are only too aware.

***See page 4: Israeli Annexation***

### ***Warring Activity...from page 2***

mighty or otherwise face their wrath. In the words of George Bush, you are either “with us” or “against us”. This is the kind of world order that Steven Harper and the Canadian establishment want Canadians to condone, accept, glorify and join.

The United Nations, as it is presently constituted, is powerless to defend international peace and security. As long as a few big powers control the Security Council the UN Charter will always be interpreted and manipulated to serve the collective or individual objectives of the big powers. Even when the big powers do not agree, as occurred before the U.S. launched its war against Iraq, this does not stop them from violating the UN Charter. In the case of Iraq, the United States took “unilateral” action outside of the UN Security Council and gathered around itself a “coalition of the willing”. Together with Britain and other countries, it launched its “pre-emptive strike” and made a “regime change”. After setting in motion the process of framing a constitution, planning elections and organizing a new government, the United States and Britain went back to the UN

Security Council which passed a resolution providing a legal basis for the U.S. and its allies to remain in Iraq. Now the “unilateral” military action by the United States against Iraq has been turned into a “multilateral” action endorsed by the United Nations. Thus, the idea of collective security, whereby the United Nations would join together against aggression has been turned into the opposite — collective aggression led by the big powers with the blessing of the United Nations. The same *modus operandi* has been employed in Afghanistan and elsewhere.

In this situation, the Canadian working class and people must uphold the principles embodied in the UN Charter but apply them in such a way that Canada can really contribute to international peace and security. The Canadian government must immediately withdraw troops from all countries such as Afghanistan and Haiti. There is an urgent need for discussion amongst the Canadian people on how we can make this demand a reality, as well as how to ensure that the government does not participate in similar imperialist adventures in the future.

---

### ***Israeli Annexation...from page 3***

In order to avoid this embarrassing situation, many on the Israeli right have for some years now favoured the expulsion of the Palestinians from the occupied territories into neighbouring Arab states. While some on the right still favour the option, prime minister Sharon concluded it was less and less likely to happen as the American quagmire in Iraq worsened. Without at least tacit U.S. approval, the Israelis would not be able to carry out a full-fledged ethnic cleansing campaign, and the Americans, Sharon believed, were not about to give approval to something that would further inflame the Arab world against the U.S.

Therefore, Sharon concluded that the only way forward was to unilaterally withdraw from certain areas while strategically redrawing Israel’s borders to include the largest settlements. From this conclusion the separation wall and unilateral withdrawal from the Gaza Strip were born. Olmert’s unilateral declaration

of annexation has now taken Sharon’s plan to its logical conclusion: an Israel existing within new borders that it determines on its own and in violation of international law.

## **Modern Communism**

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

**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**