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Canada's Integration into U.S. Homeland Security and Use of Police Powers

Canada Is Not Part of the U.S. Homeland!

- Pauline Easton -

On March 10, U.S. Secretary of Homeland Security John Kelly became the first member of the Trump cabinet to make an official visit to Canada. Whereas the U.S. Secretary of State is responsible for relations with foreign countries, the Secretary of Homeland Security oversees many of the internal U.S. security agencies including U.S. Customs and Border Protection, the Secret Service, Federal Protective Service, the Federal Emergency Management Agency and Coast Guard.

It is telling of the perspective of the U.S. towards Canada and the Trudeau government's acquiescence that the Trump administration's first emissary to Canada represents Homeland Security. The mission of the Department of Homeland Security is to "safeguard the American people, our homeland, and our values." Official reports of what was discussed during Kelly's visit to Canada indicate that a main issue is for the U.S. to also "secure" Canada by expanding U.S. authority into Canada and eliminating the border as a limit to U.S. jurisdiction.

The Secretary of Homeland Security is one of a number of former military figures placed in control of civilian agencies in the new U.S. administration. He is a former high-ranking U.S. military commander of U.S. Southern Command and of the Multi-National Force-West during the U.S. occupation of Iraq from February 2008 to February 2009. In Canada, Kelly held meetings on a broad range of subjects including "aviation security, law enforcement collaboration, infrastructure, and immigration, refugee and visa policy." He met with Minister of Public Safety Canada Ralph Goodale in Ottawa, Minister of Transport Marc Garneau, Minister of Immigration, Refugees and Citizenship Ahmed Hussen and Minister of Foreign Affairs Chrystia Freeland.

To justify increasing the use of police powers over civilian affairs, the visit was used to promote claims by Kelly and others of widespread terror threats against Canadian airlines. Even reports of the alleged misuse of arbitrary police powers towards Canadians at the border was used to suggest that either the actions were not arbitrary or that they were warranted. For instance, Secretary Kelly dismissed concerns of many Canadians about arbitrary profiling at the border saying that those who have been denied entry or detained and questioned should be viewed as suspects and possible threats to security. "Those who are stopped, a small handful, there is a reason for stopping them. Whatever they tell the press is their business but no one is stopped to be checked for their religion or their political opinion," Kelly told the Globe and Mail. Earlier, Kelly told the Canadian Press
that people may be stopped if their name turns up on a list. "There is a reason why," he said. "It's not their race, it's not their religion, it's not the language they speak."

Meanwhile, Goodale refused to address the serious concerns of Canadians over the number of incidents of apparent racial, political and other profiling they have experienced at the border. Admitting that there have been "a number of incidents in the last several weeks," Goodale said that "if they [Canadians] feel in some way aggrieved, to make sure they take advantage of that recourse process ... if people don't file a complaint, then there's no way to know for sure how many of these incidents are taking place."

The conclusion Canadians are supposed to draw is that the use of arbitrary powers is always legitimate because they provide security, which is simply not the case. The entire discussion and presentation of the issue is misleading because police powers are by definition arbitrary. Through sleight of hand, both government of police powers and the U.S takeover of Canadian jurisdictions become a fait accompli.

Canadians should not fall into the trap which suggests that the use of arbitrary police powers is justified in the name of providing security so long as regulations are put in place to curtail excesses or abuses and identify them when they take place. This discourse about legitimate and illegitimate profiling, information-sharing, detentions and deportations is used to justify a government of police powers. It may serve to recall that in Nazi Germany laws were passed to strip Jews of citizenship rights and convert them into subjects of the Reich. The Nuremberg Laws were anti-Semitic laws introduced on September 15, 1935 by the Reichstag at a special meeting convened at the annual Nuremberg Rally of the Nazi Party. However, so-called moderates in the Hitler bureaucracy complained that to apply the law, they needed regulations to identify who was a Jew and their degree of Jewishness. This in-fighting between the extremist and moderate wings of the Nazi bureaucracy is not dissimilar to the fight between the "extremists" or "far-right" and those in the U.S. and Canadian ruling circles that are quite happy to accommodate themselves to the police powers but want them to be part of a rule of law.

The visit of the Secretary of Homeland Security as the first official visit of a Trump cabinet member to Canada heralds further treachery on the part of a Canadian government which is putting Canada under U.S. jurisdiction at a time the dangers of war against U.S. rivals is increasing, including the latest U.S. aggression against Syria and attempts to isolate Russia. Claims to defend the U.S. "homeland" embroil Canadians in accepting the use of police powers under the guise that they can be made "non-arbitrary" or that arbitrariness is an "unintended consequence" which must be accepted for the greater good.

This is unacceptable.
The Trudeau government's Bill C-23, *An Act respecting the preclearance of persons and goods in Canada and the United States*, proposes to greatly expand the powers and presence of U.S. border agents in Canada. The bill was introduced on June 17, 2016 and on March 6 was referred to the Standing Committee on Public Safety and National Security.

"preclearance" is a process for clearing customs of the destination country before leaving the country of origin. Bill C-23 would expand this practice from select airports in Canada to land and water crossings, permit preclearance of cargo by U.S. agents in Canadian facilities, permit U.S. agents to carry weapons and detain, search and use force against Canadians within preclearance facilities in Canada. It would also give the Minister of Public Safety the power to designate new preclearance facilities within which U.S. agents would have these powers. Unlike in the current limited preclearance arrangements in some Canadian airports, U.S. agents would be permitted to detain Canadians if they choose to leave during the customs process.[1]

Bill C-23 would implement an agreement signed on March 15, 2016 during Prime Minister Trudeau's first official state visit to the U.S. under President Obama. The overall framework for expanding the placement of U.S. agents in Canada through U.S. preclearance operations was part of the "Beyond the Border Security and Competitiveness Agreement" signed between the Harper government and the Obama administration in 2011. In 2011 when the Harper government held consultations with those described as "stakeholders" on how to implement the Beyond the Border agreement, nearly half of the views they received opposed any expansion of the presence of U.S. security forces in Canada. In this respect, both the Harper and Trudeau governments have proceeded without Canadians' consent and in the face of their opposition.

According to the Trudeau government, the first new preclearance facilities will be installed at Billy Bishop Airport in Toronto, Jean Lesage Airport in Quebec City and for rail passengers at Montreal Central Station and the Rocky Mountaineer railway in British Columbia, as well as "certain rail and marine sites in BC." While the agreement is said to be reciprocal, no Canadian preclearance facilities have yet been announced for the U.S.

**Irrational and Self-Serving Argument**

When Bill C-23 was introduced prior to the November 8 U.S. election, the Liberals emphasized preclearance as a means to make travel to and trade with the U.S. "more efficient." Press releases from Public Safety Canada simply announced "action to ensure more efficient travel between Canada and U.S." and that the government has introduced a bill "that will bring economic and travel benefits" to various regions. The government stated that now, more Canadians will "enjoy the benefits of preclearance, which include direct access to more U.S. destinations, and greater
economic growth for local economies that will benefit from increased tourism."

Since that time, the Trump faction of the U.S. ruling class prevailed over the Clinton faction. It has sought to govern through the unfettered use of police powers, including a series of destabilizing, warmongering and racist executive orders. Two of these executive orders, banning entry into the U.S. of citizens from several countries targeted by the U.S. and halting acceptance of refugees, have had implications for the Canada-U.S. border and the rights of Canadians while traveling.

Those executive orders -- the first issued January 27 and met by mass resistance and court challenges, and the second issued March 6, a version of the first designed to comply with court orders -- have led to increasing denials of Canadian citizens and residents attempting to cross the border and uncertainty about whether Canadian citizens who also hold citizenship in any of the targeted countries would be permitted into the U.S. Various organizations, from the Girl Guides of Canada to the Toronto District School Board, have announced that they will no longer organize trips to the U.S. so that no one is turned away. Many cases have come to light of profiling of Canadians at the border.[2] According to media, new "extreme vetting" measures will soon be enacted to force travelers to give border agents access to phones and social media accounts as well as answer questions about their beliefs.

With the serious concerns of Canadians about themselves and their peers being targeted at the border, the government of Canada now cynically claims that placing armed U.S. border agents in Canada is a measure to defend the rights of Canadians. On February 21, Minister of Public Safety Ralph Goodale said that Bill C-23 will mean that U.S. border procedures are carried out "under the protective umbrella of Canadian law and the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms." His Parliamentary Secretary Mark Holland even suggested, "If something goes wrong ... we would want to be on the Canadian side of the border." To claim concern for "something going wrong" when the Liberal government has not spoken a word in defence of Canadians who are already being profiled and subjected to arbitrary measures is cold comfort.

The justification for Bill C-23 is irrational as it does not start from the premise of how to defend the rights of Canadians, their security or the economy. The starting point is instead that Canada and its economy are to be subjected to a government of police powers, not a government of laws and that national security is defended under the jackboots of the U.S. imperialist state and its police powers. Within this, increasing the direct control of U.S. agents and even military is considered "good for business" and necessary to protect "the bottom line" of "Canadian" businesses which depend on cross border trade. Any stand of principle, such as that Canada is a sovereign country and its people have the right to a say over what goes on within its territory and
all matters that affect their lives, is presented as opposed to "efficiency."

Far from defending Canadians, the government defends the rule of U.S. agents over the citizens and residents of Canada by sowing doubt about the motives of Canadians in preclearance facilities and even suggesting they are potential terrorists or criminals. Minister of Public Safety Ralph Goodale, during debate in the House of Commons on February 21, said that the powers to detain Canadians who wish to withdraw from preclearance procedures is "simply to prevent the illicit probing of preclearance sites by people trying to find weaknesses in border security before leaving the preclearance area undetected."

**Broad Impunity for Border Agents**

Claims that Canadians will be protected under the *Charter of Rights and Freedoms* from abuses by U.S. agents is not only a diversion but simply not true. The *Charter* is based on the anti-democratic premise that arbitrary powers get to impose so-called reasonable limits on rights.

Nonetheless, the issue of jurisdiction and what law prevails is significant as it concerns whose authority is supreme and its aim. Where jurisdiction lies is an important matter at this time not just because Canadians do not want to be subjected to the whims of the U.S. state. An article in *TML Weekly* on January 16, 2016, dealing with new Canada-U.S. security arrangements at that time, pointed out: "The issue of which authority presides over what jurisdiction is key to establishing who will defend you under what circumstances."[3] It also has implications for how authorities can be held to account and the ability to seek redress for wrongs.

In that regard, Bill C-23 will continue to provide broad impunity to U.S. border agents in Canada. In the case of violations of the rights of Canadians or of Canadian law, the U.S. has primary jurisdiction over investigation and prosecution, which can be invoked by notifying the host country.

Immunity for preclearance officers and their decisions in Canada is also provided for, including:

- "No action or other proceeding of a civil nature may be brought against a preclearance officer in respect of anything that is done or omitted in the exercise of their powers or the performance of their duties and functions [...]"

- "No decision of a preclearance officer to refuse to conduct preclearance, or to refuse the admission of persons or goods into the United States in accordance with the laws of the United States, is subject to judicial review in Canada."

A press release from the U.S. Department of Homeland Security concerning the Canada-U.S. preclearance agreement that preceded the bill stated that "officer privileges and immunities" will be addressed "through a shared jurisdictional framework in which the sending country may generally exercise primary criminal jurisdiction for acts committed by its officers in the performance of official duties in the Host country."

In other words, the U.S. will continue to exercise "primary criminal jurisdiction for acts committed by its officers in the performance of official duties." This entirely contradicts the claims of the government that U.S. border agents will operate "under the protective umbrella of Canadian law and the *Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms*."

Presenting the adoption of Bill C-23 as a factor for defending the rights of Canadians against U.S. agents, despite where jurisdiction lies and the lack of any authority that will defend Canadians, is a fraud. No matter whether these arbitrary powers are endorsed by Canada's Parliament or claimed to be exercised under the constitution, they cannot be legitimized in the eyes of Canadians.
Notes

1. Areas of concern in Bill C-23
- Bill C-23 allows agents to "detain the traveller for the purpose of a strip search, if the officer also has reasonable grounds to suspect that [...] the traveller has on their person concealed goods or anything that would present a danger to human life or safety, and [...] the search is necessary for the purpose of maintaining the security of or control over the border."
  - The bill allows U.S. border officers to detain an individual "If a preclearance officer has reasonable grounds to believe that a person has committed an offence under an Act of Parliament."
- Even if one is not detained, requesting withdrawal from preclearance requires a traveler to "answer truthfully any question asked by a preclearance officer [...] for the purpose of identifying the traveller or of determining their reason for withdrawing" and during that time border agents continue to possess the same powers.
- Bill C-23 allows a U.S. officer to request that a Canadian Border Services Agent bring any U.S.-bound traveller -- presumably within a given airport, rail station or border crossing -- to a preclearance area where they will be under U.S. authority.
- On the use of force, Bill C-23 states that a U.S. border agent is, "if they act on reasonable grounds, justified in doing what they are required or authorized to do under this Act and in using as much force as is necessary for that purpose." This is allegedly limited by a clarification in the bill that "a preclearance officer is not justified in using force that is intended or is likely to cause death or grievous bodily harm unless the officer has reasonable grounds to believe that it is necessary for self-preservation or the preservation of anyone under the officer's protection from death or grievous bodily harm."

2. Examples include:
- Fadwa Alaoui of Montreal tried to travel with her two children to Vermont to shop. U.S. border agents turned her away after asking her questions about her religion and her views on President Donald Trump. Alaoui said most questions focused on her religion. "I felt humiliated, treated as if I was less than nothing," she told CBC News.
  "He said, 'Do you practise? Which mosque do you go to? What is the name of the imam? How often do you go to the mosque? What kind of discussions do you hear in the mosque? Does the imam talk to you directly?'" Alaoui said. Border agents also asked her about Arabic videos on her phone. She said they were videos of daily prayers. Agents told her, "'You're not allowed to go to the United States because we found videos on your phone that are against us,'" Alaoui said. (CBC News, February 8)
- 19-year-old University of Sherbrooke student Yassine Aber attempted to cross the border in Stanstead, Quebec to compete at a track meet in Boston. He was held for five hours and questioned by agents, who eventually denied him entry into the United States.
  "They asked me, 'Do you go to the mosque?' I said, 'Yes, sometimes.' They said, 'How often? Which mosque do you go to?' They asked me about specific people," he told CBC News. Agents searched Aber's phone and allegedly found a photo on Facebook from a wedding in which he was tagged along with a former student who traveled to Syria in 2014. (CBC News, February 10)
- Manpreet Kooner, age 30 of Montreal was turned away at the U.S. border at the beginning of March and told she needed a valid immigrant visa to enter the country. Kooner said she was held at the border for six hours before being turned away. (CBC News, March 6)

- Michael Potter of Windsor said he attempted to travel to Detroit for shopping and to see friends and was taken into secondary screening and then frisked for 15 minutes in March and subsequently denied entry. Potter said for over an hour he was called back and forth to a desk by an officer, asked one question at a time, and told to sit down. After he was rejected, Potter found his belongings strewn throughout his vehicle. He told media that he had made the trip many times before, and that he believes he was targeted after mentioning his husband during the screening process.

Potter is now calling on the Canadian Parliament to reject Bill C-23, which would allow "preclearance" by U.S. border agents with their full powers to take place at border crossings within Canada. "I just want to make sure that nobody else's rights are violated and that this can never happen on Canadian soil," he said. (CBC News, March 28. Innisfail Province, April 4)

- Adeel Khan of Happy Valley-Goose Bay was stopped at the border between Quebec and New York on March 22 on his way to visit his fiancée in Washington, DC. Khan said that border officers repeatedly asked about his place of birth. Officers claimed they did not have sufficient evidence that Khan would return to Canada. Khan also told media that the officer subsequently was bragging to superiors within audible distance, saying "I stopped one of these ... Muhammads." (CBC News, March 28)


---

New Agreements Between Canada and U.S. Homeland Security

- Charlie Vita -

More U.S. Agents to Be Placed in Canada

U.S. Homeland Security Secretary John Kelly, during his visit to Canada on March 10, issued a joint statement with Public Safety Minister Ralph Goodale outlining the areas that were discussed and the "next steps." The joint statement also informed that the two countries will continue to work on "cyber security, critical infrastructure, trade enforcement, and countering radicalization to violence, as well as joint border initiatives such as trusted traveller programs."

It stated that this "starts with building on our long history of successful passenger preclearance operations." The statement said that Goodale and Kelly "discussed next steps to expand preclearance to new locations in air, rail, land, and marine modes" and that "Canada will also continue to consider potential operations in the United States."
Of interest is the fact that Bill C-23, *An Act respecting the preclearance of persons and goods in Canada and the United States*, which would authorize additional preclearance facilities and expand placement of U.S. agents on Canadian soil, has not even been debated in the House of Commons. Despite this, the Trudeau government is already discussing "next steps":

"While there is still work to be done in terms of legislation with the passage of Bill C-23 in Canada, we tasked our officials to report back on these issues, as well as negotiate a path forward to pursue cargo preclearance or pre-inspection, including identifying potential pilot sites," the joint statement said.

"Information Sharing"

"Information sharing" was presented as a tool for identifying threats for purposes of providing security. Minister Goodale and Secretary Kelly "reaffirmed [the] commitment to information sharing on threats to both our countries and open communication." The experience which shows that individuals have been profiled and sent to torture on the basis of such "shared information" is not to be discussed. The Trudeau government has now officially apologized to three Canadians -- Abdullah Almalki, Ahmad El Maati and Muayyed Nureddin -- who were deported after 9/11 on the basis of false "intelligence." The term "information sharing" is innocuous-sounding but many crimes have been committed and continue to be committed as a result of false intelligence and the use of arbitrary police powers.

Goodale and Kelly also discussed new information sharing mechanisms through the "Entry/Exit initiative once Canadian legislative requirements are met through the passage of Bill C-21." Bill C-21, *An Act to Amend the Customs Act*, is at second reading in the House of Commons. Like other legislation the Liberal government is enacting, it is part of establishing a single "North American" security cordon under U.S. control. The legislation would allow the Canada Border Services Agency to be informed by the U.S. border agencies when anyone leaves Canada at a land border crossing, permit Canadian border agents to inspect goods normally exempt from the *Customs Act* and share travel information with other agencies about Canadians leaving the country.

This will increase the profiling of citizens and residents based on "travel patterns." The surveillance of citizens and residents going about their private business and personal affairs criminalizes everyone which is unacceptable. Human beings are born to society and engage in many varied relationships on a daily basis. Considering them potential criminals because a so-called travel pattern unknown to themselves is suspicious makes it impossible to live secure lives.

Goodale and Kelly also reaffirmed that Canada and the U.S. will continue to share information on those who cross the U.S. border into Canada as asylum seekers and "work together to understand migrant flows, and monitor the situation on our shared land border, both at and between ports of entry." Asylum-seekers are also not criminals and to treat them as such is a gross violation of international humanitarian law.
During his March 10 visit to Canada, U.S. Homeland Security Secretary John Kelly told CTV's Power Play, "The most significant threat is a terrorist attack I think on aviation. That seems to be their Stanley Cup playoff. They want to knock down airplanes and they are trying every day to do it."

He said "I can't count the number of airplanes that have not been blown up in flight, whether they are United [Airlines] or Air Canada, but I can tell you there are dozens of plots ongoing all the time." Kelly said that over the past 15 years "we know there are hundreds of plots that we have discovered and ended" and that "there are dozens and dozens of ongoing plots to get to the United States or blow up airplanes."

Kelly did not provide evidence, saying the information was classified. He stated that Canada and the United States are considered "hard targets" by terrorists because of security measures with the U.S. and "seamless" co-operation on the sharing of information, including on passengers. Kelly suggests that every day Canadians are not killed or injured in terror attacks because of submitting to U.S. security agencies to protect Canadians based on "classified information."

Public Safety Minister Ralph Goodale was forced to respond to the claim and said, "No there is not a new specific threat against Air Canada. Obviously if that were to be the case, we would be taking a range of actions, but the Secretary was not referring to a new immediate threat." Goodale covered up for Kelly with talk about what the Secretary was "referring to" rather than condemning the irresponsible fearmongering about terrorists "trying every day" to "knock down airplanes."

Air Canada issued a strong denial. "Air Canada's policy is generally not to discuss issues of security. However there is no truth whatsoever in the suggestion that Air Canada may have been involved in such threats," its spokesperson Peter Fitzpatrick told The Globe and Mail.

It is a longstanding practice of the U.S. to claim that Canada is the origin of terrorist threats to the U.S. It has also become commonplace to whip up fear in Canada of an imminent terrorist attack to get people to accept the use of arbitrary police powers. Furthermore, U.S. Secretary Kelly's reliance on hyperbole is not unlike the method of the Trump administration to smash the limits of what has hitherto been considered statesmanlike discourse and behaviour so as to set a "new normal." The protestations of Minister Goodale and Air Canada notwithstanding, the idea that police powers are warranted to guarantee security remains paramount.

Under the Presidency of George W. Bush, then-U.S. Ambassador to Canada Paul Cellucci claimed that Canadians needed a terror attack on their own soil to understand what the U.S. was doing in its
war on terror, and that a number of cities in southwestern Ontario could be attacked. These statements followed Canada's decision to not openly join the U.S. invasion of Iraq as well as the calls by the North American financial oligarchy for Canada to enter into security perimeter arrangements with the U.S. Kelly's irresponsible statements today serve new demands for Canada to submit to the expansion of U.S. domination in the name of security.

**Claims of ISIS Supporters in Montreal Airport**

Less than three weeks after U.S. Homeland Security Secretaty Kelly's irresponsible remarks the *Journal de Montreal* reported on its "investigations" with the TVA progam *J.E.* that Montreal's Pierre Elliott Trudeau International Airport recently stripped some of its workers of security clearances. As well, four workers had access to a secured area withdrawn "as a precautionary measure." The newspaper also stated that some of the employees had "visited pro-Islamic (Daesh) websites, broadcast propaganda on social networks, consulted an abnormal amount of documents dealing with weapons or explosives."

The *Journal de Montreal* report said that of the four security clearances withdrawn, one was based on an alleged comment sympathizing with the November 14, 2015 Paris attack, and two were confiscated because of claims that workers had "psychiatric problems" that could jeopardize safety.

In an example of profiling and sowing doubt based on national origins, the *Journal de Montreal* report stated that one of those whose security clearance was revoked is "from North Africa." He had allegedly shared an "ISIS propaganda video" on his Facebook page. Then, contradictorily, the report claimed the individual "seems to support" the Muslim Brotherhood and the former President of Egypt Mohamed Morsi.

Right on cue, the monopoly media suggested that Canada's airports had been infiltrated by "ISIS supporters." A Postmedia report stated, "Canadian airport employees ID'd as ISIS supporters: Report." *24 Hours* stated, "Airport employees ID'd as ISIS supporters." Global News wrote, "Montreal Trudeau airport employees potentially radicalized: report claims" while the CBC stated, "Trudeau airport secure despite concerns about radicalized workers, officials say."

Spurious reporting such as this, which uses half-truths and is decontextualized, follows the method used by U.S. Secretary Kelly to justify increased police measures at Canada's airports. For more people to be victimized by profiling based on racial, religious and other criteria is unacceptable to Canadians.

The response of Minister of Transport Marc Garneau was to say that Canada's airports are secure because Canada's spy and police agencies constantly screen and vet those who get security clearances at airports, and to describe the screening and monitoring process.[1]

The dubious reports about "ISIS supporters" working at Canadian airports and Kelly's remarks about terrorists "trying every day" to attack Canadian airlines come at a time when the U.S. and Canadian governments are working out arrangements to expand the presence of U.S. security agents in Canada. Importantly, this means giving the U.S. a greater say over what happens in Canada's transportation system, which includes who can and cannot work in or near U.S. preclearance zones in airports.

All of these statements deprive Canadians of a sound position from which to consider issues of security and rights and are instead intended to incite fears and inflame passions. For one, Canadians should stand firm against any attempts to divide the working class by painting airline workers as potential security threats or accepting the state-organized profiling of Canadians based on their
Important to keep in mind is the fact that it is the U.S. imperialists, their spy agencies and military forces which are the main purveyors of terror around the world. These are now the forces seeking more powers in Canada. As in the past, the campaign to sow doubt about airport workers or claim daily plots against Canadian airlines coincides with the U.S. push for control over Canadian transportation security. Canadians should not stand for it.

Note

1. In a March 29 statement, Garneau said:

"In order to enter the restricted area of an airport, airport workers must obtain a Transportation Security Clearance (TSC) from Transport Canada. Before a TSC is granted, Transport Canada verifies that an individual does not pose a threat to the Canadian Aviation System, including completing background checks with the Canadian Security Intelligence Service, the RCMP, and Immigration, Refugees and Citizenship Canada."

Adding, "as part of Transport Canada's ongoing vetting process, all TSC holders with access to airport restricted areas are verified daily in a police database. When criminal activity is identified, we take immediate action and can suspend or revoke the clearance of an individual. As part of our ongoing security protocols, more than 1,100 clearances have been refused or cancelled at airports across the country over the past 2 years.

"These daily police checks are part of our Government's integrated and multi-layered transportation security system that combines these partnerships, intelligence assessment and sharing, policing, physical security, regulations, training and the use of human and technical resources to help minimize risks. This includes the requirement for airport workers to pass through a screening checkpoint when accessing airport secure areas.

"Canadians can be assured that their Government takes security matters very seriously and will not hesitate to take appropriate action to mitigate risks and respond to any threats, when identified, to the transportation system."

Increasing Placement of Canadian Military and Police Agencies Under U.S. Military Command

Recent developments show that far from playing a role to defend Canada and its people should any genuine threats arise, Canadian military and police forces are increasingly being placed under foreign military command, namely that of the U.S. military. Having Canada's military under the command of a foreign power, particularly an imperialist power that is notorious for wars of aggression and regime change, does not favour the cause of peace and security for Canadians; nor does placing its police forces -- which are ostensibly subordinate to the elected civilian authority -- under foreign military training and command.

Military Training Under U.S. Command

From March 27 to April 13 more than 150 members of 1 Canadian Mechanized Brigade Group from Edmonton, Alberta, deployed to Joint Base Lewis-McChord near Tacoma, Washington, to
participate in Exercise SPECTRAL RAM. This was part of the U.S. military's Exercise WARFIGHTER, a computer-assisted training event conducted at the corps and division level.

According to U.S. Colonel Edward Bohnemar, the exercise "allows units the ability to prepare their leaders and staffs to seamlessly integrate within a higher headquarters to conduct unified land operations."

Colonel Bill Fletcher, Commander of 1 Canadian Mechanized Brigade, said of this year's exercises, "The U.S. Army is our closest ally and their hard-won combat experience at the division level and beyond afford us the opportunity not only to practice command and control, but to do so within a fully enabled higher-level context. We are using this opportunity to build cohesion in training prior to working together on the battlefield."

**Police Trained by U.S. Military**

On March 31, an RCMP press release reported that some of its officers, as well as those of the Ontario Provincial Police (OPP) and Brockville Police Service, recently attended a "Shiprider Training Program" at the U.S. Coast Guard Maritime Law Enforcement Academy in Charleston, South Carolina. Unlike its Canadian equivalent, the U.S. Coast Guard is a branch of the armed forces.

The Canadian officers were being trained to join "Canada-U.S. Integrated Cross Border Law Enforcement Operations," aka Shiprider. The training includes "completion of in-class seminars, case-study scenarios, study of related criminal laws, privacy laws and policies of both Canada and the U.S." Once trained, armed Canadian police and U.S. border and coast guard officers are given authority to enforce both countries' laws and regulations while on jointly crewed boats on "shared waterways."

The RCMP reports that there are currently 240 Shiprider-trained and cross-designated officers. Full-time Shiprider operations have been established in:

- Surrey, British Columbia/Bellingham, Washington State;
- Victoria, British Columbia/Port Angeles, Washington State;
- Windsor, Ontario/Detroit, Michigan;
- Niagara-on-the-Lake, Ontario/Buffalo-Niagara, New York;
- Kingston, Ontario/Alexandria Bay, New York (the Thousand Islands area of the St. Lawrence River).

**Canadian Embedded in Homeland Security**

On February 28, the United States Department of Homeland Security, Science and Technology Directorate (DHS S&T) and the Centre for Security Science of Canadian Defence Research (DRDC) and Development, announced that Colin Murray will be the the first Canadian "exchange officer" in DHS S&T operations.[1]

Dr. Marc Fortin, Assistant Deputy Minister (Science and Technology) and Chief Executive Officer of DRDC spoke about the arrangement in glowing terms, stating "Collaboration with our American counterparts is key to finding solutions to common public safety and security challenges. These types of arrangements are about leveraging the best minds and assets in the innovation system to bolster already existing ties and identify new areas for cooperation."

The background of the exchange officer, Colin Murray, provides insights into what are the "common public safety concerns and security challenges" being discussed.

Murray has in fact been embedded within the DHS S&T structure in Washington, DC since
mid-December 2016. According to his LinkedIn profile, he is an air force pilot who flew under the command of the U.S. Navy for three years. His work with DRDC includes: overseeing a team "to push the boundaries in domains such as social media in emergency management, countering violent extremism, responder interoperability, wireless technologies, security exercises, community resilience, and major event security such as at the 2010 Winter Olympics and the G20 Summit."[2]

In other words, Murray is involved in policing politics and criminalizing dissent, including surveillance and engagement through social media and targeting people based on their ideas, affiliations or beliefs. Such collaboration with the U.S. will not guarantee the rights and security of Canadians or Americans but undermine them.

Notes

1. The Science and Technology Directorate is the primary research and development arm of the U.S. Department of Homeland Security. The DRDC’s Centre for Security Science is an agency of Canada’s Department of National Defence (DND) that provides technology for DND, the Canadian Armed Forces and other government departments as well as the “public safety and national security communities” to "defend and protect Canada’s interests at home and abroad."

2. The North American Aerospace Defence Command, which is under U.S. Northern Command was involved in commanding security operations during both the Vancouver Olympics and the G20 in Toronto, which Murray claims to have been involved with in some capacity. It was during the protests against the G20 in particular that police forces preemptively arrested those they labelled as "violent extremists" the day before protests began, establishing an atmosphere of anarchy and violence in which a massive police response was presented as being justified.

Opposition to U.S. Attacks Against Syria

Demonstrations Across Canada and U.S. Condemn Illegal U.S. Air Strike Against Syria

Ottawa, April 8, 2017.

Following the illegal U.S. missile strikes against Syria on April 6, Canadians from all walks of life, including representatives of the Syrian community in Canada, demonstrated to oppose the U.S.
attack and Canada's support for U.S. aims of regime change and war in Syria. The spirit of all the actions was to uphold Syria's sovereignty, oppose continuing imperialist interference in Syria and denounce the use of fraudulent pretexts to justify aggression and regime change. Demonstrations also took place throughout the U.S. and around the world.

Canadians who demonstrated denounced the chorus from the monopoly media and those who claim to represent Canadians in Parliament and government which repeats the spurious claims of U.S. President Donald Trump about who is responsible for the April 4 deaths in Syria as a result of exposure to toxic chemicals. People emphasized that it is unacceptable for the U.S. to make such accusations without presenting any evidence and not permitting an investigation. They condemned the launch of attacks against a sovereign country under any guise, including citing humanitarian concerns. In this case, speakers pointed out that the imperialists' own forces inside Syria are also accused of possessing and using chemical weapons. The self-righteousness of the U.S. imperialists who claim they have never used chemical weapons is deplorable. Among other crimes, they are the ones who used Agent Orange against the Vietnamese people, who still suffer its consequences.[1]

In that regard, many placards and speakers throughout the country drew parallels with the U.S. wars of aggression against Iraq and Libya, which were both launched on the basis of claims later proven to be lies. The U.S. still must be held to account for these lies and the war crimes that followed, people emphasized. This is a serious problem of the international system, not that Russia and China exercise veto power at the UN Security Council against attempts by the U.S. to legitimize its attacks. What is needed is a united front of the peoples against aggressive war.

The position of the Trudeau government, which has shown itself to be a war government servile to U.S. imperialist interests was also condemned. In less than 24 hours, Prime Minister Trudeau went from calling for an investigation into who was to blame for the April 4 chemical weapons deaths to applauding the U.S. airstrikes and declaring the Syrian government responsible reportedly after "a trusted and reliable ally in the United States informed us that the Assad regime was responsible for these chemical attacks." In this way the same military and security agencies who cannot predict anything and are involved in vicious factional fighting within the U.S. are presented as "trusted" and given a role in decision making in Canada. Following the remarks of Donald Trump on April 6 calling on "all civilized nations to join" the U.S. campaign against Syria, Trudeau and his Ministers declared that "all civilized peoples" must "speak with one voice" in favour of U.S. actions. On April 10, Trudeau continued to toe the U.S. line, calling for "peace and stability in [a] Syria that does not involve [Syria's elected president] Bashar al-Assad."[2]

Canadians of Syrian origin pointed out that the Syrian people have been fighting for a resolution to the crisis led by the Syrian people themselves, but continued interference by the U.S. and that of the big European powers, Canada, Turkey, Israel, Saudi Arabia and others, including the sponsorship
of terrorist groups inside the country, has been a major obstacle. They denounced the fact that the U.S. has intervened once again to directly support groups that have terrorized the Syrian people including ISIL, the Al-Nusra Front and others. They opposed Canada's intervention in Syria in support of the U.S. agenda, supporting groups working for regime change. They affirmed that Syria needs peace but that this will not be achieved by U.S. attacks and violation of sovereignty or any further destruction of Syria's legitimate institutions. Far from it, U.S. and Canadian interference aims to prolong the crisis and prevent any Syrian-led solution, and will create further tragedies.

In Montreal, a Syrian refugee youth said that Canadian authorities have pressured her to repeat the line of the U.S. and Canadian state on the crisis in Syria and say that the Syrian government in responsible for the humanitarian tragedies. She stated that she refused to do so and continues to defend her country against this aggression.

Many of those who came forward in these actions to denounce the U.S. missile strikes against Syria and the escalation of the war danger by the U.S. imperialists also demanded that Canada be a zone for peace and called for Canadians to establish an anti-war government. Demonstrators pledged to step up the work to mobilize Canadians to ensure that the Trudeau war government cannot speak in their name and to oppose any further U.S. attacks.

For more information, see *TML Weekly, April 8, 2017.*
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Note

1. On April 11, White House press secretary Sean Spicer went so far as to say, “We didn’t use chemical weapons in world war two” and then claimed that even Hitler had not used chemical weapons. "You had someone as despicable as Hitler who didn’t even sink to using chemical weapons." When this claim was challenged, he replied, "Thank you, I appreciate that. There was not in the -- he brought them into the Holocaust centres -- I understand that. But I’m saying in the way that Assad used them, where he went into towns, dropped them down into the middle of towns."
2. Foreign Minister Chrystia Freeland, following a meeting of G7 foreign ministers in Italy on April 11, stated, "Canada is very much of the view that, particularly in the wake of what is a war crime -- the use of chemical weapons last week -- that Assad has to go." The Trudeau government also took up the line of the U.S. that Russia, by virtue of its military and political support for the Syrian government, is therefore culpable for the alleged chemical attack. Freeland stated, "Russia needs to decide whether it wants to double down on its support for this murderous regime ... or whether it wants to say: 'We do not want to be associated with this.'"

On April 10, U.S. President Trump and British Prime Minister Theresa May claimed that the U.S. strike offered Russia a "window of opportunity" to accept that "its allegiance with Assad is no longer in its strategic interest." May and Trump declared that the visit of U.S. Secretary of State Rex Tillerson to Moscow on April 11 and 12 along with the G7 Foreign Ministers meeting taking place at the same time would provide "an opportunity to make progress towards a solution which will deliver a lasting political settlement."

At the G7 meeting on April 11, the U.S. and the UK led by British Foreign Secretary Boris Johnson called for new sanctions against the Russian Federation, allegedly in retaliation for its continued support for Syria. According to news reports, this proposal was vetoed by German and Italian as well as European Union representatives. Media reported that the failure to secure agreement on new sanctions against Russia and the failure of U.S. Secretary of State Rex Tillerson to convince Russian representatives of the need for regime change in Syria during his visit to Moscow on April 11 and 12 meant that "window" has closed.

U.S. Threatens Korean Peninsula with Carrier Strike Group

Hands Off the DPRK! U.S. Troops Out of Korea! U.S. Must Sign a Peace Treaty Now!

- Philip Fernandez and Yi Nicholls -

Toronto Pickets Against U.S. War Preparations on Korean Peninsula

April 12, 2017 picket across from U.S. Consulate, Toronto.
On April 8, the U.S. military's Pacific Command announced that it was deploying the Carl Vinson Carrier Strike Group of the U.S. Third Fleet to Korean waters, ostensibly to confront the "threat" posed by the Democratic People's Republic of Korea (DPRK). Given the already tense situation on the Korean Peninsula -- the result of U.S. refusal to negotiate a peace treaty and normalize relations with the DPRK for nearly 65 years -- this latest U.S. aggression could set the stage for a nuclear or world war. It must not pass! The pretext for the deployment is the DPRK's April 5 missile test. This denies that the DPRK has been forced into a corner to defend its sovereignty against ceaseless aggression since the U.S. was defeated in the Korean War in 1953.

The Carl Vinson Carrier Strike Group was in Korean waters earlier this year as part of the Key Resolve/Foal Eagle war exercises for invasion and regime change in the DPRK that began in March, with bombers, fighters and ships capable of delivering nuclear weapons. These were the largest exercises in 40 years and an expression of the aggressive Japan-south Korea-U.S. military alliance. While on its way to Australia, the strike group was pointedly ordered back to the region as a further threat to the DPRK. It includes the Nimitz-class aircraft carrier *USS Carl Vinson* (CVN 70), the Arleigh Burke-class guided-missile destroyers *USS Wayne E. Meyer* (DDG 108) and *USS Michael Murphy* (DDG 112), and Ticonderoga-class guided-missile cruiser *USS Lake Champlain* (CG 57).

The strike group's deployment came two days after the Trump administration's illegal airstrikes on Syria. President Trump ordered the strikes during his summit with Chinese President Xi Jinping in Florida, which included U.S. demands that China "rein in" the DPRK. This timing can be seen as a thinly-veiled threat, despite news reports that the discussions between Trump and Xi were allegedly friendly. These actions reiterate the imperialist dictum that "Might Makes Right" and underscore that the Trump administration is a government of police powers that operates outside the UN Charter, international law and diplomatic norms, and is willing to endanger humanity to assert U.S. hegemony.

This development also follows remarks by U.S. Secretary of State Rex Tillerson during his visit to
Seoul, south Korea in March, that the Trump administration was abandoning the Obama administration's policy of "strategic patience" toward the DPRK because it had "failed." Tillerson claimed that the U.S. government does not want to take military action but that "all options are on the table," which it openly states includes the option of a pre-emptive nuclear strike.

**Long History of U.S. Nuclear Weapons on Korean Peninsula**

The U.S. introduced the first nuclear weapon onto south Korean soil in 1958 -- a missile that could carry a nuclear warhead called "Honest John." It has continued to bring more nuclear weapons since that time. Its claim to have removed its nuclear weapons from south Korea in 1992 is bogus as its warships and aircraft stationed around the Korean Peninsula have always had the capability to deliver a nuclear strike. Today, there are 90 U.S. land and sea bases in south Korea with 30,000 troops armed with the latest weapons.

Furthermore, it has come to light that the south Korean government of President Park Chung-hee (1963-1979), the father of recently imprisoned south Korean president Park Guen-hye, tried to build a secret nuclear weapons program in the 1970s. A recent article by U.S. journalist Wayne Madsen points out: "In a secret cable from Seoul to the State Department dated November 4, 1974, the U.S. ambassador in Seoul Richard Sneider informed State that in conversations with the Canadian ambassador in Seoul, James Alexander Stiles, the Canadian envoy indicated that he was aware of a potential south Korean 'diversion program' to funnel Canadian nuclear power technology to Seoul's covert nuclear weapons program."[1] Madsen points out that the International Atomic Energy Agency discovered in 2004 that south Korea's Atomic Energy Research Institute secretly engaged in plutonium enrichment to make nuclear weapons.

Now, the Trump administration is considering openly placing nuclear weapons in south Korea once again, based on the irrational claim that it is the DPRK that poses a threat and requires a nuclear deterrent. It has even floated the possibility of permitting Japan to develop nuclear weapons.

The Korean people have consistently opposed U.S. aggression and the presence of U.S. troops and bases on Korean soil. Most recently they have been in motion for months to oppose the installation of the terminal high altitude area defence missile defence (THAAD) system in south Korea that poses a danger to the region, and is also opposed by China and Russia. For years they have opposed the presence of U.S. bases, including the construction of a new U.S. naval base on Jeju Island. They will surely stand opposed to the U.S. and their south Korean stooges re-introducing nuclear weapons to south Korea.

The U.S. has spurned the DPRK's many invitations to sign a peace treaty and sabotaged all efforts by China to broker a political solution to denuclearize the Korean peninsula via the "Six Party Talks" involving the U.S., China, the DPRK, south Korea, Japan and Russia. This intransigence underscores who is for peace and who is for war.

The U.S. imperialists have never given up their ambition to take over the strategically located Korean Peninsula, a beachhead from which they could then conquer all of Asia. The U.S. divided the Korean Peninsula in 1945 and has maintained a military presence in south Korea since then. It
waged the illegal Korean War from 1950-53 to keep Korea divided and the people subjugated. It is important to keep in mind that this war of aggression included the wholesale destruction of Korean cities and towns including virtually all buildings in the capital of the DPRK, Pyongyang; targeting the DPRK's hydroelectric dams to leave the country without power and flood the countryside; and killing at least 3 million Koreans. U.S. Air Force General Curtis LeMay, head of the Strategic Air Command during the Korean War later remarked, "Over a period of three years or so, we killed off 20 percent of the population."

The DPRK, with the assistance of the Chinese People's Volunteer Army, defeated the U.S. and forced it to sign the Armistice Agreement. Since then, the U.S. and its allies -- including Canada -- have tried to isolate the DPRK with military threats and blackmail, as well as crippling financial and commercial sanctions, justified using virulent anti-communist disinformation, such as a bogus campaign decrying "human rights violations." The DPRK has simply refused to submit. In the face of this, the U.S. imperialists blame the victims and even portray them as paranoid.

Canadians should look objectively at the facts and draw warranted conclusions about who is really the "threat" on the Korean Peninsula. Moreover, the situation requires that people revitalize the anti-war movement and work out how Canada can take a principled and independent anti-war stand against imperialist aggression on the Korean Peninsula and around the world that rejects the use of force to sort out differences between peoples and nations. Canadians must reject the cutting of deals with the Trump administration, taken up by the Trudeau Liberals, that is embroiling Canada in U.S. aggression on the basis that this will ensure Canada's security. Canadians must affirm that there is One Humanity and One Struggle! and that Our Security Lies in the Fight for the Rights of All!

This dangerous situation calls for all peace- and justice-loving people to speak out as one against this latest act of U.S. aggression against the DPRK and to demand that the Trump administration stand down, stop its nuclear blackmail and provocations against the DPRK and sign a peace treaty now. This is the demand of the Korean people, the Canadian people and all humanity.

Hands off the DPRK! U.S. Must Sign a Peace Treaty with the DPRK Now!
No to Carl Vinson Carrier Strike Group in Korean Waters!
No to U.S.-south Korea Key Resolve Military Exercises!
No to Missile Defence on Korean Soil! U.S. Troops Out of Korea!

Note

From March 23 to 25, the 21st International Seminar "Parties and a New Society," hosted by the Workers' Party of Mexico (PT), was held in Mexico City.

For the 21st year in a row, the Communist Party of Canada (Marxist-Leninist) participated, represented this year by a delegation from the International Commission of its Central Committee. It joined 270 other delegates representing 127 communist, workers' and progressive political parties and organizations from 36 countries from five continents. More than 200 Mexican delegates from different states of the Republic also participated in the proceedings.

The seminar was organized into sessions for discussion and exchange of experiences in the following three areas:

1. Summation of the program to build the transition to governments with alternative nation-building projects;

2. Response to the counter-offensive of imperialism against governments and alternative nation-building projects;

3. Current topics such as the consequences for Latin America and the world of the election of Donald Trump as U.S. President, the fight against colonialism and neocolonialism, peace and militarism.

A major preoccupation of many delegations was the significance of Trump's election and how to view the current situation. This is the topic the delegation of CPC(M-L) addressed and there was also a special panel on the matter. The presentation of CPC(M-L) has been reproduced below.
The opening session of the Seminar was dedicated to the life and work of Comrade Fidel Castro. This was fitting, as a main theme throughout the proceedings was one that Fidel espoused -- the need for the broadest possible unity of the peoples for the purpose of advancing the building of the new society.

The Seminar was attended by a number of personalities who spoke about particular fights of importance taking place at this time in their countries. Former Colombian Senator Piedad Córdoba called on everyone to support the implementation of the peace agreement between the Government of Colombia and the Revolutionary Armed Forces of Colombia (FARC) and emphasized the need for a similar agreement to be reached with the National Liberation Army (ELN). Honduran presidential candidate Xiomara Castro of the Libre Party also spoke, as did Adán Chávez of the United Socialist Party (PSUV), Venezuela's Minister of Culture. A Puerto Rican university youth spoke of the students’ fight against drastic cuts to post-secondary education being demanded by the U.S.-imposed Financial Control Board, and the fact that the youth are in the front ranks of the struggle for Puerto Rico’s independence from colonial rule.

Resolutions adopted included denunciations of the nefarious activities taking place against Venezuela in the Organization of American States and support for the right of the Bolivarian republic and people of Venezuela to realize their destiny free from outside interference. Another expressed support for peace in Colombia and the freeing of FARC-EP member Simon Trinidad who continues to be held as a political prisoner in the U.S. Others expressed support for the progressive forces in Ecuador in their determination to elect Alianza País candidate Lenin Moreno in the April 2 presidential election, for an end to the persecution of Basque political prisoners by the government of Spain, for the release of political prisoner Milagro Sala in Argentina, for the Mexican government to account for the fate of the 43 missing student teachers (the Ayotzinapa 43) and support for the people of Palestine.

(Photos: PT)

On the Significance of the New Trump Administration
- Presentation of the Communist Party of Canada (Marxist-Leninist) -

Donald Trump's election represents the will of a section of the ruling class to establish a police state and overcome the limits of the U.S. Constitution. Another section of the ruling class also wants to establish a police state while maintaining a constitutional appearance.
Many in the United States and Europe believe that the election of Trump and the possible election of Marine Le Pen in France represent the triumph of the extreme right. They say that xenophobia and fear of economic insecurity motivate the people to vote in favour of the extreme right. They accept the elections as a legitimate expression of the will of the people, when they are actually a fraud. The people are deprived of the possibility of electing their own representatives and setting their own agenda; it is the ruling circles that choose the candidates and they also set the ideological and political framework of the election campaign. Saying that these presidents are elected by the people is in contempt of the conception of elections. Blaming the people for racism and xenophobia is also not sound as it ignores the fact that the colonial divide and rule policy remains the policy of the ruling elite of today. Donald Trump's election confirms this to be the case and shows that racism and racist attacks are indeed state-organized.

Accepting that Trump's election is a problem of the extreme right taking over, implies that Clinton, Hollande, Trudeau, Fox, Obama and others are the centre, centre-left, or the left. In fact, they all adhere to neo-liberalism and its anti-worker, racist, warmongering and nation-wrecking program, that is to say, a "right-wing agenda."

Obama's presidency saw far more assassinations by drones and many more presidential decrees than occurred during the reign of his predecessor, George W. Bush. Still we are told that Obama was not as dangerous as Trump. Similarly, it is said that Hollande is not as bad as Marine Le Pen, although it was Hollande who used the exceptional measures adopted following several terrorist attacks to incorporate these police powers into the French Constitution.

The French nation-state and its public authority are mired in crisis whereby police powers are the only aspect that remain of the public authority. The very idea that a government of police powers can be considered a government of laws is absurd. One has only to think of the Pinochet government in Chile or the Argentinian governments during Operation Condor to see how absurd it is to believe that the conditions of governments of police powers can be compatible with a government of laws.

Therefore, in our opinion, it makes no sense to persist in seeing this as an opposition between right-wing, extreme right-wing, centre and left ideologies and policies, since that does not correspond to anything in reality. Although a stern ideological struggle is needed against the bourgeoisie and its racist, misogynist, anti-worker and anti-communist outlook and values, we do not think it useful to say that problems in the United States (or even Europe) are ideological as such.

According to our analysis of the situation, we are confronted with a very particular historical moment in which the old forms established in the constitutions of the bourgeois nation-states as created in the 18th and 19th centuries and which gave birth to the kind of civil society that was necessary for the bourgeoisie to protect its property rights at that time, are forms that have outplayed their role, are exhausted and no longer function. The arrangements, the institutions, the
form of elections to give them legitimacy and of distributing powers among the different levels of
government, the way of establishing citizenship and conferring rights according to their definition
by the ruling class, etc. -- all this has become obsolete and anachronistic. Those forms are
exhausted.

On the other hand, the forms demanded by the new society of socialized humanity required today
are yet to be created. Humanity has not yet succeeded in giving birth to the new forms that our
societies need which are based not on the defence of rights defined by ownership of property but on
the defence of the rights that all possess by virtue of being human. These forms are born of the
resistance struggle waged to oppose the denial of rights and the theoretical work necessary for their
elaboration, as is seen, for example, in Cuba and elsewhere where the refusal to reconcile with the
abandonment of the human being leads to the discovery of new forms, new ways of doing things.

In our view, the sharpest struggle within the ranks
of the big bourgeoisie in the U.S. is between
those who, like Trump, want unlimited police
powers and those who want these same police
powers given the constitutional sanction. Without
drawing unwarranted historical parallels, the
situation is reminiscent of the factional fights
within the Hitlerite bureaucracy between the
extreme wing of the Nazi forces which formed
the Brownshirts and wanted to liquidate all Jews
and the wing that wanted rules to recognize who
was a Jew for purposes of knowing how to distinguish who to expel, dispossess and send to their
death.

It is not without reason that following the fall of the Soviet Union the corporate media sought to
disinform public opinion by telling stories of fights between "conservatives" and "moderates."
After that, we were told of struggles between Muslim "fundamentalists" -- i.e. "extremists" and
"moderates." All of it is done to conceal the need to build the people's united front in defence of
their own interests, so that the struggle against the old world does not give birth to a new world
built by human beings. People are to be kept hostage to the private interests of the world's pro-war
oligopolies.

It is clear based on Trump's behaviour, there is an attempt to see how far he can go in doing
whatever he wants. Any limitations on the use of police powers imposed by the Constitution are
under attack. Trump's executive orders test what these limits are, to see who will succeed in
opposing them and how to overcome this opposition. It is a matter of assessing how far the Trump
presidency can go in this direction. The position of the opposition to Trump declares his decrees are
unconstitutional and resorts to the judicial process as much as possible to enforce the limits of a
constitution in crisis, a constitution that no longer meets the needs of the present.

This contradiction is also reflected in the fights between federal and states' rights. We cannot ignore
that 13 sovereign republics created the United States of America. They have rights that the federal
government now wants to take away because the privatization program is run by oligopolies in all
sectors, be it energy, automobile and war equipment, water, education, health, or rather the "health
industry" as it is called, and so on. Even the armed forces are privatized today, as are police and
security forces. We cannot ignore that the states and cities which have claimed to be sanctuaries for
those targeted by the Trump administration for deportation have enormous police powers of their
own and they are challenging the federal powers. When a state or a sanctuary city says it will
defend immigrants, no one in the U.S. forgets for a minute that their police forces are as racist,
xenophobic and murderous, especially against Black or Mexican or Latino communities, as the federal power.

In opposition to racist and anti-immigrant measures, the people can exploit these differences between the federal government and the power of sanctuary states and cities to defend themselves in specific circumstances, such as those that exist today. In this sense, resistance is courageously reaffirmed once again with all its very important characteristics but on the condition that it does not succumb to the illusion that the United States Constitution can be used to defend the rights of the people if only the so-called moderate forces could win the battle against the so-called extremist forces. Resistance must be directed by efforts that lead to the creation of a united front of the American people around its working class and must draw on its experience of struggle and resistance to forge and realize a vision of the world that defends the rights of all.

In this regard, we believe it is important to also deploy the necessary efforts to build our internationalist unity, in our case between the people of Canada, the U.S. and Mexico against U.S. imperialist aims to integrate the three states and governments to create a Fortress North America -- a new imperialist state directed against the peoples of the world.

In Canada, the Trudeau government is trying very hard to persuade the Trump administration that the Canadian economy is so integrated with the U.S. that Canada should not be targeted with measures such as those it is taking against Mexico, which it considers reasonable as long as they do not apply to Canada.

We rely entirely on the program of the working class of Canada, the U.S. and Mexico to defend our national interests on the basis of new arrangements that defend human beings and not the private ownership of oligopolies. Our slogan is "One Humanity, One Struggle."

In this regard we are making every effort to strengthen the anti-war movement so that Canada can become a zone of peace just as CELAC has declared for Latin America and the Caribbean. We also join with all the progressive forces in demanding an end to the blockade against Cuba as well as the closure of the U.S. military base at Guantánamo and the return of that national territory to Cuba. We congratulate the leadership of the Cuban Communist Party, its members and the Cuban people for having found in its heroic resistance struggle the forms for the renewal and safeguarding of its social project. We also congratulate the Venezuelan, Colombian and other peoples for finding a way forward in defending their rights in the conditions they face. They will overcome the reaction.

In closing, we want to express our full confidence in the people of Canada, the U.S., Mexico and all countries and their ability to continue their resistance struggle against attempts of imperialism and reaction to deprive us of the rights which belong to us as human beings who depend on modern societies for our livelihood and for our well-being, and that from this resistance struggle the new forms required by society will come into being.

(Translated from the original Spanish by TML. Photos: PT, TML.)