

More on the Great Debate

Here is how the trollbuster debates developed in the past week. First, I had this sort of chew down with whatsisname, the guy who no likee voting alliance.

He sez;

Are you disputing the numbers because they are publicly available through Elections Canada and other sources?

This is another reason why I think you must be a Conservative mole, Tim. Both you and Harper seem to have a disdain for evidence. :)

I sez;

All kinds of numbers are publicly available through many sources. I just told you how I went to the elections Canada pages and found nothing supporting your theory. Are you avoiding my question of whether this has occurred to anybody but you? tr

He sez;

Come one Tim. The election results for past elections are on Elections Canada site for all to see. Finding the riding by riding results isn't rocket science. Media sources also published the election results by riding. Just compare the results across elections to see the impact of the ABC campaigns.

I sez:

Yeah, come on Dale. Has anyone but you found these ridings where all these conservative voters went out and voted just because somebody was picking on their candidate? Which ridings are they?

Are there any ridings where the conservatives got fewer votes in 2011 than they did in 2008? There must be some because the conservatives got fewer total votes in 2011 than in 2008. They won due to the way the votes split.

I am getting tired of waiting to hear what the basis is for this idea.

He sez;

Perhaps if you read my posts before objecting to them, you would have noticed the names of the ridings. :)

Anyway, here's some nice compact tables for past elections that shows the pattern

Oshawa results are at http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Oshawa_%28electoral_district%29

Ajax-Pickering results are at http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Ajax_%E2%80%94Pickering

You will notice that in both case these targeted ridings by the 2011 strategic voting campaign did not result in the endorsed candidate winning and in both cases the Conservative support went up by 6,000 votes.

In both ridings there was no doubt about which candidate would have been the pick to defeat the Conservative but the presence of the ABC campaign appears to have boosted the Conservative fortunes considerably.

In Ajax-Pickering, the Liberal votes stayed the same but the NDP candidate seems to have picked up votes from the Greens and from some new voters. However the bulk (75%) of the new votes went to the Conservative candidate, propelling him to an easy win. This was the only time this riding had been targeted for strategic voting.

In Oshawa a formerly three-horse race evolved over time to an NDP / Conservative split. It's worth noting this riding had been a target for strategic voting campaigns in the last 3 elections. As Liberal fortunes faded in the riding, the Conservative margin of victory increased.

In short, the strategic voting campaigns in both a riding targeted for a Liberal hold and for an NDP take not only failed but appear to have increased the Conservative votes considerably.

And I sez;

Well, its time to get back to the voting alliance debate. I have been otherwise occupied for a few days. There is somebody else in cyberland who does not like a voting alliance.

The URL is here;

JUSTIN VS JOYCE WON,T SOLVE LIBERALS, PROBLEMS, by Bill Tieleman. Famous name not enough; inter-party unite-the-left scheme flawed. <http://sgnews.ca/2013/03/20/justin-vs-joyce-wont-solve-liberals-problems/>

I do not think it will work in e-mail and you will have to cut and paste it. But Tieleman is an NDP partisan, which is why he writes for Straight Goods. Just like Gary is a secret conservative. Well, not so secret.

Generally, people who are big party supporters hate Strategic Alliances and people with little patience for political parties love it. The NDP all think; it doesn't matter because we will finally wipe out the Liberals next election and then the one after that we will win power. Never mind that we will have to put up with Harper until 2020, or that deepers in office are not much different in practice from Liberals.

The Liberals think; as soon as we get the right leader we will regain our natural governing position and the heavens will be righted. The NDP will go back to being a third party. Never mind that Justin seems to be another patrician prince who is much more right wing than his parents; takes all the neo-liberal stuff for granted.

People who are more interested in getting the Harperites out and blocking any further destruction of social infrastructure are looking for ways to force the opposition to cooperate whether they want to or not. Tieleman thinks the idea is flawed but has no alternative except another decade at least of Harper while the opposition focus on destroying each other.

So, I looked in on the last liberal leadership debate today. It seems that Joyce and the alliance idea are getting some notice. All of them are attacking her over it. None of them have any real arguments against it. One of them claimed to support voting reform and then tried to equate AV with proportional representation.

I have a funny feeling Joyce will win or come a strong second. There is this thing about prince Justin getting the deadline for voter registration extended, which suggests that he is having trouble getting the people who he signed up for the party to follow through. Maybe these people are having second thoughts about him as he never says where he is ideologically.

One of the other female candidates talked about Elizabeth May's run in Nova Scotia in 2008, when Stephane Dion pulled the Liberal candidate for her. She lost. However, that was not the best application of the electoral alliance principle. The Greens had no presence there before. The Liberals were in third place as well and the NDP had the best shot at taking out the conservative cabinet minister who had been incumbent for some time. In fact, if the had been an alliance around the deeper, she would have likely won.

The aim of an alliance is to get the strongest candidate, not to do "courtesies" among party leaders.

Now, I think the key to getting a voting alliance going is to convince the liberals that it is their only way to survive. It has been noticed that they have been losing about 35 seats with every election since 2004. The next time around they are likely to be wiped out unless they get a deal with the NDP to not run against each other.

In the longer term, PR is the only way they will survive. They will always be able to get some seats and have opportunities to participate in government.

As for the deepers, if they leave the Liberal and Green incumbents alone, and get themselves a clear run everywhere else, they will get themselves into government. Probably not a majority government, but in office. Even if they do not get more votes than Harper, the public and even much of the membership of both parties are tired of these jerks fighting each other and will demand an alliance in parliament.

This is the simplest way of actualizing a voting alliance but it will still be hard to do. People inside and outside these parties will have to apply huge and

persistent pressure. There will be all these supposed proofs of why it can't be done, it will just make more people vote conservative or stay home etc.

This is another reason to get some polling research data; to answer all this crap. I want to know what a real, scientific poll says about the effects of a voting alliance on people's stated voting intentions. I am not much interested in conjectures based on cherry picked poll results.

So, Gary, I am not impressed by these two ridings you showed me where the conservative vote went up in the last election. I think if I wanted to and knew where these targeted ridings were, I could find two where the conservative vote went down or went sideways.

At any rate, I am not going to go digging through vote results for the past decade all across Canada to try to prove a negative. If you or anybody else who might be pushing this line think you have something, put it in a proper format. Show correlations between ridings targeted by the strategic voters, and those not.

Now, time to put the MAC to sleep and put me to sleep. I have lots of work to do. I need to get all my stuff moved over to the new web host, learning this new system in the process. And, I have to find some time to study for a final exam. Goodnight, trollbusters.

Then somebody said;

I watched the Leadership Debate and saw how hard certain players were trying to paint any form of cooperation as anti-democratic, or a betrayal of party values.

I think that line of reasoning is a joke, because it presumes that we have a democracy in the first place, when in fact we have a plutocracy at best or an oligarchy.

We have an "election" every four or five years that is designed to elect the status quo, always favouring business interests, with change occurring only on a geological scale.

We get out and elect a four or five year dictatorship.

The fact is that over 60% of the electorate share at least some progressive values and those values do not get represented in parliament.

So, what is wrong with progressive people voting for progressive candidates, from any party, as opposed to non-progressive candidates. Normal people see this as reasonable; party partisans see it as betrayal. Normal people are the ones who want change.

And somebody else chimed in with:
So right on...L

And guess who comes in with;
I'd question whether 60% of the voters are somewhat progressive. Half the Liberal voters are somewhat conservative and many of the Greens are also. The fact that 60% of the voters didn't vote Conservative last time out doesn't mean that they aren't conservative. It simply means that they supported another party more. When forced to chose between the NDP and Conservatives, I wouldn't count on the left getting the nod.

And I conclude all this by saying that if there is something that is well established in the social science tendency on politic sciences, it is that most of any population are basically progressive. The right wing is always a minority but is usually very aggressive. The center to left is more wishy washy and intimidated. This is why the right wing is always doing everything it can to suppress the left vote or divide it.

About 40% of people do not even come out to vote because they feel there is no real choice. This by itself is an essentially 'left' attitude. If these people started to think there was really something to vote for, they would be a powerful force.

I noticed this phenomenon years ago when I was telephone canvassing for an NDP candidate for a provincial by election in a poor part of Calgary. They called it "the holler".

I spent time very carefully assessing the attitudes of the people I contacted. This was an age before cell phones when it was a lot easier to find people on the phone. The liberals were no factor at all; had trouble finding a candidate. It was between the NDP and what still called itself the progressive Conservative party at that time.

The area was about three to one left versus right, but I noticed something. The right wing people were really loud and obnoxious over the phone, real "greaser" types. Throw all the welfare bums out of the province. The rest were very wishy washy, sort of "...well, we think there should be more social programs, if that's okay with you..." They would not commit about anything until they were sure you would agree with them on it.

Yet the conservatives won the election. Why? Well here is a clue; I also noticed the lefties were reluctant to work for the NDP or even vote for them. I learned that most had tried to at one point in their lives and felt they were treated with disrespect.

Soon after that I stopped dialing for dollars for the NDP because I was also tired of the manifest attitude of the deeper operators that I am somehow obligated to them; like they owned that end of the political spectrum.

The point of this is that for people to be left and progressive does not mean they must support a particular political party. If there was more choice on the left many more people would vote and the vote would be much more progressive. Which would be helped by having PR.....

tr