

Volume 002
Issue No. 02



CANADA
SHOULD NDP TAKE
POWER



#BLACKLIVESMATTER
RACIAL OPPRESSION
A WORKERS' ISSUE



INTERVIEW
MIMI SOLTYSIK
SOCIALIST FOR PRES.

THE RED VINE



Journal of the Red Party

**Suggested
Donation:
\$2.00 - \$3.00**

New Democrats Closing in on Ottawa

by **Gabriel Pierre**

Next month's federal election in Canada bears notice for working class partisans south of the border, representing something of a break with politics-as-usual. Voters are turning away from the Conservatives, who have been in power for nearly ten years and have overseen austerity, attacks on democratic rights and shameful cooperation with U.S. imperialism's adventures abroad. Rather than this translating into an automatic victory for the Liberals, as is typically the case¹, there is now a distinct possibility that the New Democrats will form the federal government for the first time.

Regression

Despite its name, the New Democratic Party is much more like the British Labour Party than it is the U.S. Democrats - a contradictory formation or "bourgeois workers' party" (to borrow Lenin's phrase) rather than an out-and-out capitalist party. Its origins lie in Cooperative Commonwealth Federation (CCF), an umbrella of left-agrarian and cooperative organizations and relatively small socialist and labor parties. Its existence and formal commitment to socialism was a real asset for the Canadian

proletariat, despite its limited national horizons and the absence of a commitment to extreme democracy as the form of working class rule. While the party did fight for reforms, it also declared in its 1933 Regina Manifesto² that such reforms "are of only temporary value" because the "mortal sickness of the whole capitalist system... cannot be cured by the application of salves." The CCF was committed to "eradicating capitalism" and implementing a "full programme of socialized planning." It was that kind of party that won the first single-payer health care system in Saskatchewan under a CCF government, which quickly spread to the rest of Canada.

In 1961 the CCF merged with the Canadian Labour Congress, equivalent to the AFL-CIO in the United States, to constitute the New Democratic Party. By this point the CCF had already regressed, under the pressure of Cold War anti-communism, into replacing the radical Regina Manifesto with a more moderate commitment to a mixed capitalist economy. The NDP at this point became a standard social democratic party like its sisters in Europe, undergoing the same rightward drift post-1991. And it's been quite a drift. New Democratic

Table of Contents:

General Content

- ▶ **New Democrats Closing in on Ottawa**
Pg. 02
- ▶ **Clara's Corner: A System of Violence**
Pg. 07
- ▶ **Mimi Soltysik: "Kick Capitalism's Ass"**
Pg. 08
- ▶ **Party Update**
Pg. 10
- ▶ **#BlackLivesMatter and the Working Class**
Pg. 11

Editorial

- ▶ **A Tale of Two Lefts**
Pg. 05

The Red Vine is the official organ of the RP. Signed articles do not necessarily reflect the views of the RP; editorials reflect the views of the RP Central Committee. We encourage readers to contribute letters and articles to the paper.

Submissions and Contact:
party@red-party.com

provincial governments have defenestrated their own programs when faced with Big Business opposition to their mild reform policies. In the current election campaign its platform is hard to distinguish from the Liberal Party's, with both accepting austerity measures and waffling on opposition to the grossly undemocratic C-51 spying bill, among other things. This transformation is natural - in fact *unavoidable* - for any workers' party prepared to manage capitalism and loyal to the existing bourgeois constitutional order.

The NDP's successes in recent years - from the 2011 "Orange Surge" that saw it soar from 18% to 30% in the federal government and its position within striking distance of federal office — are attributable to its status as a workers party and a fresh face as far as national government goes. And make no mistake: it *is* still a form of working class political representation, albeit in a highly attenuated way. When the New Democrats won the provincial elections in traditionally-conservative Alberta earlier this year, breaking a 44-year long chain of rightwing governments, it did so with a program of pro-worker reforms.³ The party still has an organic link with the labor movement, with affiliated trade unions and a proportional vote at conference. Of course there has been a lot of bureaucratic pressures on party democracy: a



steady purge of anti-Zionist candidates and officials⁴, the removal of references to "democratic socialism" from the party constitution, clamping down on debate and policy decisions at conference in favor of turning power over to the parliamentary wing and the party leader, *et cetera*. But as a theoretically democratic membership organization, the NDP remains as an arena of struggle for revolutionary socialists and communists.

Bury or Ignore

The Canadian left is in as much of a divided and weak condition as its counterparts in the United States. There are some Trotskyist groups

practicing entryism inside the NDP, namely Fightback (Canadian section of the International Marxist Tendency) and the NDP Socialist Caucus, made up of the Mandeliste Socialist Action / Ligue pour l'Action Socialiste and its sympathizers. These are small sects whose horizons are narrowly limited to the NDP, not as a site of struggle but as the be-all and end-all of revolutionary work. Aside from an economistic outlook and the absurdity of two entryist groups with near-identical aims failing to unite their efforts, both maintain illusions in the idea of "reclaiming" the New Democrats - a false notion because, while at its best the party and its

predecessors were viable left-reformist parties, they were *never* revolutionary parties that broke with the international capitalist state system.

Probably the most politically healthy far-left organization *outside* the NDP in Anglophone Canada is the “official” Communist Party, which still runs its own candidates. Then there is Québec Solidaire, a “broad left” alliance that, despite some limitations of its own⁵, is at least able to offer a parliamentary and extra-parliamentary political center for the left at the provincial level. (And unlike many American socialists, Québec Solidaire is lucid enough to run its own candidates *against* the Greens rather than folding into them.) QS and the smattering of small organizations in Anglophone Canada are potentially rich raw material from which a more viable socialist movement in the country can be built.

The NDP shouldn’t be ignored by working-class partisans, but neither should it be treated as a shibboleth. Under no circumstances should the left build illusions in a New Democratic government that comes to power to manage capitalism, even if - as Party leader Thomas Mulcair put it - they would implement cuts with a scalpel instead of a sledgehammer. Any reform program they are elected on, whether the current provincial

government in Alberta or a hypothetical national government, will buckle under pressure from the capitalist class (except in areas where it’s perfectly compatible with capitalism’s short-term interests, like the New Democratic policy of rebranding Canadian imperialism in more humanitarian, U.N.-friendly terms.)

As an aside, the New Democratic Party’s record shows the fallacy of the “Labor Party strategy” here in the United States. The creation of a mass trade-union based party will *not* automatically transcend the sectarian and weak condition of the revolutionary left, nor will it allow the right sect in the right place with the right program at the right time to grow into a powerful force of its own within that party. While it would be correct to join a movement toward creating a labor party and while its use as a tactic is not invalid, it can’t be divorced from the struggle to build a real Communist Party, which incidentally is the only kind of organized political vehicle that could fruitfully conduct revolutionary work among a movement for a reformist party.

Class tensions are heightening in Canada and this will continue regardless of who wins the election on October 19th. Canadian communists can give critical support to NDP candidates as a class vote against

the bourgeois parties, while arguing for the New Democrats to remain an opposition party - and in fact, transcend the status of “Her Majesty’s Most Loyal Opposition”⁶ to one of radical-democratic opposition to the capitalist class and its state. A project like this requires going beyond both burying inside the NDP and pretending it’s no different from the Liberals or Conservatives.

Notes:

- i. Canada uses the same winner-takes-all / “first past the post” electoral methods as the United States, but does have more minor parties represented in provincial and federal parliaments.
- ii. <http://www.socialisthistory.ca/Docs/CCF/ReginaManifesto.htm>
- iii. Namely raising the provincial minimum wage to \$15 an hour, repealing public service cuts and modest corporate tax increases.
- iv. Not only anti-Zionist figures but indeed any criticism of Israeli conduct: http://www.vice.com/en_ca/read/thomas-mulcair-is-cracking-down-on-pro-palestinian-sentiment-in-the-ndp
- v. Such as an interpretation of the democratic right of nations to self-determination as Québécois nationalism.
- vi. Incredibly, this is the *official* title given to the biggest non-governing party in parliament.

A Tale of Two Lefts

Editorial by the Red Party Central Committee



The United States isn't the only country to have someone considered a "socialist outsider" challenging the establishment of its primary center-left party; in Great Britain, long-time Member of Parliament Jeremy Corbyn mounted a campaign to become leader of the Labour Party after a leadership election was triggered following former leader Ed Miliband's resignation over the party's supposedly poor performance in May's general election. While Corbyn barely squeaked by the first hurdle to get into the leadership race by securing the nomination of only one more Labour MP than the needed minimum to qualify for the election ballot, and was initially expected by many in Labour's leadership to be little more than means to give the Labour left the ability to speak in the race without meaningfully affecting the outcome, Corbyn's presence in the race managed to attract tens of thousands of supporters in and around the Labour Party.

The Corbyn campaign exploded in popularity, coming to overshadow his opponents (of whom the

most "left-wing", Andrew Burnham, was noticeably to the right of Ed Miliband) until his landslide victory was announced on September 12th, winning in the first round with 60% of the vote. Naturally, the Corbyn campaign is being considered as an opportunity by socialists and communists in the UK to directly intervene in a mass movement that's already sympathetic, at least in part, to their politics. And given the apparent similarities of Jeremy Corbyn and Bernie Sanders as left-wing challengers to their respective parties' establishments, it is rather understandable that political commentators in both countries have compared the two rather favorably, with a possible conclusion that similar things can be gained by supporting each candidate in their own country.

The Red Party disagrees. We have taken up Bernie Sanders' campaign in previous articles, noting that while there may be some opportunities for communists to engage with Sanders supporters and hopefully win them over to the long-term

campaign for socialist politics, the Sanders campaign itself is severely limited in this regard, both in terms of its strategy and in terms of its broader social vision. On the other hand, while Corbyn's own politics are also somewhat insufficient from a communist perspective, the specifics of the two campaigns, the comparative structure and political history of the Labour Party versus the Democratic Party, and what is likely to come after each candidate's respective races are over, suggest that Corbyn provides a much greater chance for the advancement of the left than Sanders ever will.

The first points are primarily noting the political and organizational differences between the Labour Party and the Democratic Party. On the one hand, it could be enough for some to simply note that, for all of its flaws, (generally) right-wing leadership, and capitulations to the “practicalities” of bourgeois politics, the Labour Party self-describes as a “democratic socialist” party, whereas the Democratic Party does no such thing. Even though it should be clear by the history of the Labour Party that much of its “socialism” is, at best, a bureaucratic welfare system built for managing workers' lives within capitalism rather than a concrete step towards human liberation - and therefore Labour's self-description as a democratic socialist party should not be taken as good coin - this self-description does speak to Labour's history as a party built by and of the working class and working class organizations, from trade unions to cooperatives, workers' mutual aid societies and even socialist parties. And due to the affiliate-based structure of the Labour Party, these organizations are able to exert influence over party policy in certain quarters. While this influence has always been tempered by the oversight of the party bureaucracy, and since the onset of the New Labour project in the '90s there has been a concerted effort to reduce this organized influence further in favor of having elected officials and the party bureaucracy supported by big donors and an atomized mass of individual members (like the Democratic Party), this project has not yet succeeded, and mechanisms still exist for

members of the Labour Party to positively influence the politics of their party.

This contrasts favorably with the Democratic Party, whose lack of a formalized membership structure reduces supporters largely to voting and fund-raising fodder; even if a rush of left-wing supporters to the Democratic Party did happen, there are little to no ways to actually turn that influx of people into organized political power. This structure makes sense given the Democratic Party's position as an institutional party of the capitalist state, representing disparate social groups of which the (arguably declining) organized workers movement is simply one among many. But it means that even a left challenge in the Democratic Party immediately poses the question of organizing outside of it in order to translate left-wing supporters into an actual political current. Bernie Sanders, for all his rhetoric of people power and “political revolution,” does not make this case, and ultimately points back to the Democratic Party mainstream as the logical conclusion of his campaign.

But what of Jeremy Corbyn? Ironically, an effort to “Americanize” the Labour Party by introducing One Member, One Vote style primary campaign for the leadership actually seems to have backfired, at least initially. Hundreds of thousands of people have joined the Labour Party, most of which ostensibly to vote for Corbyn, and have provided Labour with a potentially large pool of supporters to draw into party activity. While this was not the intention of the previous leadership who introduced the “registered supporters” category, it nevertheless provides an opportunity for the new Labour Party members to connect with the already-existing organizations promoting socialism and democracy within Labour and organize towards those ends, and the Corbyn campaign should be recognized as being largely responsible for this membership influx. Furthermore, as a primarily internal election, Corbyn's campaign represents an opening salvo in a fight to potentially change the politics and structure of the Labour Party, whereas the Sanders campaign represents a bid to take the

reins of the American state to attempt to turn it in a progressive direction.

Despite a supposed attempt to do politics differently, Sanders still falls within the range of acceptability of capitalist politics; any attempt to build a meaningful alternative in a way that Sanders suggests will necessarily mean opposing the Democratic Party in general, even the Sanders campaign, from near the outset. Corbyn, on the other hand, represents at least the opportunity for a challenge - not to "take back" the Labour Party, but

to potentially transform it into a true party of the working class movement, where all of its organizations and political tendencies can debate and fight it out publicly. Corbyn's own politics will likely run up against its left-social democratic limits over the course of this fight, but it unlikely that this would even be possible without the Corbyn leadership campaign, and a Corbyn-led Labour Party will find itself better-poised to undertake this struggle.

Clara's Corner: A System of Violence

by Cassidy Good

Charnesia Corley. 21 year old Texan. One of the lucky few African American women who has been detained by the police in the past year and has lived to tell the tale. Though her story is not widely known, it should be. Like Sandra Bland, Charnesia Corley was driving in Texas and performed what would likely be a slap on the wrist for a white man. Sandra Bland did not put out her cigarette while Corley ran a stop sign!

Charnesia Corley was pulled over, cuffed and raped in what was called a "search for marijuana." Though perhaps we should make it clear the definition of rape for those of us who may not know: as defined by Webster, "unlawful sexual intercourse or any other sexual penetration of the vagina, anus,

or mouth of another person, with or without force, by a sex organ, other body part, or foreign object, without the consent of the victim." She was given a body cavity search with her legs held open on the side of the road. Later police claimed she was resisting arrest by trying to stop an illegal cavity search. She was arrested for resisting arrest. As a would-be party-movement, what can we do for women like Charnesia Corley? And how did we end up in a world where women like Charnesia are the lucky ones?

Police brutality and sexual violence is one part of the general oppression of women. What can we do for women altogether? We live in a society where the average African-American woman earns sixty four percent of a white male's pay. The average Hispanic woman gets paid only fifty four

percent of what a white man gets paid. Much less widely known is that the pay gap widens more for women over 30. Not only do we pay women less but we also have the "pink tax" - an extra cost heaped on products marketed toward women.

Next time you are at the store, compare the price between products that both men and women use every day: shampoo, conditioner, shaving cream and so much more. So we pay women less and charge them more? Smooth move, America. 96+ years ago when Clara Zetkin began International Women's Day, is this what she wanted? Is this how she saw the working woman - paid less and charged more? Raped on the side of the road by the white man sworn to protect and serve? How can we expect anything to change while 52 percent of it lives in constant fear?

Mimi Soltysik: “Kick Capitalism’s Ass”

by Mari Pierre-Antoine

Last year, this paper carried an interview with Emidio “Mimi” Soltysik, a Socialist Party USA candidate for the California State Assembly. Now he’s seeking the SPUSA nomination for its presidential campaign. I spoke with him on behalf of *The Red Vine*:

What is your message to supporters of Bernie Sanders, or even the Green Party’s Jill Stein, who see those campaigns as a more realistic avenue to build some kind of anti-corporate politics?

They are of course free to lend their efforts to whichever direction or whichever candidate they feel worthwhile. I have an opinion, of course, about the value of working to overthrow capitalism by focusing on D.C. The overthrow of capitalism will not be determined by who gets your presidential vote. It can and will happen as we strengthen our local focus. I don't mean to imply that the candidates you mention are, however, focused on destroying capitalism. When supporters of any candidate are willing to have a discussion about socialist revolution, I'll be there with a friendly smile, prepared to talk strategy and tactics. So many are doing

fantastic work in spreading the revolutionary message, and they are finding better ways to deliver that message, better strategies for engaging in a healthy and productive dialogue with the people. I might sound optimistic when I say that many elements of the U.S. Left are headed in the right direction, but I truly believe that.

Your campaign's purpose is convey a “radical message,” what are some of the key demands or policy points that you think socialists should be fighting for right now?

I think that, by working together, we can identify strategic pressure points in the capitalist system, and focus our energies on organizing around those points. This might require a great deal of cooperation, enhanced communication, and the development of working relationships across organizations and with those who are unaffiliated. I think that developing those relationships, having those strategic discussions, and finding ways to work together despite political sticking points is so important. The Socialist Party's Los Angeles Local puts a lot of effort into developing relationships with folks who are both in other organizations and who are

The Red Vine!



Get your free digital copy and view past issues by scanning the QR code above!

Listen to Anti-Capitalist Radio for weekly news and analysis!



[WWW.RED-PARTY.COM/
CATEGORY/ANTI-
CAPITALIST-RADIO](http://WWW.RED-PARTY.COM/CATEGORY/ANTI-CAPITALIST-RADIO)



How do you see your campaign intersecting with social movements such as Black Lives Matter and the Fight for \$15?

Regarding the Black Lives Matter movement, the campaign will listen and will stand in solidarity, offering support whenever and however possible. I think, regarding the Fight for \$15 movement, it's important to look at what \$15 an hour means. Does it go far enough? The living wage for one adult with one child in Los Angeles is \$25.72. Is \$15 an hour putting food on the table for that adult? I don't say this to disparage the Fight for \$15 movement. In the context of the data I just provided, I think the fact that we are fighting for \$15 an hour shows us how incredibly ruthless capitalism is. There is a line from a piece Greg Pason had written that I think offers critical insight on how we might approach the fight for higher wages: "The focus is not just to get a higher wage but also to challenge an economic model (i.e., capitalism) that takes power from the workers who provide the labor power and the communities affected by the decisions of business." <http://www.thesocialist.us/socialists-and-the-living-wage-issue/>

unaffiliated. We hold strategic planning sessions, asking ourselves how we can better develop these relationships. One approach we've taken is to host what are essentially parties, (we call these events the "Radical Ruckus"), and invite folks from as many different organizations as possible, as well as inviting as many unaffiliated folks as we can. So far, it seems to be a really good approach. We make

new friends and allies, and I think the relationships we're building will help us kick capitalism's ass. Approaching critical issues like climate change, police violence, imperialism, etc., with an eye toward revolutionary change becomes less daunting when your list of allies is continually expanding.

Your campaign wants to support local socialist candidacies. Would you support a formal socialist electoral alliance, with its

points of unity being independence from the Democratic Party, internationalism and extreme democracy?

I endorsed the "Future of Left/Independent Politics" held in Chicago this year because I do see value in organizations who pledge independence from the Democratic Party working together. I look forward to seeing this dialogue develop. Again, I'm optimistic about what might be possible.

Your campaign aims to “smash sectarian walls” on the socialist left. What does “sectarian” mean to you? What is and is not negotiable in the quest for socialist unity?

When I hear "sectarian", I envision an individual or organization unwilling to work, or in some cases even have a dialogue, with those in other organizations because of differences in political tendency. It's depressing as hell, in my opinion. I have many great

friends who are anarchists, Leninists, Trotskyists, etc. What a disservice I do to myself if I refuse to hear what they have to say because I might not personally subscribe to their particular orientation. Conversely, there is so much I can learn by allowing myself to keep an open ear and an open mind to different voices and perspectives, you know? If I can't sit down and enjoy the company of someone in the Red Party, hopefully finding ways that I can work with that person in the future, because I'm in the Socialist Party USA, I wouldn't see myself as being righteous. I'd see myself as being an asshole. I most certainly have principles that I feel strongly about, but if socialists are willing to make a break from the Democratic Party, I'm down to listen. Maybe I'm not going to agree with everything folks say, but I'm ready to listen and I'm ready to work.

Given the SPUSA's history of expelling or proscribing self-described

Leninist currents despite being a “multi-tendency” organization, what do you see the Party's role as being in the future of the socialist movement?

I can't offer a response with "given the SPUSA's history of expelling self-described Leninist currents despite being a “multi-tendency” organization" because it hasn't been part of my experience; I have yet to witness the expulsion of a Socialist Party USA member because they were Leninist. I joined the organization five years ago. What role do I see the organization playing in the future of the socialist movement? If we aren't making a contribution to the socialist movement in the U.S. as a multi-tendency, democratic socialist organization, I think it's time to close shop. I think we are making a contribution, however. So much that's happened within the organization over the past few years has me incredibly excited for the organization's future.

Party Update

by Mari Pierre-Antoine

Readership held steady last issue at 289, not including individual articles read on the Red Party website; things may be different for the next issue as we work on a way to tally those numbers in a way

that doesn't over- or under-count our actual number of readers. Nevertheless, we'd like to see those figures climb! Share this paper with friends or comrades, consider taking out a subscription, and remember that the pages of this paper are open to contributions (critical letters, notable news or events you've been to...) from readers.

#BlackLivesMatter and the Working Class

by Gabriel Pierre

(The following is the text of a lead-off presentation, edited for clarity, from a Cedar Rapids, Iowa public forum in solidarity with the #BlackOutAmerica National Day of Action on August 15th.)

The movement that began last August in Ferguson after Mike Brown's death at the hands of Officer Darren Wilson is a reminder of the power that's possible in collective, social struggle. What can any of us do as isolated individuals? Not much. But as a collective, the Black Lives Matter movement so far has trained thousands of new activists in the methods of organizing, launched the problems of police violence, mass incarceration and poverty into public consciousness and has made sure that we will never forget the names of Mike Brown, Eric Garner, Freddie Gray, Rekia Boyd and so many others.

In a country where we already have a bloated prison system, Blacks and Hispanics make up 60% of the prison population despite being a quarter of the population together. We are ten times as likely to serve prison time for drug offenses as the white population despite similar use rates. The Black unemployment

rate is twice that of whites. Inferior access to health care means that, on average, our life expectancy is four and a half years less than a white person's. All this reminds us why we've had to declare so loudly that "Black Lives Matter" – because the system we live under says they don't. But like any emerging social movement, Black Lives Matter has reached a point where forks are appearing in the road. In different sections of the movement there are different class influences trying to assert themselves.

On the one hand there is a wing, expressing the interests of the Black middle class, aspiring bourgeois types and other sycophants, that Black Lives Matter should be a pressure group on the Democratic Party. This trend manifests in softer forms – think Al Sharpton and other "official" Civil Rights leaders, though their identification with the movement is questionable anyway – as well as in 'harder' forms. With this trend you'll hear calls to vote for liberal (and not-so-liberal) Black candidates, pressuring national Democratic politicians to adopt some kind of racial justice policies. Usually these policies are pretty feeble to begin with – like federal funding for police body cameras. Whenever I hear about body cameras it reminds

me of the old saying about putting a band-aid on a gunshot wound. Remember Eric Garner – even Bill O'Reilly, that great friend of Black people, equivocated on the non-indictment in his case, where we had video. But this watering down and dismissal of demands and aspirations that come from the movement's ranks is needed. You have to do this when your strategic horizon is tied to the Democratic Party – itself a party of racism and war, a party based on the needs of big business (in Marxist terms, the capitalist class.)

Imagine if the protesters in the Baltimore uprising earlier this year had relied on "black faces in high places" to see things through, instead of turning out for mass street protests despite provocation and repression ordered by the (Black) Mayor and police chief. The problem is that not all people of color have the same interests – I have much more in common with a white worker than with a Black CEO. The "1%", the capitalist class, and their hangers-on, will not break with their own system and champion the needs of the masses, whatever their race may be. But there is another wing, made up mostly of working class and poor elements. This element is where the tireless and energetic

organizing around the country comes from. It's taken up the solidarity principle – the idea that an injury to one is an injury to all. We've seen mutual support with pro-Palestinian activists and with Native American communities enduring high levels of police violence. Steps in the right direction.

The intersections between the Black freedom movement and the fight for \$15 are especially important here. As we know, women and people of color make up a disproportionate number of all low wage workers – poverty is highly feminized and racialized. Over the past few years the movement of poverty-wage workers has made partial but real gains, mobilizing thousands of low-wage workers, trade-unionists and their allies in the community around the need for \$15 and the right to form a union. The links and integration that has taken place so far with Black Lives Matter have been key to this. For the ruling class, the idea that the white working class has a common interest with people of color is a dangerous idea – racism being one of the main tools used to keep us divided against each other, to redirect anger toward a racialized image of a “welfare queen” (to borrow Ronald Reagan's phrase) or an immigrant rather than turning that anger toward the millionaires and billionaires at the top.

There is a lot of money to be made in Black oppression. The bosses can keep a “reserve army of labor” – a pool of unemployed and underemployed whose presence is used as a downward pressure on the wages and conditions of employed workers. Look at the payday loan, the ghetto bodega, the for-profit prison and the police department running off of fines and levies drawn from the Black community. The state's repressive machine serves a dual purpose, too. The same cops who terrorize the Black community today are breaking up strikes and demonstrations tomorrow.

So what is the way forward? The existing links between the labor movement and Black Lives Matter must be deepened, the movement's identification with working class politics needs to be solidified and expanded. We've seen some of this already, particularly in the way local trade unionists rallied for the cause in Ferguson and Baltimore – we're also seeing it now in Missouri's fight for \$15 affiliate and in Wisconsin. Historically, the way our movement has cut across racism within the working class – within the majority of the population, that is – is through mass agitation, mass education and, yes, mass struggle. Recall that Dr. King's March on Washington in 1963 was a “March for Jobs and Freedom”, not for “pure” civil rights only. Democratic rights and economic rights are

interwoven. Doctor King knew this with his focus on economic justice and his support for the Vietnam anti-war movement.

And the labor movement used to know this, too. It's no coincidence that the massive strike waves of the 1930s that lifted up hundreds of thousands of workers happened while the labor movement was challenging the white supremacy within its own ranks. A representative example is the 1934 West Coast Longshoreman's Strike that united Black and white workers and denied employers the traditional tactic of using the unorganized African-American poor as scab labor; they managed to win a union-controlled hiring hall to put an end to discriminatory hiring. The most dedicated and consistently anti-racist organization of this time was the Communist Party; for them, bringing Black workers into the existing unions and forming new ones where none existed went hand in hand with fighting Jim Crow on the political terrain. Anti-imperialism has also been a historic component of radical Black struggle here at home, going back to the successful 1934 anti-U.S. occupation movement in Haiti and onward throughout Africa's national liberation movements in the '60s and '70s. In one era the Communist Party, in another the Black Panthers; the underlying rationale was the same – solidarity to the peoples of the

colonial (or today neocolonial) world because we have the same interests and a common enemy. A nation cannot be free if it oppresses other nations.

We can rediscover these traditions today on an even higher level. Now, I agree with Malcolm X when he said that “you can’t have capitalism without racism.” But we can begin building the foundations of a powerful liberation movement that points the way toward a different kind of society. Living wage jobs for all, the right to affordable housing, universal health care and education, an end to the so-called War on Drugs & the release of nonviolent offenders from prison and the radical democratization of the entire justice system; that includes the police, whose power must be vested in the communities themselves instead of wielded from above. You have to have a democratic movement - not just spontaneous protests and affinity groups but mass, permanent organizations, including a party - standing for its own class interests to achieve that kind of vision. It sure as hell won’t come from above.

WHAT WE STAND FOR

The Red Party is a U.S. political organization that fights for working class unity in a single socialist party-movement. A united organization, based on a Marxist program, would turn politics as we know it upside down, injecting the labor and social movements with a renewed sense of confidence and strength.

- * A united workers' party-movement would combine political action with economic and social action, including running socialist candidates for office, protests, strikes, co-operatives and mutual aid societies.
- * Our organization has the word party in its name, but we recognize that in the world-historic sense there is no revolutionary party in the U.S. today. Instead we have a fractured array of competing sects organized on a bureaucratic basis. Their work is hampered by hyper-activism with little to no long-term strategy, lack of internal democracy and lack of deep roots in the working class. The Red Party organizes day-to-day resistance against injustices spawned by capitalism within the context of strengthening working class organization and building support for socialism.
- * Marxists operate through democratic centralism. Through ongoing debate we

seek to achieve unity in action and a common world outlook. As long as they support agreed actions, members have the right to speak openly and form factions to advance their views.

- * Marxists oppose all imperialist wars and interventions, from Iraq to Syria, but recognize that ending war permanently means ending capitalism.
- * Marxists are internationalists. We strive for the closest unity of the working class and oppressed peoples everywhere. We oppose nationalism in all its forms. We advocate a new revolutionary workers' International. Without an International (a world party), the struggle against Capital is weakened. Capital organizes across borders; so too must we.
- * Marxists support industrial unions (organizing workers by industry) rather than the more narrow trade union structure. We support the highest possible level of pan-American union coordination for workers' rights. Bureaucratic leadership and class collaboration, particularly support for the Democratic Party, in the unions must be replaced with democratic revitalization and class independence.
- * Marxists are champions of the oppressed. Women's oppression, racism, national oppression and LGBT/QI

oppression are just as much working class questions as are higher pay, union rights and struggles for quality health, housing and education. Marxists demand self-determination for American Indian nations, Hawaii, Puerto Rico and all other territories.

- * World capitalism, based on exploitation and a reckless quest for profit, is increasingly putting the future of humanity at risk through war and climate change. World capitalism must give way to world socialism - a society based on freedom, solidarity and a radical extension of democracy.
- * Marxists oppose Stalinism, a system of bureaucratic dictatorship that rules in the name of socialism the same way the capitalist class claims to rule in the name of liberty.
- * Socialism itself is the first stage of the global transition to communism - a society where war, exploitation, money, classes and states exist only as museum pieces. Communism is the negation of class society and provides the maximum individual and collective freedom.

If you agree with these principles, join the Red Party!

red-party.com | (319) 654-4621
party@red-party.com
facebook.com/redpartyusa