

Volume 002
Issue No. 03



EDUCATION
COPS CRIMINALIZING
YOUTH



VETERANS
REMEMBERING THE
BONUS ARMY



THEORY
STRATEGY OF
PATIENCE

THE RED VINE



Journal of the Red Party

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

Blackboards and Badges

by Gabriel Pierre

By now most readers will have already seen the cell phone video¹ that caught national attention showing “Officer Slam” - a.k.a Senior Deputy Ben Fields - flipping, body-slammng and arresting an unnamed student at Spring Valley High in Columbia, South Carolina. Numerous #BlackLivesMatter activists have picked up on this issue as yet another example of police brutality, which it undoubtedly is. While this paper has carried a number of articles² on the Black Lives Matter movement, usually pertaining to its strategic and long-term perspectives, the questions raised at Spring Valley High force us to ask a deeper question than Fields’ misconduct: why was he there to begin with?

Placing dedicated police officers (called School Resource Officers or SROs) is a recent phenomenon, with only a few K-12 schools experimenting with the idea in the mid-20th century. The trend soared after the Columbine massacre, with parents and school officials groping for any measure they could to make schools safer - irrespective of whether it actually accomplished that goal or even necessarily made sense. Hence metal detectors, drug-sniffing dogs and cops. While violent crime rates in the U.S.

have steadily fallen for decades and schools are statistically the safest place for children³, public perception - shaped by a fear-mongering bourgeois media - is the opposite. This provides a favorable climate for ‘law-and-order’ forces to press a reactionary agenda.

The formal justification here is that SROs are a preventative measure - in fact FBI Director James Comey complained at a recent police chief convention in Chicago that the proliferation of videos like the one mentioned above and the social movement associated with them are making cops hesitant to get out there and “do the work that prevents violent crime”.⁴ But crime prevention as such is not the main role of police. In any class society there must be an armed wing of the state using force to uphold its property relations. Under feudalism the knight and the reeve guarded the landed fief against bandits while making sure the peasantry remembered its place in the system; under capitalism the police defend capitalist private ownership of the means of production. Suppression of crime is their secondary role, but even then, suppression is not the same as prevention. One involves prosecution after the fact while the other can’t be accomplished without changing the material conditions that generate most

Table of Contents:

General Content

- ▶ **Blackboards and Badges**
Pg. 02
- ▶ **Bullets & Gas for the Vets!**
Pg. 07
- ▶ **A Brief Introduction to Revolutionary Centrism**
Pg. 09
- ▶ **Party Update**
Pg. 10

Editorial

- ▶ **Trans-Pacific Partnership & National Illusions**
Pg. 04

Letters

- ▶ **The NDP is What?!**
Pg. 10
- ▶ **In Defense of Campaign Finance Reform**
Pg. 11

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

criminal acts.

Admittedly SROs do suppress a lot of crime in schools... by criminalizing youth. In Delaware for example, a whopping 90 percent of school arrests are for misdemeanors⁵ like disorderly conduct (talking back to a teacher), swearing or having a “disruptive appearance.” Similar figures can be found elsewhere. The authoritarian approach to misbehavior leads teachers and administrators to solve conflicts using police force rather than in the classroom. The reliance on SROs, metal detectors, drug-sniffing dogs, surveillance cameras and “zero tolerance” policies damages effective education - school as a holding pen, an alienated and alienating place, not an institution of growth belonging to students and school staff. A disproportionate

number of schools using SROs have a non-white majority student body and a large number of students from low income households.

The school-to-prison pipeline can't be dismantled without consistent campaigning to end school resource officer programs, diverting the resources used for them toward a full complement of teachers, counselors and school psychologists, and positive behavior intervention techniques like restorative justice.⁶ Education workers should be at the forefront here, campaigning to bring their unions on board - which too often dodge the question of SROs even where they otherwise do admirable social justice work in the schools.⁷

Notes

1. <https://youtu.be/qBSrcdaqXo>

2. For examples, see the editorial statement “After Baltimore, What?” (<http://red-party.com/after-baltimore-what/>) or my article “#BlackLivesMatter and the Working Class” (<http://red-party.com/blacklivesmatter-and-the-working-class/>)
3. <http://www.npr.org/2012/03/16/148758783/violence-in-schools-how-big-a-problem-is-it>
4. http://www.huffingtonpost.com/entry/james-comey-black-lives-matter_562e4745e4b0443bb5648e44
5. http://b3cdn.net/advancement/abcfda6ba6b8d3239_dbm6b501j.pdf
6. <http://www.otlcampaign.org/sites/default/files/restorative-practices-guide.pdf>
7. See agitation from the National Education Association, which organizes 3 million education workers (<http://neatoday.org/2015/01/05/school-prison-pipeline-time-shut/>) or the Chicago Teachers Union's pledge to fight for restrictions on SROs in its contract negotiations with Chicago Public Schools.



Trans-Pacific Partnership & National Illusions

Editorial by the Red Party Central Committee

The Trans-Pacific Partnership, a twelve nation transnational treaty - but one encompassing much more than tariffs - is now entering the public dialogue in a substantial way for the first time in the eight years since negotiations began. Previously talk of the TPP had been mostly limited to the odd pronouncement from the labor movement, online activists and left-liberal sources like Democracy Now, with the main bourgeois media outlets only turning their attention to it during the controversy over fast-track authorization this summer¹. Now that the 12 nations' trade representatives (the U.S., Mexico, Canada, Australia, Brunei, Chile, Japan, Malaysia, New Zealand, Peru, Singapore and Vietnam) have announced readiness to drive forward with approval, it's likely - but not guaranteed - that the TPP will be enacted before President Obama leaves office. Trade unionists and working class partisans in general will come under tremendous pressure to either begrudgingly accept the Trans-Pacific Partnership (i.e. to take Obama's word for it) or to oppose it on a "patriotic" and ultimately illusory basis.

Contents Under Pressure

As the TPP is only now reaching a broader audience beyond activist "usual suspects" on the one hand and capitalists privy to negotiations on the other, it's worth examining what the deal would actually entail should it pass - although any such attempts at examination will be by definition incomplete, as the negotiations have been held behind closed doors and with precious little in the way of public access. While much quieter than machinations in the Middle East since 2008, the Trans-Pacific Partnership arguably represents the legacy of the Obama Administration's foreign policy, with the President having been the main mover of the treaty over the past seven years.

Now that the full text has finally been released to the public after years of secrecy, we can see it certainly lives up to the "NAFTA on steroids" pejorative given to it by the labor movement. By including countries like Brunei, Vietnam and Mexico in the bloc it will put a downward pressure on wages and conditions in the advanced capitalist countries while adding to the super-exploitation of the workforce in the neocolonial countries. Since it would be easier than ever for large corporations to move their capital abroad in search of cheaper labor, the race to the bottom logic of nation-states' attacks on labor rights would intensify. The treaty would also significantly loosen regulations on finance capital - Wall Street and its cousins abroad - by locking down standards at a low common level, prohibiting even mild reformist measures like a "Robin Hood Tax" (a levy on financial transactions over a certain amount) or a reintroduction of the Glass-Steagall Act that separated commercial banking from investment banking.²

Indeed, freeing the capitalists' hands to press downward on popular rights and standards (or, as the Office of the U.S. Trade Representative euphemistically puts it, "open markets [and] high-standard trade rules")³ is a shared theme throughout. The treaty weakens environmental regulations and food safety standards, strengthens incentives to privatize public services and state-owned enterprises, extends copyright and patent lengths whether on software or medicine and increases state surveillance online. (Despite the new restrictions of online freedom, the *New York Times* still found a way to claim that the TPP will "open the Internet" in "communist Vietnam."⁴ Who knew?)

But any materialist analysis of the Trans-Pacific Partnership should see the forest for the trees. More significant than any particular counter-reform is the overall project of guaranteeing

unfettered access to new markets or deeper penetration of existing ones. Perhaps the most worrying mechanism for accomplishing this is the Investor-State Dispute Settlement (ISDS.) As this paper wrote last year:

*“The TPP would give private corporations legal parity with national governments through the “investor-state” system, where corporations would be allowed to sue governments to overturn (and get financial compensation at public expense for) any local laws that hinder that corporation’s profits. These cases would be decided not in the public court system of the government in question, but in private tribunals.”*⁵

While similar mechanisms have been enacted in previous free trade deals, the TPP version dramatically expands the definition of an “investment” to include not only measures that actually hinder corporate profitability but any measure that might reduce profits at some point in the future.

Bad for America?

So the Trans-Pacific Partnership is bad - not a particularly controversial statement even on the mainstream of U.S. politics. However, communists differ sharply with bourgeois politicians and commentators on why it’s bad and what can be done about it.

The TPP enjoys bipartisan support in Congress, with the Republican Party bucking its typical knee-jerk opposition to any Obama initiative to do so - a sign in itself of the class interests at stake here. One exception is Hillary Clinton who, tacking slightly to the left under pressure from Democratic primary voters, recently came out against the TPP. In fact the presumptive Presidential nominee claimed that she never supported the deal, despite making dozens of supportive public comments during her time as Secretary of State and

leaked diplomatic cables showing her intimate involvement with the negotiations.⁶

Among liberal Democrats and right-populist Republicans (a la the Tea Party) there is some opposition and hesitancy, but in the absence of a powerful mass movement with a realistic strategy of sinking the treaty President Obama and the new Republican House Speaker Paul Ryan (an enthusiastic champion of the TPP) enough will fall in line for the deal to pass. Naturally, none of these politicians oppose the Trans-Pacific Partnership because they’re principled defenders of the world working class. Every single one of them both liberal and conservative, including Bernie Sanders, is leaning against the TPP on a nationalist basis. We need to defend “our” industrial capitalists against foreign capital and “our” jobs against workers abroad (presumably Mexican or Australian workers can go to hell.) Measures like the investor-state dispute settlement are framed as an issue of foreigners imposing their will on American national sovereignty - neoliberalism as a foreign import. If only we could return to the good old days of protectionism! But even if it was desirable to go back to the post-WWII Keynesian consensus, the material reality of modern capitalism doesn’t allow for it. The state - which can be best understood as a firm in the world market - can’t simply pull out of that market and revert to autarky.

Sadly the labor movement in the U.S. by and large subscribes to this completely hopeless perspective. AFL-CIO President Richard Trumka penned an op-ed⁷ for Time correctly noting that “corporations seem to win at every turn at the expense of working people”... but then placing the blame on foreign imports and currency manipulation, even incredulously claiming that China - a country pointedly locked out of the TPP - will benefit from it. Leo Gerard, President of the United Steelworkers (organizing 800,000 workers) sounded the alarm about “our producers and workers” being “under siege” from “other nations.”⁸

Class-collaborationist nonsense. If it was bad for U.S. workers and capitalists alike, why would Goldman Sachs, Walmart, Haliburton, Pfizer et al. bother writing it and heavily lobbying⁹ for its passage? In reality the Trans-Pacific Partnership is as American as apple pie, both because it expresses the real needs of capital in this period and as a geopolitical tool for U.S. imperialism to block the development of its Chinese rival. (In fact the labor bureaucracy has been unwittingly playing into the hands of pro-TPP forces with its shortsighted China-bashing, as the anti-China goal is a selling point for policymakers.)

No patriotic front between the U.S. labor movement and sections of the ruling class is going to stop the TPP. Slick social media graphics and appeals to “Buy American” aren’t going to cut it, either. Some unions, like the Communication Workers of America, have been involved in on-the-ground organizing around the TPP and at least recognize some kind of international dimension to it. But they too remain hobbled by economic nationalism and a reliance on capitalist politicians to advance their interests.

Vietnamese assembly line workers and Chilean garment weavers are not the problem here; the enemy is at home. Left groups like Socialist Alternative, Socialist Action and the International Socialist Organization are right to call for “mass struggle” and mobilization against the TPP - but street action alone won’t be enough. Of course, communists should join with and build anti-TPP agitational initiatives from organized labor and the broader class, bringing with us our critique of the labor bureaucracy and popular-frontism.

We should also begin to think strategically. There is not much time to build that “mass struggle”; President Obama has signaled his intent to sign, starting a 90-day clock at the end of which Congress must vote on the treaty. In the absence of a real working class political party it’s difficult to

produce a large-scale active opposition - and the only existing mass organizations of our class, the trade unions, don’t have the political will in their leadership to do it. This isn’t to say the TPP is a foregone conclusion, but rather that communist strategy should have a perspective of what should be done whether or not the treaty is enacted. If it is, the need for unity across borders will become even more important.

This can only be done by pushing for the regeneration and construction of class organizations on a militant, democratic and internationalist basis. This means close cooperation among the workers’ movement across the Pacific Rim countries, championing our shared interests - the right to organize, the right to a living wage job, freedom from imperialist meddling in the neocolonial countries et cetera. An international day of action would have a significant rallying effect and lay the foundation for closer ties. Vitaly, we need pan-American unions, organizing workers in the United States, Canada and Mexico. If capitalism has its transnational corporations reaching effortlessly across the boundaries of nation states, the working class deserves a movement capable of fighting to level up its conditions across the board.

Notes

1. Legislation enabling a strict up or down vote, without floor debate or amendment.
2. Enacted in 1933 as part of Roosevelt’s New Deal and repealed in 1999 with the support of the Clinton administration.
3. <https://ustr.gov/tpp/outlines-of-TPP>
4. <http://www.nytimes.com/2015/10/06/business/trans-pacific-partnership-trade-deal-is-reached.html>
5. <http://red-party.com/trans-pacific-partnership-socialist-response-needed/>
6. <http://www.ibtimes.com/cables-show-hillary-clintons-state-department-deeply-involved-trans-pacific-2032948>
7. <http://time.com/4065267/trans-pacific-partnership-american-workers/>
8. <http://www.usw.org/news/media-center/releases/2015/usw-pres-gerard-statement-on-tpp-coming-to-closure>
9. From the pro-treaty TPP Coalition’s website, featuring a who’s who of U.S. capitalism: <http://tppcoalition.org/about/>

Bullets & Gas for the Vets!

Veterans Day is upon us, the annual zenith of the U.S. ruling class promotion of soldier-worship as a state religion. Beneath this ideological cover, which claims to go “beyond politics”, the official veneration of soldiers can disappear when real class interests are on the line. We reprint below an article from the *Militant*, newspaper of the Communist League of America (Opposition), reporting on the suppression of the 1932 Bonus March by President Herbert Hoover.

In the midst of the Great Depression 17,000 World War I veterans and 26,000 supporters and family members had gathered on Washington, D.C. demanding redemption of bonus certificates they were issued as compensation for their services in the Great War. They were swiftly repressed by force of 800 police, six tanks and a thousand infantry and cavalry commanded by General Douglas MacArthur and Major George S. Patton, a stark reminder of how imperialism’s bloody tactics wielded abroad are also wielded against the working class at home.

By order of the arch-reactionary, Hoover, amid clouds of tear gas, “gently prodded by bayonets”, struck by the flats of

sabers, the veterans encamped in Washington have been driven from their billets by infantry, cavalry, tanks and machine gun detachments. Tear gas bombs were hurled into the midst of women and children standing on the sidewalks, booing the misguided soldier’s. It was a mopping-up sortie reminiscent of world war days, say the capitalist reporters.

This incident, foreshadowing what capitalism holds in store for the future revolts of its wage slaves, followed a skirmish earlier in the day in which the enraged veterans drove off the police and Treasury agents who attempted to evict them from their makeshift homes. In this affray a veteran lost his life, a number of others were injured, and several policemen received as well as they gave.

For hundreds of thousands of workers all over the country the true nature of American democracy has been revealed. Before their very eyes the views of the Communists have been proved. Capitalism rules by force. It spares nobody.

The veterans have reaped the only reward their capitalist masters will give them. This is what they get for their defense of “innocent, bleeding Belgium.” This is their reward

for making the “world safe for democracy”. The gas bombs they once hurled at equally misled German workers have now been hurled at them by “their own countrymen”. The bayonets which they once used to rip and slash the bodies of “enemy” soldiers have been applied to their own skins by men wearing the same uniforms they wore in the Argonne and Chateau-Thierry. What a bitter education these workers are getting under the driving force of the class struggle!

The Veterans’ Progress

How far they have come on the road to class consciousness can be seen from the fact that these are the men whom the capitalist class had organized into the American Legion and the Veterans of Foreign Wars as instruments to smash strikes and working class demonstrations. Now, having learned by their own experience what capitalism is, they will no longer allow themselves to be used for this kind of capitalist dirty work.

But they still have a long way to reach the ranks of the class conscious vanguard. They must learn that the fight for the bonus must be made a part of the class fight for relief from the crisis at the expense of the capitalist class and its

government; that their fight must be made a part of a united working class fight embracing with employed and unemployed workers.

It is the task of the Communists to teach them. They must advance the correct slogans, and work in the ranks of the veterans to raise them to class consciousness. The Communists must support the fight for the bonus – as a special measure of relief for a special section of the working class. In this connection it must be noted that the *Daily Worker* [Communist Party USA publication - Ed.] has made a profound mistake in relegating the fight for unemployment insurance and relief to a position second to the bonus fight. If the fight for the bonus is to yield results in relief and class consciousness the correct relation between it and the broader fight for unemployment insurance must be observed.

Communist Opportunities

The Communists now have a splendid opportunity to take over the leadership of the bonus fight. In the crucial moment when the veterans needed leadership and direction their commander, Waters, turned out to be, as the Communists foretold, a coward and faker. The tide of battle swept him aside. The men are now leaderless. The prestige of the Workers' Ex-

Servicemen's League will rise if it steps into the breach and leads. It has in this situation an opportunity to smash through the isolation into which its incorrect tactics led it. It can demonstrate that it is capable under Communist guidance, of leading not only isolated demonstrations of the vanguard, but the masses of the vets.

The Communists must rally the vets, draw for them the lessons of their fight for the bonus and the most recent actions of the Hoover starvation government, and raise the fight for the bonus to the higher' plane of the general class fight for relief. If they will do this they will advance the vets toward class consciousness and raise the prestige of Communism in the eyes of the whole working class.

Credit to the Marxists Internet Archive,
<https://www.marxists.org/history/etol/writers/stamm/1932/07/veterans.htm>

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)

A Brief Introduction to Revolutionary Centrism

by Jessica Marshal

What is centrism? It is the tendency of the patient. It is the tendency of those who can see an opportunity and wait. The centre avoids the pitfalls of opportunism. The centre sees the unity of the proletariat as its goal. It seeks to unite the tendencies within the proletariat, the right and left. The centre understands we need the working class as a united whole. Right, centre, and left. But let us define these terms.

What is the 'right-wing' of the worker's movement? In this sense, they are those who seek reforms under the capitalist nation-state(s). What is the 'left-wing' of the worker's movement? In this sense, they are those who call for strikes and agitate for action among the masses. They are both manifestations of the objective conditions the working class as a whole faces. The working class has to fight for alleviating reforms and it also has moments of – more or less – spontaneous action brought on by the inevitable exploitation all workers face. These tendencies, on their own, are clearly inadequate for global revolution. The right will be absorbed by the nation-state and its apparatuses;

and the left will inevitably dissipate either into, at best, economic sects, or will simply disappear until the next spontaneous movement. What does the centre do?

The centre unites the right and left so they can apply their tactics to the proletariat as a whole. The centre develops a strategy of mass party-building, utilizing the twin tactics of both the left and right. The centre develops itself on the necessity of the highest level of revolutionary proletarian organization: A party. Not of 'genuine Marxist revolutionaries', but of the working class. Such a party would be, in a sense, a Marxist party but it would not be a party of solely Marxists. The working class does not consist solely of Marxists and never will, it contains within it radicals of many stripes. None of this is to downplay the differences within the left – there are clearly many – and most are genuine issues well worth debating and discussing. None of this changes the ultimate point, however. The revolutionary left cannot lead the proletariat if it cannot talk to itself, debate with itself, and work with itself. We need an organization – a party – where



everyone can talk openly, honestly, and seriously about our divisions, why we're incapable of coping with our situation, and why we aren't able to – even in the face of global economic depression – connect with the working class as a whole.

Such a party would need multiple basic things to function as more than an idealistic and well-intentioned sect. A clear revolutionary programme, freedom of factions (permanent or temporary), the freedom for any individual to dissent publicly, free access to the party press and publishing, and the requirement that we all work together on actions collectively agreed upon by the majority in a full and free democratic debate. The centre sees the need for a united, militant, truly democratic, and highly organized international proletariat.

Party Update

by E.I.C.

Our website had over a thousand unique visitors in September, way above our typical count in the low hundreds. The increased traffic came courtesy of the editorial “A Tale of Two Lefts” (Jeremy Corbyn and Bernie Sanders),

showing that the most important thing about Corbyn is *not* the struggle to transform the Labour Party but... sending more people to our website.

Jokes aside, we hope to maintain that readership this time around and deepen the level of engagement. So send in those letters!

Letters

The NDP is *What?!*

Considering the Canadian elections and the tight race it happens to be, I had been anticipating the response from various leftist groups on the New Democratic Party (NDP), and by extension, *what* the NDP was. Unsurprisingly, none of them are of particular worth. We have the views of the entryists in Fightback and the NDP Socialist Caucus, which are decent enough, minus the idiocy of pretending a bourgeois worker’s party can become a serious communist party (or whatever exactly they *think* they’re doing). Then we have the views of other Trotskyist groups like Socialist Alternative who are bumbling all over themselves saying nothing of particular worth,¹ going into detail about how Harper is, believe it or not, bad. Even going as far as to say that strategic voting is a bad idea, and that the NDP is disappointing! Scathing analysis, indeed, comrades. Then we have the lovely Maoists of the Revolutionary Communist Party (no affiliation to Bob Avakian, or so I’m told) who are calling for a boycott of the election² because... Well, why not, I suppose? I can appreciate their dedication to doing nothing, must take a lot of effort.

Given the pathetic state of the left in Canada (and most elsewhere), it wasn’t surprising to me to see the Red Party being the first organization (at least to my knowledge) showing the capacity to make a basic Marxist analysis! Someone

understands that the NDP is a bourgeois worker’s party and that we need a serious communist party! Well done. Of course, it’s quite clear to any good reader of the *Weekly Worker* that it’s a position very much in line with the Communist Party of Great Britain, so I can’t particularly praise them for originality, however I can absolutely praise them for sanity (something very much needed on the left).

So, all in all, good job comrades, always nice (and rare) to see an analysis worth reading. I look forward to reading more of the Red Vine.

Solidarity.

- Liam Fletcher

1. <http://socialistalternative.ca/posts/1449>
2. <http://www.pcr-rcp.ca/en/archives/1690>



In Defense of Campaign Finance Reform

This is in response to Gabriel Pierre's "Beyond Money in Politics" (<http://red-party.com/beyond-money-in-politics/>). First I want you to read this:

"I'm not saying campaign finance or lobbying reform is bad or that it wouldn't help us at all, but the transformative effects touted by organizations like Move to Amend and Represent.Us is totally unfounded. It starts from a false premise – that if we restrict big corporations' ability to buy elections or legally bribe elected officials, we'll open up space for politicians to be more representative to their voters. But the people who would be doing the regulating are the very same people who serve the ruling class of this country – the capitalist class, the 1%. This is why the Federal Elections Commission is such a toothless body. Our national politics were dominated by corporate interests before the 2010 Citizens United ruling. With strict financing and lobbying laws, these interests would turn their attention to court challenges, watering down enforcement or simply flouting the law altogether. Then there are the other, more traditional mechanisms of ruling class control.

They would still have their parties, the Democrats and Republicans. They would still have control over the economy, able to threaten capital flight in the face of any reforms that threaten their interests. Entire countries have been brought to their knees this way.

And of course we would still have a situation where ninety percent of American media is owned by just six companies – GE, Disney, News Corp of Fox News fame, Viacom, Time-Warner (think CNN) and CBS. With or without clean election reform, that's a powerful

arsenal. And then there is the most entrenched obstacle of all: the U.S. Constitution."

In effect what the author is saying here is correct, the power of the media, CEO's and the rest of the powerful bourgeoisie is immense and that getting campaign finance reform won't do a whole lot. Not on its own. The article then launches into a myriad of fixes that would fix this situation or at least do so in part, which is really good and I encourage you to read the rest of the article as it does have some quite good points. However these are all things that today need to pass the political process. One part I want to focus in on is this:

"There is no silver bullet here. Single-issue campaigns aren't fit for purpose. They limit themselves to one core reform in the name of being broad enough to attract as many people as possible in the short term, but this robs them of the perspective needed to actually develop and sustain a mass movement. We need a holistic approach – anything less is lying to ourselves, lying to those we say we want to empower. In the Marxist tradition we call this a democratic-republican program."

But recalling back to the previous quote about the power of the media, we know that the power of the media is strong. It is in fact to the level of brain washing, it can drown out a message to the point that creating that holistic approach is impossible.

But let's assume for a minute that it is not. Let us assume for a minute that roughly half of the largest demographic of americans are socialists (this is actually roughly true) and Americans are ready to accept socialism.... Now what? Well Marxism is an economic system but the people lack the first tool at the negotiation table, capital and money, to buy out their masters. We've long relied on government to regulate business capital but as we've already

established that's near impossible. So what then? I have already spoken on the nature of leverage once before but for those that have not read it I will briefly quote the relevant parts.

“It is easy to understand why the democrats haven been unable to affect change, they are the reserve army of the upper class. What is less easy to understand, however, is the inability of the people and their champions to affect any change. To understand this one must first understand the nature of people and change. To get someone to do something requires leverage. This can be societal pressure, threat of force, money, position, or any number of things. The important part is that the party you wish to persuade either has something to gain by obeying you, or lose in not.

The inability of the people to affect change, stems from the loss of their leverage. They have lost their first form of leverage in the vote, due in part to the wealthy using their monetary leverage to influence the process. The proletariat simply cannot keep up with the bourgeoisie in disposable income per capita and therefore the bourgeoisie win. Now, I know you know this and it's been said a hundred times before. The real question is why do we continue to play these games, to fight on an uneven playing field against a team that uses dirty tricks on their home field? Remember gaining votes with money is the bread and butter of CEO's and board members, it's what they do everyday. We aren't just fighting an opponent that has more resources but more experience using those resources. So why play their game? Why do we submit to playing the game on their terms?”

You see in order to change anything, we are going to need leverage. We don't have money, we have the vote and force. So we start by getting the vote to mean something again. I'm not saying it is the end all be all but that it is the first step and an very high hurdle to clear in a battle that will last a long, long time. It is a crack in the foundations of the system that lets future victories happen. We get this passed and someday we will be able to pass laws

that clean up campaign oversight, and maybe someday end the electoral college after that. Starting with small things and using a workers movement to keep people engaged in the political process and informed. But you start that by making them feel their vote counts again. People are not going to be inclined to give a shit if they think it won't matter, but give them a reason to believe that and you get them involved again, which starts a snowball effect.

But without this, without this critical cornerstone, everything we can possibly do will be blackballed and shutdown by the media, the government and economic power the bourgeoisie hold. “but wait” I hear you say “the bourgeoisie will use the other powers to block any change even after this is done!”

Yes, yes they will, or they will try. But the American people woken from their hopelessness won't give two shits. First of all with campaign finance reform they cannot stop the influx of non approved ideas. They have no legal way of doing so, if the money is good, and being from the government, it will be. So they will HAVE to let Stewart Alexander and Alan Moore onto the ballot box, they will HAVE to let them on the air at least in commercials, and given equal screen time and budgets, who wins the guy lying through his teeth or the guy who's in it for the people? The guy who's for the people. Sure they can refuse to interview them but even Bernie is getting press time because he's no longer ignorable because he has the fame and money to challenge them.

“But this process is fragile and will take many many years” I hear you say. Yes. Yes it will. The alternative is what? I've searched for one but all I can find is picking up a rifle and sticking it to the bourgeoisie, which frankly doesn't win you a lot of friends. But hey, force has been used to great effect before in history, just keep in mind it's been used to great detriment on behalf of the instigators as well.

- Anonymous

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