

Volume 002
Issue No. 09



GREEN TOWN HALL
A REVOLUTIONARY
ALTERNATIVE?



PRISON LABOR
ORGANIZING THE
INCARCERATED



A CRITIQUE
WORKERS' OFFENSIVE
POINTS OF UNITY

THE RED VINE



Journal of the Red
Party

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

Prime-Time Greens

by Gabriel Pierre

While still highly marginalized by the official opinion-makers that make up the capitalist media, the inclusion of the Green Party's Jill Stein / Ajamu Baraka ticket on a prime-time CNN Presidential "Town Hall"¹ speaks to at least some opening for the larger third-party candidates in this election cycle. (The Libertarian Party ticket, headed by former Indiana Governor Gary Johnson, had its own spot in June.) Given the exclusionary nature of the official debates organized by the Commission on Presidential Debates, the Greens are eager for any platform they can access to help reach their nationwide goal of 5% of the vote in November, enough to qualify the party for matching federal funding in 2020. Achieving that would be no small feat - a little less than double Nader's total from 2000 - but the money would go a long way to establishing the Greens as a credible left opposition to the Democrats.

In her opening remarks, Dr. Stein struck a chord of continuity with Bernie Sanders' primary campaign that she would stick to for the evening, calling for a "stimulus package" in the form of a mass jobs program, free higher education and universal health care, a "path to citizenship" for undocumented

immigrants, an "end to police violence", and action against climate change. In that sense, the program is to the left of Sanders but not qualitatively so. The language of a "pathway to citizenship" (the only policy suggestion made on immigration that night) as well as the policy of police review boards are reforms that any Democrat, Hillary Clinton included, could and *do* endorse at least rhetorically.

Rather, Dr. Stein's pitch to disaffected Sandernistas, who she's sharply pivoted toward since the DNC, was based more on proving the Green Party's fitness as a vehicle for the "political revolution's" continuation. The Greens are the only party "not corrupted" by corporate cash, lobbyists and Super PACs; you can't make *r e v o l u t i o n* in a "counterrevolutionary party," she explained in response to a question from a former Sanders supporter.

At face value this is a completely correct statement, but it's worth noting how the Green Party, which does not claim to represent any kind of *systemic* alternative to capitalism or even represent the distinct interests of the working class as a class within the existing system, is able to capitalize on the language

Table of Contents:

General Content

- ▶ **Prime-Time Greens**
Pg. 02
- ▶ **Letter to the Communist League on a Joint Publication**
Pg. 04
- ▶ **Party Update**
Pg. 04
- ▶ **Nothing to Lose But Your Chains**
Pg. 08
- ▶ **Workers' Offensive Points of Unity: a Critique**
Pg. 10

Editorial

- ▶ **Left Strategy and 2016**
Pg. 05

Letters

- ▶ **Another Way**
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



of being a revolutionary party. The limitations of the party's reformist approach are more noticeable at some points than others. Jill Stein's promise to create a foreign policy "based on human rights and international law" echoes the 2000s anti-war movement's naive focus on the Iraq war's supposed 'illegality', as though international law was anything but the rules imposed by and in the interests of the major imperialist powers, mainly the U.S.² After all, the 2011 military intervention in Libya and the current one in Syria are authorized in the name of the 'international community' expressed through international law.

One interesting moment came when the moderator tried to hit Ajamu Baraka with a 'gotcha' question over calling President Obama an 'Uncle Tom' on his blog. To his surprise Baraka stood by the remark, explaining:

"What I wanted to do was basically to tell people who had this hope in Barack Obama, that if we were concerned and serious about how we could displace white power, we had to demystify the policies and the positions of this individual. So that was how it got framed to sort of shock people into a more critical look at this individual. And that's how I did it. And I stand by that even though it sounds very inflammatory, provocative and probably very strange to this massive audience here tonight."

After further pressure to back down on this and his public criticism of Bernie Sanders' pro-imperialist foreign policy, Baraka went on to say:

"...We can't build a progressive or revolutionary process by just looking at the United States of America. That, you know, you can't disconnect U.S. foreign policy from domestic policy. And so, I was concerned by some of the

comments around, you know, allowing the Saudis to get their hands dirty. You know, because many of us who follow geopolitical events understand that not only were the Saudis' hands dirty, they were dripping with blood.

...this wasn't about the man [Bernie.] It was about the movement. We've got to disconnect personalities from movement building. You know, and we've got to -- we see contradictions. We have to engage in those conversations with our friends. This was a conversation among those of us on the left, progressive people."

In other words: Obama has served the interests of the ruling class in office, not poor and working class Black people in the U.S. or elsewhere. Sounds like Uncle Tom is a fitting term to me. Naturally the media has lambasted Baraka in the following days for owning up to his own words.³ (Stein is also broadly criticized for failing to moderate her platform's commitment to slash military spending and close foreign bases abroad - there's just no pleasing some people.)

Throughout the debate, the candidates took opportunities to counter some of the vitriol hurled their way throughout the campaign - like the specious claim that Dr. Stein is an anti-vaxxer. She did a fair job criticizing the lesser-evil

thinking that will no doubt compel millions of sympathetic voters to support the Democratic Party in November, comparing Trump's right-wing rhetoric to Clinton's actual right-wing *record* during her time as politically-active First Lady, U.S. Senator and Secretary of State. She will "have trouble sleeping at night" regardless of which candidate is elected in November, and rightfully so.

But she was less convincing when answering the

question of whether or not she can "win," hampered by the nature of her organization and the political role it envisions for itself. By focusing so much of its rhetoric on the reforms they'd pass if they were in power, the Green Party fails to stress the value of building up a strong, well-organized opposition party that can in the short term put real pressure on the ruling class regardless of who occupies the Oval Office... and in the long term, transform society as a whole.

Notes

1. Transcript at <http://transcripts.cnn.com/TRANSCRIPTS/1608/17/se.01.html>, video at <https://youtu.be/SJhUNxKQh18>
2. <http://weeklyworker.co.uk/worker/497/the-war-and-the-law/>
3. See for example this gleeful assessment from NBC News: <http://www.nbcnews.com/politics/2016-election/analysis-clinton-lucks-out-jill-stein-her-left-n633591>

Letter to the Communist League on a Joint Publication

by Liam Fletcher, for the Red Party Central Committee

As it so happens, the Red Party finds itself in more-or-less political agreement with the Communist League of Tampa and wishes to begin a joint publication with them for the purpose of opening up debates between the two organizations and the individuals within them. Ideally, over the course of the coming months - perhaps years - the organizations will find themselves in general agreement on major issues of political principle and hopefully find a way forward as a unified

political party. Of course, before we can even get started, we need to sketch out a draft for what this joint-publication could or should look like.

An Editorial Board should consist of at least one Main Editor, one Assistant Editor, and one Art Editor. Who occupies these positions should be the result of discussion between the two organizations and then elections held for the positions.

T a k i n g i n t o consideration the small numbers of our organizations and the reality that we are left with a

relatively small amount of free time to write articles *et cetera*, it should be considered that the publication run on a monthly or bi-monthly basis.

There are, of course, other issues that should be discussed (for example, do we have a paid staff? How long should someone be on the Editorial Board? What should the publication be called?), however this letter is being published with the intent of opening up these issues for debate and discussion rather than demanding a specific line be followed before we even begin.

Party Update:

by Mari Pierre-Antoine

The new masthead may have given us away, but we're in the midst of renovations. *The Red Vine* is getting some improvements, and a re-launch of the website is being prepared - if you're reading this on

a smartphone, rest assured it will have a better mobile layout! If you're a returning reader of the 510 since the last issue, let us know what you think as changes appear. And as always, we invite you to send us your articles, letters and / or donations!

Left Strategy and 2016

Red Party Central Committee



Now that Bernie Sanders has given his full-throated support to Hillary Clinton, the sections of the left that backed his primary campaign - and those that didn't - are grappling with how to advance socialist ideas and organization in an election climate marked by an almost apocalyptic narrative between the major party candidates.

On the one hand, we have that section of the left whose project is to transform the Democratic Party into something like the social-democratic parties that exist in much of the world - that is to say, one organizationally based on the workers' movement in one form or another, even if on a program of running capitalism in a friendlier way than the open bourgeois parties. In recent decades, the scope of this project has narrowed considerably. Groups like the "official" Communist Party USA

and the Democratic Socialists of America only occasionally make the case in their press that the Democrats can be transformed in this way. The majority of their agitation focuses on putting the Democrats in power in order to pressure them for pro-worker concessions... or, more banally, supporting the centrist party to keep out the 'greater evil' Republicans. The experience of the Bernie Sanders campaign, whose platform of relatively mild reform was sabotaged at every turn by the party establishment, is the best demonstration in recent memory of where this project ends up.¹

Green Horizon

Even among those of us who advocate some form of independent politics, there is wide divergence over what "independence" looks like and

what end it serves. While constrained by the fear of a Trump administration, the widespread disgust with the political establishment and the reluctance felt by segments of pro-Sanders activists to support Hillary Clinton offers real potential to left-wing third party challengers. Many of these “Bernie or Bust”

supporters have joined the Green Party’s camp. In fact, while Stein’s poll numbers (between two and four percent²) are pretty dismal by mainstream party standards, her campaign has galvanized the left in a way not seen since Ralph Nader’s run in 2000.

The Green Party’s status as the default home for left-wing protest votes in a country without a mass workers’ party, combined with the momentum Jill Stein has from her previous run in 2012 - not to mention her active promotion of herself as the natural successor to Bernie’s ‘political revolution’ - has brought much of the organized left into the fold. It’s not difficult to see why this model is attractive. For those who want to use the Greens as a step toward a new class-based formation (or in at least one case, transform the Greens into that formation),³ they offer the largest pre-existing infrastructure, can boast of at least modest electoral successes, and often collaborate at a local level with various left groups in activist work.

But this approach is unlikely to produce what sections of the left hope it will. While Solidarity, the International Socialist Organization and Socialist Alternative have all enthusiastically joined the Stein campaign, the latter offers perhaps the most developed strategy to justify it. In the latest *Socialist Alternative*, Joshua Koritz calls for a “new party of the 99% that bases itself on the interests of working people.” This would be a broad party, in which the Greens can play an “important role” alongside sections of the labor movement, Black Lives Matter, student groups *et cetera*. Elsewhere, S.A. City Councillor Kshama Sawant highlights the similarities between Stein’s and Sanders’ platforms and argues that the bigger the vote for Stein in 2016, the better positioned we will be for this new party.⁴ Socialist Alternative has even converted its pro-

Bernie front group ‘Movement4Bernie’ into ‘Movement for the 99%.’

Leaving aside the muddled, popular front-esque nature of the ‘99%’ formulation (which groups together the working class with the petty-bourgeoisie and even some of the outright capitalist class), and whether or not we actually need a broad reformist party (as opposed to a revolutionary party organizing a politically substantial minority), the Greens are unlikely to be the stepping stone these comrades want them to be.

The Green Party is to the left of the Democrats, but it is not and does not claim to represent the working class’s interests as a class - even within the confines of capitalism. The ‘anti-capitalism amendment’⁵ ratified by the national convention didn’t change that; nowhere is the working class so much as mentioned, much less understood as the historical agent of social change. It is a middle-class party, and its organizational structures reflect this. Many politicians enter the Green Party to bolster their progressive credentials, then defect to the Democrats after having won office.⁶ Elected Greens at the local level commonly govern no further to the left than Democrats. There is no means to hold representatives accountable to the platform or the party, no means to overcome the status of satellite to the Democratic Party, and little political will to change either of these things. In practice, campaigning for the Green ticket tends to build the profile *of the Greens* rather than open up the possibility of furthering socialist politics.

Talk Sects

Although a large share of the U.S. left is bound up with Jill Stein, there are those running agitation and propaganda campaigns for an avowedly socialist candidate. In fact, we have an embarrassment of riches in a sense. There are *six* competing socialist campaigns for president, the Party for Socialism and Liberation (Gloria LaRiva / Eugene Puryear), Workers World Party (Monica Moorehead / Lamont Lilly), Socialist Party USA

(Mimi Soltysik / Angela Walker), Socialist Workers Party (Alyson Kennedy / Osborne Hart), Socialist Equality Party (Jerry White / Niles Niemuth), and Socialist Action (Jeff Mackler / Karen Schraufnagel - as an aside, in previous elections Socialist Action has given blanket endorsement to other left organizations.)

On a positive note, these campaigns are starting from an essentially correct premise: that elections under capitalism are an arena of struggle which revolutionaries should not ignore. General elections are an opportunity for party-building and spreading socialist ideas to a wider audience than what is typically possible. But these campaigns' potential impact is limited on both counts. As far as program goes, they are largely limited to economic 'bread-and-butter' demands that, while useful minimum reforms for our movement to fight for, don't present a systemic alternative to capitalism. For example, the PSL's ten point election program⁷ makes demands for free health care, the right to guaranteed employment *et cetera* but fails to make the case for the radical-democratic politics the working class needs if it's going to take power and remake society. Programs fixated on economic demands at the expense of democracy fail to qualitatively distinguish between communist politics and the reformism of Sanders or Stein.

More immediately pressing than the demands themselves, though, is the fact that there are competing campaigns in the first place. Unfortunately, the left's division into an alphabet soup of small groups extends into the electoral sphere. The division between these campaigns, which for the most part have very similar politics,⁸ comes down to the fact that they're not party-building exercises so much as they are sect-building exercises. It's a wasted opportunity that there is no socialist unity project this election cycle. A campaign uniting the disparate radical left organizations around a common candidate and platform, although it may not be much more of a vote-getter than the current arrangement, would do far more to build class organization - and lay the

groundwork for a future party - than any individual campaign, or putting hopes in the Green Party, will. A united campaign's impact would be felt both politically and structurally, even on issues as mundane as having more resources to overcome the restrictive ballot access thresholds many states set.

Still, socialist candidacies standing on a platform of working class political independence should be supported, ideally not just as an end in themselves but as a means to campaign for the kind of party we need. The vote share for the radical left as a whole will be squeezed both by the specter of Donald Trump and Jill Stein's relative popularity, but working for the best possible result will help consolidate what support we can while laying the groundwork for the future. The Socialist Party's Mimi Soltysik / Angela Walker ticket remains the best choice for class-conscious workers to give support while arguing for unity, electoral and otherwise, on the basis of class independence, internationalism and a commitment to radical democracy. Where this is not possible, support Gloria LaRiva (Party for Socialism and Liberation), Monica Moorehead (Workers World), or Mackler (Socialist Action) along the same lines.

Notes

1. See <http://red-party.com/tag/democratic-party/> for more on the structures of the Democratic Party.
2. 4%, according to a Pew Research Center poll released on August 18. <http://www.people-press.org/2016/08/18/1-voters-general-election-preferences/>
3. <http://red-party.com/the-green-party-and-socialist-strategy/>
4. <http://www.socialistalternative.org/2016/07/13/bernie-abandons-revolution-time-jill-stein/>
5. <http://gp.org/cgi-bin/vote/propdetail?pid=835>
6. <http://libcom.org/news/real-problem-jill-stein-15082016>
7. <http://www.glorialariva4president.com/program>
8. Except for the more cult-like organizations running, the Socialist Workers Party and Socialist Equality Party.

Nothing to Lose But Your Chains

by Josh Hollandsworth

On August 10, around 40 people of varying tendencies and backgrounds showed up in front of Durham County Prison in North Carolina, nestled downtown across from the Durham Performing Arts Center. Their purpose was to rally showing support in advance of a nationwide prisoners' strike on September 9 being organized by the Incarcerated Workers Organizing Committee, a branch of the Industrial Workers of the World. People from various groups attended, including the Workers World Party, Ignite NC, and the Inside-Outside Alliance (to name a few). I attended as well, representing the Red Party North Carolina. It is the duty of all revolutionaries and those who claim to be pro-worker to stand with the inmates of the world, who suffer intolerable conditions and who can legally be paid nothing or almost nothing for their work. For all intents and purposes, this is modern slavery and the creation of a better world starts with better treatment for the victims of our so-called 'justice' system.

The rally started around ten minutes after the scheduled start of 7:30 PM. Greg Williams, a member of the Triangle IWW branch-in-formation made opening statements on a set-up microphone. Among other things



he mentioned that the goal of the IWW (and any comrades in the struggle) is "ownership of the means of production." Chants were led of "no justice, no peace!" and "if we don't get it, shut it down!" As the chants carried on, distinct banging could be heard from the windows above. Some inmates whose cell windows faced the streets were banging for our attention, expressing solidarity with our cause and showing that they saw us and appreciated what we were doing. That happened in and out throughout the demo and it had a very powerful effect on us all. Who knows what punishment they may have faced for that display of support? At one point we turned and looked up at the windows, in some of which orange-suited figures could be seen, and chanted "we see you, we love you!" As is common at any 'wobbly' event, union hymns

such as "Solidarity Forever" and others were sang openly. Though unlikely, it is my hope that their sounds may have reached the prisoners.

Cops saw fit to close about 40-50 feet of the sidewalk closest to the entrance for some arbitrary reason, but on the sidewalk beyond it our protest spilled out onto a lane of the street in front of the prison. There was little interference with this, though two cops did approach Greg at one point and talk to him. He explained that though he "respected their opinions as an individual," he would not tell the protesters to leave the lane. The porkies, apparently unsatisfied at a citizen knowing and flexing their rights and seeing other people openly recording the interaction, chose not to push the issue any further and walked away.

Between the songs and chants came the most important voices - those of our scheduled speakers who had family, friends, or personal experiences in the brutal penal institution. Letters were also read directly from inmates who gave firsthand accounts of expired food, unsafe living conditions, blatant racism and a total lack of proper medical care as major concerns facing those in the system. These accounts should be spread to everyone, that they may drop their hatred of fellow human beings just for being in prison. By far the strongest personal account came from an unexpected source - an old van which happened to pass our protest. It stopped by Greg and the occupant, an elderly black man, spoke to him for a few minutes. He then waved the car to stop close to the center, where he got out and was given the microphone.

This random passerby, with his young grandchild in tow, then shared with us on the spot his account of three months spent in this very prison. Of the same problems we're hearing about today. Of the fact that nothing has changed since he was in there. Of the fact that the people being locked up are *his* people. And when he was done and getting ready to leave, the young child ran up and grabbed the mic. Along with the youthful playfulness that would be

expected of any child his age given a microphone, he said that "kids want to be with their parents so they can be good to their parents!" I personally couldn't agree more. We all thanked him from the bottom of our hearts for taking the time out of his day to share his important story with all of the people assembled and for driving home the point that the people in here are human beings worthy of the same rights as anyone else.

At one point during the event a reporter from a local paper noticed me passing out flyers for the Red Party and mentioning the organization to another demonstrator and approached me asking for information about our group. He took down my name and some basic details of our organization before departing. Though ultimately nothing about the RP appeared in their article¹ the next day, it was a significant moment for a representative of ours to have contact with press. It is our hope that through increased visibility we can unite the fragmented left and realize the goals together that we'd only dreamed of before.

Prisoners, like all other laborers, need a union. And in conjunction with that the Red Party North Carolina demands a citizen-controlled board which can help confirm the proper treatment of inmates and ensure that more stories like what we

heard today aren't created. We need to end the incarceration of all non-violent offenders and treat prison only as a last resort of the criminal system, with all efforts at rehabilitation being the first. There must be an end to privatized prisons which profit off of increased incarceration rates and which have every motive to run the lives inside as cheaply and inhumanely as possible. And ultimately we must abolish capitalism, the root source of nearly all injustice and the primary catalyst of poverty, crime, and racism.

What happened here is only the beginning. This September 9, let's rise against injustice once more and stand with the worker-prisoners of the world!

Notes

1. <http://www.newsobserver.com/news/local/community/durham-news/article95029777.html>

Workers' Offensive Points of Unity: a Critique

by Patrick Janis

The Workers' Offensive (formerly known as the Communist League of Miami) is a new organization that sprouted off from the Communist League, this being the second split in the CL's short history, the first involving the branch in New York. One would expect a certain amount of hostility towards the new organization, but this split was a rather friendly one that came out natural political differences between one of the local branches and the general politics of the CL. Although I personally do not think it was a particularly wise decision to split from CL considering its rather absurdly tumultuous short history, the WO expressed a willingness to participate in the national convention of the CL if it ever happens and to be friendly towards CL overall.

However, I believe that it's important to address the political differences between the two organizations that caused the split in the first place in order to examine a rather cancerous trend within the American left. That trend is spontaneism, or as I'm going to call it neo-Bakuninism to specifically highlight the un-Marxist nature of said trend on the left. Neo-Bakuninism has been popular among the post-Cold War left due to its anti-

authoritarian nature, which makes it appealing to those who want to avoid the sort of Stalinist or crypto-Stalinist politics that have defined much of the history of the radical left. Now you will not catch me or anyone involved with the CL defending Stalinism in any of its forms. However, crypto-anarchism is not just anti-authoritarian; it is also anti-organization and ironically in this situation anti-working class. So with all that in mind let us examine the politics of the WO illustrated in its points of unity.

“Labor unions, regardless of their internal structure, are not workers' organizations but organs of the capitalist state that smother and contain the resistance of the working class against the exploitative system through the negotiation and enforcement of contracts with capital. In the heat of the class struggle, the workers must destroy the unions and form their own mass and unitary organizations to direct and carry out their struggle against capitalism.”-5th point of the WO's PoU¹

Now before we get into the more theoretically heavy part of deconstructing this point let us get a basic fact out of the way: unions are not a part of the state. They may interact with the state through negotiating contracts with governmental agencies for

public sector workers or lobbying for legislation and numerous other examples but it is completely asinine to say that unions are organs of the state. Unions do much more than simply interacting with the state, they also negotiate with the capitalist class directly. With that being said we can rip into theoretical meat of this point. WO rejects working with labor unions regardless of their “internal structure” and claims that union's smother class struggle.

While this is partially true for business unions, there remains a long tradition of radical unionism in the United States with the IWW and other organizations like it. These organizations may not be strong at this point in time but working within said organizations has yielded some results. For example, the Fight for 15 movement has organized fast food workers, a particularly hard part of the proletariat to organize in the past due to the temporary nature of service work in the industry. WO would probably dismiss Fight for 15 and other labor movements like it as reformist but this is a rather simplistic view of class struggle. Yes, such movements struggle for reform within the capitalist system. There's a need, however, to engage with these movements because they are

means of organizing the working class and defending its interests in the short term. Even Proudhon, the original revolutionary gnostic, acknowledges that engaging in what he calls “political and economic movements” will at least achieve short-term benefits for those who are supported by capitalism: “In a word, the workers should cross their arms and stop wasting time in political and economic movements. These movements can never produce anything more than short-term results.”²

Now the reasoning between the two is somewhat different, however still ultimately similar in the final result. Both deny the ability of the proletariat to defend its short-term interest by participating in the political and economic struggle, leaving the proletariat wholly at the mercy of capitalist class to be exploited while waiting for the Gnostic revolutionaries to decide when

class struggle is pure enough for them to join in. Much like Marx points out...

“The master preached indifference in matters of economics -- so as to protect bourgeois freedom or competition, our only guarantee. His disciples preach indifference in matters of politics -- so as to protect bourgeois freedom, their only guarantee. If the early Christians, who also preached political indifferentism, needed an emperor's arm to transform themselves from oppressed into oppressors, so the modern apostles of political indifferentism do not believe that their own eternal principles impose on them abstinence from worldly pleasures and the temporal privileges of bourgeois society. However we must recognize that they display a stoicism worthy of the early Christian martyrs in supporting those fourteen or sixteen working hours such as overburden the workers in the factories.”³

When revolutionaries engaged in class struggle for temporary goals they were not only successful, but they ended up creating some of the most popular revolutionary organizations in the history of the Left - from the IWW to even the Bolshevik party, the number of revolutionary organizations that engage in what would be called “reformism” by the WO is extremely staggering. There has never been an organization that has not engaged in struggle for short-term proletarian class victories and lead a relatively successful movement.

Notes

1. <https://workersoffensivegroup.wordpress.com/points-of-unity/>
2. Pierre-Joseph Proudhon, “De la capacité politique des classes ouvrières.”
3. Karl Marx, “Political Indifferentism.” <https://www.marxists.org/archive/marx/works/1873/01/indifferentism.htm>

Letters

Another Way

Last May, shortly after Bernie Sanders entered the Democratic Party presidential primary, I wrote an article for the *Red Vine* where I outlined a general position about his candidacy and how it would unfold.¹ In doing so, I made a few predictions - always a risky

move - about the development of the Sanders campaign and how it would feed into both the primary process and the eventual general election. While some of the predictions still have yet to be fully borne out one way or another, thinking about them fourteen months after the fact makes me think I was, at least in

general terms, right. Hopefully I can bring that out a little bit below:

“1) Gain a reasonable degree of popular support among sections of the populace who have been active in broadly-defined progressive social movements in the past 3-5 years,

particularly those campaigns seeking to address economic inequality (Occupy, the various minimum wage increase campaigns, and so on.) This will also include sections of the organized left, both in its radical liberal forms (Greens and others), and its socialist forms. “

I think this is largely true. While the Sanders

campaign has attracted a large number of people for whom this is their first real political or social movement engagement, a significant section of Sanders's supporters came from people who have been active in one or another of the protest or social movements that have started to emerge in the past five years, such as various post-Occupy groups, Fight for 15/15 Now, Black Lives Matter to a degree, various anti-fracking and climate justice movements, and many others. Furthermore, the Sanders campaign did create pull in fairly reasonable sections (for what that's worth) of the radical-liberal and socialist left; the Green Party had to deal with several members and a couple state parties arguing for people to support and vote for Sanders, and a few socialist groups and many individual socialists have been some of Sanders' strongest supporters. Both Democratic Socialists of America and Socialist Alternative, for example, have strongly pushed the Sanders campaign as an opening for the left.

”2) Do well enough in some primary states to reinforce a hold over the aforementioned groups and project the idea that it is better/more effective to fight for progressive social change within the context of Democratic

Party politics as opposed to an independent political force. In this sense, it seems possible that Sanders does better than Kucinich in this regard, at least in terms of votes won in primaries, as at this point Sanders is the only official challenger to Hillary Clinton. This will probably change over the next six months, which may eat into Sanders' vote totals as a result, but Sanders still seems to have an advantage here that Kucinich didn't in 2004.”

This one is still somewhat up in the air. Certainly, Sanders did better than Kucinich did twelve years ago, partially because he was pretty much the only other candidate in the race (RIP Lincoln Chafee.) I think it's also true that this is the role Sanders wanted to play, or was intended to play - bring in new layers of progressive and socialist activists into the orbit of the Democratic Party so that its own left-wing rhetorical credentials would be secured, and even the “independent” networks that are/will be created to supposedly further the agenda that Sanders has raised will largely remain as half-inside half-outside organs of the

Democratic Party. And at least to a point, that's probably what will happen in November. I for one have no doubt that the vast majority of people who votes for Sanders in the primary will, for better or for worse, vote for Clinton in the general election.

However, reality has intervened. While Sanders would have most likely lost to Clinton even in a completely transparent and fair process, the development of the primary process has exposed hundreds of thousands of people to the bureaucratic tyranny and Byzantinism that is the structure of the Democratic Party, its cozy and completely legal entanglement with state institutions (boards of elections and so on), and the periodic scandals of Democratic Party officials apparently trying to tip the balance in Clinton's favor anyway. Even if the vast majority of these people remain in the Democratic Party orbit for the next few months, hopefully enough of them will remember this experience and be able to engage in some critical reflection on what went wrong, why the Democratic Party is structured the way it is, and what sort of structures might actually be needed to both meaningfully fight for the politics that they claim to support, and how their elected representatives can actually be controlled by their members, rather than the other way around.

“3) Either drop out of the race before the Democratic National Convention and endorse the frontrunner, or declare support for the eventual nominee during/immediately after the DNC, on the argument that, given the choice between the Democratic and Republican presidential candidates, it will be more possible to fight for the issues that the Sanders campaign has raised with Democrats in power than with Republicans in power, based on some combination of the Democrats either being the more natural constituency for progressive politics and/or the Democrats being more susceptible to pressure from the left (two very closely linked, but ultimately separate arguments.) While the entirety of the base that the Sanders campaign has built won’t go along with this, a large enough majority likely will so that the Democrats’ left flank is sufficiently secured, and the rest of the presidential campaign can be spent on attacking Republicans, wooing “moderates,” and ensuring their patrons in the capitalist class that the presence of a left constituency within the Democratic Party won’t be a major threat to them.”

The first part of this has basically already happened, even if some Sanders supporters and delegates are pushing ahead anyway. As the Democratic National Convention rolls on,

this will become even more apparent. As for the other part, sections of it have borne out (witness some prominent neo-conservatives come over to the Clinton camp), but on some level that prediction won't fully be tested until November. So let me take a couple more risks, and make a couple more predictions:

- 1) Hillary Clinton will win in November. She will do so with the votes and support of the vast majority of people who votes for Bernie Sanders in the primary. Some Sanders voters will turn elsewhere (largely to the Green Party, most likely, but I hope many of them give the Soltysik/Walker campaign a serious consideration) but level of defection of Sanders supporters away from Clinton will likely be lower than the level of anti-Trump Republicans away from Trump.
- 2) A number of these anti-Trump Republicans - moderates, the few social liberals that bizarrely remain in the party, neo-conservatives as mentioned above, will also end up supporting Clinton. (A smaller number will likely turn to Gary Johnson and the Libertarian Party, which is already happening in some quarters.) This will happen as the result of a targeted effort by the Clinton campaign to vote for

“common sense” or “decency” or whatever against Donald Trump.

- 3) In the calculus of the Clinton campaign and the eventual Clinton presidency, these supporters will ultimately be seen as the people who bring Clinton over the top, because it will be widening the big-tent coalition that the Democratic Party seeks. While progressives are also part of that tent, they will be taken for granted on a political and policy level, as they largely have been for years, while a Clinton presidency will govern in a way which aims to keep their new-found supporters from the right under the tent as well. It may work for 2018, 2020, and so on, or it may not; the point is that a Clinton presidency will be much more beholden to them than to the progressives who came in earlier. As far as the left goes, Clinton will ask for everything and give nothing. And while it may defeat Trump, I doubt it will put a serious damper on the social forces that Trump has rallied, thus giving yet another (albeit frighteningly real) bogeyman for the Democratic Party establishment to bring up whenever progressives start complaining too much.

There has to be another way.

Fortunately for all of us, I think there is one. Fortunately for progressives and socialists who feel like they have to vote for Clinton, their vote in November has nearly no bearing on the development of that other way. The real work begins after the election, to lay the groundwork for a party that can seriously challenge the Democrats, the Republicans, and the state itself.

It's not going to be easy. It will likely mean grinding through boring meetings, organizing sessions, and study groups, but will likely also have some very inspiring campaigns. It will likely mean hard-fought political arguments, but so long as we are able practice unity within diversity in good faith, those arguments will hopefully produce even higher forms of unity. And it will likely mean losing, at least in the short term.

But we have a world to win if we do.

- Peter Moody

Notes

1. <http://red-party.com/the-sanders-trajectory/>

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