

Philosophers in La Casita

Hal Adams' Politics in Theory and Practice

ANNE CARLSON AND MICHAEL STAUDENMAIER

I. INTRODUCTION

Hal Adams befriended us individually before the two of us met, and he was witness to the beginning of our relationship in the spring of 2003. Prior to meeting each other, we had come to know different sides of the same person: Michael had befriended Hal through a common interest in radical politics, while Anne's connection was through the writing workshops Hal coordinated with Janise Hurtig. As our relationship developed, our contact with Hal ebbed and flowed, but his influence on our lives remains palpable.

Our essay is a joint effort, which we see as a way of honoring the legacy of collaboration that was so central to Hal Adams's vision for social change. Michael's contribution is based in large part on his research into the history of the Sojourner Truth Organization (STO), a radical group opposed to white supremacy and capitalism, to which Hal belonged in the 1970s and 1980s. In Part Two of this essay, we describe the work and theory of STO, focusing on the group's internal educational efforts and the special importance to the group of Antonio Gramsci and C. L. R. James, two twentieth century Marxists whose influence is clearly visible in Hal's subsequent work and writings. We believe that Hal's experience of participation in a revolutionary organization, one with an especially active and critically reflective internal intellectual culture, strongly influenced the unorthodox educational approach that characterized his subsequent efforts.

In Part Three, Anne takes the lead. Here, the starting point is her years of work, between 2001 and 2005, as a dual language teacher at Whittier Elementary School in the Mexican neighborhood of Pilsen, on the near southwest side of Chicago. We focus specifically on her implementation in 2003 of the Community Writing Project (CWP) model with a group of parents, which culminated in the publication of an issue of the CWP's journal, *Real Conditions*.¹ In this part of our essay, we describe the structure, the strategy, and the subjective experience of this particular workshop. We then use this example to highlight some of the strengths and the weaknesses of Hal's pedagogical approach.

Finally, we argue that the 2003 Whittier School workshop contributed to laying the groundwork for the 2010 occupation of "La Casita," the field house at Whittier, by parent and community activists demanding better educational resources for their chronically underfunded school. While the occupation was eventually followed by the demolition of the field house in 2013, marking a defeat for the movement, we maintain that it represented a coming together of the various elements of Hal's approach to social change: the intersection of writing and action, and of education and autonomy. Together, we feel that an examination of these two aspects of Hal's work—his commitment to theory and his practical work—offers new insight into the complicated, sometimes dialectical interplay between politics and pedagogy, and between history and contemporary reality.

II. STO AND THE POLITICAL/INTELLECTUAL DEVELOPMENT OF HAL ADAMS

In political terms, Hal Adams was a product of both the 1960s and the 1970s. While the former is often remembered as a high-water mark for radical activism, the latter also featured an array of vibrant struggles for liberation and justice, often informed by a sense of the limits and flaws of earlier efforts. At the dawn of the 1970s, Hal was still very much in his formative years, politically speaking. Iowa, where he worked as a university educator, was something of a minor hotbed of New Left radicalism during this period, with collective projects emerging in cities large and small. Hal participated in a number of political initiatives, including the New University Conference, which he described as a sort of professorial version of Students for a Democratic Society, as well as in the New American Movement (NAM), a multi-tendency grouping that laid the groundwork for what is today known as the Democratic Socialists of America (DSA).²

Several hundred miles to the east, Chicago remained a major center for left politics, even as the upsurges of the 1960s receded into the past. Virtually every trend and tendency of the American left was active in the city, from the Communist

Party to the Industrial Workers of the World to the Chicago Women's Liberation Union. In this context, the Windy City served as a mecca for radicals who craved a larger-scale environment for organizing than the college towns and small industrial cities of Iowa could provide. Several of Hal's friends made this move, and many of them were quickly drawn to the Sojourner Truth Organization (STO), one of many obscure groupings in Chicago's constellation of the organized left. Through these continuing friendships, STO eventually caught Hal's eye as the 1970s progressed. As he put it later, "I was taken with the quality of the discussion, the serious nature of things, the complexity with which people —it was like nothing I'd ever been affiliated with before on the left."³

STO had been founded in the waning days of 1969 by a group of youthful but experienced veterans of the movements of the 1960s.⁴ Over the next decade and a half, Hal and his friends were among the hundreds of radicals drawn to STO's efforts to balance the development of revolutionary theory with an equally intense commitment to practical work. At its inception, the group strongly emphasized workplace organizing in Chicagoland's apparently booming heavy industry sector, especially in the steel mills of South Chicago and Gary, Indiana. Once deindustrialization began to set in, factory jobs became harder to obtain and in-plant organizing became more difficult to sustain, leading STO to a shift in strategic orientation around 1976. During this phase, the group put less effort into workplace efforts and prioritized solidarity with third world national liberation struggles, especially those active in the mainland United States. Eventually, ideological disagreements with many of the leading groups in this milieu caused STO to transform its strategy once again around 1981, focusing instead on the range of so-called New Social Movements then emerging in the global north, from anti-nuclear campaigns to struggles in defense of reproductive freedom.

Throughout these strategic twists and turns, STO remained committed to collectively developing revolutionary theory that could guide a wide range of social change efforts. The group took inspiration from a highly unusual pantheon of theorists. Its admiration of Karl Marx and V. I. Lenin was shared in that era with a large number of other radical groups (certainly a larger number than would be the case in the second decade of the twenty-first century), but STO's other touchstone political theorists were far less common: the Italian Marxist Antonio Gramsci, the African American polymath W. E. B. Du Bois, and the Trinidadian revolutionary C. L. R. James. (It is important to note that STO's interest in the theoretical work of both Gramsci and James was in full bloom years before either became the focus of academic fads in the 1980s.) Hal's exposure through STO to the work of Gramsci and James in particular would profoundly influence his future work as an educator. In particular, Gramsci's *Prison Notebooks* and James' *Notes on Dialectics* drew the continuing attention of STO, and of Hal.

STO's interest in Gramsci was based in his pioneering analysis of the contradictions of working class consciousness. At the end of World War One, Gramsci had been part of a vibrant insurgency led by industrial workers, apparently following the classic model of revolution attributed to Marx himself. But by the mid-1920s, Italy was in the thrall of Mussolini's fascism and Gramsci was in prison. While incarcerated, in an attempt to understand the failure of Italy's revolutionary upsurge, Gramsci developed the now well-known theory of hegemony, which describes the hold that bourgeois consciousness exerts over the worldview of all who live under capitalism.

Within the confines of hegemony, the parameters of a capitalist economy—wage labor, exploitation, and so forth—are seen as permanent and unchangeable, impervious to challenge by the working class or by anybody else. For STO, the most exciting implications of Gramsci's theory had to do with his belief that workers under capitalist hegemony developed “two theoretical consciousnesses (or one contradictory consciousness)” (1971, 333). Don Hamerquist, one of STO's founders, reformulated this as an analysis of “dual consciousness,” arguing (1976 [1971]) that “what is in the worker's head is a source of power insofar as it reflects the worldview of the working class—and a source of weakness—insofar as it reflects the worldview of the capitalist class.”⁵ Herein lay the potential for collective power and social change embodied in the famous assertion from Gramsci that Hal Adams subsequently adopted as his own, that “every man [sic] is a philosopher.”⁶

Like Gramsci, C. L. R James was a major influence on STO, and subsequently on Adams. James was a black revolutionary from Trinidad, who spent almost 70 years immersed in working-class radical movements in the West Indies, Great Britain, and the United States. While living in the U.S. from 1938 until his forced departure in 1953, he was profoundly affected by the developing struggle for black liberation in North America.⁷ One of his most powerful essays addressed the ways in which the everyday lives of African Americans reflected the capacity of people to understand and resist their oppression. As James (in Worcester, 1996, 53) put it,

Let us not forget that in the Negro people, there sleep and are now awakening passions of a violence exceeding, perhaps, as far as these things can be compared, anything among the tremendous forces that capitalism has created. Anyone who knows them, who knows their history, is able to talk to them intimately, watches them at their own theatres, watches them at their dances, watches them in their churches, reads their press with a discerning eye, must recognise that although their social force may not be able to compare with the social force of a corresponding number of organised workers, the hatred of bourgeois society and the readiness to destroy it when the opportunity should present itself, rests among them to a degree greater than in any other section of the population in the United States.

Where Gramsci is focused on the theoretical considerations of the possibility of human agency, James begins from the lived reality of black people in the US,

a consideration that was also prominent within STO's anti-racist analysis from the very beginning, as a result of the growth and militancy of the Black Freedom Movement over the course of the 1960s. As an early STO pamphlet, drafted largely by Noel Ignatin (now Ignatiev) put it, "the central point of reference on any issue is the need to tear down the walls of white supremacy and achieve equality for black people." (STO 1972, 25). STO also saw the terrain of popular culture and daily life as a crucial space for developing capacities for critical thinking and for collective action along the lines advocated by both Gramsci and James.

For Adams, this level of sophisticated analysis was a revelation. He later described himself and other younger members of STO as "novices on the left; we'd come to it from the civil rights movement and the war, like everybody did then."⁸ In order to bring newer members up to speed intellectually, STO initiated an internal educational course on dialectics, sometimes called "How to Think," not long after Adams joined the organization in the mid-1970s. "And that made a big difference," he later indicated. "People really started to get things in a way that they thought they could discuss them on a level equal to these people [like Hamerquist and Ignatin] who had been studying it for years."⁹ Among the most prominent figures studied in the courses were Gramsci and James. Adams remembered the dialectics courses as demanding and intensive endeavors lasting several days. While there, the instructors helped guide discussion, so that while the students were expected to contribute extensively to the conversation, "there was a role for a teacher to play in the thing." This set of insights was reflected later in the development of the writing workshops, which were based on the premise that all participants had the capacity to contribute in powerful ways to both the group and the wider world, even as teachers did play a unique and active role alongside and in solidarity with the participants.

After Adams left STO in the midst of its terminal decline in the mid-1980s, he retained the political analysis he developed while a member, and pursued its application via his work on community writing groups and the publications he started, the *Journal of Ordinary Thought* and *Real Conditions*. The magazines regularly reprinted Gramsci's conviction regarding the capacity of all people to be philosophers. Adams argued that there were "liberal" and "radical egalitarian" versions of this principle, and all the way to the end of his life he advocated for the radical version by reiterating STO's understanding of dual consciousness:

[Gramsci] explores the processes whereby the masses overcome their oppression. The first element of the struggle is an internal, dialectical one in which the masses overcome their firm belief that it is natural for the ruling class to rule them, and that being successful is to become a rich, functioning member of the ruling society. At the same time, however, the subordinate classes nurture a suspicion among themselves that as individuals and collectively they can make a better, self-governing society for themselves, that is, a society based upon on their interests and abilities, and free of the domination of the ruling class.¹⁰

For Adams, the legacy of STO and the dialectics course involved a very basic set of propositions about the mass of humanity. In this context, he was clear about the implication of the line from Gramsci that appeared in each issue of the *Journal of Ordinary Thought*: “The intention was for readers to grasp the idea that the poor, oppressed, marginalized people who wrote for the magazine could be considered philosophers, but not in the usual sense that people become known as philosophers.”¹¹ Of course, this was not only an issue for outside readers, but first and foremost for the participants in the writing groups; in the process of writing for publication, the writers themselves became more conscious of their own (potential) role in analyzing and changing the world. In a small way, then, the community writing workshops and the publications that emerged from them, represented a thoughtful implementation of the political understanding that Adams had adopted during his time in STO.

III. HAL’S VISION IN PRACTICE: ANNE’S EXPERIENCE AT WHITTIER SCHOOL

I met Hal in 2002, when I was a fifth grade teacher at Whittier Elementary, a dual-language neighborhood public school in Chicago’s Pilsen neighborhood. Right next to it stood an aging field house known in the community simply as “La Casita” (the little house). The year I met Hal I taught in La Casita while my regular classroom in the main school building underwent lead abatement.

There was a lot of change going on in public education around the time I met Hal, with the federal No Child Left Behind policy just starting to unleash its fury. Similarly, the Renaissance 2010 initiative, launched by then-CEO of the Chicago Public Schools Arne Duncan and Mayor Richard M. Daley, represented a pioneering attempt by Chicago’s commercial, political, and educational elite to privatize the education sector and undermine community control of public schools. It called for the opening of up to 100 new privately managed charter schools. Part of the process involved labeling schools as “failing” to justify their closure, only to turn them around or reopen them as corporate-run charter schools, a privatization agenda that is ongoing today. Despite the high quality of Whittier’s dual-language program and an involved parent body, everyone at Whittier knew our school was being negatively evaluated based on systemic factors outside of our control. Ninety-nine percent of the students qualified for free lunch; many parents were unemployed or were working extremely low wage jobs; an overwhelming percentage of students were English Language Learners; and families were relatively transient. The neighborhood regularly witnessed gang violence, and I attended funeral after funeral with students whose family members were shot and killed.

These students' test scores would never measure up to the high-ranking schools in affluent neighborhoods. They could not compete with middle class students for whom English was their first language. Whittier had a staff of dedicated teachers who were committed to working long hours to ensure the best education possible and to provide a safe space for children. The parents were supportive and encouraging. But there was no magic bullet to save our school from being branded with the label "failing." The students walked in the door with disadvantages that were reflective of a *society* which had failed them.

Under these circumstances a small group of parents, mostly mothers, began to organize and agitate for change. They found their voice in a community that had been marginalized and ignored by politicians. These mothers were immigrants from Mexico, many undocumented, living in rough economic circumstances. They were not going to settle for "less than." They were proud and determined to demand city officials provide the quality education their children deserved. By 2002, these mothers had reached a breaking point: why was the local alderman prioritizing the opening of a charter school just a few blocks away, while failing to support Whittier, a long-established neighborhood school? This was my first taste of an extended battle that eventually resulted in the occupation of the field house.

As a teacher I was searching for ways to connect with these mothers and support the activism that was brewing inside and outside the walls of Whittier. If the families and teachers stood side by side as a united front, I thought, we might have a chance to stand up and demand justice for our students. It was in this milieu that I met Hal. Another Whittier teacher and close friend of mine, Allie Epstein, introduced us. I don't even remember why Hal came to Whittier in the first place. I remember learning about the community writing groups that he and Janise Hurtig had helped initiate at various public schools in Chicago, where mothers and some fathers would gather early in the morning, during the school day, or in the early evening, sometimes with preschool aged children in tow. Nothing sensational. No fanfare. Just ordinary people coming together to write and share stories. Wow.

Like many teachers around this time, I was fed up with racist policies of the Chicago Public Schools, and the unfunded educational mandates from state and federal governments. I wanted to rally in the streets and demand justice for neighborhood schools. After meeting Hal and attending one of his writing groups, I became more conscious of my *own* agenda; I needed to listen to the communities most impacted by these policies. I learned to shut up and actively listen to people's stories. Changing the system was possible when those without a public forum, the so-called "voiceless," felt heard. Revolution, it seemed, could begin in these ordinary classrooms with ordinary people writing their truth.

I told Hal I wanted to launch a writing group at Whittier. He was my mentor; I would call and whine about my lack of expertise in leading a group. Because I grew up in a family of "professional" writers, I imagined I needed to be a published

author; I was hoping he would give me coaching lessons. As a teacher I was used to being criticized for my lesson plans or instructional methods. I was accustomed to “experts” knowing more than I did. Hal would point out that I wasn’t leading anything. I was merely creating the space for the sharing of stories. I didn’t need to turn in lesson plans aligned to the standards, follow the Writer’s Workshop model, or move any piece toward publication. He was gifted in the art of active listening, something I really needed help with.

In order to prepare for the group at Whittier, I accompanied Hal to other community writing groups at various schools throughout Chicago. Hal did not speak Spanish, and he worked largely in schools with predominately African American populations. I remember watching Hal in his writing groups. He was good at maintaining silence when someone was getting emotional or was trying to collect their thoughts. He didn’t nervously interrupt or fill the silence with meaningless babble because he felt uncomfortable. Incredibly adept at getting to the heart of a person’s story, he would latch onto one apparently innocuous sentence and ask the author to elaborate. This would invariably lead to an emotional release which illuminated the importance of the story. It became the seed from which the story grew.

I was also struck by how quickly Hal put workshop participants at ease. Hal had the ability to take his ego out of the picture and pack it away, and he had this laugh that would convey to people that he was really getting their experience. It wasn’t a laugh of mockery. People shared their worries, insecurities and their triumphs. We sat in a circle. Hal read parts of his writing, which was key. He was writing too, sharing too; as if he was part of the group too, he was learning as much as they were. It wasn’t Hal’s knowledge being poured into open vessels; rather, he created a safe space that gave people the freedom to speak.

The Whittier group started in the basement of our school in the fall of 2002. The sessions were held in Spanish. About eight mothers and one father showed up to the first meeting; I taught many of the children of these parents. The structure was fairly simple: there was time in the beginning to share what people had written. Then we would ask questions, comment on the pieces, and make connections. After sharing writing, we spent twenty minutes or so just writing in silence, writing without caring about grammar, editing, and so forth.

In Whittier’s basement, a writing collective was born. There was no leader. Week after week, the walls listened without judgment and soaked up stories that had never been told. It was more like a therapy session with these moms realizing that they had many things in common. They all had crossing the border stories. One story stood out for me: Maria Cristina shared that she had to hide her gender to come to the States. She worked as a migrant farmer disguised as a man.

I never thought I’d have to change my sex in order to come to the United States. I got to the plaza of the town and all the workers were on the bus. I arrived dressed like a man. I

had a big jacket and a hat on my head. It was a hat with a wide brim that covered almost half my face. We all left in silence. I was barely 15 years old and I didn't really understand what was happening. But the reality of what happened was far crueler than they had told me it would be. I lived with more than 50 men... I worked there from five in the morning until eight at night. My job was to pick fruits and vegetables. I had to move my hands fast or the machine would cut them off.¹²

The other moms also wrote about incredible sacrifice. I remember there was one particular mom who felt ashamed that she didn't know how to write. They never thought their ordinary lives mattered to anyone, but as they wrote many themes emerged: survival, discrimination, sexism, and so forth. They told me that the writing groups gave them a voice in a world where they felt insignificant. I think it gave them an opportunity not to feel guilty about focusing on themselves. This model for community writing, which I still associate with Hal, is something I continue to carry with me today.

The women in the writing group had largely swallowed the idea that their purpose in life was to serve their families. Many talked about domestic violence and sexual abuse, all too common in their community as in so many others. But just as Gramsci, James, STO and Hal all anticipated, the experience of collective activity, in this case writing and telling stories, helped bring to the surface a very different sense of their place in the world and their ability to change it. This process first became noticeable in a very practical way: on a blustery, winter day in the middle of February, as two people from the group helped me paint the interior of the field house with environmentally-friendly paint. Through these writing groups we had talked about how the school needed a separate space just for parents; a place where parents could gather, have meetings, share food, have ESL classes, and learn about how to become more involved in the community. A resource center for parents. We felt that by painting the field house, it would bring some dignity to this rundown space.

In below zero temperatures and with a portable CD player blasting tunes, we painted the entryway of the field house with the hope that this would become an important space. The school principal liked the colors and job we had done so well that she ended up hiring painters to complete the job in the two other rooms. Little did we know at the time that this would be the same space that the parents would occupy for a month in 2010 to demand a library and community space instead of allowing CPS to spend \$350,000 tearing it down. I can't help think these early actions, the writing groups, the painting laid the groundwork for this action. The pump had been primed.

It would be tempting but inconsistent with the humility Hal brought to the writing groups, to attribute too much to that liberatory space created by our weekly writing workshops. Hal's approach was powerful as a pedagogy of humanization, but far from perfect as an approach for moving people collectively from theory to

practice. On the basis of my experience as a classroom teacher and my years of experience fighting for educational justice across the city, I believe Hal overestimated the potential of the writing groups on their own to produce social movements for radical change. In some ways, this was a problem Hal inherited from STO, which—especially in its later years—had a tendency to bend the stick too far in the direction of hyper-autonomous and spontaneously self-radicalizing social movements. Like STO’s late-period approach to social movements, Hal’s model of the writing group lacked a mechanism to catalyze action from analysis. Participants’ lives were validated and they became more self-aware, but this did not lead to an analysis of the systems and institutions which marginalized and oppressed the participants and their communities. It seems clear that Hal did not view the writing groups as the only viable form of political engagement, but the experience at Whittier shows some of the weaknesses as well as the many strengths in his model.

IV. CONCLUSION: MOVING BEYOND DEMOLITION

In September, 2010 a city demolition order was issued for the field house, at the request of CPS. That was when the occupation began. About a dozen women, mostly mothers of past and present students, including some veterans of the writing workshop in 2003, entered the building and refused to leave. When they were confronted by police on the second day, it looked like the occupation would end quickly and quietly. But then, in the words of reporter Micah Uetricht (2010):

The large crowd of supporters gathered outside realized that the numbers were on their side—and that the police would likely be hesitant to drag a group of mothers out of their community center and arrest them in front of news cameras—and began jumping the fence, rushing past the police line to join the protesters in La Casita. With no other choices, the police left.

Over the course of a 43-day occupation by activist parents, La Casita became a symbol in Pilsen and in wider Chicago for community-based educational struggles. The mothers of some of my students from 2003 were among those who occupied that field house seven years later. Its dilapidated structure was falling apart on the outside but maintained its strength within, and occupiers were fighting the city’s plan to demolish the field house. Citing the lack of library facilities inside the school building, the activists had proposed repurposing the field house as a library for the school and community. The building and the battle to hold onto it received local and even international acclaim, as the ability of community members to fend off the CPS bulldozers for a time inspired many people from around the world. Six weeks later, the occupiers declared victory after signing a series of agreements with CPS that appeared to guarantee the future of the field house as a community center.

While those agreements were subsequently ignored and the field house was eventually demolished as CPS had originally intended, the occupation itself triggered much discussion on the left. Hal had moved from Chicago to Minneapolis a couple of years before, but he paid close attention to the struggle around the field house, perhaps because of his memories of the community writing group. In one reflection on the nature of the struggle, he argued that “Viewed from several hundred miles north of the event, it appeared to me that the occupation of the Whittier space was by mothers who had no particular political position. Rather, they were a group that believed itself to be equal to anyone in experience and ability, which would be the real revolutionary position.”¹³ Here we can see the practical implications of Hal’s commitment to Gramsci and James: every person a philosopher, indeed. This action was not organized by teachers, or sponsored by established community organizations; it was started, maintained, and supported by ordinary people who inspired the whole country.

As the wrecking crews closed in on La Casita in 2013, we couldn’t help but think of the classic children’s book *The Little House*, where the house has to defend itself against all of the development around it (Burton, 1942). It gets crowded out by skyscrapers and massive freeway systems, yet stands its ground, until it is ultimately moved out of the expanded city. The Casita was not moved, and did not survive. But the struggles it symbolized have certainly continued. For us, this made an apt metaphor for Hal’s life and legacy: while he is no longer with us, his legacy—both theoretical and practical—has maintained its strength.

Editors’ Post-Script 2015

Recently, Janise Hurtig and her UIC colleague Zitlali Morales initiated a new writing group at Whittier School; among the participants are three women who were involved in the Casita initiative. They have carried their community commitments and social change convictions into the group, animating each meeting with a sense of purpose and possibility. Already the group is exploring ways to organize parents to improve traffic safety around the school.

REFERENCES

- Burton, V.L. *The little house* (1942). New York: Houghton Mifflin.
- Gramsci, A. (1971). *Selections from the prison notebooks*, edited and translated by Quintin Hoare and Geoffrey Nowell Smith. New York: International Publishers.
- James, C. L. R. (1971). *Notes on dialectics: Hegel, Marx, Lenin*. Detroit: Friends of Facing Reality Publishers.
- Sojourner Truth Organization (1972). *The united front against imperialism?* Chicago: STO. Available at www.sojournertruth.net/unitedfront.html (accessed September 30, 2014).

- _____ (1976 [1971]). *Toward a Revolutionary Party: Ideas on Strategy and Organization*. Chicago: STO. Available at www.sojournertruth.net/tarp.html (accessed September 30, 2014).
- Staudenmaier, M. (2012). *Truth and revolution: A history of the Sojourner Truth Organization, 1969–1986*. Baltimore and Oakland: AK Press.
- Uetricht, M. (2010). “A Sit-In Success Story,” *YES Magazine*, November 18, 2010. Available on the internet at <http://www.yesmagazine.org/people-power/a-sit-in-success-story> (accessed October 5, 2014)
- Worchester, K. (1996). *C. L. R. James: A political biography*. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

NOTES

1. *Real Conditions*, Vol. 4, No. 3 (September, 2003).
2. Hal Adams, interview with Michael Staudenmaier, August 5, 2005. For more on the history of radicalism in Iowa, see the website <http://iowaradicalhistory.wordpress.com> which hosts transcribed documents from throughout the 20th century, with an emphasis on the 1970s. (Accessed January 21, 2015)
3. Hal Adams, interview with Michael Staudenmaier, August 5, 2005.
4. For a comprehensive history of STO, see Michael Staudenmaier, *Truth and Revolution: A History of the Sojourner Truth Organization, 1969–1986* (Baltimore and Oakland: AK Press, 2012).
5. The text of this pamphlet was written largely by Hamerquist.
6. This phrase recurs in Gramsci’s *Prison Notebooks*, notably on pages 9, 323, 344, and elsewhere.
7. The best overview of James in terms of his ideas and his activities remains Kent Worcester, *C. L.R. James: A Political Biography*. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press, 1996.
8. Hal Adams, interview with Michael Staudenmaier, August 5, 2005.
9. Ibid.
10. Hal Adams, email correspondence, January 18, 2011.
11. Ibid.
12. María Cristina, “For the Love of My Father,” *Real Conditions* Vol. 4, No. 3 (September, 2003), 8.
13. Hal Adams, email correspondence, November 11, 2010.