

**PROCEEDINGS of the
LAKE QUONNIPAUG
CONFERENCE**

Cover artwork by Comrade Lane of
the Shenandoah Cadre

PROCEEDINGS of the LAKE QUONNIPAUG CONFERENCE

The Connecticut Radical Reading Group

A Unity-Struggle-Unity Publication
www.unity-struggle-unity.org



Creative Commons ShareAlike License 2023 by Unity-Struggle-Unity Press

Print ISBN: 978-1-300-99406-0

Ebook ISBN: 978-1-300-99406-0

The peoples hear our clarion call and they awaken!

Table of Contents

Call for the Conference	3
Lake Quonnipaug Proposals	5
CTRRG Keynote: An Overview of the Movement in Its Current State.....	11
Report on Organizing in the Shenandoah Valley	19
Cincinnati Community Aid and Praxis Lake Quonnipaug Conference Report.....	43
Minutes of the Proceedings.....	45
Charter of the All-Empire Workers' League.....	53

Introduction

On September 7, 2024, the Connecticut Radical Reading Group (CTRRG) hosted a conference of Marxist and Marxist-Leninist organizations and unaffiliated individuals at Lake Quonnipaug, Connecticut for the purpose of discussing the formation of a league of organizations, tentatively dubbed the All-Empire Worker's League, which could allow coordination and communication to go forward with the eventual goal of founding a militant Communist party in the United States and Canada. In the lead-up to the convention, proposals were circulated by the CTRRG for the form of the conference and the potential league.

Ten organizations were present for some or all of the conference. Of those organizations, three met the criteria presented under the proposed Convention Agreement. As a first order of business, that Convention Agreement was edited and ratified. Thus, the conference was composed of three organizations with voice and vote, and seven observer organizations with voice but no vote. Each member organization possessed a single collective vote, which was cast unanimously in all instances.

Member Organizations:

- The **CTRRG**
 - Represented by Cdes. Gracchus, Frank, Jen, Will, and Andy
- **Cincinnati Community Aid and Praxis (CCAP)**
 - Represented by Cdes. Peter and Nails
- The **Atlantic Regional Communist Party (ARC)**
 - Represented by Cde. Mike

Observer Organizations:

- The **Cadre from Shenandoah (CS)**
 - Represented by Cdes. Abba, Koa, Lane, and Memphis
- **RedHelp ATX (RHATX)**
 - Represented by Cde. James
- **Unity of Fields (UF)**
 - Represented by Cde. Gray

- The **Kansas Socialist Book Club** (KSBC)
 - Represented by Cde. Persephone
- The **Western Massachusetts Popular University for Palestine**
 - <https://www.instagram.com/wmapopuni4pali/>
 - Represented by Cdes. Sachin, Lulu, and Aidan
- The **Ocean State Student-Worker Alliance** (OSSWA)
 - Represented by Cdes. Maria and Cde Sean

Observer Organizations who had Technical Trouble:

- **RedSails**
 - Represented by Cde. Alice
- **Chunka Luta**
 - Represented by Cde. Zitkato

Individual Observers

- Cde. Khadija from Brooklyn

The 22 attendees of the conference traveled from across the country to meet and discuss their work as Communists and the experience of their organizations.

At the close of business, a vote was held whether to form a federated league of organizations. The three Member Organizations, CCTRG, CCAP, and ARCP, voted in the affirmative. ARCP, however, was unable to commit to membership in the league immediately, as the ARCP delegate related labor shortages in their organization meant they needed to concentrate on the development of new member-cadre. Thus, the All-Empire Worker's League was formed with an immediate membership of two organizations. Certain observer organizations are consulting on applying for either full or candidate membership in the League.

The following journal contains the record of conference proceedings and all documents which were presented at the conference, in both original format and with any editing or amendment that was made while the conference was in session. It is organized into several sections. The first section is the initial call for the conference, with the documents that were circulated in the months, weeks, and days leading up to the meeting. The second section is the CTRRG keynote address on the Communist movement and its current state. The third section contains all the reports that were delivered during the conference in their full text. The fourth is the running minutes of the conference. The fifth and final section contains the ratified All-Empire Workers' League charter.

Call for the Conference

The Lake Quonnipaug Conference

September 6-8, 2024

September 7

- **9:00 - 9:30 AM: Welcome, Coffee**
Participants arrive, coffee and nametag making
- **9:30 - 10:00 AM: Org Introductions**
Brief introduction of each group, its members, and its location, and a brief description of its activities.
- **10:00 - 11:30 AM: CTRRG Report of the Movement, Tasks and Goals**
The CTRRG will deliver a short analysis of the current state of the movement and put forward a proposal for immediate goals for Marxist-Leninist organizations.
- **11:30 - 12:30 PM: Lunch**
- **12:30 - 2:00 PM: Organizational Reports**
More detailed reports from individual attending organizations.
- **2:00 - 2:30 PM: Coffee Break**
- **2:30 - 4:00 PM: Unification discussion, towards an all-empire Workers League**
Group discussion designed to address the challenges facing the movement, hopefully with the hammering out of basic principles.
- **4:00 - 5:00 PM: Formal votes and closing**
Any formal voting and debate matters will be taken up at this time.
- **5:00 PM: Dinner**

The Lake Quonnipaug Conference


September 6-8, 2024

September 7

When to Arrive

If you are coming for the business portion of the conference only, organization introductions begin at 9:30 AM on September 7 and the opening report begins at 10:00 AM. If you'd like to arrive on September 6, the location should be available after around 2 PM.

Where to Go

The conference and accommodations are located at  *Connecticut.*

What to Bring

If you are a delegate from an organization, please bring your organization's bylaws, a signed resolution indicating your powers to enter into preliminary agreements, a description of your organization's work, and (at your discretion) a detailed report to be delivered in the afternoon. If you have sleeping bags or air mattresses, it may be wise to bring those as well, as we will be adjusting accommodations based on the number of attendees over the course of the week.

Please Review the Conference Documents!

Lake Quonnipaug Proposals

The following proposals are divided into two sections: 1) the convention agreement which is intended to govern the actual conference taking place on September 7, 2024, at Lake Quonnipaug and 2) the proposed form of a loose organizational structure that can allow our various organizations to continue to hold conventions, communicate, and coordinate, during the time it takes to (re)establish a Communist party in the U.S. and Canada.

The convention agreement would govern the convention during its initial term and contemplates dissolving the convention itself into a broader form — the Quonnipaug Worker's League — which would serve as a secondary regional (or all-empire) organization and would itself dissolve once the party-to-be has held its first successful conference and begun the process of integrating all the disparate primary organizations into a single party.

The Quonnipaug Convention Agreement

Article I. IDEOLOGY

1. The ideology of the Convention is Marxism-Leninism.
2. The Convention views Marxism-Leninism as a living, organic body of revolutionary theory and methods of struggle, as the culmination of the experience of the history of revolutionary struggles, and shall therefore be guided by all universal advancements made to Marxism-Leninism by the experiences and contributions of revolutionaries in every country and by our particular application of Marxism-Leninism, in study and practice, to the conditions within and external to North America.
3. Furthermore, the Convention shall be guided by a genuinely revolutionary materialist feminism, distinguished from reformist and unscientific "Left" feminist trends by its recognition of gendered oppression as not merely ideological, but structural, and by its prioritization, in praxis, of organizing the most acutely gender-oppressed among the revolutionary masses towards self-emancipation.

Article II. FOUNDING PRINCIPLES

1. The Convention stands for the right of all peoples to self-determination and for the socialist transformation. As Communists, we stand for the total, universal liberation of humanity from all modes and structures of oppression, which entails the transformation of class society into communist society. The *Proposed 10-Point Program of the Quonnipaug Convention* is incorporated as Article V of this document.
2. The Convention recognizes that the revolutionary aims of Communism can only be accomplished through a period of revolutionary transformation, which in turn can only begin

with the initial victory of social revolutions: the seizure of state power by the oppressed masses, the abolition of the existing, reactionary order, and the establishment of People's Republics under the temporary, self-extinguishing rule of the Dictatorship of the Oppressed, which may also be called Dictatorships of the Oppressed [This reduplication was rectified during the first session, to read "Dictatorship of the Proletariat, which may also..."].

3. The Convention recognizes that social revolution only becomes possible when the revolutionary masses, having been united, organized, and galvanized under the leadership of a capable revolutionary vanguard, are prepared to launch an all-out war against the oppressing classes and to fight until victory is achieved. This vanguard can only be the Communist Party.
4. Therefore, in concrete terms, the Convention recognizes the necessity of creating the conditions necessary for the refoundation of the Communist Party that will lead the masses towards the social revolutions for decolonization, socialism, and the abolition of all structural oppression in North America.
5. Finally, the Convention recognizes that the ideology, methods of struggle, and mode of organization of a successful Communist Party, that is, one worthy of claiming the role of revolutionary vanguard and leading the masses, must be Marxism-Leninism applied to the conditions of North America.

Article III. STRUCTURE and MEMBERSHIP

1. The Convention shall be composed of Member and Candidate organizations. Member organizations of the Convention shall certify that they have:
 - a. A democratic structure (by submitting their rules, bylaws, or charter to be approved by the Convention);
 - b. A defined membership;
 - c. At least a nominal commitment to Marxism-Leninism; and,
 - d. Five or more members as certified by the organization's deputies.
2. Candidate organizations shall be any organizations in attendance that do not meet all of the requirements under Article III § 1 above.
3. Each Member organization shall collectively have one vote. That vote shall be cast by all of its delegates. Candidate organizations shall have voice but no vote.
4. Any attendee is who not a representative of a Member organization or a Candidate organization shall have voice but no vote as an Observer.

Article IV. AIM, PURPOSE, and TERM

1. The purpose of the Convention, its long-term aims, and the reason for its existence, is to unite all genuinely revolutionary, committed, and militantly active Communists across (and, in some

cases, beyond) North America, into a continent-spanning Marxist-Leninist formation that will become the refounded Communist Party. The basis for this purpose is our analysis of the situation of Communism in the U.S. and Canada, which is summarized as follows:

2. Two overwhelming, complimentary problems have prevented such a unification and refoundation, and thereby impeded the development of Communism in North America, since the revisionist degeneration of the CPUSA in the 1950s: On the one hand, the organized, centralized, All-U.S. Parties that have managed to last have been, with very few exceptions, revisionist from the outset, and have served only to draw in and pacify the greater mass of active Communists. (This includes the remnant CPUSA.) On the other hand, all anti-revisionist Parties and other formations have failed to last, because their members have, without exception, fractured and splintered at the slightest provocation of ideological impurity — while in most cases, at the same time, also failing to excise *actually* counter-revolutionary elements, such as racism and gender chauvinism. These problems are borne out of common attitudes, namely the American attitudes of exceptionalism, arrogance, egotism, and individualism, which stem from the common material basis of the settler-relation and American imperialism.
3. Thus, at present, lacking any viable centralized Party, the greater portion of genuinely revolutionary, committed, and militantly active Communists across are organized only in the most localized and atomized, however practically impressive, fashion, while most of the lesser portion are wasting away within revisionist, however centralized, Parties.
4. The first strategic aim of the Convention is to organize its constituent member-organizations into a formal organization of organizations and permit the Convention to coordinate activities between these organizations and direct joint struggle.
5. The second strategic aim of the Convention is to organize and host further unification efforts between Marxist and Marxist-Leninist primary organizations (circles, study groups, logistics organizations, etc.) either to join the current Convention and its League, or to create similar Leagues.
6. The third long-term strategic aim of the Convention, to which all its tactical and strategic methods are directed, is the establishment of a Unification Convention which shall lay the foundation of the Communist Party of North America.
7. This Convention shall become the central organ of the Worker's League of Marxist-Leninists upon the adoption of the League structure.

Article V. TEN-POINT PROGRAM

1. The overthrow and total abolition of the fundamentally illegitimate and irredeemable United States and its junior partner, Canada;
2. Black and Indigenous sovereignty over their respective indigenous homelands and/or rightfully claimed national territories, in forms that will be collectively and democratically decided by each people, nation, and community on its own terms, on the basis of mutual respect for the right of all peoples to self-determination;

3. Partition of any remaining (that is, unclaimed) territories into a centralized union of local socialist states, wherein self-determination for all oppressed peoples, nations, and communities is guaranteed;
4. Reparations in the forms of wealth, land, and labor, to be forcibly extracted from the U.S.-Canadian imperialist and settler bourgeoisie, landed colonial aristocracy, and other exploiting classes, as well as from the colonial police and imperialist military, and justly redistributed to the victims of U.S.-Canadian colonialism and Western capitalist imperialism;
5. A program for structural depatriarchalization, focused on true emancipation for women and LGBT people; the reorganization of social labor, the labors of production and reproduction, on gender-equal lines; the abolition of all outmoded institutions, industries, and medical, professional, and cultural practices that rely on gendered violence and maintain gendered oppression; justice for all victims and survivors of sexual violence — in short, the beginning of the end of gendered oppression in all its forms;
6. Preparation for humanity's collective survival of the ecological devastation wrought by modern colonialism and capitalism in the pursuit of worldwide environmental justice through internationalist cooperation and reparations;
7. Abolition of outmoded and inhumane models of "justice," including modern police, jails and prisons, psychiatric "hospitals," and other such institutions, to be replaced with models of revolutionary justice;
8. Defense of the revolution, including the ruthless defeat and suppression of all reactionary classes and counter-revolutionary forces, especially the forces of white supremacy, within North America, through an organized and sustained campaign of Red Terror;
9. Internationalism, put into practice by supporting the independent economic development and self-reliance of the world's underdeveloped countries and regions, by forming comradely alliances with socialist countries, and by supplying aid to revolutionary struggles across the world;
10. The democratically self-determined, cooperative, ecologically sustainable development of socialism in every state that emerges from the total decolonization of the North American continent, planned and administered by the revolutionary Dictatorship of the Oppressed.

Proposed Form of the Quonnipaug Worker's League

PREAMBLE. Where no party or organization currently exists which has the faith of the workers or possess the true form of democratic centralism in the settler-occupied states of the U.S. or its junior partner in imperialism, Canada, and where the formation of such an organization is of central importance to our movement, and where that organization must immediately grapple with the national question in such a way as to defeat the settler-chauvinism that has corrupted and destroyed all past attempts at establishing a Marxist-Leninist organization, we, the constituent members of the League of Occupied North America (Marxist-Leninist) hereby set out the following rules and

regulations, agreed upon, to allow us to maintain cohesion as we plan for the convention of a proper conference of unification to found the Communist Party of North America.

Article I: LEAGUE MEMBERSHIP

1. Membership in the Workers League of Occupied North America (Marxist-Leninist) shall be open to any organization in the United States, Canada, or any of the nations currently imprisoned therein, which has:
 - a. Formal bylaws or regulations that do not conflict with this charter;
 - b. Defined membership and membership responsibilities, which must include the regular payment of dues and performance of labor;
 - c. A professed and actual commitment to Marxism-Leninism, to the national liberation of the subject nations of the U.S. settler-republic and its junior partner Canada as well as all its subjects and vassals, and has codified such commitments as part of its most basic rules;
 - d. A membership of at least five (5) full members;
2. The process of joining the League shall be through application by an organization or solicitation from the League. Applicant organizations shall:
 - a. Submit their most recent bylaws or charter for consideration and ratification;
 - b. Submit a brief statement setting out their work, connection with the masses, if any, and geographical location;
 - c. Submit a resolution, passed by their organization according to its forms, demonstrating a desire to join the League, which must be signed by that organization's record keeper attesting it to be correct.
3. The League shall consider all pending applications either in full session or by means of a Membership Committee, but in any case no less than once each month.
4. The League shall either:
 - a. Accept such application;
 - b. Recommend revisions to the bylaws or charter of the applicant and suggest resubmission; or,
 - c. Reject such application.
5. In any case, the League will promptly communicate its decision to the applicant organization.
6. Candidate organizations may be admitted to league business and conventions upon application and approval. To be eligible as a candidate organization, an organization must be at least nominally Marxist and possess an actual organizational form. Candidate organizations which have been recognized by the Membership Committee and approved by a vote shall have the right to participate in all League discussions and send delegates to all League events and meetings in a number as determined for member organizations under Article II below, but in any case no fewer than one delegate.

Article II: DELEGATES

1. Each member organization shall maintain an up-to-date count of its active membership and shall submit such count to the League once every three months.
2. Each member organization shall be entitled to elect one delegate for every five active members in its organization or fraction thereof.
3. These delegates shall be selected democratically. Each organization shall submit certified minutes wherein elections of each delegate were held as well as the vote counts electing each delegate to the Article III Credentialing Committee prior to the Convention.
4. Any member organization that does not meet the requirements under Article I may nevertheless join and send delegates, but will not be permitted to vote on League matters.

Article III: STRUCTURE

1. The League shall not interfere with or direct its constituent organizations except insofar as such interference or direction is either: i) necessary for the furtherance of the strategic goals of the League as determined by either the Convention or its executive committee, or ii) such interference or direction is requested by the member organization.
2. The League shall hold a Convention once yearly, which shall constitute its highest organ.
3. Prior to each Convention, a Credentialing Committee shall be assembled from all credentialed League organizations, to optimally consist of one member democratically selected by each. This Credentialing Committee shall assess delegate credentials and issue the same at the Convention.
4. The Convention shall elect, each year, an executive committee composed of five members who shall direct the activities of the League in accordance with the direction and resolutions adopted by the previous Convention.

Article IV: PRINCIPLES

It is proposed that the Worker's League adopt the principles and program outlined in the Convention documents.

CTRRG Keynote: An Overview of the Movement in Its Current State

The Russian Social-Democratic Labour Party, which would give birth to the Bolshevik faction and ultimately the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and the science of Marxism-Leninism, held its founding conference in 1898 in the city of Minsk. The Communist Party of China was founded on July 1, 1921. In both cases, the parties were created out of the union of study circles as their principal element. The unification of these study circles into militant revolutionary parties was a necessary step on the road to social revolution. No such solid history undergirds the so-called “parties” in the U.S. and Canada today. Here and now, on September 7th of 2024, fully 126 years after the founding of the RSDLP and 103 after the founding of the CPC, the date in the most powerful capitalist empire in the world might as well be 1897.

Not only did the U.S.-Canadian movement never establish a solid foundation — thanks, in part, to the ComIntern’s merger of the CPA and SPA in the early 20th century and the failure to establish an organizational safeguard against the latent reformism and opportunism that already plagued those formations — we have a century of false starts and the wreckage they created to deal with. At the heart of what we can call the American errors are 1) the failure to establish national liberation of the Black nation and captive Indigenous nations as a special stage in the U.S. revolution due to the settler-colonial relations, and 2) the failure to establish gender liberation as a bedrock principle of Communist organization. I can confidently state that, had those issues been properly addressed by the overwhelmingly white petit-bourgeois leaders of the early CPUSA — had the party not sidelined and then expelled Harry Haywood and the other so-called “Black nationalists,” every other error would have been, if not avoided, at least avoidable.

The list of secondary and subsidiary errors made by the movement in the U.S. over the course of the 20th century is too long to enumerate today. Now, we must assess the current conditions and put forward a program and plan that takes these conditions into account. What are these conditions?

Rightism Predominates

The overwhelming tendency on the U.S.-Canadian left has historically been and continues to be the predominance of rightist deviations from Marxism-Leninism. This has manifested as opportunism — the adoption of politically popular but non-Communist positions to maintain personal power and popularity — as revisionism — the “revising” of Marxism to remove its revolutionary content — as tailism — the adoption of positions which are already no longer relevant to the masses and their consciousness because they appear to be “safe” — and as simple reformism. The reason for these deviations is manifestly a desire to preserve the system of capitalist exploitation because the corrupt leadership of these formations does not in fact desire a world in which the benefits of national oppression have been eliminated. If the choice, they reckon, is between being socialist but eliminating whiteness, or being capitalist but nice, they proclaim: “Let me be capitalist – but let me be white.”

In other words, the movement has never progressed in any meaningful sense beyond the social chauvinism of the Second International.

To protect their social chauvinist lines, the U.S. and Canadian formations have adopted a perversion of democratic centralism. They cannot admit full democratic participation within their parties because to do so would be to invite real revolutionaries in and jeopardize their century-long legacy of tailism and legal Marxism. Over time, as leadership became insulated from democratic pressure, they parroted the justification of “professional revolutionaries” to give themselves unassailable perquisites, such that leadership in one of these parties comes with stipends, apartments, and paychecks. Every word ever written by Marx, Engels, Lenin, Stalin, or the founders of the CPC, can be perverted once the living legacy is gone. These parties have adopted the political slogans, but emptied them of meaning and now they spout them to justify the inverse policies of the historical revolutionaries. They are, in a very real sense, traitors to the cause of revolution.

Leftism Is the Natural Response

The predominance of rightism in the movement throws up its own dialectical shadow: ultra-leftism. When it is impossible to participate in a party with a revolutionary line, and where the existing parties pervert and corrupt the revolutionary line into a reformist one, committed revolutionaries are prone to leftist errors. These are made as a result of the predominant rightist errors, and sometimes even made knowingly, as a corrective. But it is not the ultraleftist deviation that currently threatens the integrity of the movement. The ultraleftists could be brought back into the revolutionary fold of correct theory and practice if (and only if) the rightist deviation were defeated.

The most pervasive version of this ultra-leftist response is what we have jokingly called “anarcho-maoism” in the past. This is a form of extreme misreading combined with doctrinaire book worship of Mao Zedong while excluding the historical context of his works (for instance, the fact that the Communist Party of China was already iron-strong compared to the limp-noodle parties of the modern West) and to essentially read him as an anarchist. Anarcho-maoism focuses almost entirely on “doing the work,” and utterly rejects all attempts to produce and agree upon correct revolutionary theory as “philosophizing.” Anarcho-maoism advocates narrow, local work to connect with the masses above and beyond the work of organizing a functioning party. This is a dangerous deviation, because it deprives us of both the theoretical and practical basis upon which to build up the Communist Party.

Without revolutionary theory, there can be no revolutionary movement.

Without the Communist Party, there would have been no new China.

The First Weapon of the Proletariat Is Organization

All across the left, the mistaken call goes up: “just do the work.” Many sources tell us not to worry about the party-form, that we don’t need it yet or that it will arise “naturally” as we connect with the masses. This is a holdover or expression of the same anarcho-maoist ideology which we criticized above. It may also manifest as a type of Third Worldism in which the job of overthrowing the empire is shrugged off from its historical subject, the U.S.-Canadian proletariat, and thrust upon those who are already the most oppressed by the imperial machine, the Third World proletariat. These are two

different types of ultra-left capitulationism, two different ways of ignoring the world-historic task set out before us, and ultimately feed back into the rightist belief that the United States capitalist empire is too powerful to be overthrown; the rightists and segments of the ultra-left both ask us to adopt a “holding pattern” until the day that American capitalism falters and a new horizon comes into view.

Other ultra-left sects demand immediate application of terror tactics, the formation of combat organizations, open revolt against the enemy state. This, too, is incorrect. Even in the conditions of a fully-formed party as in Russia, combat organizations of socialists were often used by the Tsarist secret police, the Okhrana, to crack down on socialists, to jail them, to hang them. The use of terror split the socialists from the masses, who were not prepared for it, and isolated these lone terrorists; stranded and alone, they were unable to spark a mass movement.

If our weapons are not, at this stage, arms (guns, bombs, bullets) nor survival programs (food, shelter, showers), then what are they? The chief weapon of the proletarian class is organization. Although our enemy is already organized and supplied with both its main force (the state in the form of police and the armed forces) and its auxiliaries (paramilitary settler-garrison societies like the Oathkeepers), the strength of our enemy does not lie in its organization, but rather in its command of the productive property, capital, and political power. To challenge the concentrated power of the capitalists, which is everywhere funneled down from the glass and steel towers into the battering ram of the police on the street, we must be capable of exerting concentrated proletarian power.

Revolutionary capacity — proletarian class power — is a special characteristic of an organization that is organized in a certain way and which possesses an authentic connection with the masses and which develops and adheres to the correct revolutionary theory. The power of the proletariat is expressed in these two simple truisms:

1. The proletariat is the necessary workforce for all social production and,
2. The proletariat is the fundamental basis, the social foundation, of all capitalist society.

One proletarian alone cannot access the strength implicit in either of these statements. One proletarian cannot alone convince the class to resist the capitalists' blandishments and lies. So long as the class remains disorganized, this power is latent, sleeping. Only once the class has become organized in a highly disciplined form according to true democratic principles and along Marxist-Leninist lines can it exert its class power. What is the vehicle for this organization? It is the revolutionary political party.

Will it be built spontaneously? No. Only through dedicated study, hard struggle, and long hours of labor will it come into being. The first task of every cell of the Party-to-be must be the production of new, militant, revolutionaries. That is one reason why Unity–Struggle–Unity is working with RedSails on a schema for a series of political education courses.

A Party of a New Kind? No! A Party of the Correct Kind

We have already acknowledged that we lack this vehicle above, that there is no militant, disciplined, revolutionary political party currently organized on the correct lines that would enable the

revolutionary class to exert its class-power here in the U.S. or Canada.

What are the hallmarks of the vanguard party? In both Tsarist Russia and the Qing Empire, the Communist Parties were formed from the unification of study circles and struggle leagues: local, primary organizations that operated on the ground. We must study the party-formation period of these two organizations to learn the "secrets" of what came before. In Russia, where incorrect socialist theories made the formation of the party difficult, one of the preconditions of party formation was the demolition of those theories to pave the way for the RSDLP

As Comrade Stalin wrote in the Short Course History of the CPSU (Bolsheviks), (and here, comrades, I apologize, as I will quote at length):

In a number of his writings during this period Lenin criticized the methods of political struggle employed by the principal Narodnik group, the "Narodnaya Volya," and later by the successors of the Narodniks, the Socialist-Revolutionaries — especially the tactics of individual terrorism. Lenin considered these tactics harmful to the revolutionary movement, for they substituted the struggle of individual heroes for the struggle of the masses. They signified a lack of confidence in the revolutionary movement of the people.

In the book, What the "Friends of the People" Are, Lenin outlined the main tasks of the Russian Marxists. In his opinion, the first duty of the Russian Marxists was to weld the disunited Marxist circles into a united Socialist workers' party. He further pointed out that it would be the working class of Russia, in alliance with the peasantry, that would overthrow the tsarist autocracy, after which the Russian proletariat, in alliance with the labouring and exploited masses, would, along with the proletariat of other countries, take the straight road of open political struggle to the victorious Communist revolution.

...

Of immense significance, too, was Lenin's struggle against "legal Marxism." It usually happens with big social movements in history that transient "fellow-travelers" fasten on them. The "legal Marxists," as they were called, were such fellow-travelers. Marxism began to spread widely throughout Russia; and so we found bourgeois intellectuals decking themselves out in a Marxist garb. They published their articles in newspapers and periodicals that were legal, that is, allowed by the tsarist government. That is why they came to be called "legal Marxists."

After their own fashion, they too fought Narodism. But they tried to make use of this fight and of the banner of Marxism in order to subordinate and adapt the working-class movement to the interests of bourgeois society, to the interests of the bourgeoisie. They cut out the very core of Marxism, namely, the doctrine of the proletarian revolution and the dictatorship of the proletariat. One prominent legal Marxist, Peter Struve, extolled the bourgeoisie, and instead of calling for a revolutionary struggle against capitalism, urged that "we acknowledge our lack of culture and go to capitalism for schooling."

In the fight against the Narodniks Lenin considered it permissible to come to a temporary agreement with the "legal Marxists" in order to use them against the Narodniks, as, for example, for the joint publication of a collection of articles directed against the Narodniks. At the same time, however, Lenin was unsparing in his criticism of the "legal Marxists" and exposed their liberal bourgeois nature.

...

In 1898 several of the Leagues of Struggle — those of St. Petersburg, Moscow, Kiev and Ekaterinoslav — together with the Bund made the first attempt to unite and form a Social-Democratic

party. For this purpose they summoned the First Congress of the Russian Social-Democratic Labour Party (RSDLP), which was held in Minsk in March 1898.

The First Congress of the RSDLP was attended by only nine persons. Lenin was not present because at that time he was living in exile in Siberia. The Central Committee of the Party elected at the congress was very soon arrested. The Manifesto published in the name of the congress was in many respects unsatisfactory. It evaded the question of the conquest of political power by the proletariat, it made no mention of the hegemony of the proletariat, and said nothing about the allies of the proletariat in its struggle against tsardom and the bourgeoisie.

In its decisions and in its Manifesto the congress announced the formation of the Russian Social-Democratic Labour Party.

It is this formal act, which played a great revolutionary propagandist role, that constituted the significance of the First Congress of the RSDLP

But although the First Congress had been held, in reality no Marxist Social-Democratic Party was as yet formed in Russia. The congress did not succeed in uniting the separate Marxist circles and organizations and welding them together organizationally. There was still no common line of action in the work of the local organizations, nor was there a party program, party rules or a single leading centre.

For this and for a number of other reasons, the ideological confusion in the local organizations began to increase, and this created favourable ground for the growth within the working-class movement of the opportunist trend known as "Economism."

It required several years of intense effort on the part of Lenin and of Iskra (Spark), the newspaper he founded, before this confusion could be overcome, the opportunist vacillations put an end to, and the way prepared for the formation of the Russian Social-Democratic Labour Party.

In contrast, the Communist Party of China faced a relatively easier road to consolidation. The incorrect tactics, theory, and practice of the 19th century had already been exposed globally by the foundation of the Bolsheviks and the triumphs of October by the time the labor struggles intensified in China. There were no major competing socialist formations for the Communists of China to sweep away. Instead, Li Dazhou, a Chinese peasant born in 1889 who became the librarian and professor of Peking University in 1917 and who had fought for national liberation of the Chinese people, founded a study circle in Beijing that would become the core of the party. He also began to publish a Marxist newspaper designed to unify the budding Marxists in the country.

As a result of the leadership of Li Dazhou's study group during the May Fourth Movement protesting the continued national humiliation of China under the Versailles treaty, Li's protest against the Paris Peace Conference of 1919, etc. he became one of the leading lights of Marxism in China. Along with Chen Duxiu, Li built up the basic organizations that would unify to become the Communist Party of China.

Both the RSDLP and the Communist Party of China were constructed not out of whole cloth; not conjured into being by the dictate of a central organ, but through the diligent creation and unification of local, primary, organizations.

But What is the Party of the Correct Type?

Let us look at the structure of the CPSU and the CPC, the debates around their forms and

formations, to understand the structure of a Marxist-Leninist party, for we will not find it incarnated in the so-called "parties" of the United States or Canada.

The split between the Menshevik and Bolshevik factions in the RSDLP, which led directly to the foundation of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, was precipitated around the question of "Paragraph 1" of the party rules draft presented by Julius Martov for the second party congress, held in 1903. This concerned membership in the party and what was required to be a member. Martov's draft became the party rules for the Mensheviks; Lenin's, for the Bolsheviks.

Martov's draft reads: "A member of the Russian Social-Democratic Labour Party is one who, accepting its programme, works actively to accomplish its aims under the control and direction of the organs of the Party." Comrade Lenin took issue with this formulation, correctly stating that this was "only an empty phrase. That Party members must work under the control and direction of the organs of the Party goes without saying; it cannot be otherwise, and only those talk about it who love to talk without saying anything... can the organs of the Party exercise actual direction over Party members who do not belong to any of the Party organizations?" Comrade Lenin's reformulation was that members must belong to a Party organization.

And what does Comrade Lenin say about the Party at large? In *One Step Forward, Two Steps Back*, he writes "The word 'organisation' is commonly employed in two senses, a broad and a narrow one. In the narrow sense it signifies an individual nucleus of a collective of people with at least a minimum degree of coherent form. In the broad sense it signifies the sum of such nuclei united into a whole... the Party is an organisation, should be an organisation (in the broad sense of the word); at the same time, the Party should consist of a whole number of diversified organisations (in the narrow sense of the word)." He says, "The Party should be a sum (and not the mere arithmetical sum, but a complex) of organisations."

At the same time, the Bolsheviks had to struggle mightily against the "circle principle," the idea that individual party organizations had "rights" of their own. The party is more than just a sum of organizations, an organization of organizations, but a unity divided into cells. Comrade Lenin and the Bolsheviks also struggled over what democratic centralism meant. In 1906, Comrade Lenin published *Freedom to Criticise and Unity of Action* in which he strictly defined democratic centralism's relation to criticism. This is critical, because criticism and self-criticism is the chief weapon of struggle within the Party (which we will see when we turn to Comrade Mao's *On Correcting Mistaken Ideas In The Party* and other writings): "The principle of democratic centralism and autonomy for local Party organisations implies the universal and full freedom to criticise, so long as this does not disturb the unity of a definite action; it rules out all criticism which disrupts or makes difficult the unity of an action decided on by the Party."

In our context, a primary organization is therefore the cellular network of Marxists working in any given region, enterprise, or locality and performing real work to develop its membership in political understanding of Marxism-Leninism as well as developing connections with the masses and elevating their consciousness. In essence, the organically-forming local Marxist organizations already engaged in real Marxist work, from ongoing logistics and survival mass-oriented programs to political education and cadre-building, are the basic stuff of which the Party will and must be made. In other words, the organizations that have sent delegates to this very conference are the building blocks of the Party-to-be. We will hear reports of work later today in order to more fully understand and communicate the conditions in each region that is represented here.

Class Consciousness is Rising

What else typifies our current moment in the heart of the U.S.-Canadian capitalist block? The tide of class consciousness has reached a lifelong high. Why is this? To put it very simply indeed, we have come to the end of a long period of capitalist-imperialist stabilization in which Western capital was relatively more powerful and secure than it had been and we are entering — or have entered, with the outbreak of war in Ukraine and Palestine — a period of instability and crisis.

Beginning in 1991 with the forceful disintegration of the USSR and the reopening of one sixth of the surface of the earth to Western capital and the depredations of its markets, the instability of the imperial centers in Washington, London, and Berlin was more or less ameliorated. This doesn't mean there weren't a series of crises within the Western block; the crash of 2008 and the Eurozone debt crisis of 2009 are stand out examples of the periodic capitalist crises evidenced even during this period of stabilization. However, the periodic crises did not throw the Western capitalist block into a sustained depression. The Western capitalists were able to crawl out of the occasional and intermittent holes into which they stumbled by virtue of the overall character of stabilization.

This period lasted roughly thirty years, between 1991 and 2019. In 2020, the COVID crisis erupted across the world and stabilization can be said to have come to a close. As the Western block began to decompensate, other signals of this shift in the overall character of capitalism emerged: the 2020 June Uprisings in the U.S., the 2022 invasion of Ukraine to prevent the joining of that country into the NATO block, the 2023 invasion of Palestine in response to the heroic October 7 strikes, etc. Civil unrest within the core of the capitalist block has become endemic, and periods of calm are relatively fewer and shorter between. Labor struggles have become more acute, and several major strikes have either been broken by the U.S. government or capitulated through their leadership. Standards of living are decreasing in the imperial core. Despite the muttering of bourgeois mouthpieces, actual wages have fallen sharply. The median household income in 2019 was roughly \$69,000/year. At the current rate of inflation between 2019 and 2024, that would have had to rise to \$85,000/year to maintain its equivalent purchasing power. In actuality, the median household income in the first quarter of 2024 is roughly \$59,000/year. That is a fall of 14%.

The imperialist contract, the promise of superprofits in exchange for class peace, has broken down.

National consciousness is also rising. It is, in fact, national liberation that will provide the wedge that will split apart the capitalist block and put an end to the Western capitalist empire. Every time class consciousness rises and then recedes, it reaches a higher resting state and the next explosion of consciousness carries the high-water mark further and faster, leading to progressively more intense bursts of class-activity. The U.S.-Canadian proletariat is not yet aware of itself as a class-in-itself, but this awareness is growing. As the awareness of American imperialism becomes more widespread, the basic features of class are becoming more and more widely known. As the system of imperialist spoils and the distribution of imperialist superprofits breaks down, the working classes of the capitalist empire are beginning to rise, to look around them, and to realize their actual position vis-a-vis the ruling classes. Each failed rising creates a new population of activists who are aware, who are becoming more well-versed in organizing techniques and tactics, and who have seen the state repress their movement. There is a straight line through the sixteen years between Occupy and the 2024 Student Intifada.

It is now our task to harness that rising tide. The Communists must stand at the forefront of all progressive movements, and there is nothing more world-progressive than attacks on U.S. empire across the world. At this time, resistance against the imperial genocide of Palestine, backed by the U.S. colonialists for the security and profit of the zionist state, is the forefront of the class struggle. It is recognized as the forefront of the global class struggle across the world. This is our proving ground.

Building Capacity; Building the Party

It is now our duty, then, to build the basic blocks of the Party-to-be so they can be united in an inter-circle struggle. Today we are taking the first tentative steps toward unification. It may be that, like the first Congress of the RSDLP, we fail to achieve our lofty goals today. We have set our sights high. Yet, even should we fall short, the fires we light today will help us clearly see the way forward.

In order to settle theoretical issues once and for all, we must have an organization capable of democratically debating them and testing them against the world through manifest practical action. That organization is none other than the Communist Party — I don't say reborn or reforged, because the Communist Party in the U.S. Empire has always been compromised, going all the way back to its foundation. Let us say a real Communist Party of a type that has not been seen in the U.S.-Canadian block before.

The road to the militant party is long, but we are embarking on that journey today. We must create organizations capable of reproducing Communist cadre. We must pool our resources together, use the technological advances that unlock our capacity to work across regions, across cities, across the continent. We must labor diligently toward the day we can confront the enemy state.

History is with us. The time is right. It is the tidal force of history that brought all of us here today to embark on this great project. It is my suggestion — and to be clear, not mine alone, but developed with the other theoreticians at Unity–Struggle–Unity and the members of the Connecticut Radical Reading Group — that we must first unite in an organization of organizations, continue working toward a loose effective unity across the entire empire, then, when we have brought together those circles, to unify them such that they are no longer a federation of organizations but a single, powerful, militant, revolutionary political Party that can challenge the enemy state on every field: economic, political, military.

We propose today nothing short of casting the very metal from which the social revolution will be forged!

Report on Organizing in the Shenandoah Valley

1st Draft For Presentation at The Lake Quonnipaug Conference

on Saturday, September 7th, 2024

Written By Comrades Abba, Koa, Memphis, and Lane

Edited by Comrade Rain

Let us learn the truth from our own experiences. Mao said, "Experiences' are all things that objectively (concretely) happen: and 'truth' is their internal cohesiveness, those laws that affect them, and 'research' is the study part."

Analyzing the condition and the struggle to change it is a continuing process.

-Activist Study, Araling Aktibista (ARAK)

Introduction

Araling Aktibista (Activist Study) is part of the required study for activists in the Filipino revolutionary movement. Our comrades in The Philippines who published this course of study in 1999 have a depth of knowledge and understanding, notably revolving around reaching correct and revolutionary analysis, which we constantly pull from. The text states, "It is through analysis that we are able to deeply understand why things and events work. The conclusions that are formed by correct analysis guides us in the most important step in our study—putting it in practice. Let us therefore study how we analyze things and events" (The CPP). As communists, we want to understand how things work! This is a skill that must be built and maintained if we are to lead and direct the struggles against Capitalism and Imperialism. The Araling Aktibista also states, "More often, it is hard to obtain correct conclusions even if there is enough or even more than enough data collected. In relation to this, it might also be due to the lack of applying principles learned in studies that we are not able to tie up the loose data"(The CPP). This potential problem is one we hope to confront through struggle and synthesis. This is why we are prepared to present this report openly and discuss it. We are a small cell of communists who have recently undergone great organizational change, and we understand we are not infallible and must be checked on our analysis and our methods. The purpose of this report is exactly this, and we hope all readers take this assignment very seriously! We ask our readers to mull over this document, pick it apart, and share even minor gripes with us. It is understood among us that through this process we will all become not only better communists, but better writers, researchers, and editors. In addition to this goal, we hope we can advance our collective understanding by describing our experiences and observation of the motion of the study group model and organizing in general.

The document will follow a chronological order of events from which authors can recall. The purpose is to provide context to the Revolutionary and organizational action in Harrisonburg.

Chronological Recollection and Analysis of Organization

Harrisonburg has a long history of attempts at progressive organization (even if they have hitherto been co-opted or controlled from the outset by liberals). In 2018, after failed attempts to create a local DSA chapter and subsequent disillusion with DSA National and Social Democracy, a few like minded comrades created the Shenandoah Socialist Collective (SSC). A constitution was drafted and two bodies formally recognized— The General Body and The Central Committee, with about 10-15 members across both. There was also a Statement of Principles, which functionally served as a Points of Unity as it was required these principles be adhered to by membership. The Constitution of SSC defines membership according to the following:

1. The General Body includes all members in good standing.
2. The General Body is ultimately responsible for determining the organization's policies and priorities and for carrying out its political project. The General Body may delegate responsibilities to members or an appropriate Standing Committee.
3. The General Body has the power to form or disband Standing Committees, determine the scope of their purpose and powers, and appoint a chair to each committee.
4. The General Body may set membership dues, but must consider financial hardship. Inability to pay dues must not be a barrier to membership and participation.
5. The General Body may appoint a Treasurer, but will maintain ultimate authority over the use of funds at all times.

We are not entirely sure how closely the membership section, The Statement of Principles, or The Constitution was followed before our arrival, however, in the time three of the authors of this document (Abba, Memphis, and Lane) spent in SSC, none of these structures outlined in the constitution were formally followed. Cde. Abba and Lane joined SSC in 2019 and Cde. Memphis joined in 2020.

The main activity of SSC prior to Summer 2020 was limited to irregular, informal meetings, cookouts, and occasional flyering of general, unfocused agit-prop. Collective study occurred occasionally, but was irregular, and eventually abandoned altogether in favor of simply relying on individual study. A lack of clear program or real organization left SSC in the ineffective position of being a group of Socialists sitting around, waiting for the opportunity to tail any struggle that might arise. In his article, *Lessons from Practical Work: The Taxonomy of Local Organization*, Cde. Katsfoter describes this type of organization as; "Category 4, the social investigation organization." It is important to note that while SSC's form resembled organization, it could not meaningfully be called an organization. A more accurate description would be an interest group that communicated primarily through digital means.

During this time Cde. Abba and Lane were fledgling members of SSC. Both had high revolutionary energy and were excited to get involved in organized political action. As SSC was poorly organized, and offered little in terms of political programs, our energy was directed towards unfocused independent action; which regularly veered into adventurism for adventure's sake, such as

sporadic flyering and urban exploration missions. Most projects were driven by a wish to cause small nuisances and agitations to the local petit bourgeois. Without any organization guiding our revolutionary energy, we jumped from project to project. Slowly, as we developed our understanding of communist practical work, we began to engage in reckless or unfocused political action less, getting more involved with the inner workings of SSC.

In Summer 2020, at the height of the George Floyd Uprisings, SSC grasped the national momentum and tailed other local organizations in mobilization attempts. This included a large demonstration followed by scattered attempts at copwatch style action; including door to door preparation for police walks and sharing of legal rights and protections. All of this culminated in our armed defense of a handful of BLM mobilizations throughout the valley, but this armed defense was thrown together hastily. We were approached by BLM organizers after they had faced threats from local white supremacist militias. Through 2020, we lacked a materialist understanding of organization; unable to organize a copwatch program (Katsfoter's Program Type 1E). We had no definite organizational form, no relationship of members to one another, member duties, and no regular meetings.

COVID-19 and Shenandoah Mutual Aid

Once easy mobilization opportunities within the 2020 uprisings had fizzled away, we began to turn our focus to "mutual aid" work. After failing to coalesce around copwatch organization, the COVID-19 pandemic presented the opportunity and need for a survival-logistics organization. After all, we had all seen the multitude of these organizations forming around the country after 2020, and we seemed suited to the work, having a sufficient amount of resources and personnel required for carrying out the task. These efforts began through the creation of an ancillary organization specifically designed for this work—Shenandoah Mutual Aid (SMA). SMA utilized Google Forms, a mailing list, social media, and a Venmo to carry out the task of providing aid on an as-requested basis. Forms for requesting assistance were shared via social media and flyering campaigns. Most of the services we provided were delivering groceries, giving rides, and one instance of home repair. There was no politicization of these programs.

SMA was again, a loose, informal structure with no clearly defined duties of its membership or material organizational relationship. This begs the question— why did we form SMA and not just conduct this work in SSC?

The initial construction of SMA took place in the minds of leadership, even if we were materially lacking the necessity for such organization, or efforts were needed in other areas. The grandiose vision was for SSC to serve as the local vanguard organization, with SMA serving the role of the above-ground, legally recognized mass-organization. We were over organizing, which will be a common error we run into. It's clear SSC was in no shape to function as a vanguard organization—we did not even have a capable cadre of revolutionaries yet! Thus, the error of idealism leads to over-organization. A common mistake we made was to build and construct the ideal in our minds eye and then over-organize in an attempt to mangle reality to fit our vision, with no reverence for the actual material reality! It is clear to the authors of this document now that Idealism was the primary theme of all the errors prior to SRSO.

The Breakfast Program

The longest running program of Shenandoah Mutual Aid was The People's Breakfast Program (PBP). This started from the onset in a scattered, loose phase of mobile breakfast distribution to people around town. We loaded a wagon full of water and non-perishable foods and distributed largely to the homeless population and anyone else we came across. There was little politicization, which included brief conversations during the distribution of food, and passing out Marxist literature.

The second phase of the PBP is characterized by higher coordination and routine. In tandem with the regularity of CC meetings in 2021, we set a twice-weekly routine of food distribution, and conducted the program at a central location—Open Doors, a homeless shelter near downtown Harrisonburg. The little politicization of the program continued into this phase in a similar form, and became more focused, reflecting our renewed level of organization and routine meetings. We now had the ability to openly analyze the politicization of the program and plan and task for logistics. We were relatively effectively synthesizing the concerns of the masses and building plans. We could come back to the masses and consistently find ways of demonstrating the correct path forward. Our organizational level with the advent of routine meetings had increased relatively but not to a sufficient level to begin funneling these advanced sections of the masses into our organization. In reality, this politicization resulted in a slow, general level of consciousness raising which resulted in a spontaneous sit-in at Open Doors in response to the worsening conditions. Further, because of our regularness of routine and reliability, we became the primary option for the homeless community to share concerns and grievances. We would discuss methods of resolution and give advice, but were unable to take these grievances and fully politicize them and advance the struggle.

The third and final phase of The PBP consisted of a change in location to Our Community Place (OCP). OCP is a local non-profit designed to offer services to the lowest strata of the local proletariat and sub-proletariat— primarily the homeless population. This phase is also characterized by massive organizational, logistical, and political decline of both SSC and The PBP (with the disorganization and liquidation of our internal structures affecting the two latter aspects). We became comfortable relying on informal structures (as the organization's structures were liquidated). Also we focused conversations on the social connections we had made in the second phase; over-relying on those preformed connections instead of forging new connections and heightening the struggle. We again regressed to tailism. We were content with focusing on the issues of the masses only as they were delivered to us, instead of synthesizing the issues and returning to the masses with a plan for advancement. As time went on, we over-relied on and ceded ground to sections of the masses which could now be described as backward, reactionary sections, which should have been isolated.

In light of all of these errors, we realized that we did not have the requisite organization to properly run a revolutionary aid program. Ultimately, we decided to end the program to allow us the time and labor to construct a real organization, with the understanding that a similar program may be developed once we had the capability for it. The PBP ran for three years, and despite its demise, brought us a wealth of social connections and trust within the community.

The Group Chat Model

During the height of SSC's attempts at facilitating a mutual aid program, the most prominent form of organizational relationship was through a series of group chats on the messaging app Signal.

For the purpose of this analysis, a group chat can be defined as a form of SMS text and image based communication involving three or more parties. Many in SSC came to a false sense that the group chat should remain the primary relationship between the members itself, rather than being a heavily limited tool of communication. To define the organization's membership by group chat (or a series of group chats) is to idealize the nature of organization. We had removed the material primacy of communist organizing and in this idealist error, were unable to make the adequate concessions to the limitations of the group chat form.

This mode of communication is prominent in much Left organizing due to the immediate nature of SMS messaging. Where does this trend in organizing stem from? Members working one or more jobs makes scheduling routine meetings difficult, and the group chat allows for many disparate people to communicate simultaneously without having to schedule time for such communication. While group chats and SMS in general are useful for sharing information, as members of SSC, we observed the momentum-killing effect of primarily relating to comrades through digital means.

In *Constructive Struggle* by Cde. Katsfoter, he states; "Struggle within a Communist formation is the way in which disputes are resolved and the way in which... political positions are correctly developed" (Cde. Katsfoter). SSC failed to develop political positions or programs, as well as failed to mediate disagreements between comrades precisely because the primary mode of relating member to member was incomplete. Despite our attempts to use these group chats as an arena for struggle and the primary method of decision making, the form of the group chat was and remains inadequate for the purposes of struggle and synthesis.

Again, Araling Aktibista states, "More often, it is hard to obtain correct conclusions even if there is enough or even more than enough data collected" (The CPP). The nuances of human communication extend beyond the written word and still image and these nuances must be accounted for in struggle. Emotions regularly played a silent part in group chat discussion, and our collective ignorance of this human nuance was not remediable within the form. The frenzied influx of messages was regularly too overwhelming to parse, as well as generally unfocused. Nuggets of truth were passed over alongside every other message. Collecting correct ideas and new levels of unity from the hodgepodge of takes and brainstorms would have required an immense amount of personal labor and organizational form to promote interrogation and analysis which did not exist.

SSC's official communication channels consisted of a general body chat, a central committee chat, a few committee chats, a chat for "struggle," and an informal chat for non-org specific discussion. The informal chat eventually became the most active form of communication among members. At a general body meeting held on Zoom, four working committees were formed, for the purpose of keeping membership active. The purpose was never realized as these group chats were used only in the weeks following their inception to schedule Zoom meetings and share loose ideas for action. These Zoom meetings were sporadic and uneventful, never resulting in group action. Voting on organizational matters took place within these chats, usually taking the form of react emojis as replies to a message. The ultimate decision to address the issue of organizational stagnation, in connection with our digital organizational form, came after a vote was called to decide whether to release a statement on a local sexual predator. The org consisted of 25 members; 6 members voted. This further highlights the inadequacy of digital communications being primary. Had this vote been called at an in-person meeting, the issue of mass abstention could have been recognized and struggled over with all 25 members. In that case, the struggle has the capacity to be complete,

as all members are present and engaged at the same time. The group chat form does not allow for assurance that all members are engaged or even present for discussion.

The idealist over-reliance on digital communication can only be disproven through organizational practice, as our cadre carried out with the dissolution of SSC and reorganization into a subsequent form. Since practice and struggle resolve the idealist conception, Communist Organizations primarily organized by digital means have not yet engaged in a sufficient quality or quantity of struggle, allowing to resolve the contradiction at hand and progress into a material form of organization.

Through our interaction with the form, we have recognized the group chat as a useful communication tool for specified needs, but organizing digitally does not support a more cohesive nor unified cadre. By idealizing forms of digital communication as “spaces” for comrades to organize within, we severely limit our abilities as Communist Revolutionaries. This view of digital communication formed as spaces are reinforced by the language we use to describe them. To be “in” a group chat, to be “on” the internet is to have access to that communicational form and should never be confused with occupying space, as it is so regularly. In a time of that very confusion being exploited by the bourgeoisie to obfuscate the distinction between media and reality let us heed, albeit rather anti-poetically, the words of Olúfemi Táíwò when he implores us “to build the kinds of rooms we could sit in together.” [The Philosopher Vol. 108. Emphasis Added.]

2021: The Age of Reckoning

In early 2021, Cdes. Abba and Memphis are elected to the Central Committee (CC), and successfully push the body to hold regular meetings. Until this point, meetings were held irregularly, as they were called by CC members; rather than a set day and time routinely. Now that we finally had regular meetings, in our typical fascination with understanding the minutia, we must ask—what is a meeting?

A meeting can be described as the coming together, the assembly of two or more people, by chance or arrangement. The two components of this definition are the presence of two or more people and the “coming together” of those people. As Communists, we may need a more precise definition, as we understand in the meetings of primary Communist Organizations, there is a lot more at play than simply two or more people coming together. Who are the people and why are they coming together?

1. The meeting must have a purpose—as communists we reckon this purpose is synthesis. The meeting should serve, no matter the minutia, to heighten unity among the participants and struggle toward some synthesis—even if this is a minor heightening of unity of tactics by coming to synthesis on the time and location of the next meeting.

2. For this purpose to be achievable and to even meet in the first place, the two or more individuals must have a baseline unity of purpose. If there is no shared, agreed upon unity on the above described purpose of the meeting, and if there is no synthesis, advance, or heightening of unity anticipated, then an effective meeting of communists is not possible.

We also understand the qualitative occurrence of synthesis (realization of heightened unity) to be the product of a quantitative increase of the interactive sense-data produced in the meeting (struggle). So accounting for more variables through more viewpoints, thought processes, individuals, and frequent meetings produce a more complete synthesis. The advent of the regular meeting was

a key advance for our formation because now we could begin the process of self-recognition through synthesis. We met more often with a regular body, so the understanding of our previous failings could now be reckoned with and understood!

As an organization, SSC was progressing but was still not capable of much outside of communication. These regular meetings bolstered a drive among the CC, and members close to the CC, to attempt to remedy the failings of SSC. What followed were three major changes that focused on the correct problems, without grasping the root cause of those problems.

Re-Organization Attempts

The issues SSC had which we on The Central Committee focused on can be narrowed down to:

1. Lack of attendance at general body meetings
2. Lack of activity for membership to engage in
3. Lack of political education
4. Lack of structure

There were many varied attempts at combating each of these issues. The lack of structure endemic to SSC was something we could not effectively address in our form, because there was no material organization relationship among bodies and members. We instead continued the idealist method of imagining structural changes (amendments to the constitution, voting procedure changes, task delegation, etc.) and expecting to simply conform our organizational body to those whims. We attempted to rectify the lack of organization with idealist over-organization. We conducted no investigation, struggle, synthesis, or rectification.

The lack of political education was an issue we believed was easier to tackle, simply get people to read, but there was no responsibility to the organization. To remedy this, leadership crafted *The Program of The Individual*— a document meant to outline the duties of individuals of SSC. These duties included regular attendance of meetings (there were maybe three meetings in this period of the whole body), the writing of personal reports to provide at meetings, and engaging in individual study of Marxism. The latter was ineffective, as there was no program of collective study, no curriculum, and no way of enforcing this.

We incorrectly believed the lack of activity for membership to engage in could also be rectified in *The Program of The Individual*. In the organizational document, we outlined regular meetings, social gatherings, and study sessions which members could attend that did not exist, believing that our credence was enough. If we put it in the document, then we would surely follow through! Our idealism stuck through all of these rectification efforts.

One change was the idea of mandatory personal reports written between meetings by members. The purpose of these reports was to promote more engagement with the organization. However, the engagement was incredibly individual and focused solely on personal progress, without relating members to the organization as a whole cohesive body. Eventually this idea was assimilated into the larger change of the Program of the Individual (POTI).

The POTI was a six-page document that laid out the expectations of SSC members and came as

part of a broader campaign of organizational reformation, which included the creation of several new committees. Since SSC as an organization barely existed, there was no material basis for these expectations; the committees themselves were formed arbitrarily. Once again, we repeated our idealist conception of organization and these “sweeping reforms” led to no real changes.

We attempted several other organizational reforms over the next year, all of which repeated the same error of over-organizing based on an idealist conception of organization. All of these efforts failed quickly, and SSC’s General Body became increasingly less active. At the very least, our varied attempts at failed reform had allowed us to recognize a need to understand organization scientifically, even if we presently lacked this understanding. It was in this context of general disorganization and decline that we encountered two texts from Unity-Struggle-Unity, namely *Constructive Struggle* and *The Study Group*.

On top of being fitting for our context at the time, these guides gave a grounded, materialist understanding of organization which we had previously lacked. We soon after brought these guides to the remaining members of SSC. Cdes Abba and Memphis proposed that SSC collectively study these texts and vote on organizing under the models laid out in these works.

The Organizing Committee of Shenandoah Revolutionary Study Organization

After several months of loose collective study, SSC formally voted to transition into The Study Group model layed out in *The Study Group: A Guide for Revolutionary Cadres*. The vote itself was indicative of the organization’s general disorganization, with only a quarter of membership participating in the vote. Upon this decision, we began the immediate construction of a Study Group Organizing Committee (OC). Although being open to any SSC member that could commit to routine meetings, the OC ended up being made up of the same four most active members, Cletus, Grey, Memphis, and Abba. A few weeks later two other SSC members, Alvin and Lane, moved back to Harrisonburg from Richmond and joined the OC.

The work of the Organizing Committee can be broadly separated into two phases, the first being Cadre formation and Social Investigation, and the second being Study Group Construction.

Cadre Formation and Social Investigation (August – October 2023)

The first task carried out by the OC was defining and establishing its own organizational structure, represented by the making of bylaws. These bylaws recognized meeting attendance as fundamental to membership. We understood if a person is unable to consistently attend OC meetings they were functionally not a member. We also institutionalized the understanding that organizational decisions and discussions were to be had in meetings, and not over group chat. In addition we formalized standing meetings, agendas, note taking/record keeping, and the giving of oral reports. All of these were qualitative organizational advancements from SSC. At this point, we began functionally acting as a cadre, defined as a group with a relatively high-level of unity existing in a defined organizational structure based on face-to-face relationships. We did not view ourselves consciously as the local

vanguard or even a distinct cadre yet, and so our effectiveness was decreased. This was because our work was less conscious of both our makeup and our position in relation to the struggle. This is yet another holdover of idealism, but a more expected hiccup to come in a period such as this one, which should have been easily rectified (it was not, as will be shown).

After establishing our bylaws, and therefore our material existence as a cadre, our first task was conducting a social investigation to assist in the creation of a study group. We analyzed the general demographics of the area, constructed a general map of Harrisonburg and its working class neighborhoods, identified the largest industries and employers in the area, analyzed the local Left and Progressive organizations, and produced an analysis of the local struggle in the area. Through this process we began the practice of formally delegating out of meeting tasks, and with the notable exception of Cde Alvin our cadre members were contributing meaningfully to out of meeting work.

During this period we lacked the ideological development to produce any real class analysis, and our social investigation consisted mainly of individuals collecting and synthesizing data themselves, or with another comrade when work was conducted together. Group discussions of social investigation consisted mainly of unstructured conversations after comrades gave reports on their work, as a result there was not a high level of group synthesis.

Construction of the Study Group (November 2023 – January 2024)

After conducting our social investigation, the OC next set itself the task of constructing the Study Group. We worked based on the model and example bylaws provided in *The Study Group: A Guide for Revolutionary Cadres*, but there was notable confusion as to the precise form of organization being constructed. We debated whether this org was a “mass organization” a “pre-party formation” etc. At the time, we lacked the understanding of different aspects of organizations laid out in *Taxonomy of Local Organizations and Organize by Cmde. Katsfoter*. We particularly struggled to grasp the delineation of members, attendees, and the Executive Committee, and how they related to each other.

Our confusion and inability to reach a correct understanding was a result of us not fully understanding the state of the revolution and failing to have a materialist analysis of our own organization. This second error is exemplified in the “Executive Committee Guiding Principles” document, which was created and approved by the OC just before the launch of SRSO.

The document identified the primary contradiction within SRSO as the contradiction between the high level of development of the Executive Committee, on the one hand, and the low level of the General Body, on the other hand. Instead of understanding this as a material relation (with the EC existing objectively as a cadre and the general body not), the document erroneously portrayed this as purely ideological (i.e. of individual EC members being of higher political development). This led to a tension, with the Organizing Committee (and later Executive Committee) existing as a cadre but failing to understand its own organizational form.

The OC let ideological confusion disorganize it with meetings becoming less structured and less formal, while still being qualitatively more organized than the SSC days. Still, the OC was producing constructive work and developed the bylaws and official structure of the Shenandoah Revolutionary Study Group (SRSO).

It was during this phase that members of the OC became increasingly involved in fractional

work, notably around a local unionizing effort and pro-Palestinian activism. Cdes Grey and Memphis had been working with UNITE HERE in unionization efforts for food services workers at several universities in the state, and the union was looking to seriously begin its campaign at JMU. Simultaneously a popular movement for Palestinian liberation was forming in town, and Cde Memphis (a JMU student at the time) through her university connections was able to make contact and became involved in the movement; Cde Abba also became significantly involved. Much of the work was assisting the movement in developing structure and political direction, as well as identifying and contacting the revolutionary elements in the movement. A thorough analysis and recollection of this work is one of the next tasks of our cadre, but it is sufficient here to note that through this the OC was involved in vanguard work.

The Study Group

The first session of SRSO was scheduled for January 6th, 2024, but was rescheduled due to snow. On January 20th the session convenes in the basement of a local Lutheran church. We continue holding sessions twice-monthly, beginning with business meetings, followed by at least an hour of collective study and analysis. The Organizing Committee self-dissolved into The Executive Committee of SRSO, and sought to trial run the tactic of collective study with a smaller group of attendees we had personal connections with. Our initial meeting had a little over a dozen attendees. Most in attendance were white, with only 3 non-white people, an issue that would continue throughout the duration of the organization's existence. Most attendees were proletarian or semi-proletarian, with only three university students present, which is notable considering most Leftist spaces in the area are predominantly college students or oriented towards them. Our initial read was Marx's "Theses on Feuerbach," which spawned lively and fruitful discussions on materialism and consciousness, which was encouraging since most attendees had never engaged with Marxist works before.

In the first three months we had tremendous success with a smaller group of attendees. Quantitative growth of study group attendance was spurred on as attendees requested to invite their own contacts, becoming the primary mechanism of growth. We never publicly advertised the group or took the effort to develop a more conscious method of controlled growth.

After some time meeting in a small room of the Lutheran church basement, we decided the size of our sessions necessitated a move to a larger space in the church. We had roughly 10-15 members regularly attending sessions.

The Executive Committee also regularly met at this point for facilitating the operations of the study group—printing and curating reading suggestions which were presented to the body of attendees to choose from^[1] and scheduling the meetings. Further, we attempted theorization and development of our understanding of the organization and how we could develop further. Much of the analysis of this period centered around understanding our purpose as an organization and investigating collective study as a tactic.

The Vanguard Organization

As we mentioned before, The Executive Committee had not viewed itself as a distinct, revolutionary body at any point during the construction of SRSO. This organizational misunderstanding continued for several months without any interrogation. Excited by the initial success of the study sessions,

the Executive Committee spent most of its meetings discussing its fractional work and discussing potential ways SRSO could expand and develop. We had “taken our eyes off the prize” and became dizzy with success!

This lack of attentive care to the study group and abandonment of our primary task led to the unintentional liquidation of SRSO structures. The business meetings before study sessions became less structured, and certain attendees scoffed at formality and official voting procedures. EC and SRSO business meeting notes were never read into the record. The EC did not initially conduct serious investigation into the process of collective study, and therefore were not able to recognize our successes and failures. Additionally, criticism and self-criticism were never properly implemented as the EC never established a formal process for it. Most glaringly we liquidated much of our membership process, and the first batch of new members (all of whom would be involved in our eventual split) were admitted based on a single unstructured interview and verbal assent to our Points of Unity. One of these members was of particular concern due to their liberal tendencies, but a general aversion to struggle left this concern unspoken. Even worse, one attendee was granted membership despite the fact that they were unable to attend business meetings due to their work schedule. Once again, we had slipped back into our idealist errors, assigning the title of membership to those who functionally were not members.

In March 2024, most of the EC and Cde Liam took a trip down to Charlotte, North Carolina to attend the Charlotte Revolutionary Study Group’s International Working Women’s Day event. This event and fraternization with RSG members spurred general organizational reflection by EC members.

We understand the fundamental error of the entire SSC period was an idealist conception of organization. Cdes Abba and Memphis saw this trend arise again in SRSO through The Executive Committee not recognizing itself as the local vanguard in development despite that material reality. As a result, we also did not understand concretely our relation to the attendees and membership of SRSO as well as the broader community. As Cdes Abba and Memphis noticed this lapse, they studied organization, analyzed, and struggled with one another.

The Executive Committee continued in the position of the proto-vanguard organization locally. The EC acted functionally as a small pre-party formation concerned with creating revolutionaries, and consolidating them into cadre with the study session being the tactic applied to achieving this goal. Another one of our tactics that arose was entering into other local “left” organizations as individuals, and identifying the advanced sections of organizers (what we came to recognize as fractional work)—the kind of folks we could invite to coffee and discuss Marxism with, to serve SRSO’s stated goal of developing revolutionary cadre. Once Memphis and Abba understood fractional work and how this tactic solidifies further our position as the local vanguard, our understanding was presented to The Executive Committee and investigation and struggle commenced.

After reading sections of *Urban Perspective* by CPI Maoist and engaging in struggle as a body, The Executive Committee came to recognize this function as the work of a potential vanguard organization, and developed the following analysis of SRSO:

Analysis of Shenandoah Revolutionary Study Organization's Position

SRSO Executive Committee- 4-13-2024 Draft

The purpose of the vanguard party is to establish a dictatorship of the proletariat. Before this, it is the party recognized by the advanced section of the revolutionary classes as leading the struggle.

We as the Executive Committee view ourselves as a local vanguard organization in development. This is a formation of and for communists which help to embody the conscious, directed efforts of self emancipation of the revolutionary masses.

The goal we've identified of the local vanguard organization is to direct and lead the struggle in our area. At current, this task is being carried out with the tactic of open study and the quantitative development of SRSO by the vanguard organization (currently just 'The Executive Committee'). We are turning non-communists and under-developed communists into organized communists and raising the level of revolutionary consciousness. This tactic toward our larger goal will change qualitatively either as the direction of the struggle calls for new tactics or as we develop and advance our goals.

SRSO, the study group, itself is neither a mass organization or the vanguard. It only represents the aforementioned tactic of quantitative development of communists and the quantitative development of the vanguard organization. The study group, under the direction of the vanguard organization, captures and develops individuals into communists, then identifies and trains the potential vanguard elements to the ideological and practical level required for vanguard organization. Upon a member being trained to the necessary level they become a 'vanguard element' pending involvement in the vanguard organization.

Reflected in attendance at study sessions are non-communists and potential vanguard elements, who should be identified. The potential vanguard elements, upon identification, should be on the way to general membership- a body that reflects these potential elements in training, the vanguard elements outside vanguard organization, and members of the vanguard organization.

The vanguard organization will continue to grow through committees and through fractional work via activist groups and party cells. These groups and committees will work to grow and develop the whole vanguard organization, and further its goals. At current, we see the development of committees being primary over the development of fractional work. This is because fractional work is most effectively directed by the vanguard organization, and as it develops itself through committees, it will be able to direct fractional work. The committees represent a qualitative advance for the vanguard organization, and will create a basis for and give rise to real, directed fractional work.

In addition to this understanding our body produced, we were continuing to study Urban Perspective and taking the general analysis we found observable under our local conditions. We began to chart out plans to develop our low level of fractional connection into 'activist groups' — a transitory form of organization designed to facilitate the consolidation of advanced sections of the masses into the vanguard organization.

Cdes. Memphis, Lane, Abba, and Grey seemed to have reached a high level of unity on this

understanding, but it became clear Cde. Cletus had a combination of misunderstandings and lingering disagreements not brought forward through struggle. This was expressed to Cde. Abba, and was counter-opposed to the contradictory analysis of the Revolutionary Study Group (RSG), a Maoist 'mass organization' growing out of The Red Guard movement in the South. Cde. Abba believed these conversations were characteristic of simple misunderstandings of Cde. Cletus's, but it later became clear this was complete ideological disagreement and aversion to struggle which would precipitate factionalism and an eventual split of the organization.

The analysis of The Executive Committee was shared at a joint meeting of SRSO attendees including The Executive Committee (Cdes. Abba, Memphis, Lane, Alvin, Grey, and Cletus) as well as Liam, Kia, Demi, and Lonnie. The meeting itself was haphazard and disorganized, and the understanding of the EC as a proto-vanguard was not shared or understood by everyone in SRSO, leading to tensions forming between the EC and some members.

After this synthesis the EC understood its primary task as running the study group, and most of its meetings concerned conscious reflection on the study sessions. It was during this period that we made serious developments on our understanding of study, namely that at our low level, the application of textual concepts to everyday life was in fact revolutionary practice and the primary form of practice the study group could engage in. This led us to refocus study on these practical applications. In addition, we altered the role of EC members during study sessions, instructing them to talk and theorize less, instead focusing on sharing personal experiences and to ask prompting questions. These changes immediately bore fruit, with discussion becoming more lively and engaging especially from the working class attendees.

Cdes. Abba and Memphis's proto-fractional work, having been conducted even before SRSO's existence, bore the fruit of a few stable social relationships with organizers in a local organization called Friendly City For Palestine (FC4P). This is where we initially met Cde. Koa, who became one of our first regular attendees to the study sessions. Shortly after, Cde. Koa began to organize a chapter of Students for Justice in Palestine (SJP) at JMU with the help of Cde. Memphis and others.

Notes on Experience with SRSO from Cde. Koa

Prior to Cde. Koa's attendance to SRSO meetings, their conception of organization was limited and unsustainable; constantly informed by urgency and quantitative qualities – "on-the-go organizing." At the time, Cde. Koa realized the importance of building discipline and commitment within themselves as an aspiring organizer. Cde. Koa's attendance to SRSO meetings helped facilitate discipline and displayed how to conduct business meetings more effectively and intentionally; having a consistent time, date, and place to meet allowed for them to allot time in their life to dedicate to SRSO. Very quickly, Cde. Koa noticed the lack of people of color involved in leadership and in attendance. This was something they brought up to Cde. Memphis either when they used to meet for lunch on-campus at JMU or at our Coffee Hound meetings (which Cde. Abba was typically present). During collective study sessions, Cde. Koa was open to struggle because they desired to uncover correct ideas from the readings the group was doing.

At times, they felt out of place or unwanted in these spaces, but most of the time this feeling of insecurity was triumphed by their desire to read and study in a group. During SRSO collective study sessions, Cde. Koa noticed the lack of willingness from other attendees and members to struggle

or share their thoughts on readings. The lack of participation from others made them feel like they were “talking too much” or “being too much.” The unreciprocated enthusiasm in the collective study sessions created an unwelcoming space for them. Despite the group being overwhelmingly trans and queer, Cde. Koa being one of the only consistent people of color attending made them feel even more isolated.

Formation of JMU Students for Justice and Palestine

The formation of SJP was conceived through the national call to action to current university students who did not have an active SJP chapter on their campuses. Dalia (JMU graduate student) and Cde. Koa started to find out the process of creating an official student organization at JMU. The first officer meeting occurred on February 6th, 2024. For the first few months of SJP, the officers (Koa, Memphis, Dalia, and Skye) identified a purpose, structure, and attempted to draft points of unity for SJP. Between the months of February through April, SJP attempted to recruit and build membership and invited interested students to Friday night officer meetings. SJP had a few programs: partnered with the Muslim Students Association (MSA) and faculty to host speaker Dr. Sahar Aziz, a few movie nights, tabling outside one of JMU’s dining halls, and a few general body meetings. Urgency for organization became apparent during the peak of the university encampments popping up in April/May. Currently, JMU SJP is pursuing further base building with students and crystallizing the organization’s structure.

Abba’s Notes on Liquidationism

The liquidation of structures was a process that began before The People’s Quad (pro-Palestine action in May), and was primarily rooted in an initial aversion to struggle and right liquidationist trend of the Executive Committee. We quickly pushed through the membership process for individuals we had solid social connections with but had important ideological hangups with (primarily the liberalism of Liam, and the gender chauvinism and off-putting anti-social trend within Byron). We recognized liberal and potential wrecker trends but thought that they could be easily overcome once incorporated into the organization— an error that proved wholly incorrect and cataclysmic for the organization.

A manifestation of this error and how it led to liquidation of our structures lies in meeting formality. The EC achieved unity on business meeting formality in the construction phase of SRSO, and ran the first study sessions following a semi-formal brand of Robert’s Rules of Order. It became clear that these same elements we were overconfident of viewed this formality as “silly” and “unnecessary”. We were socially involved with these people because of similar age and experiences. Soon, we adopted parts of this idea, feeling our process to be awkward or uncool, and began using this formality in an ironic manner. Eventually this led to the outright abandonment of formality in the business meeting. Why would we proceed with our formal structures at all if we were going to do so ironically? We ceded too much ground to these elements, when we should have engaged with this attitude through serious struggle on the necessity of this formality. Later, with The Peoples Quad, we engage in a left liquidationism that has the same effects on SRSO’s structures being abandoned.

Cde. Alvin and The Proletarian Feminist Working Group

Preceding the time of the SRSO group trip to Charlotte, North Carolina a distinct feminist ideology was burgeoning among many of the study group members. The works of Andrea Dworkin, Katherine MacKinnon, and other prominent Feminist thinkers were in circulation, being regularly studied outside of the study group meetings. During the Intl Working Women's Day event thrown by RSG South, ideas were floated by members of RSG concerning organization building on Proletarian Feminist lines specifically. These discussions - in tandem with the communal celebration and sharing of Feminist art and history - further bolstered the Feminist resolve within the now centralizing Proletarian Feminist (Prol-Fem) concerned body of members. Returning to Harrisonburg, the topic of a working group dedicated to studying Materialist Feminism was introduced. The possibility of a code of conduct was loosely floated. Cde Lane reached out to multiple contacts from NC who had shared interest in Feminist organizing, but this communication either was not reciprocated or petered out quickly.

A small Prol-Fem interest group had formed in SRSO, and rapidly advanced both ideologically and in focus of scope due to interaction with higher forms of organization and an expanse of historic knowledge. However, this momentum would soon be cut short. The group met informally, and because Prol-Fem concerned discussion was assimilated into casual conversation many ideological disagreements were never struggled over, nor even recognized. Struggle is already a focus intensive task in a formal organizational context, and the capacity for clear and disciplined struggle is marred by social taboos and marijuana smoke. Although some comrades did advance ideologically, all failed to recognize the falsity of the interest group's unity. False unity was either ignored, neglected, or actively hidden. Some comrades failed to voice their disagreements while others failed to recognize disagreements at all. Frequently, disagreements were shared in private, most prominently by one former comrade (Liam) whose aversion to struggle regularly acted as a hindrance to organizational synthesis and the building of unity. This aversion cannot be properly critiqued without the equal and opposite critique of the organization for lacking the structure necessary to formalize such an interest group initially. Without formal integration, an informal interest group will remain just that and would be incapable of struggle and synthesis, and therefore would be incapable of producing higher unity. The false unity present in the interest group, as well as the aversion to struggle prevalent among its ranks, precipitated the later dissolution of the group, and in part, the organization. However, the tensions caused by these parallel regressive forces were first catalyzed by a discovery that would shake the Executive Committee of SRSO.

Two members of the interest group, Cdes. Lane and Liam, discussed Cde. Liam's relationship with Cde. Alvin, and the conclusion was reached that Cde. Alvin's behavior was sexually coercive. They specifically used their power as an executive in the organization as well as some circumstantial social power to coerce Liam into silence about the relationship. Cdes. Liam and Lane confronted Cde. Alvin once each individually and once together to share their analysis, as well as their emotions. An emergency Executive Committee meeting was called to discuss the situation and decide action. It was decided unanimously that Cde. Alvin be notified the next day of their indefinite suspension from SRSO, with a General Body vote being held to determine permanent expulsion.

Little investigation was undertaken organizationally during our crafting of the report on former Cde. Alvin. No investigatory structure existed prior to the allegations against Alvin, and none was created to properly deal with the situation as an organization. The content of the report is composed

primarily of raw information presented by Liam and Cde. Lane. This method was erroneous, as exemplified by a counter-method of report crafting: The structure of SRSO allowed the Membership Committee (functionally the EC at the time of the report) to suspend any member indefinitely, which the EC did act upon. However, only about a week elapsed between Alvin's suspension and expulsion. This was not enough time to properly conduct the investigation the EC had the capacity to carry out, nor was the frenzied rush to produce the report conducive to organizational discipline.

The report was presented to the General Body with the recommendation of permanent expulsion. The recommendation passed. Although, the way the Executive Committee carried out this information sharing and subsequent voting was not conducive to open dialogue nor struggle with the idea presented in the document. At the pre-study business meeting the EC presented the general body with the full report and called for a vote on permanent expulsion the same meeting, not allowing any time for attendees to grapple with the text, not to mention the severity of the situation. The character of conversation at this meeting was somewhat distrustful, being largely dominated by an attendee who harped on what "AMABs" owe their "femme" comrades, which we recognize as biologically essentialist language, as well as obfuscating the central issue of sexual manipulation. This comrade also expressed distrust in the EC after the sharing of the report on former Cde. Alvin. A collective failure to voice any disagreements or interrogate the matter further exemplified an aversion to struggle that affected the whole organization. This same former cde. later shared that they were accused of sexual assault in the past. Due to organizational limitations, and an aforementioned aversion to struggle, the EC failed to undertake an investigation into this former comrade. However, the link between sexual misconduct and gender chauvinism present in this situation could not go unnoticed. Despite this less than ideal atmosphere, no other members shared hesitancy to continue studying with the organization, and our future study sessions continued to be productive.

Sometime after this, the idea of specifically tasking a group to draft a feminist based standard of conduct for members, including provisions on relationships of members, was reintroduced. Eventually this group was established and accompanied by a Signal group chat, which was used for about one month. This moment again highlights an opportunity for structure crafting that was ungrasped. The work group could have been formalized, but instead the formalization of a work group structure was postponed indefinitely by the same idealist error that led to SSC's dissolution initially— digitization of form.

During this time, the only action taken was the discussion of possible tasks of the group: drafting standards of conduct, revising and expanding the report on former Cde. Alvin, and creating a database of knowledge pertaining to recognizing and weeding out sexual abusers. This large chunk of work was outside the original scope of the group, which had lost its material basis at this point. The group had been formed during a time of great structural liquidation within SRSO. Formal processes that had been established were not practiced, and opportunities to create necessary structure were passed over. The lack of structure led to a lack of actionable focus, which grew parallel to some of our Executive Committee. The EC's involvement in a growing coalition geared towards erecting an encampment for Gaza on JMU's campus. As this pro-Palestine organizing became more time intensive, the Prol-Fem group chat petered out. A date was set for a final meeting, but this was never realized due to more pressing organizational complications and a lack of material organization present in the Prol-Fem group.

The People's Quad

In March 2024, Cdes. Abba, Koa, and Memphis formed an analysis group on the Palestinian struggle, which we referred to as 'The Palestine Analysis Group.' This group consisted of Cdes. Abba, Koa, and Memphis, and also included Cdes. Demi, Lonnie, and Skye who we also met in FC4P. By the end of April, the Palestine Analysis Group met to talk about a potential encampment at JMU.

Cdes. Memphis and Abba approached the group with a left liquidationist line which was met with hesitancy from Cde. Koa. This line consisted of ignoring the material reality of our local conditions and our organizational-logistical ability in favor of the broader, national struggle on the issue of Palestinian support. We left no room for struggle, and assumed the only correct position was mangling reality to quickly catch the national conditions. We liquidated SRSO's structures and primary program of regular study in this pursuit. With hindsight, we now understand that our position locally, at JMU particularly, was not favorable to immediately fall in line with an equally militant action as the other encampments taking place nationally. We had no basis of organization to even materially build an encampment, let alone to sufficiently politicize the action toward a revolutionary line.

Throughout the planning stages of the action and the action itself, Cde Koa reckoned with their own class position, retaining their class position through the pursuit of college education while identifying the problem with abandoning previous organizational efforts (SJP and SRSO alike) in order to pursue an encampment. There was a lot of enthusiasm amongst the local organizers and community members with the idea of an encampment, and most of the hesitation and pushback was from JMU students. What amounted to a right-liquidationist line arising in combination with Cdes. Abba and Memphis recognizing their error, caused the correct position and a revolutionary line to be greatly weakened.

This right line that surfaced, attempted to reduce the action to a hangout, and abandon the building of real, material organization out from the event. The correct line in between these two erroneous trends should have been organizing what event we were capable of (preferably something attune to politicization, rather than a simple public demonstration) and then building organization as a result, so that next time we are prepared to answer the call of the broader, national struggle. This correct line was realized by us, and pushed for far too late in the planning phase. The event amounted to a collection of action on the quad at JMU, including demonstration, speeches, and some collective study sessions. These hour long, outdoor sessions, the first of which concerned group reading of sections of The Study Group by Cde. Katsphoter, were ultimately rather successful in generating interest in continued organizing efforts. The merits of collective study were immediately grasped, and the majority of people interested in organizing (one Comrade gathered names and phone numbers) had attended these study sessions. However, the building of organization planned to follow the event was abandoned. We should have had this understanding from the jump, and planned adequately to capture the progressive movement and general advance that was produced in the event. Currently, Cde. Koa is attempting to rectify this mis-step in the current semester through SJP, and they are conducting individual meetings with those interested in further organization.

After the People's Quad, Cde. Koa conducted several interviews from community members, students, and professors. Some key takeaways from the interviews:

1. Interviewees acknowledged and identified the class composition of JMU students and how it

contributes to the difficulties of student power building on campus

2. The space occupied on JMU's quad during those three days was welcoming and therapeutic for students who were not aware of an existing community of folks who were sympathetic to the Palestinian cause

3. While there was a list of demands, there was little to zero leverage to actualize and meet those demands; JMU administration didn't feel any pressure

4. Accessibility was lacking throughout planning and the action itself and barred disabled people from participating

5. Burn-out was experienced before, during, and after the action; not sustainable for organization and prevented organizers and participants from reflecting and struggling together after the action

The Split of SRSO

By the conclusion of the People's Quad, SRSO had eight members— the EC (Memphis, Grey, Cletus, Abba, Lane), Liam, Byron (who seldom attended business meetings), and Kia. We had an additional three or four consistent study session attendees.

Just before the People's Quad began, Vickie re-established contact with Cde. Memphis. Vickie was a high school classmate of Memphis's and had long been an orbiter of "leftist" spaces. In the months before the OC was formed, Cdes. Abba and Memphis had met with Vickie to discuss his potential involvement in SRSO although he had since moved to Charlottesville, a city an hour away. Notably, he was a close associate and former roommate of Byron and was an acquaintance of Kia.

Vickie contacted Cde. Memphis a day before the People's Quad and asked about potential protests on JMU's campus in support of Palestine, and upon being informed of one planned, Vickie pledged his attendance and support.

At the People's Quad, Vickie was one of the two initial Community Defense Committee members and performed admirably, handling agitators and organizing cop watches as police movements and numbers intensified throughout the day. However, Vickie had a clear penchant for adventurism and ultra-leftism. In conversation with a group of radical students attending the People's Quad, who had become dissatisfied with the pacification and disorganization of the event, Vickie attempted to agitate these students towards an attempt to occupy the JMU football stadium during a game. He stressed the need for immediate action, undermining Cde. Memphis's attempts in the same conversation to steer the students towards the understanding of the necessity of organization.

At the People's Quad, Vickie approached Memphis about connections to guns, both legal and illegal, and again floated the idea of a leftist gun club. Serious self-criticism is required from Cde. Memphis over how she handle this situation, but the general ultra-leftist attitude that had been advanced initially (and never effectively retreated from), the general liquidation of SRSO, and the "dizziness of success", led to her and others of our cadre handling this situation with a lack of discipline. A meeting was arranged between Cdes. Memphis, Abba, and Lane with Byron and Vickie. In this meeting Byron and Vickie presented a plan for the immediate acquisition and manufacturing of weapons, citing presently existing legal loopholes. With Vickie and Byron once again pushing an adventurist line (militarization without the prerequisite organization), Cdes. Memphis, Abba, and Lane attempted

to ground the conversation and discuss what a militant wing of SRSO might look like and how it could develop. The outcome of the meeting was the tasking of Cde. Memphis with drawing up a short reading list on armed struggle and organization for collective study. In hindsight, it is clear that Byron and Vickie emerged from this meeting disillusioned with SRSO. It is important to note that while our faction stated our disagreements with the adventurist line in this meeting, Byron and Vickie did not engage in struggle over any of our ideas.

Upon their inauguration as members of SRSO, Liam, Byron, and Kia became increasingly socially involved. It is clear that at some point after the People's Quad, they and Vickie began acting as a faction, evidenced by their cohesion at the point of the split, repetition of similar talking points, and a few notable instances of them moving as a social unit separate from us. We are now even able to pinpoint a conversation they initiated with Cde. Memphis under false pretenses to gauge if she would join their faction.

Byron and Liam arranged a meeting with Cde. Lane, under the pretense that it was a purely social affair and not connected to organizational business. They presented Lane with a series of personal grievances, organizational critiques, accusations of misconduct, and opinions on various structures or lack thereof in SRSO. Almost none of the content of this meeting had ever been brought up to the organization by Liam or Byron, and the two indicated that because of their grievances they would be stepping back from SRSO. Liam indicated some interest in having a discussion with the EC about these issues, while Byron had moved on completely..

This method of grievance airing in place of substantive, concrete critique is antithetical to a struggle towards unity. Prior to this impromptu critical ambush both Byron and Liam engaged in SRSO's collective study of Cde. J. Katsphoter's *Constructive Struggle*, which describes the necessity of making intra-formation critique concrete and doing so in an organizational setting. In this instance, neither Byron nor Liam attempted to actualize nor focus their laundry list of grievances, which included such issues as: the over structuring of the organization, the lack of formal structures in the organization[2], the requirement that members pay dues, the location of the study sessions, the study group model itself, critiques of comrades' body language, personal accusations of lying, and an accusation that Liam was secretly labeled "reactionary" by the EC. Their critique was unstructured, undocumented, and delivered in a social setting to only one member of the organization, making struggle and synthesis a non-starter. We were left to extract what bits and pieces we could, and try and formulate critique for the faction.

That evening Lane met with Cdes. Memphis and Abba to discuss her meeting with Liam and Byron, and to discuss the grievances. The trio agreed that the correct course of action would be to present these grievances at the SRSO meeting that was scheduled to take place the next morning, and that any decision on how to move forward would be made as an entire body.

At next morning's SRSO meeting (which Memphis was unable to attend due to work) Abba attempted to share what they had been told with Grey and Cletus, but was met with derision for failing to present the information sooner. Abba and Lane attempted to explain their reasoning for sharing the news at the current time, but they were lambasted for making excuses. It became clear at this point that this faction had swayed Cdes. Grey and Cletus. The business meeting that followed was a loud and agitated frenzy of grievances from Grey and Cletus vaguely concerning many of the issues shared with Lane by Liam and Byron. This critique was unfounded, uninterrogated, and

delivered with a vitriolic zeal uncommon to SRSO. Cletus lobbed personal insults and accusations with a growing volume to the point where he was yelling at Cdes. Abba and Lane. He singled in part of his critique on Cde. Rain, then a new attendee. Minor, insubstantial struggle was had between Abba and Grey. Eventually the tirade ceased and the study session was carried out surprisingly well.

After this it was agreed, an Executive Committee meeting should be planned sometime in the coming week. What followed was Memphis, Lane, and Abba pouring over documents, meeting notes, and recommended texts in an attempt to understand the motion of the situation thoroughly, as well as to prepare for arduous struggle in the imminent EC meeting. Little communication arose between the now completely separate factions in this time. Abba, Lane, and Memphis met regularly and discussed the myriad of possibilities to arise from the consequences of this meeting, and the likely possibility of a split was recognized. The understanding was that this meeting presented an opportunity to struggle over and weed out false unity that had surfaced, that is if the "brick wall" option of complete antagonism from the faction wasn't reached. Eventually a formal meeting (to act as an open arena for struggle) was scheduled to occur at Westover Park. Abba, Memphis, and Lane formulated critiques of Liam, Cletus, and Grey, as well as self-critique of themselves individually and as a cadre. On the night before the scheduled meeting at which SRSO would unfortunately split, Memphis, Abba, and Lane discussed their expectations for the deliberation, and a final refrain was shared by Abba, "We must be prepared for the possibility that we are wrong."

The "struggle session" at Westover Park was completely farcical. Before anyone other than Cdes. Abba, Memphis, and Lane showed up, the three of us were removed from admin positions in any shared group chats. This shows that this faction never intended to constructively struggle or account for the possibility of the incorrectness of their position. Cde. Memphis began the meeting by reiterating the guidelines and importance of constructive struggle. She was soon interrupted by Cletus and Grey revealing their surprise guests of Liam, Kia, Vickie, Gills, and Jeffrey (Cletus's partner who has a strange, historical personal vendetta against Cdes. Abba and Lane). Their faction presented us with a twenty-odd page 'critique' document and demanded our resignation from the organization. The document and the demands were presented as infallible, and the faction actively denied struggle on any topic. Clearly the "brick wall" had been reached.

The bulk of the meeting was a one-sided personal attack on the characters of Cdes. Abba, Memphis, and Lane. This included vague accusations including 'performativity,' maniacal, self-interested use of structure, and having an incorrect line on The People's Republic of China. They slandered us as "men pretending to be women," and posited what we understand to be a slew of incredibly gender chauvinist attitudes. Further, they made known their complete disunity with the concept of struggle and *The Study Group* put forward by Cde. Katsfoter and USU (we thought we had achieved unity on these subjects, but were led into false unity by members of this faction in reality).

The central accusation of the document shared with us centered around an incident that occurred at a local house show venue two years prior. Then Cdes. Lane, Abba, Memphis, and Alvin were regularly attending this venue when a personal acquaintance of theirs was sexually assaulted by a house resident. The group attempted to organize around this issue and expel the abuser from the house. As this came during SSC's period of disorganization, the effort was carried out with much enthusiasm but lacked a high level of political maturity and revolutionary discipline. Much of the specifics of this incident were described and cataloged in an organizational document authored by Abba, Lane, and Memphis titled "The Crayola Report." Ultimately, the organizing efforts culminated

in SSC releasing a statement warning the community of the abuser (and another known abuser that frequented the house). The abuser moved out of the house shortly thereafter due to the release of SSC's statement. During this time and in the following year, the affected party of the assault grew disillusioned with these organizational actions. Shortly before the split, Liam became friends with the affected party and their disillusionment was used to claim the Crayola Report was completely and knowingly fabricated. The accusation was that we were bad faith actors that used a sexual assault to boost our own egos.

This faction's general line of argumentation was that we should subsume all organizational activity to the desires of the affected party. This is a manifestation of liberal individualism— prioritizing the subjective feelings of individuals over the broader social and class forces at play.

Past organizational failings were presented as solely at the feet of the three accused Cdes. Abba, Memphis, and Lane, while the minutia of their existences were simultaneously lambasted. Abba was critiqued for supposedly weaponizing their autism over specific phrasing of text messages from three years ago, and was subsequently called ableist. Lane was critiqued as gender chauvinist for the inconsistency of their eye contact. Cletus at one point exclaimed his "regret having ever known any of you." Vague threats of violence and murder passed, dual accusations of larping and adventurism were shared, and our very reluctance to engage in a similarly undisciplined shit-sliding was noted as evidence of our conspiratorial and cliquish nature. The faction proceeded to blackmail the accused parties by threatening to publicize their document if any of us would refuse to step down from the organization. We recognized the faction to be incapable of struggle at the meeting, and upon a lull in dialogue decided to make our intentions to continue organizing known before leaving among sniveled accusations of being Trotskyists.

True to their word the faction set about spreading their document after the meeting. This consisted of them sending the document to two group chats, one for the planning of the People's Quad with around 30 members and a broader local pro-Palestinian mobilization chat with over 150 members, posting the document on twitter, and sending it via email to Cde. Lane's mother. Their messages were mostly ignored, the twitter post was liked three times (all from members of the faction) and the message in the large mobilization chat was simply a link to a pdf with no preamble that received no replies and it's possible no one even opened it. The message in the People's Quad chat was the only one, to our knowledge, that received any engagement.

The reaction to the document was largely confusion and disinterest, as most people thought it was an internal matter that had no reason to be shared. In the following days and weeks, we met with as many SRSO attendees and comrades we had developed from the People's Quad as we could, explicitly seeking to discuss the document, gauge their thoughts, and engage in struggle where applicable. The outcome of these discussions is covered later in the section concerning Demobilization & Subsequent Organization.

With what little kernels of truth we were able to extract from this entire debacle (while under looming threats of gang violence and being ran off the road by the faction), we have come away with the following understanding of the motion and rise of factions and the split:

We view the initiation of factional motion and ideological split coming in the midst of our sharing of analysis of the local vanguard organization, and subsequent misunderstandings and veiled disagreement. On one side, there were those of us who either accepted the analysis or struggled over

it and came to a developed understanding (Cdes. Abba, Memphis, Lane, Koa, and Demi), in opposition to those who either misunderstood or outright disagreed with the analysis and deprived the body of struggle (Cletus, Grey, Byron, Liam). This initiation of the factional motion can be abstracted, and be said to really be factionalizing along the lines of the materialistic outlook of organization and willingness to struggle.

This faction is/was an ideological and practical melting pot including ultra leftists, anarchists, liberals, wreckers, and abusers. From this described initiating point, the motion from here on was one-sided. The faction and its members, consciously or unconsciously, built the necessary conditions for a split from here on. They sought any personal grievances or shortcomings to justify this motion. A defensive faction was not raised until it was necessary for the purpose of critique and counter-critique formulation and investigation.

Demobilization & Subsequent Organization

The two months following the split and dissolution of SRSO brought a lull in organizing action for our cadre. What momentum we felt from the Palestine action at JMU had been dissipated and we felt more isolated in our cadre than we had for some time. We recognized our primary goal as reconstructing organization with the local connections we retained. Slowly, we began to reach out to community organizers and activists we were familiar with to discuss the split of SRSO in hopes of consolidating a committee to organize a new study group and organization.

We prepared to struggle openly with everyone who we discussed the document produced by the initiating faction of SRSO's split with. We understood that the document, for as incohesive it was, held kernels of truth that would require new perspectives to extract, additional to our own efforts to analyze the document. The general attitude towards the document and its proliferation via social media was dismissive and confused. Most people we talked to spoke of the clear factual errors and ideological contradictions present. Most also shared a rejection of the theoretical conceptions of the document, such as the critique of our actions surrounding Crayola as primarily adventurist, or the idealist labeling of Cdes. Abba, Memphis, and Lane as ontological white chauvinists. It seems our history of organizing work had given us a reputation as trustworthy and capable comrades that contradicted the document's characterization of us.

During this time of focused consolidation, Cde. Abba reached out to Cde. Katsfoter of USU to discuss a possible meeting between USU and our small cadre. This request developed into the Lake Quonnipaug conference, the announcement of which acted as a jump start to our revolutionary motors propelling us into full blown report crafting.

Cdes. Abba, Memphis, and Lane began meeting routinely again to discuss organizational direction, sharper organizational form, and the crafting of an analytical report on our history of organizing. Soon, Cde. Koa moved back to Harrisonburg and began attending these regular meetings, as well as broadening the cadre's scope of connection through organizational effort with the Virginia Student Power Network (VSPN) and JMU SJP. We have kept up with and routinely meet with a few other comrades who we are looking forward to organizing with.

Conclusion

The transition from SSC to SRSO was a qualitative organizational advance, spurred by a new materialist understanding of organization. Great strides were made in developing organizational structures, raising consciousness, revolutionary discipline, particularly among cadre members. The correctness of our organizational model was proven by our ability to engage in vanguard work and by the enthusiasm advanced sections of the masses took towards collective study.

At the same time a lack of structured and routine criticism and self-criticism, and a general inability to engage in disciplined struggle torpedoed the organization's ability to develop. This was compounded with the EC failing to apply its materialist understanding of organization to itself. The EC recognized the latter mistake, but without the tool of self criticism was unable to recognize the former. Given time, disciplined revolutionaries committed to struggle could have resolved the organizations contradictions non-antagonistically, but our mistakes had already borne fruit and opportunist and wrecker elements had already been allowed in. External circumstances and further errors spawned by the protests in support of Palestine caused a further stress that broke the organization, resulting in a split.

Despite the unfortunate demise of SRSO, there remains a hopeful path forward. The destructive struggle waged by the SRSO dissidents produced the ground for constructive struggle between the remaining cadre and our close contacts. We are beginning the process of cadre formation with three former SRSO EC members and two contacts made through our Palestine fractional work. This group already has a high level of unity and commitment to struggle, which has been solidified through months of joint practical and ideological work. We plan to begin with a period of collective study, reading basic revolutionary and Marxist works to strengthen our ideological unity. Continued social investigation and analysis, particularly of the local Palestinian mass movement and our experiences with SRSO will constitute our practical work during this period.

It is our hope that our developing cadre will be able to expand and deepen this report, and extract some general truths that may be useful to the national movement. We are eager for continued communication and struggle with local organizations throughout the U.S. imperial center, and are encouraged by the developing trend of unity amongst revolutionary communist organizations.

References

Araling Aktibista, *Activist Study*, Collection "Colorful Classics," vol. 22, ed. 2, Foreign Languages Press, 2020, Paris.

J. Katsfoter, *Constructive Struggle*, Unity-Struggle-Unity Press, 2023.

Katsfoter, Cde-Editor, et al. "Lessons from Practical Work: The Taxonomy of Local Organizations." *The Red Clarion*, 9 Aug. 2024, clarion.unity-struggle-unity.org/2024-08-09-lessons-from-practical-work/.

Olufemi Taiwo, "In-The-Room Privilege: Elite Capture and Epistemic Deference" *The Philosopher* Vol. 108 No. 4 (no date of publication could be found)

[1] The Executive Committee viewed this as a happy medium between simply deciding every text the attendees would study, and turning over that decision entirely to the body of attendees. This allowed the attendees the opportunity to be involved in a voting matter of the organization even though they were not yet a membership body.

[2] These two grievances seem contradictory, but this is how they were presented. This initially was confusing, but what we came to extract from this is that the faction felt Cdes Abba, Memphis, and Lane were using the structure we had only when it suited us.

Cincinnati Community Aid and Praxis Lake Quonnipaug Conference Report

CCAP was founded in response to our founding members' experiences in large national organizations such as DSA, Socialist Alternative, and PSL, among others, and those organizations' failures to constitute a real revolutionary political force in this country. It was the opinions of those members that the only organization which even approached the title of vanguard during the organizing struggles of the 20th century was the Black Panther Party, and thus we attempted to borrow from their practices when forming our own organization. As such, the theorists of the Black Panthers, namely Huey Newton, were instrumental in our foundational ideology and direction.

In an essay written in 1971, Comrade Newton defined a revolutionary formation as an organized structure equipped with revolutionary theory and put into practice by a dedicated cadre. Here Newton illuminates the three most basic aspects of an organization: revolutionary theory, organized structure, and dedicated cadre. Utilizing this definition as a framework, we can analyze the existing organizations and assess the current state of the socialist movement.

The number of organizations that possess two of these elements is small, and even fewer are the number of organizations which demonstrate all three, if such organizations even exist. For different reasons and to different degrees, different leftist tendencies lack each of these essential elements. Within radical student and worker organizations that spring up as a result of spontaneous activity, there is a tendency towards formlessness and a rejection of a solidified structure, which causes their organizations to be ineffective and easily dealt with by the state apparatus. Within some of the large national organizations is a lack of revolutionary theory with a prevalence of social democratic attitudes and distorted versions of Marxism. Within many smaller organizations and reading groups who equip themselves with revolutionary Marxist analysis is a serious lack of cadre level members, those who are able and willing to dedicate everything to the struggle and serve as the backbone of an organizations' political activity.

Our role, then, must be to work within our own organizations and adjacent organizations to develop these three elements.

In response to the anarchistic trends of our peers and the anti-democratic practices of the national parties, CCAP has taken great pains to develop our structure and ensure that it is thoroughly democratic. Additionally, we are equipped with the revolutionary theories of Marxism-Leninism, Decolonial Marxism, and materialist feminism. However, what we have found through the operation of our aid programs is that we lack a sufficient number of cadre-level members. As such, our most recent effort has been the development of a cadre education program.

We have identified four areas in which a member should be proficient to qualify as cadre-level. The first is theoretical understanding. A cadre-level member must be able to conduct accurate analysis of conditions utilizing the science of Marxism. The second proficiency is in logic. A cadre-level member must be capable of forming, delivering, presenting, and defending an argument as well as critique those of others. The third area is public speech and the fourth is leadership and management. A cadre-level member must be able to speak confidently in front of others and have the knowledge and

experience to be an effective leader.

We are currently in the process of developing a curriculum that will address these four proficiencies and help us to develop our cadre. With a developed and functional cadre, we can begin to expand our programs and capabilities as an organization. Additionally, the entire process will be meticulously documented so that other organizations will be able to recreate this program within their own organizations. Every advancement in our organizing knowledge and ability is a collective advancement for the movement as long as it is documented and shared with others.

Without a fully formed and capable party, there is no central apparatus to conduct education and development. However, we still need fully educated and capable individuals to serve as the backbone of our movement. As such, we recommend that all organizations engage in the process of education and internal development so that they can establish these three elements of a revolutionary organization.

When it comes to party building, there is a fourth element of organization: unity. CCAP is also in the process of developing unity with other revolutionary Marxist organizations in our city. We have identified one such organization, Cincinnati Socialists, and have spent the last several months growing our connections and relations with them. We aim to hold a unity conference with them to form the basis for what can become a city-wide league of Marxist organizations, the first step towards establishing a revolutionary vanguard capable of realizing the interests of the working classes.

The big national parties that currently lay claim to the title of vanguard have proven themselves to lack most, if not all, of these elements of building a revolutionary formation. They defang and distort Marxism to their whim, and refuse to engage in detailed analyses of colonialism and national liberation developed by Black and Indigenous Marxists the world over. They utilize their structures to stifle the democratic process and repress the revolutionary drive of their at-large membership. They refuse to meaningfully engage in the political development of their membership, causing opportunism, idealism, and defeatism to run rampant. Above all, they refuse to engage in the process of unity. They say, "we are the vanguard, join us" while we say "let us build the vanguard, unite with us."

As independent Marxists and Marxist organizations our strategy therefore must be twofold: unity and development. We must develop our formations and ensure their democratic structure and capability for growth. We must develop our analysis based in materialist dialectics and revolutionary philosophy. We must develop our membership until they become a cadre of committed, capable revolutionaries. Then, we must unite with one another to form coalitions, alliances, and leagues, all of which understand this strategy and understand the need for the construction of a revolutionary party.

Unity and development. These two parts of the strategy must always be present in our minds with every action and effort we undertake. Everything we do must be framed around these two ideas. For too long, our collective organization has stagnated, flailing around in the dark for a foothold. We have run out of time to treat our organizing as if it is a game or a hobby. If we are to succeed in our world-saving mission, we must develop and we must unite.

Minutes of the Proceedings

Welcome and coffee begins at 9:00 AM EST.

Conference begins at 9:30 AM EST with attendance.

The Convention Agreement is reviewed between 9:30 and 10:00 AM.

OSSWA delegates object to the calling of the conference on the grounds that all party-building efforts should be underground; object to the convention documents for failing to name Browderism, Avakianism, and for repeating the "Avakianite error" of creating an "intermediary organization" that is neither a cadre-organization nor one with open membership. Conference attendees disagree with this characterization of the proposed League.

Convention Member Organizations vote to adopt amended Convention Agreement and proceed in the face of OSSWA's objection.

At 10:00 AM the CTRRG delivers the Report on the State of the Movement.

Cde Gray asks what the figure of opposition will be for the movement in the absence of a czar or king. They remark that the term "all-empire" is international in scope because of the characteristics of the U.S. capitalist empire and suggests coordination across the Caribbean and all operative vassals and colonies.

Cde Gray remarks that the RSDLP had decades of revolutionary work before the revolution.

Cde Gray continues that the president is a tricky figure to oppose because the bourgeoisie change the president around every few years to keep the position itself from being attacked.

Cde Sean from OSSWA remarks that the study groups of the RSDLP and CPC were doing mass work before they were integrated into a party, that they were already integrated into the mass struggle, and that they were already illegal.

Cde Memphis indicates that the natlib struggle has been the leading struggle locally for the CS. Remarks contra Cde Sean that study groups can also be clandestine. Remarks that "to be leaders, we must lead because we deserve to be leading, we must learn how to lead."

Cde Lane remarks that there are issues with using digital communication. CS has a section in their report on the group chat model. Primacy of being face to face as the basis for organization. Must be very precise that digital communication is done through **tools** and that these are not **spaces**.

Cde Persephone echoes the primacy of meeting offline. Asks the use and practical purpose in plain English of the proposed Workers' League. Suggests a central repository of lessons and summations that are the analysis of events and efforts, a standardized reporting form, and the sharing of a curriculum.

Cde Lane remarks that centralized lessons and tactics could be said to constitute a line. Practice is

for the struggle over events. Centralization of documents is difficult due to security concerns.

At 12:30, organization reports are given, beginning with the CS.

Cde Persephone asks how the CS handles internal crit/self-crit.

Cde Memphis says that the CS method was not very structured and consisted of asking if anyone had criticisms. Did not proactively engage in analysis. The CS has been undergoing rectification in the last few months.

Cde Khadija remarks that there was friction around the Palestine organizing in the New York CPUSA before she left.

Cde Abba remarks that the Palestine issue created the need for an organization on campus at a local university. The CS report contains a self-criticism for the former organization's left liquidationist line.

Cde Gracchus asks for clarification on what constituted left liquidationism.

Cde Memphis replied that a fraction that split took a dismissive attitude toward campus organizing.

Cde Lane says that was a failure of the CS Executive committee to not bring the fractional question forward. The campus coalition they created wasn't explicitly a CS organization.

Cde Memphis explains the left-liquidationist line was that the CS should maximize struggle in the Palestine movement despite its organizational capacity. An executive meeting determined that all CS business would be abandoned and entirely identified the work with the campus movement.

Cde Abba remarks that this led to entirely ignoring the local conditions and liquidating the organizations formal structures to engage in Palestine organizing. Right-liquidationist line was forwarded of subsuming the national into the local as a dialectical reflection.

Cde. Peter reads the CCAP report into the record.

Cde Memphis asks for an elaboration of public speaking as part of cadre training.

Cde Peter replies that a part of aid programs is conducting social investigation, which involves talking to attendees, interacting with the public, knocking on doors, etc. and gathering information. It is difficult to approach strangers without much Marxist education and convey complex positions. This is an extremely important skill.

Cde Persephone asks about the details of the CCAP logic training.

Cde Peter replies that the program is still in the works. Goal is to work through foundational logical texts in both binary and dialectical logic. "I have had people approach after conversations where they have said they can't form effective arguments."

Cde Khadija says that CCAP mentioned members who were formerly in larger organizations. A criticism of smaller groups is that they are sectarian and we should be joining larger organizations to change them.

Cde Peter replies that it was helpful that in Cincinnati the national groups don't have a huge presence. There is no real CPUSA or FRSO presence. The Socialist Alternative chapter was dissolved.

There wasn't another option. For others — it is very difficult. Made connections for a few years. In cases where an org demonstrates anti-democratic structure, it becomes easy to convince people to leave. What do you do once we've left the big organization? Collect people and form a group.

Cde Memphis says that in Shenandoah there are no big organizations. Many new socialists joined the CS as a result. "A lot of people just searching for socialism."

Cde Peter says that founding members of CCAP were disillusioned members of large organizations, but now the organization has brand new organizers with no prior experience. It's good to grab new people before they're sucked into sinks.

Cde Abba says they are curious about food aid and survival work. Is a potential candidate pool advanced sections of the masses involved in food work?

Cde Peter replies that CCAP tried to do things like that. When *The Study Group* was published, they attempted to form a study group out of attendees. Turnout was low. They reassessed what was being talked about in *The Study Group* handbook. Came to the conclusion that *we, CCAP*, are the advanced. Cannot bring in the intermediate yet.

Cde Abba asks if CCAP has plans for figuring out better ways of identifying who is advanced?

Cde Peter says they are engaged in a unity process with the Cincy Socialists. Were originally focused solely on survival programs, but have since stopped trying to expand the programs to focus on development.

Cde Gracchus remarks that the movement is not opposed to the masses, that it is not yet organized. That the advanced are the people in the room working toward Marxism. Organize, get unity, then educate the intermediate. Discusses the way to hold a mass meeting to identify advanced members of the masses who aren't automatically drawn to the movement. "Let the people speak and you (advanced) rephrase and situate the speaker's comments."

Cde Gray agrees — bringing in tenant's work in Pittsburgh, focusing on organizing people already in housing. Housing situations are shaky and the people there are looking for institutional answers. This requires deeper class analysis. If you could construct a list of waiting people or get the Housing Authority's list, you have a body of people who need a very basic right to live.

Cde Frank asks for the CCAP breakdown of aid stations and survival programs.

Cde Peter replies that the number of people is consistent. Food programs serve roughly 60-100 people and shower program which runs weekly serves 5-10.

Cde Frank food program is in contradiction with cadre development for spare labor time.

Cde Nails replies that sometimes aid and survival programs are about being seen and establishing trust in the community. When it's needed, the masses will trust us and come to us.

ARC delivers their report.

ARC report is not a written document and has not been appended to these proceedings.

Cde Lane asks how the class consciousness of the Coastal Canadian population compares to the American south.

Cde Mike speaks to conditions in Halifax, Canada. There is an undercurrent of passive defense and the raising of militiamen/ "citizen soldiers." Casual disregard is drilled into the populace from a young age. Whereas American settlers are seen as brutal, Canadians "smile" while they are oppressing you. There is conflict between the government and the Mi'kmaq Nations. Where class consciousness exists, bourgeois control malforms it into personal or specific goals.

Cde Gracchus asks how Canadian settler colonial contradictions compare to statesian. Can you analyze why settler colonial violence is higher in some areas of Canada?

Cde Mike replies that he doesn't believe violence is higher in Nova Scotia compared to other parts of Canada or the U.S. Indigenous reservations are much smaller in the province of Nova Scotia and treaties with indigenous nations are older.

Cde Grey says that communicating through a group Wiki could help with developing curricula.

Cde Khadija asks how to work through the spontaneity of Canadian workers without being tailist or communist.

Cde Mike says it is hard. ARCP uses a "What is Marxism?" explainer and pamphlets to share with more advanced workers. ARCP has a newsletter for in-town events. The group does not have a super clear plan as of yet.

Cde Gracchus says that ARCP's pamphlet will be published.

Cde Persephone asks for clarity regarding Canadian military culture in Halifax. Asks Cde Mike to speak on revolutionary defeatism.

Cde Mike mentions the high number of cops in Halifax. 12,000 military and police (municipal and federal) overall. Most of that number (10,000 or so) military personnel. Comments that the Canadian military is garbage because they promote people to keep them in. Skills, equipment, and ships keep getting worse. Conditions will have to get a lot worse before the military people can be mobilized.

Cde Khadija asks if there are any Marxist sympathizers or "one-book Marxists" who choose to call themselves Marxists.

Cde Mike says yes and that there are more who sympathize with Marxism and that they often label themselves socialists.

Red Help ATX delivers their report.

Red Help ATX report is not a written report and has not been appended to these proceedings.

Cde Nails asks if RHATX was allowed to engage in their activities while they were still a part of CPUSA.

Cde James says yes and no. Red Help was one reason for the group's expulsion. CPUSA did not approve of the group taking inspiration from the Black Panthers. The Austin chapter was verbally critical towards RHATX.

Cde Khadija says she had a very similar experience with CPUSA in New York City.

Cde Gracchus if the group is engaged in education.

Cde James says RHATX has a reading list and are working on more educational materials.

Cde Khadija asks more about who and what RHATX is involved with.

Cde James speaks on unhoused encampments in Southern Austin that are at risk of sweeps.

Cde Khadija comments that some people say there are not many black people in the former Austin Club, now RHATX.

Cde James replies that Austin is a relatively white town. Requests ideas for engagement.

Cde Lane says it can be a labor cop out to request ideas for engagement from black members.

Cde Gracchus distinguishes between mutual aid and "Red Help." Red Help is unilateral ("Red Aid") and non-transactional while mutual aid is part of a community's own internal processes of exchange and fairness.

Cde James says it's about being out and having a presence.

Cde Sean asks if RedHelp works with the Austin RSG group

KSBC delivers their report.

KSBC report is not a written report and has not been appended to these proceedings.

Cde Nails asks if the club is in person or online.

Cde Persephone replies that it is both, but it's hard to gather everyone in person consistently.

Cde Khadija asks whether using the phrase "death to America" is appropriate for a specific crowd.

Cde Persphone replies that when protesting they use slogans and take the temperature of the crowd; if the people reject the slogan and don't take it up, they don't continue to use it.

Cde Lane asks what the efficacy of KSBC's "4 oppressed (noneconomic) classes" is.

Cde Persephone replies that the working class is hard to approach in full. There is a precariat; the rest of the working class has consistent access to work. KSBC thought the groups mentioned were disproportionately represented in the prison population and this formed a good rule of thumb for identifying super-exploitation. Identities on the margins. More precarious groups.

Cde Lane replies that this is divorced from the proletariat and class.

Cde Persephone responds with a defense of the labor aristocracy theory and the existence of unequal exchange. The New Deal is used as an example. The four social classes are marginal.

Cde Gracchus asks if he can rephrase Persephone's point in other language; does so, offering that the four groups identified aren't in actuality classes, but are the social embodiment of economic relations which structure and order class.

Cde Lane agrees that this is a better formulation.

The convention takes a coffee break.

The meeting resumes with a question as to whether or not to address the raised question of digital

communications platforms, which the CS has specifically addressed and many other reports have touched on.

Vote is held to continue unification discussion at the prompting of OSSWA, who want to make their objections known.

Convention proceeds to the proposed formation of the Workers' League.

Three voting organizations are identified from the minutes: the CTRRG, CCAP, and ARCP.

Cde Maria argues that the ideological section of the Workers' League proposals is not properly defined. ML is an insufficient definition. Risk of eclecticism.

Cde Sean argues that there is a lack of a stand on communist experiments after 1953. The PCP fell to revisionism and legalism and was reconstituted. Required clandestine work. A specific formulation of ML is necessary to avoid repeating work of the past. Sectarianism has plagued movement. The dialectic of workers/capital has to be the core. See the Brazil comm. Reconstitution. The Workers' League is an Avakianite, intermediate organization proposal. League reinvents the wheel unnecessarily and incorrectly. Will not lead to concentration of forces, but rather further dispersal.

Cde Lane asks for clarity on an "intermediate organization."

Cde Sean replies that it is neither a mass organization with a specific line nor a cadre organization. RCP is clandestine, intermediate organizations suffer repression because they are open.

Cde Khadija asks if OSSWA's position is that we should do only underground work.

Cde Sean replies that it is not sufficient to be doing Red Aid/tenant work but we should be developing the mass movement. There is a particular way of doing this.

Cde Khadija asks if PSL, CPUSA, etc. are doing too much above-ground work.

Cde Sean replies that in the late 20s and early 30s, the Third Period, shop units and clandestine factory units existed but were later liquidated.

Cde Peter asks what OSSWA means by a party not being clandestine going against the principles of Leninism.

Cde Sean replies that the Bolshevik/Menshevik split was between an open organization and a party organization. In order for centralization to exist, the elective principle is not sufficient.

Cde Gracchus asks how to determine the correct line without a party.

Cde Sean replies that local areas split themselves into secret work then also engage in secret communication to form the party.

Cde Memphis says that this seems to be a tactic choice, not a principle, because it's predicated on the level of repression faced.

Cde Sean responds that if you are a Marxist, you will be repressed.

Cde Memphis says that the state has laws that govern its action.

Cde Sean replies that the PCP formulated those laws. Fascist repression comes when there are mass movements. A movement without a military is merely legal Marxism. You don't form any party cell in the open.

Cde Khadija asks whether that leads to sectarianism.

Cde Sean replies "A party smashes the revisionist line."

Cde Peter remarks that the process of building the party is uniting secretive clandestine orgs with the correct line. How can this occur without a party to enforce that line? Huey Newton brings out this point about being clandestine and being above-ground and that the party cannot be known among the masses if it is in hiding.

Cde Sean replies that nothing related to the party can be done in the open. OSSWA delegates do not have the authority or experience to speak on party formation. Only the party can enforce a line. When we work in the open movement, we should be struggling against each other to find the class line.

Cde Peter asks what do you do if people disagree about a difference of strategy?

Cde Sean replies that, in the background, according to concentric construction, there will be people guiding the process. In the foreground we should be building up an objectively correct line.

Cde Grey asks why anyone should follow a hidden party. To withstand pressure is 1) to regenerate losses and 2) to be protected by the masses. OSSWA is narrowing down the channels of communication and leaving the field open to opportunists posing as socialists.

Cde Sean replies that they develop the sea to float in. We study the lines of work. There will have to be intercourse.

Cde Grey asks what that has to do with being clandestine.

Cde Sean asks why we are wasting time instead of going into labor work and forming clandestine units.

Cde Lane asks that, if the recommendation is not to form the League, what would be the recommendation?

Cde Sean replies to centralize and submit to democratic centralism.

Cde Lane clarifies: what do you recommend we do *today*.

Cde Maria says that the proposal recognizes that everyone is scattered. Instead of forming the League, we should establish an organization so people aren't all isolated mountain kingdoms.

Cde Peter replies that he doesn't see how what she's suggesting is different from what the convention is doing.

Cde Sean replies that sectarianism is unavoidable.

A long conversation ensues in which the convention attempts to draw out the suggested organization that OSSWA recommends. OSSWA delegates reply that they are not permitted to speak about it.

Cde Peter remarks that this keeps us from understanding specifically what we are being asked to

do by OSSWA.

Cde Gracchus poses a theoretical overarching organization behind the cellular clandestine organizations.

Cde Sean replies that would conceptually be a guiding party.

Cde Peter responds that there is no party yet.

Cde Maria indicates that OSSWA has made its position clear and we may move on.

The proposals are read. The noted amendments are suggested. The proposal is voted on by the voting members. The Workers' League is formed, but ARCP cannot join at the present time. RedHelp ATX and the CS agree to submit applications when they can.

The convention is adjourned.

Charter of the All-Empire Workers' League

PREAMBLE. Where no party or organization currently exists which has the faith of the workers or possess the true form of democratic centralism in the settler-occupied states of the U.S. or its junior partner in imperialism, Canada, and where the formation of such an organization is of central importance to our movement, and where that organization must immediately grapple with the national question in such a way as to defeat the settler-chauvinism that has corrupted and destroyed all past attempts at establishing a Marxist-Leninist organization, we, the constituent members of the League, hereby set out the following rules and regulations, agreed upon, to allow us to maintain cohesion as we plan for the convention of a proper conference of unification to found the Communist Party of North America.

Article I: League Membership

3. Membership in the League shall be open to any organization in the United States, Canada, or any of the nations currently imprisoned therein, which has:
 - a. Formal bylaws or regulations that do not conflict with this charter;
 - b. Defined membership and membership responsibilities, which must include a mechanism for the assessment and collection of dues and the mandatory performance of labor in furtherance of the organization's goals;
 - c. A professed and actual commitment to Marxism-Leninism, to the national liberation of the subject nations of the U.S. settler-republic and its junior partner Canada as well as all its subjects and vassals, and has codified such commitments as part of its most basic rules;
 - d. Bylaws or policies to address harassment, misconduct, liquidationism, and the process of criticism and self-criticism;
 - e. A membership of at least five (5) full members;
4. The process of joining the League shall be through application by an organization or solicitation from the League. Applicant organizations shall:
 - a. Submit their most recent bylaws or charter for consideration and ratification;
 - b. Submit a brief statement setting out their work, connection with the masses, if any, and geographical location;
 - c. Submit a resolution, passed by their organization according to its forms, demonstrating a desire to join the League, which must be signed by that organization's record keeper attesting it to be correct.
5. The League shall consider all pending applications either in full session or by means of a Membership Committee, but in any case no less than once each month.
6. The League shall either:
 - a. Accept such application;

- b. Recommend revisions to the bylaws or charter of the applicant and suggest resubmission; or,
 - c. Reject such application.
7. In any case, the League will promptly communicate its decision to the applicant organization.
- 8. Candidate Organizations.** Candidate Organization may be admitted to League business and conventions upon application and approval. To be eligible as a Candidate Organization, an organization must be at least nominally Marxist and possess an actual organizational form. Candidate Organizations which have been recognized by the Membership Committee or other League body and approved by a vote shall have the right to participate in all League discussions and send delegates to all League events and meetings in a number as determined for member organizations under Article II below, but in any case no fewer than one delegate.
9. Each Member Organization shall submit its bylaws, constitution, and charter once yearly for review by the Article III § 4 Executive Committee.

Article II: Delegates

1. Each Member and Candidate Organization shall maintain an up-to-date count of its active membership and shall submit such count to the League once every three months.
2. Each Member and Candidate Organization shall be entitled to elect one delegate for every five active members in its organization or fraction thereof.
3. These delegates shall be selected democratically. Each organization shall submit certified minutes wherein elections of each delegate were held as well as the vote counts electing each delegate to the Article III Credentialing Committee prior to the Convention.
4. Delegates sent to the Convention by a Candidate Organization shall be entitled to voice but no vote on all League matters.

Article III: Structure

1. The League shall not interfere with or direct its constituent organizations except insofar as such interference or direction is either: i) necessary for the furtherance of the strategic goals of the League as determined by either the Convention or its executive committee, or ii) such interference or direction is requested by the member organization.
2. The League shall hold a Convention once yearly, which shall constitute its highest organ.
3. Prior to each Convention, a Credentialing Committee shall be assembled from all credentialed League organizations, to optimally consist of one member democratically selected by each. This Credentialing Committee shall assess delegate credentials and issue the same at the Convention.
4. The Convention shall elect, each year, an executive committee composed of one voting member from each Member Organization and one non-voting member from each Candidate

Organization, who shall direct the activities of the League in accordance with the direction and resolutions adopted by the previous Convention and shall have the power to appoint and dissolve committees and subcommittees.

Article IV: Principles

1. The overthrow and total abolition of the fundamentally illegitimate and irredeemable United States and its junior partner, Canada;
2. Black and Indigenous sovereignty over their respective indigenous homelands and/or rightfully claimed national territories, in forms that will be collectively and democratically decided by each people, nation, and community on its own terms, on the basis of mutual respect for the right of all peoples to self-determination;
3. Partition of any remaining (that is, unclaimed) territories into a centralized union of local socialist states, wherein self-determination for all oppressed peoples, nations, and communities is guaranteed;
4. Reparations in the forms of wealth, land, and labor, to be forcibly extracted from the U.S.-Canadian imperialist and settler bourgeoisie, landed colonial aristocracy, and other exploiting classes, as well as from the colonial police and imperialist military, and justly redistributed to the victims of U.S.-Canadian colonialism and Western capitalist imperialism;
5. A program for structural depatriarchalization, focused on true emancipation for women and LGBT people; the reorganization of social labor, the labors of production and reproduction, on gender-equal lines; the abolition of all outmoded institutions, industries, and medical, professional, and cultural practices that rely on gendered violence and maintain gendered oppression; justice for all victims and survivors of sexual violence — in short, the beginning of the end of gendered oppression in all its forms;
6. Preparation for humanity's collective survival of the ecological devastation wrought by modern colonialism and capitalism in the pursuit of worldwide environmental justice through internationalist cooperation and reparations;
7. Abolition of outmoded and inhumane models of "justice," including modern police, jails and prisons, psychiatric "hospitals," and other such institutions, to be replaced with models of revolutionary justice;
8. Defense of the revolution, including the ruthless defeat and suppression of all reactionary classes and counter-revolutionary forces, especially the forces of white supremacy, within North America, through an organized and sustained campaign of Red Terror;
9. Internationalism, put into practice by supporting the independent economic development and self-reliance of the world's underdeveloped countries and regions, by forming comradely alliances with socialist countries, and by supplying aid to revolutionary struggles across the world;
10. The democratically self-determined, cooperative, ecologically sustainable development of socialism in every state that emerges from the total decolonization of the North American

continent, planned and administered by the revolutionary Dictatorship of the Oppressed.

Signed 9/7/2024

The Connecticut Radical Reading Group, full affiliation

Cincinnati Community Aid and Praxis, provisional ratification by delegates Peter and Nails, ratified on 9/17/2024 by the full membership

Unity-Struggle-Unity Press admitted to full membership on 9/26/2024

About Unity-Struggle-Unity Press

We are a Marxist-Leninist press based in the U.S. Empire. We are currently focused on publishing the *Red Clarion*, our mass political newspaper.

The *Clarion* can be read for free at **www.clarion.unity-struggle-unity.org**. If your local organization is interested in partnering with our press to distribute the paper and other Communist literature, *free of charge*, to working-poor and oppressed people in your locality, then please contact us at **USUEditorial@protonmail.com**.

We are always looking for correspondence from comrades and readers for the *Clarion*. We welcome both articles, intended for direct publication, and letters, not intended for publication, but rather to inform our journalists of the social conditions of working-poor and oppressed communities. Please, if you have the time, write to us! Your correspondence will help to build a truly mass Communist paper in the U.S. and Canada.

Additionally, comrades can find a full catalogue of our free-to-download standalone works at **unity-struggle-unity.org/pamphlets**.