

PROCEEDINGS OF THE SECOND CONVENTION OF



THE ALL-EMPIRE WORKER'S LEAGUE

UNITY—STRUGGLE—UNITY PRESS

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE SECOND CONVENTION
OF THE
ALL-EMPIRE
WORKER'S LEAGUE**

published by Unity-Struggle-Unity Press

Creative Commons Share
and Share Alike License
2026 by Unity-Struggle-
Unity Press

Contents

Schedule.....1

Introduction 2

Opening Address4

Cde. Kira.....4

Cincinnati Community Aid and Praxis 7

River Valley Liberation Organization 13

Unity–Struggle–Unity Press17

Red Help Austin.....23

Address from Chunka Luta Network25

Conference Minutes..... 27

Day One: January 9, 2026..... 27

Conference Minutes.....28

Day Two: January 10, 202628

Conference Minutes.....43

Day Three: January 11, 2026.....43

SECOND CONVENTION OF THE ALL-EMPIRE WORKER’S LEAGUE

JAN. 9TH

12 PM - Check-in and Orientation
 1 PM - Introduction
 2 PM - Annual Member Organization Reports
 5:30 PM - Dinner
 6:30 PM - Closing Speaker and Discussion
 7:30 PM - Adjournment

JAN. 10TH

10:30 AM - Arrival and Breakfast
 11:00 AM - Begin Deliberation on Resolutions
 12:15 PM - Lunch
 1 PM - Continue Deliberation
 4:30 PM - End Deliberation/Closing
 4:45 PM - Dinner
 5:45 PM - Dismissal

JAN. 11TH

12 PM - Arrival/Lunch
 2:00 PM - Election of the Executive Committee
 3:00 PM - Final Discussion and Year Plan
 5:00 PM - Closing Remarks and Adjournment

FOR HOUSING, TRANSPORTATION, OR OTHER QUESTIONS PLEASE CONTACT

UNITE. STRUGGLE.
WIN.

INTRODUCTION

On January 9th, several individuals representing half a dozen local organizations from across the US-Canadian Empire met in Cincinnati for the second annual convention of the All-Empire Worker's League. For three days, these individuals discussed reports prepared by the Member Organizations of the League, resolutions put forward by those organizations for deliberation, and the outlook for the next year of work. Within and between these discussions, several important questions floated to the surface. What is the exact purpose and function of the League? How should it operate as we move towards a revolutionary moment? What are the problems we have faced since the founding convention in September of 2024, and how do we address those? What are the problems facing the movement for socialism in the US and how can the League facilitate the resolution of those issues? I believe that we managed to answer many of these questions, and that we have come out of this conference with renewed focus and resolve in our struggle.

To begin, what is the League?

The League is an organization of organizations, a unity of four primary organizations from around the country. The stated goal of the League is to assist in building the foundation for a Communist movement and the constitution of a true vanguard party in the US by building relations with local and regional organizations and uniting with them under a common strategy of movement building. It is not a party in its own right and has very little in the ways of internal structure and procedure separate from that of the Member Organizations. It has limited power to compel its Member Organizations to do anything. So what, then, is the point?

To some, this defeats the purpose. If the League has no firm authority over its member bodies, if it can't really do anything on its own, then the labor that the League asks the Member Organizations to commit to its functions is basically wasted. That labor would be better applied to the development of the local organizations, and once a suitable number of local organizations has reached a suitable level of development, then we can re-open the question on the usefulness of the League form. This critique of the League carries weight, for it is true that the development of the League is a draw on labor from the local organizations, and, at times, it has been difficult to acquire the necessary labor to satisfy the League's existing functions from those local organizations, which was a large topic of conversation at the conference itself.

The main issue with this line of thinking, however, is that *the local organizations in the US are NOT developing independently to a satisfactory degree*. The US Communist movement, in effect, does not exist. The culprit? Mass political underdevelopment, resulting in the pervasiveness of the rightist deviations of revisionism, opportunism, and tailism. Proving Lenin's famous quote true, there is no revolutionary movement because there is no revolutionary theory. US "Marxists" do not practice Marxism, they adopt the sayings, slogans, conclusions, and exact strategies from Marxists and Marxist movements past, but they do not understand the creative core that is the true essence of scientific socialism. They do not know how to conduct analysis, they do not know how to produce theory of their own, because they have not been taught how. And this dead, stagnant, blunt Marxism has caused the Communists in the US to go round and round in circles, utilizing the same dead-end organizing strategies (constant rallies, electoralism, vulgar trade unionism) and the same ineffective organizational forms (anti-democratic and ultra-democratic, horizontalist and cultist, hobbyist and amateurist) for over a century. The local organizations cannot escape this pattern because they cannot ask the right questions, they cannot even see that

they are stuck.

This is what the League exists to combat. The League's most important function is that of a platform for communication between local organizations, where they can share information, experiences, strategies and tactics, and eventually, assets. They can assist in the development of one another, keeping a local organization from become isolated, turning inwards, and struggling in circles until it ceases to exist. But above all, through facilitated struggle, through principled debate and deliberation, the League can establish standards of ideological and practical development and standards of procedure that will, slowly but surely, drag the Communist movement kicking and screaming from the mud.

The outcome of the Second Convention was, more so than any concrete decision made during deliberation, a renewed resolve and determination to put this into practice, a greater degree of unity and mutual respect between the Member Organizations, and a vital camaraderie to fuel our development for the coming year.

OPENING ADDRESS

CDE. KIRA

Good afternoon comrades, allies, and friends to the movement. We are gathered this weekend to perform a vital task: we aim to diagnose our conditions and forge a path forward for our development as a cohesive organization of organizations. We are here to find clarity through a fog of imperial propaganda, a disorganized left, and our own inexperience. Clarity comes from principled discussion and disciplined action. Right now, the movement in the imperial core is dormant. Our enemies: the financiers, warmongers, exploiters and oppressors of all kinds, find themselves comfortable with the current state of affairs. Comrades, we know what their comfort is built upon.

The True Cost of Imperial Comfort

At home, the people are subjected to rising prices, fewer jobs with fewer protections, and blatant repression at the hands of the police and policy-makers. However, this struggle is amplified abroad for the benefit of the people here.

Our comrades in struggle internationally pay the direct price for our simple luxuries. They are paid pennies on the dollar, if they are paid at all. Their political leaders are kidnapped or killed. Their lands are bombed while every resource is looted for the benefit of the ruling class. All the while, that same ruling class tells us these stolen resources are our birthright, that we too should side against our comrades abroad. The poverty abroad is the price to pay for our comfort.

This is the reality in Venezuela with the kidnapping of Maduro so the empire can pillage oil. The United States did not work alone in this process. European states also ramped up their political attacks against the country from political mud-slinging to the outright seizure of assets. Venezuela is not alone in their political oppression at the hands of empire. The whole of the global south faces attacks like these daily, with the entire bourgeoisie working in solidarity with one another to steal great amounts of wealth from the peoples of the world.

These are not simple policy decisions made by a few people. These policies are active and violent insults to humanity. We must respond to these insults with the same aggression shown to our class but magnified tenfold through an organized, intelligent, and militant force. For too long the imperialists have felt comfortable with their actions. It is time to end that comfort. We begin this process by analyzing the system the bourgeoisie has built.

The Necessity of Ruthless Analysis

We are here to conduct an analysis of our work and the conditions we find ourselves surrounded by. Our analysis must be ruthless because we exist in a movement which has been mired in a century of failure and false starts. The analysis from our conference in Lake Quonnipaug about the history of the movement in North America still stands. We have not seen a party built in the communist tradition practiced by the Soviet Union, China, Korea, and so on. There have only been top-down attempts to build organizations here or groups which attempt the direct growth model.

The movement in North America never championed national liberation for Black and Indigenous peoples as a central aspect to our conditions. Many organizations ignore identities

outside of economic class as part of their analysis and thereby recreate patriarchal systems in their groups. We inherit this legacy and we must take these lessons into account when developing our movement.

This legacy manifests today in two dominant deviations. First, the dominance of rightism: opportunism, revisionism, tailism, and reformism. These chauvinistic tactics favor our enemies, they mirror a white capitalist society more so than they embody a spirit of revolutionary solidarity. Perversions of democratic centralism create insulated leaderships which lead organizations nowhere and the vast majority of people ignored. This problem must be rooted out and all organizations guilty of these tactics must be harshly criticized for the health of the movement.

The second deviation appears to us as ultra-leftism. Party building is shrugged off, and in similar fashion to the bourgeoisie, these deviationists throw the work of revolution onto the citizens of the global south. We see wild acts of adventurism from the most active members of this deviation which only serve to alienate us from the masses of people as these disorganized acts of terror happen without the backing of a revolutionary strategy.

Our analysis must take these developments into account when creating our own path forward. We must understand our history and the current tactics in use by organizations today. The movement does not grow from the tactics of organizations like PSL. Organizations like theirs simply gain profit off of revolutionary imagery and create dead-ends for passionate workers who wish to bring an end to their oppression. We must analyze the successful tactics of past movements and bring them into our conditions. We must question the robustness of these tactics in our time and in our spaces. Through this action, we create the grounds for a proper practice which can challenge the imperial beast and provide us the tools through which to slay it.

Forging the Weapon: The Party-to-Come

The movement at large is aimless and anxious. The peoples of the world are looking for a weapon to thrust into their oppressors. Comrades, we must forge this weapon. The coals of struggle are burning, the unshaped metal of a vanguard party is in our grasp and we hold the hammer of theory. We must shape this metal with coordinated and disciplined strikes.

Our predecessors were not born by a divine decree, but through the unification of study circles and the unification of leagues of struggle which engaged in the process of on the ground work and theoretical analysis of the conditions before them. This is what we must do and this is why we are gathered here. We are not here to declare the party yet, but we are analyzing the work done since the last conference. We are discussing our growth as individual organizations and how we can replicate this growth among other organizations throughout the continent.

The party-to-be is formed by our organizations. It is not enough to simply agree with one another. Our organizations must test their mettle in theoretical debate and by carrying out tasks in the field. We can never stop engaging in this process or else our party will never come to be, or, worse than that, our party may fall victim to one of the deviations we see in practice among the main players in the movement today. The party-to-be would be the sum of all of our parts. Comrades, it must be a unified and disciplined whole with rigorous protocols and a powerful theoretical backing. Our conference is a workshop for the forging of our main weapon against the bourgeoisie. We must guide our actions through revolutionary science and action. We cannot fall victim to dogma. Our analysis must serve our practice, our practice must inform our analysis, and we must forge this revolutionary weapon.

The Rising Tide of Our Task

Comrades, the crises of capital are growing every single day. Inflation is getting worse, real wages are falling, the pandemic has harmed capital severely. Capitalism is once again desperate to squeeze profits from wherever it can and it is finding itself needing to tighten its grip on all of us. The people of the world are, as ever, feeling this squeeze and are looking for ways to solve this problem.

We are more powerful than the bourgeoisie. Even a fraction of the proletariat's power could wipe out their parasitic class, yet the proletariat needs a weapon. Our enemies derive their power from the state they created and from the control of private property. Our power comes from our numbers and the control of production in every form. Our power can only be harnessed through an organized and militant party. This party will not arise spontaneously. We must build it through dedicated study and hard struggle.

This is the work that lies before us. We must build organizations capable of reproducing committed cadre. We must link these organization together. We must use that organization to form the vanguard party and strike a death blow to our enemies.

Comrades, our discussions here are essential. We must utilize this time to examine where we are and plan how we build. We must undertake the serious work of electing a new executive committee who will see us through the interim to ensure we do not lose the momentum we build this weekend. The agenda is set. The need is dire. The people are waiting. Let us get to work forging the steel of a revolutionary vanguard party. Welcome to the 2026 All Empire Worker's League conference.

ANNUAL REPORT

CINCINNATI COMMUNITY AID AND PRAXIS

Section 1: Membership

Membership in CCAP is stratified according to the following schema:

Affiliate Volunteers are those individuals who are interested in getting involved with CCAP's work but are not able or willing to commit the amount of time and labor required for full membership. Affiliate volunteers are invited to involve themselves in the work of some committees and are asked to attend one meeting per month of whatever committee they are working with. Affiliate volunteers are not invited to General Body meetings nor do they pay dues to the organization. A prospective member of CCAP is also now required to serve as a volunteer for a minimum of four months prior to pursuing full membership with the organization.

Candidate Members are those members who are pursuing full membership, have completed their 4 month requirement as an affiliate volunteer, but have yet to complete CCAP's Beginner Education Program. Candidate members are invited to attend General Body meetings, where they are granted voice but no vote, but they are not expected to pay dues to the organization, nor can they run for office.

Full Members are those who have completed their candidacy. Full members are granted full voting rights on all matters, pay dues to the organization, and are permitted to run for office. They also are expected to join at least one standing committee and abide by the labor expectations set by that committee, and enroll in CCAP's Cadre Development Program.

In total, CCAP currently has approximately 8 affiliate volunteers, no candidate members, and 10 full members, one of whom is taking a temporary hiatus.

In terms of development, most of CCAP consists of new and learning Communists, with less than three cadre level members.

Section 2: Organizational Form

CCAP was founded in 2022 with five members following the dissolution of its previous iteration, the Cincinnati Civil Defense Initiative, in 2021. The founding members had no distinction in responsibility or authority, and the organization consisted of just a single body. Today, CCAP has a total membership of 10 individuals and consists of several standing committees and the General Body. The standing committees are the Aid Committee, the Agitation and Propaganda Committee, the Communications Committee, the Education Committee, the Operations Committee, and the Security Committee. Each committee is granted the authority to make decisions pertaining to their area of work, including setting meeting times and labor standards. The highest body of the organization is the General Body. Each Committee is headed by a secretary who is responsible for delegating tasks and running meetings, and the organization as a whole is headed by the General Secretary. Elections happen every six months, and any member of the organization who has completed their candidacy is eligible to run.

Section 3: Brief Analysis of Local Conditions

CCAP is currently undertaking a more in depth and more detailed study of the history of the

region and the current class structure, which is intended to be completed in the next few months. In lieu of this, we have included a short summary of the region's history and economy.

Established in 1819 after the dispossession of the Indigenous Shawnee people following the Battle of Fallen Timbers in 1794, the City of Cincinnati has been critical to the U.S. colonial project, serving as a base of operations for westward expansion throughout the 19th century as well as a major center of industry. Situated at the confluence of the Ohio, Great Miami, and Little Miami rivers, Cincinnati was known primarily for its meatpacking and ironworking industries. In the late 19th and early 20th centuries, as riverboat travel gave way to the railroads, Cincinnati was somewhat overshadowed by Chicago, however it remained a central logistics hub for the U.S. economy, which it continues to be today. Like many midwestern cities, Cincinnati was greatly affected by the process of de-industrialization which saw the rapid flight of much of the wealthy class of labor aristocrats from the city center to the suburbs. At the end of the 20th century and beginning of the 21st, several neighborhoods in Cincinnati became the targets of gentrification which saw the forced displacement of much of the city's Black population, a process which continues to this day.

Several major US companies have their headquarters or otherwise major locations in and around the city, including Procter & Gamble, Kroger, Fifth-Third Bank, GE Aerospace, Cintas, and Amazon's principal air hub at the Cincinnati/Northern Kentucky International Airport. Cincinnati's central location makes it arguably one of the most important locations in the U.S. for shipping logistics and distribution. Despite not appearing frequently in conversations about the biggest or most important cities in the country, Cincinnati is quietly one of the U.S. empire's most vital points.

CCAP primarily operates in and around the neighborhood of Camp Washington, which is situated between the main University of Cincinnati campus and the CSX rail yard along the Mill Creek. Camp Washington was a major location for the meatpacking industry, and boasted a population of over 20,000 people in the late 19th century. However, due to deindustrialization and the construction of I-75 bisecting the neighborhood, today it has fewer than 1,000 permanent residents and is one of Cincinnati's most impoverished neighborhoods.

Section 4: Active Programs

CCAP's work in Camp Washington primarily involves our regular aid programs, which consists of a monthly trash pickup program, a monthly food serve program, and a weekly shower program. The monthly food serve regularly feeds between 40 to 80 people. The weekly shower program sees approximately 5 to 10 people each weekend, and provides free toiletries, clothing, and clean needle kits. The aid programs are staffed by CCAP members and volunteers. CCAP runs three separate education programs, including our weekly book club run through our Discord server, our Beginner Education Program, and the two tracks of our Cadre Development Program. The book club is run by a CCAP member but is attended mostly by affiliate volunteers and orbiters who are in our Discord server, usually two to three individuals each week. The Beginner Education Program is a six week program designed to establish a baseline understanding of Marxism-Leninism as well as CCAP's general structure and practice. All members are required to complete the BEP prior to attaining full membership with the organization. Currently no individuals are taking our Beginner Education Program. The Cadre Development Program is our largest education program, which is designed to continually develop our membership into a functional and cohesive cadre. It is split into two tracks based on the amount of time members are available to commit. The Lower Commitment Track meets twice a month and combines collective theory reading sessions with reflections on practical work.

Members on this track are expected to take field notes whenever they engage in some action or activity as part of CCAP, and these field notes are reviewed collectively, tied to theoretical concepts learned in study sessions, and combined into reports at the end of each month. The Higher Commitment Track is the theory intensive track, which involves weekly meetings where members discuss the assigned readings for that week. This track also completes short essay assignments and is engaged in a collective research project on the class structure of Cincinnati. Five CCAP members are taking the Higher Commitment Track of the CDP alongside a former member and a member of Cincinnati Socialists. The remaining five members are taking the Lower Commitment Track, whose sessions have also recently been opened to affiliate volunteers.

Section 5: Organizations of Note

Fellow Traveler Organizations

Washington United Church of Christ (WUCC): WUCC and CCAP have found unity in our shared desire to help the houseless population in Camp Washington, with the church allowing us to use their facilities to run our food and shower programs free of charge, though attempts at establishing new programs like opening the church apartments to house individuals has met pushback from the church council. This relationship is stable, however it does not have a clear path for development.

Community Survival Network (CSN): The CSN was an effort that CCAP started around two years ago as an attempt to get outside individuals and organizations involved in our aid programs, however, it quickly exceeded the original scope and became a coalition/communication channel for many different progressive organizations in the city. While attempts at developing the CSN in a meaningful direction largely fell through due to ideological disagreement and mismanagement by CCAP, a weekly food serve was established downtown that serves between 50 and 100 people each week, with organizations taking turns serving each week. Four organizations serve food on each Saturday of the month, with CCAP serving food on months with five Saturdays.

CSN consists mainly of liberal progressive and anarchist aid organizations, the most notable of which will be listed here as they all have roughly the same relationship with CCAP:

Coalition for Community Safety (CCS): An anarchist aid organization that engages in food distribution, clothing distribution, and harm reduction.

Food Not Bombs (FNB): An anarchist aid organization involved in food distribution.

Black Power Initiative (BPI): BPI was formed in 2020 as a revolutionary Black nationalist organization, though with the loss of some of its more radical members, it has since developed in a more liberal direction and pursued non-profit status. BPI mostly runs various aid programs around the city. They helped to establish the Queen Mother's Market which is a Black-owned food co-op in Walnut Hills, who is also in CSN.

Triiibe: Triiibe is a Black artist collective and activist group that runs many art-centered community and aid events.

Cincinnati Palestine Justice Coalition: The Palestine Justice Coalition was established by the Students for Justice in Palestine chapter at the University of Cincinnati (SJP UC), the Palestine Diaspora Movement (PDM), and Northern Kentucky 4 Palestine (NKY4Pal) as an attempt to cohere the movement for Palestine in Cincinnati. It primarily functions as a communications network for the sharing of information related to protests and other events put on around the city for Palestine. The group consists of many Palestinian orgs, liberal progressive and anarchist organizations, and Communist organizations.

Food Not Lawns (FNL): A progressive/socialistic organization that established itself in the

past year which exists to help individuals destroy their lawns and establish urban gardens instead. They are very involved in food aid efforts.

513 Food Initiative: An effort which was spurred on by FNL in November of 2025 in response to the announcement of SNAP benefits being cut. The coalition consisted of individuals from many local aid organizations including many from CSN mentioned above. The main focus of the group was to recover leftover food from restaurants at the end of the day and distribute those to people in need. The effort has little structure or direction despite attempts by the Communist elements to develop those aspects, and lost much of its momentum as quickly as it came. While it still technically exists, its direction is unclear.

Cincinnati Tenants Union (CTU): CTU was an effort started by students at UC YDSA in 2019, but was quickly adopted by individuals outside of those circles. It continues to operate today attempting to organize tenants in buildings in the city. Though the successes of those efforts are varied, CTU has a decently strong connection with the masses.

Communist Organizations

Cincinnati Socialists (CS)

A Leninist organization that was established in 2021 following a split from Socialist Alternative. It is the most closely aligned organization to CCAP in the city, and we have collaborated on many fronts. CS engages in a range of actions include running and marshalling protests, town halls, public education events, coalition work, as well as internal development. CS and CCAP met at a conference in March to establish a second order organization called the Ohio River Valley Revolutionary Socialists (ORVRS), though this organization has yet to properly establish itself due to miscommunication between the two orgs and disconnect regarding the effectiveness/urgency of the effort within CS membership. CS is also involved in the Palestine Justice Coalition and the 513 Food Recovery Program.

Party for Socialism and Liberation (PSL)

PSL is involved in CSN and the Palestine Justice Coalition, however, they have proven difficult to work with. Attempts were made to struggle constructively with PSL two years ago but they were rebuffed. PSL is currently focusing all of its efforts on its campaign for Ohio State Senate.

Communist Party USA (CPUSA)

Cincinnati has a very small CPUSA chapter (3 to 5 members) which appeared a year and a half ago. They share very little about their operations and not much communication is had with them.

Socialist Alternative (SAlt)

Socialist Alternative is a national Trotskyist organization which has a chapter in Cincinnati. They are a part of the Palestine Justice Coalition, but otherwise they engage very little with CCAP.

Democratic Socialists of America (DSA)

The local DSA chapter is difficult to get a full read on. They are also involved in the Palestine Justice Coalition but it is not clear what other activities the chapter is engaged in. They have recently been combative towards other Communist organizations in the city, stating that they will cease working with PSL and Cincinnati Socialists over ideological and tactical disagreements.

Young Democratic Socialists of America (YDSA)

The Cincinnati area has two YDSA chapters at the University of Cincinnati and at Miami University. YDSA engages largely in campus activism.

Socialist Unity Network of Southwest Ohio (SUN)

SUN grew out of a PSL effort to establish aid programs in Dayton, Ohio, though they are no longer formally connected. SUN has Marxist and Marxist-Leninist elements which CCAP and CS have been attempting to grow a relationship with.

Section 6: Reflection on Last Year of Work

CCAP has undergone some very significant changes over the past year. In 2024, we identified the primary cause of our stagnation as an organization to be a general political and organizational underdevelopment among membership. As such, the focus of 2025 was primarily on internal development and explicating our form. The first half of the year saw the preparation and finalization of the Cadre Development Program, which was then implemented beginning in June. Additionally, 2025 was a year of movement building through growing our relationship with the rest of the organizations in the League as well as organizations here, most notably Cincinnati Socialists (CS). In March, we held Cincinnati's first Unity Conference which saw the establishment of a second order organization similar to the League between CCAP and CS.

The main driver of our internal development outside of the Cadre Development Program has been the period of volatility of our membership numbers which began in November of 2024. Following the re-election of Donald Trump, CCAP saw a major increase in individuals pursuing membership with the organization which extended through to March of the next year. Membership more than doubled in size, approaching 30 members, but since March, membership has just as rapidly dwindled to less than 10 full members. The current membership structure was adopted at the end of the year as a response to the issues that have arisen due to this fluctuation. Over the past six months, we have attempted to study the cause of this drastic change in membership and a few things pointed to an interesting pattern. First, almost all of the individuals who joined CCAP in the past year were newly radicalized individuals who were drawn to the organization by our only real visible work to outsiders, our aid programs. This attracted a number of people who felt compelled to get involved by the apparent worsening conditions in the U.S. political sphere and were driven by a desire to "do something". Secondly, almost every departure from the organization was amicable, in that they were not caused by a major disagreement over CCAP's political line or internal practice. Almost every departure was a result of changing life circumstances, such as new or lost jobs, starting school, mental or physical health problems, or burnout. Each member who left expressed regret in the fact that they could no longer be a part of CCAP and shared various degrees of a desire to reconnect in the future. Thirdly, almost every individual who left the organization started with a decrease in activity. They were able to attend fewer meetings and events, they communicated little in the main channels, and they were often difficult to get a hold of. We ended up with members who were active and individuals who were really just paper membership.

We made many attempts to resolve the apparent issues during the year. There was an attempt to increase standards of work by adding labor requirements to the Code of Conduct, which was also expanded to include procedure for inactive members. There was an attempt to make committee work more accessible by creating subcommittees that focused on specific tasks from a committee's regular work, which served as a lower barrier of entry to the main committee work for members who could not or would not commit as much time as others. None of these solutions seemed to properly address the issues.

After some reflection, a few things became clear:

There is a contradiction between CCAP's outward image as a simple mutual aid organization and the reality of CCAP's Communist practice.

CCAP was attempting to function both as a mass organization and as a cadre organization. It simultaneously had a low barrier of entry which allowed for any interested individual to become a full member in a matter of weeks, and expected a high level of discipline from its membership.

These contradictions resulted in an influx of newly radicalized membership who were not

familiar with the demands of Communist work and who were misled in what to expect from CCAP by its outward image and its own confused messaging.

It became necessary to consolidate the organization into a single cadre, establish new standards for membership, and move away from the Menshevik-esque recruitment model. Instead of accepting every individual who has expressed interest and attempting to simply inform new members of what work in CCAP entails, the focus must be shifted to whether or not an individual has demonstrated the level of commitment necessary to become a full member of CCAP.

As such, the Affiliate Volunteer Resolution was adopted to both raise the barrier of entry with the organization by instating the volunteer requirement as well as to provide a level of engagement with CCAP that was not subject to the same disciplinary demands of the full membership. With this change, we have also shifted our mindset around growth and development. Over the past year it has become clear that a quantitative increase in membership does not immediately equate to an increase in the collective available labor. Where previously, our focus was to gain new members to increase our capability, the focus has been shifted to internal development. Advancement in one's theoretical and practical development and an increase in ideological buy-in is a much more efficient method of increasing the available labor capabilities of the organization than rapidly bringing in new members with low levels of development and buy-in.

While these changes will mean that CCAP will grow much slower than before, we hope that they will unlock the potential of our current membership and increase the cohesion of CCAP as a single unified cadre.

In Summary, CCAP is in a new place but with a clear direction: to continue to develop our membership and our internal form, to continue to build the foundations for the movement through the AEWL and ORVRS, and to continue to refine and clarify our work in the new year.

ANNUAL REPORT

RIVER VALLEY LIBERATION ORGANIZATION

Organization Form: In September of 2025, the Connecticut Radical Reading Group (CTRRG) reorganized from a hybrid study group/cell form into a fully professionalized cell form. This represented the conclusion of period from January 2025 to September of that year in which the organization was pursuing increased professionalism and represents the last of a series of stages of internal reform. At the time that form was adopted, the CTRRG changed not only its charter, but also its name, becoming the River Valley Liberation Organization. The new charter has been submitted to the League.

Organization Size: 5 cadre-level members.

Class Composition: RVLO is composed entirely of petty-bourgeois and landlord elements.

Orbiters and others: Approximately 8 untrained petty-bourgeois radicals. Approximately 20 other liberals. The 8 radicals are firmly new or learning communists. The other liberals are still undergoing radicalization and cannot be said to be communists of any stripe.

Resources available: Comparatively large treasury and high capacity of individual members to pay dues and extraordinary expenses. Considering purchasing desktop publishing hardware. We also have a space available at a local church basement that can be used for meetings (internal, external, and mass meetings). The organization also has potential safe-house space for traveling comrades.

Connections: Locally connected with the Connecticut organization "Right 2 Rebel," a Maoist student group. Unfortunately this organization appears to be suffering from an acute capacity shortage in the wake of our last joint-organizing activity and mutual criticism (more on this below).

Open lines of communication with the Rhode Island Red Congress, a secondary organization formed this year in Rhode Island, and direct communication with the constituent organization Providence Workers' Defense.

We have communication with the PRP and attended the PRP conference this year. That has led to tentative links with two organizations that we are attempting to strengthen our lines of communication to: Mass Action, Boston based, which shares most of our analysis on the Labor Aristocracy line, and Anti-Imperialist Action, based in Amherst, which is a present distributor of the *Red Clarion*.

Active Programs: A single active program remains to us at this point after a year of disappointments and setbacks. This is a mass meeting of petty-bourgeois radical liberals that occurs once a week in Hartford, Connecticut, called Communi-tea. This meeting has fluctuating attendance and membership.

Areas of Work: Despite numerous attempts to broaden our areas of work and forge deeper connections with the masses, these have each suffered from either the liberalism of the individuals we were seeking to connect with, or from our own small and geographically scattered numbers. Our sole area of working at the time of this report is an intensive development and recruitment training program that is now in the pilot stage and has recently been deployed. This occurs once monthly, following a Communi-tea meeting. It represents a new undertaking for us and is essentially a more directed and focused form of the original study group model. We consider this a major tactical retreat from our most recent efforts, which will be addressed below.

Future Areas of Work: We anticipate expanding our development class and engagement and the steering of Communi-tea toward the holding of mass meetings in the Hartford area. These mass meetings will target the working masses and our strategy is specifically designed to avoid labor aristocrats and petty-bourgeois elements in the area. These meetings will be focused on two of the sharpest contradictions in the city: housing and the presence of ICE.

Hurdles to Development: Despite our increasing professionalization in organizational form, we have failed to adopt a professionalized methodology of recruitment and training. The biggest hurdle to development at the local level has been a voluntarist, blindly optimistic, and individualist mode of recruitment and a failure to create a rigorous training and screening program to increase the political development, militancy, and professionalism of potential recruits. To wit, we have committed the following errors which are working to rectify:

1) Liberalism in recruitment and assessment. This has manifested as a blind optimism in the self-reported militancy and development of orbiters and candidates for our organization. Rather than investigating and testing the capacity of applicants or pressing them to give realistic and honest assessments of their own development, militance, etc., we have relied on the simple method of self-reporting to assess their ability to engage in revolutionary work.

It has also manifested in our intentional blindness to the necessity of slow, targeted, development programs. We have rushed ahead and attempted to integrate individuals directly into the heart of the cell-organization that have not demonstrated the necessary commitments, development, etc., in any of the categories that are required to make a good revolutionary.

For instance: despite three candidates failing to i) have read any of the books on our preliminary assessment reading list, ii) regularly attend our meetings, and iii) read the books we are presently reading and debating, we have maintained the candidacy of two of those members and elevated one of them into the organization as a full member based solely on their self-reported militancy and work (Cde. Amber). This has resulted in an acute crisis, wasted labor, and months of wasted time as we attempted to pursue areas of work that were heavily reliant on the three candidate members in question. This also resulted in the explosion of the Cde. Amber affair when she was criticized for failing to engage along the above-mentioned lines, which further depleted organizational resources, not only of the RVLO but of USU.

Certain members of the RVLO have self-criticized informally for the fundamental error that led to this type of unprofessional recruitment process: overeagerness to convince candidates to "learn on the job," and overreliance on unrealistically optimistic assessments of individuals capacity to bring themselves up to the level necessary to operate as cadre.

2) Voluntarism in development. We have failed to set a development program for incoming candidates and recruits. We have instead relied on voluntarism among those candidates and recruits, essentially willfully blinding ourselves to this major deficiency in our organization.

We have now begun a remedy for this, as our pilot development program attests.

Liberalism in planning and execution of revolutionary programs. We have relied on non-Marxists and under- or undeveloped individuals to provide the labor backbone for areas of work that we wish to pursue. This has led to enormous amounts of wasted time and effort, as these individuals are not yet capable of carrying through these plans, either in combination with the RVLO or under RVLO direction.

Stemming from our failure to realistically assess capacity, development, etc., and our willful optimism, we have therefore deprived these individuals of the opportunity to develop into cadre and instead endangered our own internal organization and thrown an entire year worth of work into projects that had no potential of succeeding even in the limited goals of sparking further organizational crystallization among their labor-base.

Nevertheless, we remain capable of assessing the root causes of our errors and are "crossing the river by touching the stones." We have already begun a course-correction here and are focusing on the necessary development program.

Our organization pursued a number of areas of work unsuccessfully as a result of these errors. First, we attempted to organize the "Marxists" at a Hartford college into the CTRRG itself as a student wing; efforts were devoted to this project until Cde. Amber, who was our contact among the student Marxists, disclosed that the organization had collapsed mid-way through the process. Second, we founded our Combat Organization out of Communi-tea and pursued its creation along the lines proposed in the "Combat Organization" article until it became clear that the members were incapable of meeting with the RVLO because they were never available and incapable of engaging in even the most remedial actions for the same reason.

As a result, the RVLO has transformed the nascent ComOrg into the political development program mentioned above.

Major Disciplinary Actions or Crises: The only disciplinary action that the RVLO had this year also precipitated its single major crisis. We also underwent a minor crisis of struggle with Right 2 Rebel.

The cause of the major crisis was a routine comradely criticism that should have resulted in increased work capacity and development; as it unfolded, however, it more thoroughly exposed some of the errors mentioned in the report above and led to a sharp crisis and overdrawing of available labor in RVLO and USU. The eruption of this crisis was a result of the above-mentioned errors and caused the organization to interrogate its own behavior and the internal contradictions or errors that led to the crisis.

This disciplinary action was instituted as a result of our November regular meeting. At this meeting, a criticism from Cde. Imran was brought forward concerning Amber. She had been absent from the last several RVLO/CTRRG meetings, had not engaged in any of the readings on her candidacy list, had not engaged in any of the readings that we were doing collectively, had never paid any dues, and had devoted increasing time to other organizing while holding it apart from CTRRG/RVLO. The following day, the criticism was conveyed to Amber for her response, which was requested before the next meeting so we could have a discussion and a limited struggle concerning her activity level.

She replied immediately rejecting some of the criticism and then said she intended to resign rather than address the issue. When she was pressed to wait until the next meeting to at least hold the discussion, she resigned on the spot. She then went to USU and levied what we later determined was a largely baseless criticism, putatively against the RVLO, Cde. Imran, and Cde. Gracchus.

This criticism included a number of complaints, all of them actually directed at Cde. Gracchus' behavior in the RVLO and on twitter. USU responded indicating that it lacked sufficient information to determine if it was grounded in anything and also indicating that it was the wrong forum or venue for the complaints, directing Amber to submit her counter-criticism to RVLO. She indicated that she would.

When an RVLO executive board member (not one of the criticized comrades) reached out to her about this, she indicated that she would no longer engage with RVLO and would not pursue any degree of struggle.

The RVLO reviewed her counter-criticism at its last meeting. It seriously considered her points, despite the fact that they were delivered in an unprincipled and uncomradely fashion. The full membership of the organization determined that her criticisms were unfounded.

Amber presented herself as a very active member, interested in a high degree of militant action. The RVLO relied on her participation in a number of initiatives; that participation never emerged, leading to the RVLO to make incorrect judgments about its own capacity to engage in certain areas of work, including the comorg mentioned above.

Resources were wasted in pursuit of the Marxist organization Amber indicated she was a part of (which later turned out not to exist as an organization); they were wasted in attempting to bring the comorg online; they were wasted in pursuing local organizing efforts around the college where Amber was a student and relying on Amber to act in combination with other RVLO members. Worse, time was wasted trying to cultivate these fields of work that could have been spent in other places.

Ultimately, this disciplinary action and crisis revealed the deficiencies in the RVLO's capacity to identify advanced workers and students to integrate into the organization and further deficiencies in its approach to training and education of its new and candidate membership, leading to the adjustments in the RVLO's immediate outlook and strategy as outlined above.

A second, minor crisis, took place between RVLO/CTRRG and Right 2 Rebel. The two organizations had been engaged in a joint study of the Maoist International Ministry (Prisons) documents from the 1990s at the suggestion of Right 2 Rebel. However, there was a lack of formal commitment to points of unity and disagreement. This manifested as error where, after joining with Right 2 Rebel to conduct extended social investigations, CTRRG suggested transforming those social investigations into a mass meeting on the topic of the government shutdown. Right 2 Rebel's membership indicated this was a waste of time and they would not pursue such a strategy with RVLO/CTRRG; their line on the labor aristocracy precludes organizing workers-as-workers and requires them only to organize along national self-determination of oppressed nations. This brought our joint work to an immediate halt and we began the process of struggle over our incompatible theoretical commitments, but Right 2 Rebel has not had the capacity to respond.

Commentary regarding the League convention: Despite whatever level of organization and professionalism that exists in its constituent members, the RVLO membership is concerned that the League itself remains very amateurish in its organization and operations. The manner in which the convention has been organized has appeared haphazard, with elements of the League's central body either failing to plan ahead or to have sufficiently detailed areas of responsibility to permit coherent planning.

Indeed, the League has remained largely inactive as a "connective tissue" for organizational issues during the last year. We believe that initiatives being brought forward at this conference will help cure these errors and bring the League closer to the professionalization that is needed within the movement.

Therefore, we strongly support the propositions to increase centralization, to disseminate a League Handbook, and resolutions to require the constituent organizations to pursue directed study of their conditions and suitability for the holding of mass meetings and formation of combat wings. We also highly suggest the creation of a League organ of centralized cadre development, as the lack of trained, militant, dedicated cadre has hampered the efforts of the RVLO and remains the central roadblock to our local work in Connecticut.

ANNUAL REPORT

UNITY-STRUGGLE-UNITY PRESS

Organization Form and Purpose

Unity-Struggle-Unity Press (USU / the Pressorg) is a non-local, digital organization that produces and distributes Marxist theory to raise the general understanding of class-consciousness amongst the masses and to cohere the disorganized Marxist elements where they exist in this occupied land. We work towards this goal mainly through our newspaper, *The Red Clarion*, which we distribute in print to grassroots affiliate organizations, as well as publish articles online weekly.

The Editorial Board is the elected leadership of USU, although the final and highest authority is the general Pressorg itself. The EB is able to make general executive decisions for the Press and the Pressorg itself has "the authority to overturn any decisions the EB makes by a simple majority of its Members in good standing."

Weekly executive meetings are held every Wednesday by the EB. General monthly meetings are held each third Sunday and run by the EB.

USU's membership structure is determined by the operation and distribution of the Red Clarion. As such, members are designated as its Pressworkers, Agitators, and Correspondence and Distribution Deputies.

Pressworkers are assigned, or self-assigned, either one or several of the organization's labor roles, including: Writers, Artists, Copy Editors, Communication Officers, and various managing officers.

Agitators are "responsible for conducting agitation by the sharing of Press literature, attending mass events, posting flyers, and motivating the masses."

CDN Deputies are "responsible for representing their respective organizations as voting members of the Pressorg and for conveying the Pressorg's decisions to their respective organizations, and for writing brief monthly reports on the distribution work of their respective organizations."

Size of USU

Membership Numbers

USU has 11 actual members, not including a Deputy from CCAP.

We had lost two members, and gained three this year.

It is made up of 5 writers, 3 artists, 2 copy-editors, and one web developer.

We have not done a formal survey of the educational development of membership, but it ranges from very advanced to relative beginners in Marxism. We also have not conducted a formal class analysis of the membership, but a prior informal discussion suggests it leans heavily petty-bourgeois and labor aristocratic.

Orbiting and Candidates

In our discord server, we have a variety of guests in our orbit who volunteer writing articles and doing line-edits. Some guests are from member-orgs, while others found us online and were invited into the server through connecting with us on social media.

Available Resources

As it stands, our treasury's funds have been increasing but recently the rate has slowed. We temporarily paused our patreon payments due to a falloff in our print publication. As previously stated, we have a Discord server, a couple social media accounts for posting articles, and two websites. We have no physical resources at the org's disposal; but utilize various websites, software, and third party services as needed, for scheduling and printing literature.

Connections

League Member Orgs

We have two League organizations directly affiliated with us, River Valley Liberation Organization (RVLO) and Cincinnati Community Aid and Praxis (CCAP). Both organizations purchase a large amount of papers from us to distribute, as well as contribute articles. Two members of RVLO are also Pressworkers in USU.

Chunka Luta Network

Throughout this year, we've attempted to deepen our connection to the Chunka Luta Network (CLN), starting most practicably with an effort to address principled criticisms offered by CLN towards USU's "A Decolonial Manifesto," published at the beginning of 2025. This resulted in the creation of a group chat and a handful of meetings. Later USU voted to pull from its treasury to meet donations for CLN's efforts to interview former American Indian Movement (AIM) members and investigate the current state of organizing among Indigenous communities. This fundraising effort succeeded rapidly and USU is proud to have contributed in some capacity. However, we have since then not followed up meaningfully in our collaboration with CLN. The logistics of further collaboration have been tentatively discussed among our membership internally, but these have yet to manifest. It is our sincere hope that the conference will offer us this chance for deepening ties.

Ex-FRSO Members

This year, a small group of Ex-FRSO members reached out to us concerning retaliation they were facing for investigating a pattern of sexual abuse within FRSO and wanted to discuss next steps to building a primary organization. A few Pressworkers held a series of meetings with these members to help them navigate the issue and offer solutions. In the end, these ex-members published an expose on the FRSO, which we followed with an article from our Editorial Board urging readers to recognize FRSO as part of the pattern of abuse we've identified.

Minor Connections

USU had minor connections with a few other organizations: Firstly, with the New Labor Press (NLP), who wanted to engage in struggle over ideological and strategic questions in response to our request for republishing a pamphlet they had written, which we decided was unnecessary; secondly, with the Decolonial Communist Collective-Mni Sota Makoce (DCC), who expressed interest in affiliating with USU; thirdly, with People's Revolutionary Party (PRP), who we came in contact with through the AEWL's former Outreach Committee, and who offered us a couple articles to consider for republication several months ago, but to which we have not yet given a reply; and lastly, with the Socialist COVID-19 Organizing, Resistance, and Education (SCORE) who we reached out to to offer an article for republishing and to establish a working relationship. Unfortunately, none of these interactions led to anything notable to date.

Internal Development

There have been several sporadic efforts to grow a Member Development program in USU, that would consist principally of shared study and collective reading. These were initially attended by about half of membership, for a very brief period, but attendance seems to work in gradually lessening waves. Members within this member-development were not bound by any sort of formal process or expectation of responsibility. Often, only one or two members would ask if a member-development meeting was even still occurring the morning of.

One meeting, the only two attending members workshopped and presented a proposal that suggested absent members who had committed themselves to Member-Dev, write a report on the sections covered in the meeting they'd missed. This resulted in discussion, but ultimately the proposal was not adopted. Such a proposal demonstrates a desire for greater accountability and structure to internal development, but was insufficient in itself to offer that change. This is part of a larger issue of unreliable member development that we suspect extends beyond USU, but is perhaps heightened by our digital space.

The rest of the internal ideological development of members occurs inevitably from their participation in the editing process. To edit a theoretical or agitational piece carefully is to engage with every line and argument far more considerately than one typically does when reading an article or a book, even for study. The same is true for our writers, who must investigate, craft compelling arguments, and subject those arguments to repeated scrutiny and criticisms. Therefore, the extent to which participation in the press promotes ideological growth should not be overlooked. It just can and should be done more consistently for every member involved.

Hurdles to Development

The greatest issues plaguing USU are disorganization and a shortage of labor.

Since February, there have been discussions about the Pressorg's inability to delegate and maintain labor consistency. In spite of this being, perhaps, the most consistent issue within the organization, attempts to address it have been generally unsystematic. In May, a document of suggestions was submitted by an Executive Editor for review, that listed potential Bylaw amendments that would make enforcing labor expectations more formally actionable. However, it was determined that what was within the Bylaws was sufficient, and that the EB needed to be doing a better job at keeping Pressworkers on task. The change in expectation was communicated to the general membership, and suggestions were made to use weekly EB meetings to track and discuss writers' activity. This procedure was not consistently maintained.

A degree of amateurism still plagues our editorial process, in the case of offering feedback and suggestions to guest authors, particularly. While our editors are capable in surmising the quality of a piece in most cases, and suggesting useful adjustments to general author satisfaction, there are too many examples of an underdeveloped, yet passionate writer submitting a draft well below our publishing standards, that our editors don't know what to do with. Often, a piece may be too rough and/or underdeveloped to justify putting through our standard editorial process; in spite of this, our editors attempt this very process, resulting in one or two Ideological Editors having no option but to commit an extraordinary amount of effort to making revisions. Due to our labor shortage, this results in the same two or three editors puzzling over what to do.

In the end, these pieces become "low priority" and end up neglected. This lack of communication and progress with a guest author risks alienation, when a simple rejection with feedback early on, may work better.

We began our first 6 Month Plan in 2025. The planning and proposal process for putting the 6

Month Plan into effect was delayed and the 6 Month Plan started late. The plans were structured as three separate portions, each with a different "Owner" responsible for reporting its progress to the Pressorg on a monthly basis. These portions were: 1) Research into operational security, 2) Misconduct Training, and 3) Standardizing print publication.

The most recent update on the 6 Month Plan is that no portion has progressed beyond first steps, and has been pushed back to the end of January, 2026.

Disciplinary Crisis and Criticism

Internal Discipline Conflict

In addition to our problem of inconsistent labor, USU had an internal conflict arise halfway through the year, stemming from a problem of discipline. A member of the Pressorg had been inconsistent with dues payments and labor for months. She entered in the Writer role, but over the course of much of the year of membership had only submitted a single, short piece of creative writing. When asked about Dues, when she answered, this individual would say that she could not afford it for that month. USU has a sliding scale for calculating dues from membership, relying on variables such as location, income, real property ownership, etc. Dues payments can be as low as \$2 a month, and payment exemptions can also be requested, if communicated to leadership. This was never done by this individual, but she often expressed frustration when asked about dues or labor. This was also the case when her comrades expressed criticism about her conduct on social media, or when an Executive Editor informed her that a separate organization was preparing a formal criticism of her. In each case, the individual made suggestions or outright accused the pressorg of unfairly treating her. Eventually, when the Editorial Board decided to revoke her good standing, as she was several months behind on dues and labor, she quit the organization.

Criticism and Self-Criticism for Anti-Democratic Errors

In late May, one of our members was internally criticized for subverting the democratic processes of USU, specifically pertaining to her conduct in an Executive Committee (EC) meeting of the AEWL, where despite attending as a guest, she steered the meeting towards expressing her concern with the League's pace. This pushed the business of the meeting into overtime, requiring a follow-up call be scheduled. When the individual was criticized, she expressed her appreciation at the criticism, and responded with a self-criticism/response in writing. The self-criticism was interpreted by some as insincere and doubling-down on errors, however, and a call was made by the Editorial Board to declare a formal Struggle Session with this member. At the meeting, which had the attendance of most members, there was a lengthy discussion of the member's errors as in large part stemming from a general misunderstanding of USU's place within the AEWL. The criticized member clarified on the intention of their self-criticism and its sincerity, and unity was reached on the importance of not subverting democratic discussion and the validity of the criticism. Many points regarding the problems with structural communication did not continue beyond this meeting, and should be revisited.

Lastly, the member committed to mitigate damages by agreeing to write a USU self-criticism and a draft for Standards of Procedure (SOP) for Member Organization participation in the AEWL. These commitments have yet to be fulfilled, as of the end of 2025. They were not enforced or brought up again by the Editorial Board, though as of writing this report, the member has reaffirmed her commitment to fulfill these expectations.

Criticism and Self-Criticism for Ideological and Professional Standards

In June, an external criticism was shared with the EB, criticizing it for the publication of Cde. Reed's article, "Liberal Feminism and the Commodification of the Cunt," which the critic identified

as "crypto-terf" and "bioessentialist." The EB had deemed the criticism valid. Two members, the first an Ideological Editor (IE), the second an Ideological and Executive Editor, were deemed principally responsible, and submitted self-criticisms prior to a Self and Community Criticism meeting.

The first Editor's self-criticism identified his principal error as an unwillingness to struggle, in spite of knowing the article was in serious error. Though this member left suggestions to this effect, he backed away from struggle when necessary changes weren't made. At the struggle meeting that followed, he revealed that his hope was that the errors would be caught by the following editors. This Editor also identified his reason for avoiding struggle being his history of conflict with the author, and how he feared an ideological struggle would repeat that history to the detriment of the pressorg.

The self-criticism from the EB member was for their dual responsibility for the published article, both as an Ideological Editor, following the first IE, as well as an Executive Editor, who gave the piece its "Final seal." This member's self-criticism identified their principal error as an unwillingness to investigate, when the EB member was concerned with certain points and particularly sources relied upon by the author -- particularly the zionists Dworkin and MacKinnon. The EB member felt as though if a much more ideologically developed comrade passed a piece on, their concerns were unwarranted.

Another EB member had passed on the piece, and throughout the community criticism process, the question was repeatedly wrestled with to what degree this EB member was himself in error. He had not repressed reservations and consciously avoided his duty in the way the other Editors were responsible for, but he had expressed he felt unclear as to his own duties and expectations as an Editorial Board member yet continued to work, which indicated a structural issue with USU' leadership onboarding practices and a personal failure to understand his tasks. This member agreed to update our SOP in regards to the Editorial Process on our website.

As a result, the criticized members, and the Editorial Board in general, recommitted themselves to higher standards of quality, and began operating with more scrutiny of sources and better communication between Editors.

Stalled Cde. Reed Criticism

Following the Self and Community Criticism meeting summarized above, the Press informed Cde. Reed of the criticism, and the upcoming retraction, which followed. At first, Reed responded amicably, with a desire to see the criticism plainly laid out. We communicated that this would be addressed in brief with the retraction statement, and our own internal criticism process would result in a more detailed criticism piece. This criticism was assigned to one of our Ideological Editors, who had expressed a lot of the most salient criticism of the article following the initial criticism. However, a combination of several factors resulted in this vital criticism being delayed many months, up to and including now, where as of this next year the finishing touches are being made.

First, this assigned member was in the process of moving abroad. This obviously interfered with the writing process significantly, well past when we wanted it done by, yet the task was not reassigned. And after the draft was ready for review, it was determined that it did not fulfill the expectations of what the Pressorg had decided would be an appropriate criticism. The author worked back and forth with editors in order to get the piece to the right place, but this process continued to take a few months. Afterwards, the author asked for the piece to be reassigned, and work on it was adopted by the aforementioned Ideological Editor who submitted to self and community criticism regarding the piece. The originally assigned writer has continued to assist as requested on the piece, when clarifications are needed or citations.

Externally, due to the delayed nature of USU officially offering a statement, and the semi-virality of the author, the retraction became something of a fiasco. Many followers, orbiters, and friends of Reed responded with indignation, and flooded the press with criticisms and complaints. Some of these were ideologically incoherent. None of the criticisms we decided required response or consideration beyond the publication of our criticism. It was interpreted as a retaliatory effort to freeze the press, rather than actual constructive criticism.

Areas of Work

The single most active program of USU remains the *Red Clarion*, by far. A great majority of all labor and organizational considerations are made towards the publication and distribution of this literature.

Aside from the aforementioned activities for the *Red Clarion*, USU serves in a consulting capacity with many inexperienced or isolated activists. We've met with fewer activists than in 2024, where we experienced a bump in exposure and outreach due to our coverage and criticisms of the CPUSA convention; however, we still consider these meetings an essential part of our work, and this year's coverage of FRSO's abuses and support towards its brave whistleblowers is one of the year's highest achievements.

We've also been working on a re-release of Liu Shaoqi's *How to Be a Good Communist*, same as last year. Efforts have stalled due to the length of the piece and the lack of available labor. It is always returned to the backburner. There was a period of a few months where a comrade with some Chinese language proficiency was appointed to provide an alternative translation to certain sections. But after this took up so much time from someone who had been serving as a writer and ideological editor, with little justifiable reason to repeat what was already a capable translation, we abandoned this effort. Since then the piece has been languishing in a final copy-edits phase.

Future Areas of Work

We have been looking into ways to offer a method of cash disbursement to members of the lower proletarian strata. Where they may make a monthly application to the press to receive up to a set amount of money in exchange for committing to one or more organizing activities under USU direction.

Organizing activities may include:

- 1) a 500+ word report on ground work or conditions;
- 2) Organizing or running a study circle under the guidance of USU and according to USU/AEWL approved rubric;
- 3) Distributing a set number of copies of the *Red Clarion* without contributing press funds.

If this initiative is successful it could greatly expand the reach of the press, as well as connect it directly with the lowest and deepest stratum of wage workers.

ANNUAL REPORT RED HELP AUSTIN

Who are we: We are Marxist-Leninists in Austin, Texas who believe that a revolution which feeds the people will free the people. We work towards this revolutionary goal by engaging in direct mutual aid with two local homeless communities, distributing books and propaganda, holding bi-weekly theory study groups, and engaging in direct action.

2025 Overview: This was our first full year as an org independent from CPUSA. While we made some mistakes and encountered a few hiccups along the way, we learned a lot, gained the trust of the communities we work with, and expanded our reach. We gained two new full member comrades in 2025, after they completed our robust vetting process and probationary period - our first new members since becoming independent!

We also gained many reliable and hard working comrades at the volunteer level. We have been able to reliably collect dues and donations at a level which sustains our current needs. We're also very lucky to have comrades with a variety of skills who can donate their time and services to the cause - first aid, translation help (Spanish), and notary services are things we have offered. Our fall 2025 winter clothing and blanket drive was our biggest yet! Becoming more established in the community has helped to gain trust and allowed us to expand our reach and collect more donations.

We have built closer relationships with other groups working with the homeless community. Our South Austin drop piggy-backs on a church that does hot meals every Saturday. This relationship has allowed us to meet the community in a place where all can gather safely. We met a group of public defenders who shared "Know Your Rights" literature with us, and who will be helping us conduct educational services over the next year. We have also been working on building relationships with the local SRA and Palestine Action to coordinate efforts.

Month by Month

January: our reading group began *Women, Race, & Class*, and we expanded to our second community drop in East Austin

February: comrade James officially became our AEWL liaison, and we began planning our game night fundraiser

March: planning fundraiser and getting to know the east community

April: our reading group began *Dialectical and Historical Materialism*, having venue issues with fundraiser planning

May: game night fundraiser was fun. We raised just over \$500, mostly internally. The venue issues lead to low turnout, but the people we talked to were supportive of the cause. We distributed left over baked goods at our south drop

June: the church group that we piggy back on for the south drop finally got a permanent location to set up

July: reading group began *How to Blow up a Pipeline*

August: our first official new member since rebranding graduated their 6 month probation

September: we set stronger guidelines for organizing the drops to make them run more smoothly

October: we begin looking into how to set up a 401(c)
November: second official new member graduates, begin reading Wretched of the Earth
December: officer slate reelected

ADDRESS FROM CHUNKA LUTA NETWORK

Hello relatives and comrades.

I want to begin by naming a constraint rather than a position. In spaces like this, some things do not need to be said in order to be understood. That matters, because the point of gathering is not performance but clarity. What I want to do is say only what is necessary for that clarity. Many of the conflicts inside communist spaces are framed as problems of legitimacy. We argue about who is a real communist, who has misread the texts, who has betrayed the line. Those arguments feel satisfying because they allow separation without explanation. They let us distance ourselves from outcomes we dislike without explaining why those outcomes keep recurring. But separation is not analysis, and it does not resolve harm. What I mean is, though yes Marxism has most of if not all the necessary tools to come to the correct conclusions through the scientific method, we can not rely on everyone who engages with Marxism to apply those tools correctly. Especially with the growing trend of posting as praxis, which is just the digital manifestation of picketing as praxis.

When people appeal to doctrine to exempt themselves from critique, the issue is usually not bad faith. It is that doctrine is being treated as if it operates in a neutral environment. Social conditions shape conclusions long before anyone opens a book. I want to propose a small analytical shift. Instead of treating ideology as primary and colonial conditions as secondary, reverse the order. Settler and Indigenous orders function like operating systems. They set defaults and constraints that any ideology running on top of them inherits unless explicitly accounted for.

This helps explain why disputes repeat even when the language changes. Practices that claim a scientific basis still reproduce settler homogeneity. That does not require calling anyone a fake Marxist. It requires noticing which conditions are being treated as given. This is why class positions can behave in ways that look contradictory. It is not a moral ranking but a structural observation. Inherited relations to land and extraction shape what futures appear reasonable.

When I use terms like decolonial Marxism-Leninism, it is not to assert purity. It is to mark an unresolved analytical problem. Marxism contains tools capable of addressing this, but tools are not guarantees. A scientific view requires checking whether conclusions change when conditions are made explicit.

That is the question I am leaving you with. Not whether you hold the correct label, but whether your analysis survives contact with its conditions.

There is a tendency for one reason or another to overly rely on a historical narrativizing of our analysis and a claim that this is in itself science, and we find examples to support ourselves, and perhaps we support our arguments incredibly well. Even making them so compelling they are hard to falsify, but we do not provide for an easy way to learn how exactly the author did besides maybe their citations. Ultimately however there should be deeper research methods, and explanations of methodology when writing that helps teach people to learn for themselves. To prove replicability and explain how our conclusions are reached.

When we are looking at available avenues of struggle, what should underpin our planning is accounting for the many worlds around us, and the many worlds that we could see, and will come after us. By world I mean different understandings of the world that contradict and bolster one another, in a sort of cosmic dance. I'm being poetic because it almost feels like an art form to organize people into flowing communities, and I don't know a lot of people able to conduct a symphony of people. But this is what any would-be vanguardist would have to do.

What I say is not to act holier than thou, but to express my own shortcomings, and the

shortcomings of the people around me, the people I respect the most and admire the work of the most, and of whatever our movement is. I think there is a deep need for honesty about our realities, and I think a lot of people are too focused on maintaining a smooth conception of the world, they don't account for the jagged contradictions that shatter that cohesion. We then get defensive and try to save time, because we know we don't have time, by dismissing arguments that contradict our own. This is respectable, anyone who was aware of the climate cacophony rising around us, would want to maintain what little bit of song they've written through their own praxis.

We are also witnessing a collapse of radicalism. One might misinterpret it as the growth of radicalism, but in reality what growth we see isn't one of a genuine movement, but a manufactured brand being engaged with. This brand, whether spontaneous or astroturfed (I suspect it is not a black or white situation), is mired in the ideology of the dominating hegemony whether it proclaims to constitute a different ideology or not. Whereas classic conceptions of the struggle are labeled through ideology, I argue Settler and Indigenous order represent what amounts to operating systems that fundamentally skew the proclaimed ideology from the outset.

An Indigenous bourgeoisie might be more sympathetic to fighting climate collapse, than the settler proletariat, due to the inherited class positions and how they articulate themselves. This operating system framing solves a lot of fundamental misunderstanding undergirding the misapplication of Marxism, or co-option we accuse the No True Scotsman Communists of. It isn't that they aren't true Marxists, its that their idea of Marxism fundamentally requires homogeneity with settler society.

This is how Kluxism manifests itself inside Marxist spaces, and why it is not enough to be anti-racist. We must be militantly counter-Kluxist. This means discipline, accountability, humility, respect for our relatives and their visions, making space for caretaking, and compassion and understanding. How does one become a fish in the river? How does one account for the non communist-cadres still aligned with the end goals of national liberation and socialism? What does this even matter if climate collapse will radically shift our long term plans if it is not accounted for when we plan? At the end of the day we always have to make dirt and end food apartheid. Landback begins there. That is how we will reclaim dignity.

CONFERENCE MINUTES

DAY ONE: JANUARY 9, 2026

Member-Organizations of the League:

CCAP = Cincinnati Community Aid and Praxis

RHATX = Red Help Austin Texas

RVLO = River Valley Liberation Organization (Formerly CTRRG)

USU = Unity-Struggle-Unity

Guest Organizations:

CS = Cincy Socialists

CLN = Chunka Luta Network

FrsoA = FRSO Accountability

Delegate Attendees:

K. (CCAP), Roa. (CCAP), P. (CCAP) (CCAP)

A. (RHATX), J. (RHATX)

Imr. (RVLO) (Representing 2 votes)

Ro. (USU), Win. (USU)

P. (CCAP) is the meeting Chair

Note: Due to an oversight by the League, detailed notes of conversations were not recorded for the opening day of the conference. The following are the minutes of the opening day showing the general record of what transpired on 1/9.

- 12:00 PM Greeting and Check-in begins
- 1:36 PM Conference is called to order, introductions and roll call begin.
- Member Organizations present: RVLO sends one delegate : Cde. I. CCAP sends three delegates : Cdes. P., Roa., and K. Red Help ATX sends two delegates : Cde. A. and Cde. J.s,

CONFERENCE MINUTES

DAY TWO: JANUARY 10, 2026

Call to Order at 11:33 AM

P. (CCAP): Today will be our day of deliberation on the resolutions that were put forward by the Member Organizations (MOs) prior to the conference. Today's gonna be pretty long. Depending on how the schedule goes, the idea is to dismiss guests (non-member org individuals) around 6 PM. Members are trapped here a little longer.

P. (CCAP): I will read out the resolution and put it on the screen. The floor will then be open for discussion on the matter. We'll set some time for debate for each point, and then when that time ends, we'll hold a vote and the delegates will vote on a choice of action pertaining to the resolution, and that will become binding for the League going forward. Delegates have the right to vote, introduce main motions, and amend motions. The rest of you are free to talk and take the floor during open floor discussion. You can also raise points of order, or points of privilege.

P. (CCAP): We will begin with our first resolution, which is the League Manifesto Resolution. This one is a little peculiar in the fact that USU has only submitted a text, no resolution.

Ro. (USU): It is similar to the guidebook. Resolution is that it be submitted for the League to begin editing it into a publishable state. The exact way that should be organized is unclear. It would be up to the EC (Executive Committee) and the member orgs. We're submitting it for review, editing, and adoption.

P. (CCAP): EC, or are we assigning a new body?

Ro. (USU): That's up to the EC.

P. (CCAP): Resolution is we are submitting the text as is to the EC. Essentially, we're adopting this text as something we want to put out that will represent the League's political view.

Ro. (USU): Yes.

P. (CCAP): We are taking the current draft, submitting to the EC to work on final review, editing, and ultimately publishing.

Ro. (USU): Submit to the EC to then begin editing into a publishable form.

P. (CCAP): Anything about intended audience?

Ro. (USU): No.

P. (CCAP): begins editing document "USU resolves that the text REVOLUTION AND EMPIRE

who is late. USU sends two delegates : Cdes. Ro. and Win.

- Guest Organizations present: Cincinnati Socialists : Cdes. St. and Is.; Independent : Cde. Teq.
- 1:41 PM Opening Address read into the record by Cde. K. (CCAP)
- 1:50 PM Open floor discussion
- 1:59 PM Floor closes, Cde. P. reads CCAP Report into the record
- 2:23 PM Open floor discussion
- 2:50 PM Floor closed, recess called
- 2:59 PM Conference resumes, Cde. Imr. reads RVLO report into the record
- 3:17 PM Open floor discussion
- 3:30 PM Cde. J. arrives
- 3:50 PM Floor closed, Cde. Rose reads USU report into the record
- 4:10 PM Open floor discussion
- 4:27 PM Floor is closed, recess called
- 4:43 PM Conference resumes, Cde. J. reads Red Help ATX report into the record
- 4:48 PM Open floor discussion
- 5:16 PM Floor closed, break for dinner
- 5:30 PM Cde. Z. from CLN arrives
- 6:22 PM Dinner ends, open floor discussion begins
- 7:00 PM Action item assigned to the Executive Committee of the League
- The Conference recommends the new EC of the League pursue two items as its first items of business, the first being seeing to the creation of reports from each member organization on their view of preparing for, putting on, and attending the conference, and the second being to bring definitions of "Cadre" from each member organization to struggle over to arrive at a standard definition.
- 7:27 PM Cde. P. moves to extend time by 15 minutes. Seconded by Cde. Kira. Motion passes
- 7:27 PM Call for unanimous consent, motion passes unanimously
- 7:40 PM Floor closed, conference adjourned.

be adopted by the AEWL as its political line and that the current draft be submitted to the executive committee for editing, final review, publishing, and distribution." Does that accurately reflect the motion being put forward today?

Ro. (USU): Yes.

P. (CCAP): This is the current motion on the floor. The main motion. The floor is now open to discussion.

K. (CCAP): I wanted to ask a question about the editing process. I know it's being taken on by the EC, but when we discussed it at CCAP, we wanted to suggest some edits. Can edits come from general bodies? Will edits be allowed to come from general bodies? Not just done by the EC.

Ro. (USU): We didn't have any clear idea for how the editing process would be done collectively by the League. Mostly because collective collaboration between member orgs has yet to happen, and this is going to be one of those tests to figure out how that would work. Just speaking for myself, I think the idea of the general membership of different member orgs proposing suggestions and offering those sounds like a really good idea. I do think there should be a sort of-- The way I think would work really well is each member org, upon reviewing it again, essentially came to their issues with the piece -- what works, what doesn't -- bring a list of suggestions to the committee to edit by and communicate progress on that to their member org.

K. (CCAP): Thank you. I do like that idea. I think if we were going to go with that as part of the process it might have to be added as an amendment to the resolution itself. But the resolution might already imply that.

P. (CCAP): I think it might be best to state it explicitly so that there's clear action for the Executive Committee to take. I also want to second Ro. (USU)'s idea. Something Gra. (RVLO) and I talked about months ago is to have an initial distribution between member orgs for them to read and then send in responses for edits and changes they'd like to see. Then a second editing process and almost a second edition created for wider circulation.

Ro. (USU): Sounds similar. Do you mean that each org would have their own draft to apply edits/suggestions to, which is then given back to the EC or a committee for this? What's the difference between what I suggested and what you said? If each member org has their own draft that would be a little more difficult in my opinion. Need more clarity.

P. (CCAP): I was thinking like each organization each has their own draft, but I can see that would be maybe difficult to reconcile, but I wonder what the alternative to that would be.

K. (CCAP): I think what's being proposed is that if the general bodies of the member organization want to see a certain change, they'll give that to their EC member, and you'll all work on a copy together. We bring edit ideas to the EC and then try to make the next draft.

Ro. (USU): I think what K. (CCAP) just said very much reflects my idea, the only clarification on that is that I was thinking it doesn't necessarily need to be the EC member that's trusted with communicating and making these edits, it could also be a member of a working committee

appointed by the committee. But this process may not have been part of the consideration for EC selection, so a working committee appointed by the EC might be better.

P. (CCAP): The motion is that we amend the current motion to include a statement shifting the responsibility from the EC to an EC-appointed working committee.

P. (CCAP): Added to motion that the current draft will be submitted to a working committee (WC) appointed by the executive committee of the League for editing.

Ro. (USU): Add that there is internal discussion among member orgs so that the WC suggestions should come first and member orgs should determine their WC members.

P. (CCAP): Can you suggest a rewording?

Ro. (USU): I think this works for now.

P. (CCAP): This amendment has been suggested and seconded. I will ask for unanimous consent. Any objections? No objections. Motion passes. We resume talking about the main motion which is to adopt this resolution as a whole. The floor is open for discussion.

K. (CCAP): If we're worried about the specific rules for the WC not being in the resolution, it's okay if the WC has these rules later, it doesn't need to be reflected in this resolution.

S. (CS) *suggests how to use a mic properly*

P. (CCAP): Are you suggesting any changes? No? Okay, floor is open.

Ro. (USU): Related to what K. (CCAP) said, a first action item for the WC is they should draft standards of procedure for how it should be done which should be voted on by either the EC or member orgs.

P. (CCAP): Is that a recommendation or should it be included in the resolution?

Ro. (USU): Yes

P. (CCAP): To which one?

Ro. (USU): It should be in the resolution. Motion to amend the wording.

P. (CCAP): What is the specific amendment?

Ro. (USU): The first action of the formed WC should be the drafting of the standards of procedure for how the editing process should work and that should be ratified by the League itself.

P. (CCAP): Let me suggest a wording and let me know if this is accurate to what you're thinking.

Ro. (USU): Okay

P. (CCAP): I'm gonna say that a working committee be established for the purpose of editing, final review, publishing, distribution of the text, and that their first point of business will be to establish standards and procedures for the editing process.

Ro. (USU): That sounds good

P. (CCAP): The current amendment as written: "USU resolves that the text REVOLUTION AND EMPIRE be adopted by the AEWL as its political line "*****". It's been seconded. Floor is open for discussion. Proceed to vote – do we have unanimous consent? Any objections?

Motion Passes Unanimously.

P. (CCAP): Back to the main motion. Floor is open for discussion of this motion.

Win. (USU): Suggestion that fact checking be a focus for the WC.

Roa. (CCAP): I think the editing process involves that but including language around that could be beneficial. It could be worth adding.

Na. (CCAP): I think that further amendments to the resolution probably aren't necessary and this WC will be tasked with looking at the notes to this discussion. I'm wondering what the difference in purpose of this and the handbook is.

P. (CCAP): The handbook is not theory intensive. It's about types of organizational work and best practices for reference by the League and outside orgs. It's the League's official recommendations on types of work that primary orgs should be engaging in. The manifesto is more like a political program and an analysis of the conditions and is our strategy for building within those conditions.

Ro. (USU): Organically, as a result of work being done on both, we'll find areas of overlap that can be removed, in which one document better serves that focus.

Win. (USU): Was the purpose of REV AND EMPIRE clear for those who read it?

P. (CCAP): For those who read the text, do you agree with it? Were there parts you felt needed to be adjusted and changed? Do you feel this is a political line you feel comfortable adopting? Does it represent your org's beliefs and interests? Floor is open

A. (RHATX): That's a really big question. I wonder if I could propose that we break this up somehow.

P. (CCAP): Was there a specific part that you wanted to talk about? I was just asking generally. If there's a section that we want to look over and discuss briefly, I think we have the time to.

Na. (CCAP): I think it was good. All the edits I had were very small and had little to do with substance. I'm also willing to be on the WC whenever that happens. But yeah, I thought it was really good.

P. (CCAP): We're a little late for lunch, I'm going to set a limit on the debate: 10 more minutes. If anyone wants to raise a motion to extend or limit that, feel free. Then we'll have our vote and move to lunch.

Ro. (USU): The editing process will have to come before we have these discussions.

Imr. (RVLO): Along the lines of what Win. (USU) brought up about fact checking. The global average wage of 18k -- that's something that should be specifically fact checked more. Torkil Laueson came up with the same number, but with different means. We should clarify how we're getting this number.

Z. (CLN): Requests to receive a copy. Win. (USU) will provide.

Teq. (FrsoA): Also requests a copy. ""

Ro. (USU): We'll discuss with USU.

K. (CCAP): I'm not intending to jump the gun on editorial standards, but I wanted to ask. The manifesto and handbook are separate; can we talk about fact checking sources/citations in the pieces?

P. (CCAP): I believe there will be sources and citations in the text. Review will be something the WC does.

Z. (CLN): I think an explanation about methodology and how conclusions are made, working towards a scientific process. Just so others who might adopt the line can understand how these resolutions came to be. Part of the scientific process.

Ro. (USU): One of the questions that can be posed to be included in the standards and procedures for the new WC is the policy on sharing it with orgs outside the League. I think that would be really important and helpful, so everyone knows who they can share it with. Should determine this from the outset.

P. (CCAP): Move to vote. Vote is to adopt this resolution as written.

CCAP: 3 yes

RVLO: 2 yes

USU: 2 yes

RHATX: 2 yes

Motion Passes Unanimously.

P. (CCAP): We will now do lunch.

Call to Order at 1:21 PM

P. (CCAP): I will now read the next resolution into the record. This resolution was submitted by RVLO. "Mass Meeting Resolution". Reads full resolution. The floor is open and debate is being set for one hour.

Na. (CCAP): On the last point, I think the mass meeting article by the Red Clarion (RC) should be required reading; however, I want to avoid having a dogmatic approach to the article itself. Edits should be made to adapt the resolution to actual practice.

K. (CCAP): Is the point of adopting this to encourage groups to adopt a mass meeting? Is there a quota? Why does it need to exist?

Ro. (USU): One of the discussions that we had at USU, regarding this proposal, determined that it was generally premature: that in accordance with the mass meeting piece by the RC, we strongly doubt that any member of the League is even close to being able to conduct mass meetings. One of the things we suggest in the article is that you need minimum 8 to 10 ideologically developed and disciplined professional revolutionary cadre. I don't think any of the orgs are close to having the minimum number of cadres to carry out mass meetings. More investigation needs to be done on the ground to determine who the masses are that you're meeting. If you live in a very PB (petty-bourgeois) and/or LA (labor aristocratic) area, it could be very different.

P. (CCAP): *Brings up the article for reference on the projector.*

Na. (CCAP): *Reading the article from the screen.* "We have found that five dedicated cadre level members is an appropriate benchmark." I don't disagree that this is a good rule of thumb, but could you expand on how you found that number and the significance of it?

Ro. (USU): No real answer to this, other than historical investigation

Win. (USU): We didn't feel that the orgs could be required to do this without practical experience first.

P. (CCAP): Refers to League charter. We aren't allowed to require the member orgs to do anything, so just keep that in mind.

Roa. (CCAP): I had a general question for the delegate for RVLO. I'm curious if y'all have had experience with these mass meetings, if you can clarify any language that we're talking about. Is this something that people will have to do, or are they recommended to seek out on their own terms?

Imr. (RVLO): In the past couple years we've had, I'd say, minimal experience with mass meetings. We had one in east Hartford that had 4 people attending. That's not an indication of failure, but I would say minimal experience. One mass meeting in the past two years. Gra. (RVLO)

reports that he's held mass meetings before joining the CTRRG.

Roa. (CCAP): [inaudible]

Imr. (RVLO): That was a clarification on whether this was a recommendation or requirement?

Roa. (CCAP): Yes.

Imr. (RVLO): We agreed that it should be recommended, but had no lengthy discussion on whether it should be required.

A. (RHATX): I think then we can classify this as a direction for the AEWL. Next question should be: does it meet the criterion for whether this resolution would support the overall aims of the AEWL? if we decide that we can pass this, we'd have to demonstrate that it met this criterion, is that right?

P. (CCAP): Imr. (RVLO) just clarified that it's being suggested as a recommended course of action for organizations, not as a directive.

Na. (CCAP): First clarifying question. We had plans to talk about this yesterday, but are we going to define cadre?

P. (CCAP): That was assigned to the EC.

Na. (CCAP): If we were to adopt this suggestion, just the way that the mass meeting article is written as a suggestion, and this being a suggestion. Don't want to fall into the cult of action. 5 cadre members benchmark is ideal. CCAP's cadre development has been in progress for almost a year. At the end of that we'll have maybe 3 or 4 cadre members. And, again, we haven't defined the word, but that's going off CCAP's understanding. So, I think suggesting five cadre level members, something like that will take a lot of time and we don't have a lot of time.

K. (CCAP): There are a few things that I find problematic with the resolution that I'd like to work through and say out loud. First, I don't think it does totally read as just a suggestion. I think it definitely requires something of the organizations -- "shall seek to hold mass meetings in their locales" -- in that the requirement is literally to do social investigation, not that mass meetings actually need to be held. However, I also don't like that as a suggestion if we're not outright requiring it. I think that as a resolution it should have more clearly defined parameters, or if it's just a suggestion it should just be a point of discussion. Making it a resolution isn't necessarily doing anything at this point.

J. (RHATX): I think just to summarize, resolutions should be actionable. There should be a certain action item coming out of them, and if there's not it needs to be revisited in another form.

Z. (CLN): Just piggybacking on what J. (RHATX) said. The action item should be a detailed report to the League as to what strategies you could take towards the mass meetings. How could we start doing mass meetings that are actually effective?

P. (CCAP): Are there any disagreements with the tactic of mass meetings?

K. (CCAP): I don't know that I would want us to go through and rewrite a whole resolution and say that the group should undertake mass meetings. I think it should just be encouraged, and the job of the EC should be to focus on development of these organizations, and that could be pursuing mass meetings, but I don't think even with the edits we're talking about it would necessarily make sense.

P. (CCAP): Can I ask for clarification on why specifically? What's the issue with agreeing that mass meetings are something we want to do and preparing reports on where we are on capacity to pursue these?

K. (CCAP): I think half of that is fine, but I don't know about specifically seeking how possible mass meetings are, when I think maybe the focus should be more on how to develop the membership at the moment and how to make them better. I don't know that this should be the focus.

P. (CCAP): Could this not be a short term goal at the moment? Rather than nebulous development.

K. (CCAP): EC needs to define what cadre is first, and then we focus on developing membership to that standard. Maybe we will decide that conducting mass meetings is part of it, but it may be problematic to focus on when we don't know that that's the best thing to be focusing on.

Win. (USU): That was essentially the point arrived at by USU. We don't know that this is necessarily the best developmental path and will have to investigate that.

P. (CCAP): What can we take away from this then?

Imr. (RVLO): I like the suggestion from Z. (CLN) on mandating a detailed report on local conditions, and investigating with that in mind.

Z. (CLN): Everybody keeps bringing up the definition of cadre. Revolutionary cadre, or cadre that happen to align with the goals of national liberation? What we're doing is creating asset lists: what do you have and who do you have that can help move along with your goals? If your org doesn't have an asset list, step one is get one. Start with the dictionary definition, and go from there.

P. (CCAP): We did table that already to the new EC as one of its first items of business.

Z. (CLN): Just for today we work with the definition, it is a professional group of people working for a specific task.

P. (CCAP): How do delegates feel about this?

Ro. (USU): I want a little more clarity on what professional means. I think we can all agree

that cadre are professionals, but in our context, what we're working with, what's a professional?

Z. (CLN): EC should do standards on what they're looking for.

P. (CCAP): Are we still comfortable having like a short definition here that we agree on for this current discussion, to look into in more detail later? Is Z. (CLN)'s definition good?

Teq. (FrsoA): So, if we're talking about the definition of cadre in relation to that article, I know RC has an article on this. I haven't found it yet, but I'm looking for it.

Win. (USU): Z. (CLN)'s idea of an asset list is a really good idea and is worth discussing.

Ro. (CCAP): What's an asset list? Let's hear more about it

Z. (CLN): An asset list is essentially a list of people, things, and actionable goals that are in your foreseeable future. List of people you can reach out to, money, assets -- something a cadre can look at to understand what's available. Common in business planning. A lot of org structure becomes very corporate, so it's not wrong to look at how they plan things. Like running it like a kitchen -- I'm a chef, that's how I think about organizing. Being able to switch people out between roles is common practice in a fast food place, it's a good thing to do. Hard to accomplish with revolutionary projects, but the asset list helps us get there.

P. (CCAP): Gonna go back to the earlier question, take an informal poll. Two suggestions on what definition of cadre to use at the moment: Z. (CLN)'s offered definition, or USU's definition.

Teq. (FrsoA): Reads the cadre definition from the RC organize article.

Z. (CLN): A looser definition allows us to think about non-revolutionary cadre; we will not accomplish our tasks without cadre who aren't revolutionaries. We need people able to do work, and the role of vanguardists is to get them doing it.

Ro. (USU): The point about non-revolutionary cadre, of course there's historical examples of those being used by parties, i.e. hiring professionals. I think that's a really important distinction to make early on. I think in terms of our own definition it's definitely revolutionary cadre but Z. (CLN)'s point is worth keeping in mind. But USU's is sufficient for the sake of this meeting.

Informal Poll of which definition to use.

P. (CCAP): Z. (CLN)'s will be used for the duration of this conversation. "A body of professional people trained for a specific goal."

Ro. (USU): With that in mind, I think that's a great definition generally, but when we're speaking of cadre in terms of revolutionary cadre, please try to clarify which you mean.

P. (CCAP): Any objections to that suggestion? Okay, back to the previous discussion on the resolution. So, we had been discussing how to move forward with this. From my understanding it seems like we either are against the resolution in its current form, or we want to make some

changes to it, so we're trying to figure out a course of action.

Win. (USU): The resolution isn't workable in its current form so we shouldn't move forward with it. We should just make a recommendation to the EC to work on it later.

Imr. (RVLO): Propose to amend the resolution to compile a detailed report on the efficacy of holding mass meetings in their locality.

Ro. (USU): To clarify, if this amendment goes through, are the delegates voting on the new phrasing or the original?

P. (CCAP): We're going to vote on the amendment, and then we'll vote on the resolution.

Roa. (CCAP): Considering the amendment would be to change it from holding mass meetings explicitly, wouldn't we need to amend more points on the resolution?

P. (CCAP): We could amend the amendment to strike points that no longer make sense, or reword it.

K. (CCAP): It might be best if the comrade from RVLO came up to you and you rewrote everything as it needs to be

Win. (USU): Since we're representing our orgs, we can't vote on whether to adopt this if the whole thing is changed

J. (RHATX): Should we amend it and then pass that to the EC?

Ro. (USU): I'd be interested in the discussion about each member org doing a study, but even if the resolution is amended, [USU] will probably vote to reject it.

P. (CCAP): Right now, we're just talking about voting on the amendment. All we're talking about right now is striking the highlighted language and inputting the suggested changes. Or we vote to reject this one and a different amendment is proposed.

K. (CCAP): I think Win. (USU) does have a point: this amendment would fundamentally change what this resolution is, so I would say I encourage not doing that, but the people who have written this can keep this in mind for later discussion.

Ro. (USU): If we want a decision now, I recommend we reject the amendment.

P. (CCAP): Is there a motion to amend the amendment?

Z. (CLN): I can't suggest amendments, right?

P. (CCAP): You can't make a motion, but you can suggest

Z. (CLN): I would suggest we just strike the next four points of the resolution.

P. (CCAP): Any delegates want to follow that suggestion and amend the amendment.

K. (CCAP): [unclear]

Win. (USU): Can you summarize what you just said?

K. (CCAP): Suggestion for amending the amendment still results in a fundamentally different resolution, so we shouldn't be voting on it.

P. (CCAP): You are empowered by your org to make these decisions, so it's up to you.

Teq. (FrsoA): I was going to say something similar. The point of amendments is to change the resolution fundamentally.

P. (CCAP): Is there anything else we want to talk about before we put this amendment to a vote?

CCAP: 2 no, 1 abstain

RVLO: 2 yes

RHATX: 2 abstain

USU: 2 no

4 No, 2 Yes, 3 Abstention

P. (CCAP): This amendment fails. We will continue discussing the main motion, which is the resolution as written. The floor is open.

Roa. (CCAP): I think it may be worthwhile to refer this to the EC with the context of the discussion that we have here today so that any potential edits to the language can be gone over and we can have internal discussion on that.

K. (CCAP): That's essentially the strategy I'm looking for and why I voted the way I did. My intention is to get that direction.

Roa. (CCAP): I would like to move to refer to the EC for an editing process within the context of the conversation that we've had around specific language and fundamentally altering the resolution.

P. (CCAP): Are we giving them specific direction in what [they] should be looking for?

Roa. (CCAP): Include the notes about language in changing the amendment, discussion on the 4 points, people not wanting to speak on behalf of their orgs with it being fundamentally altered.

Roa. (CCAP): Motion to refer to the EC with the context of the discussion around the specific

amending of language that we just had and the altering of the 4 points.

P. (CCAP): Any discussion on the motion on the floor? Amendments?

P. (CCAP): Can we give the EC a clearer directive than just looking over the notes? A specific direction? Can we refer to the EC to discuss specifically the changing of the wording regarding the efficacy of the mass meeting strategy at the current moment, and the current conditions of the League? Something like that.

Ro. (USU): An action item we could give to the EC is more specifically determining the necessity of investigation and reports on conditions like the amendment Imr. (RVLO) suggested. By passing it to the EC, we're taking the part that seems to be a synthesis of the discussion we've had here. The EC will discuss the ability of member orgs to prepare reports on their conditions and their ability to conduct mass meetings.

P. (CCAP): Adds five minutes to this discussion.

Z. (CLN): You're empowered to decide on this. We can do that today. This is very frustrating, feels like student government or model UN.

Ro. (USU): I'm cool with rejecting the proposal.

P. (CCAP): Then you can reject the amendment. Call a vote to this resolution

CCAP: 1 yes, 1 no

RVLO: 2 yes

RHATX: 2 yes

USU: 2 no

5 Yes, 3 No

The motion to amend passes.

P. (CCAP): Let's move to vote. This vote is to defer this resolution to the EC to investigate the ability of orgs to prepare reports on their ability to conduct mass meetings.

5 Yes, 4 No

The motion to defer to the EC passes.

10 Minute Recess

Call to Order at 2:42 PM

P. (CCAP): Coming back into order to discuss our next resolution. I'm just gonna read this resolution into the record. "CTRRG/RVLO resolution for the League Press resolution".

K. (CCAP): I wanted to ask, specifically point 3 on publishing theory, would there be an exception carved out for particularly sensitive theory/documents?

A. (RHATX): So, clarification on what K. (CCAP) asked, basically we're asking do we want USU to be entrusted with sensitive information, or do we want to allow them to defer that to the League?

K. (CCAP): Asking if a League org produces a sensitive document, is there an exception carved out for its publication?

Ro. (USU): Motion to amend the resolution to add a section to point 3 to establish exceptions.

Win. (USU): All news and theory intended for publication should be sent to USU

Ro. (USU): Rescind my motion, second Win. (USU)'s

A. (RHATX): Does that mean intended for general League publication? Or do the orgs lose their independent voice?

Z. (CLN): missed this, suggested amendment to amendment

K. (CCAP): recommends against amendment to amendment

Ro. (USU): There is precedent for this. It's already what we do, but it would be more systematized. Might need clarification on whether USU does all publication or alongside a member org.

P. (CCAP): Concern from A. (RHATX) whether member orgs can't speak publicly except through the League, or if they can still do independent publishing.

K. (CCAP): If a member org is intending to publish something, it should also be sent to the League. As this stands right now it's good and should be used.

Ro. (USU): To my understanding that's an accurate reflection of what we intend. This helps elevate and raise our standards for scientific study and reporting.

Win. (USU): Ultimately, this is all still on a voluntary basis. We are trying to streamline everything to avoid duplication of efforts.

Ro. (USU): Disagree on the voluntary basis, we need to be able to enforce discipline here. But this should not slow down what the organization does. There should be a time limit on requirements for submitting publications to the League.

J. (RHATX): I know we briefly mentioned that the editing process going through USU is going

to be different -- are we sure USU can handle the additional workload?

Ro. (USU): As USU is now? No. An essential part of this is that we need to better systematize our internal structure, and one of the ways that we want to do this is-- I think part of this process will be involving the mention of delegates, utilizing delegate editors. We spend a lot of labor on other matters that can be refocused.

Win. (USU): This won't necessarily be a smooth process, but it should reveal contradictions in our practice that we can work together with the other orgs to resolve.

P. (CCAP): Just for clarification: we're still discussing the amendment above

Ro. (USU): What do I have to do so we can move to vote on this?

P. (CCAP): Move to close discussion

Ro. (USU): I move to close this discussion

Seconded. No Objection. Motion Passes.

P. (CCAP): We'll proceed to vote on the amendment. Again, the amendment as written here is all news and theory intended for publication by a member org shall be submitted to the press.

No Objection. Motion Passes Unanimously.

P. (CCAP): This amendment is adopted. The floor is now open for discussion of the main motion.

Ro. (USU): I don't remember all of the proposed amendments that I mentioned. I remember one being the possibility of voting deputies on the press org; I'm curious about what others have to say about where this amendment should be put. Member orgs having deputy editors or writers that work with the press.

P. (CCAP): You are moving that section 5 be amended to include-- can you repeat?

K. (CCAP): suggesting "Each member organization shall be entitled to one editor-deputy to the press organization."

Ro. (USU): We should include language about "with voting rights at all press organization meetings"

P. (CCAP): We will now discuss this amendment, floor is open.

A. (RHATX): Move to close discussion and put it to a vote.

P. (CCAP): Any objections? No objections? I will ask for unanimous consent.

No Objections. Amendment is adopted.

P. (CCAP): We return to open floor on the main motion.

Ro. (USU): Slight clarification: By "all press org meetings," we mean general press-org meetings, not weekly EB meetings. Our monthly press-org meetings should have deputies.

P. (CCAP): To be clear are you making an amendment to add "monthly"?

K. (CCAP): I don't think it needs specified within this resolution, and when it comes to whoever ends up being this deputy, they can get that information at a later time.

Rob. (CCAP): Because they're "entitled" to send a deputy, it doesn't mean they're required to.

A. (RHATX): I like that because it builds the language into it, like if you don't send them it means you can't complain if you don't like the decisions made, so it's sort of a requirement.

Ro. (USU): Thank you, I won't move to request this amendment. There was one amendment considered about having a time limit.

Win. (USU): I don't think we need to worry about this until it's become apparent that it's an issue in our practice.

K. (CCAP): I tend to agree with what Win. (USU) just said. I will say you could just immediately nip this in the bud, and the only word you have to add is "be immediately submitted". As soon as you're publishing a thing you can send it to USU.

P. (CCAP): Are you motioning an amendment

K. (CCAP): Just a point of discussion

A. (RHATX): Agree, we don't need to add it.

P. (CCAP): I have a quick question about revisiting point 3 a little bit. I have a question about like what if an organization produces something that USU doesn't want to publish? Does USU reserve the right to reject its publication? I don't think there's a clear as-written protocol for how to approach that situation

K. (CCAP): I don't agree it's not clear. If you're submitting something to the press, it's going through their process. If there's disagreement, then it can be hashed out.

Imr. (RVLO): I agree, but we also regularly publish things we disagree with, and just include an editorial note

Ro. (USU): Yeah, going off of those two last points, I think I like the idea of still maintaining that consistency of "This isn't something we agree with but think it's necessary for discussion"; but there will be things we don't feel are up to argumentative standards, and we'll workshop it if

we can, but will reject it if we can't improve it. Main point is this will be a point of struggle, line struggle between orgs.

P. (CCAP): What if USU rejects something but the other orgs want it to be published?

Ro. (USU): This would be a great opportunity for democratic centralism -- USU can be required by the member orgs to publish something

Win. (USU): *Explains process of unity, struggle, unity. Struggle is a good thing.*

P. (CCAP): Motion to add amendment, include a new point 4 which says that "the press reserves the right to reject a publication submitted by a member organization. However, the EC can overturn rejection with a 2/3 majority."

Ro. (USU): Reminder, what do you feel about the point about USU getting the right to express disagreement in the publication? Or is that a separate conversation?

P. (CCAP): I think that was implied but should we make it explicit?

A. (RHATX): We could say that when rejection and overturning happens, we can make a note of it in the publication.

P. (CCAP): Adding, "should a rejection be overturned, that process must be included as a note with the final publication." Floor is open regarding this amendment as written.

Ro. (USU): Move to close discussion.

P. (CCAP): Any objections to closing this discussion and moving to a vote?

No Objection

P. (CCAP): We will now proceed with a vote on accepting or rejecting this amendment to the resolution.

CCAP: 2 yes

RVLO: 2 yes

RHATX: 2 yes

USU: 2 yes

Passes Unanimously

P. (CCAP): Discussion returns to the main motion. The floor is open. Motion to close discussion. Any objections?

No Objection. Motion Passes.

P. (CCAP): We will now proceed to a vote on the resolution adopting this resolution as the new article 2 of the bylaws (bumping the existing article 2 down) of the AEWL.

Passes Unanimously

5 Minute Recess

Call to Order at 3:31 PM

P. (CCAP): I'm gonna read our fourth resolution today as written into the record. "Drafted resolution USU press resolution, demarcation between press agitation and propaganda." Essentially what is being suggested is that a higher standard for editorial procedures for the RC be adopted, to ensure content doesn't veer into chauvinism. Suggesting requirements for bibliography, works cited, and a demarcation between agitation and propaganda. Hopefully everyone understands the gist. The floor is open. One hour time

A. (RHATX): I want to quickly and aggressively trim the shit out of this. I think it needs to be very slimmed

P. (CCAP): Do you have suggestions?

A. (RHATX): When those question marks start showing up [in the resolution], let's whack that. Either we're going to say there are going to be separate sections for agit or prop, and the distinction between online and not doesn't strike me as important.

Ro. (USU): Move to amend the resolution to reflect the summary given by the P. (CCAP).

K. (CCAP): The difference between the print and online got screwed up -- it's supposed to suggest that for the most part the print paper will be things that don't require the source, information, etc. and will still all be online.

P. (CCAP): *Reads newly revised resolution.* Let's refrain from discussions of content and put this to a vote, then we can discuss the content.

Ro. (USU): Move to close discussion.

P. (CCAP): Any objections?

No Objections.

P. (CCAP): Move to vote on the amendment. Any objections?

No Objections. Motion Passes.

Ro. (USU): Explains editorial process, how we manage ideological rigor, and the self crit resolutions since the retraction of the "Liberal Feminism" piece.

K. (CCAP): The distinction between agitation and propaganda was written into the original resolution to ask for higher standards for certain articles.

Ro. (USU): We are working on that; works cited and bibliography we agree on. Then the point on sections of the paper for agitation and propaganda, we disagree with that and one of the biggest reasons is that the people that we send the papers to most regularly are study circles, people who are trying to advance their development.

Z. (CLN): It would be advisable to include a methodology disclosure in your procedures from authors. Would help solve a lot of these problems.

A. (RHATX): From a web design point of view, asking for a separate section is kinda burdensome. It can make things messy in a hurry.

P. (CCAP): I'd like to suggest, since we've adopted the League press resolution, that some of USU's internal procedures for how those things go should be made available to the rest of the League, to ensure that we're agreeing on what standards need to be adopted.

Ro. (USU): A lot of these are things that will be addressed and resolved as part of the League press collaboration. I really like Z. (CLN)'s suggestion to have a clear methodology.

Z. (CLN): Each author should be disclosing their methodology.

Ro. (USU): Each writer gets their own channel, at the top of which we list the steps of the editorial process, and I think including a point where we request a brief report, like a paragraph, "this is how I investigated these things, and I'm targeting this audience for this reason". I like the point about having our standards of procedure available for other orgs

Win. (USU): We've already either covered every point here, or it will be covered as part of the League press process, so I still don't see this as being a useful resolution.

Ro. (USU): I agree with that, but it is essential that we lay out standards of procedure from the outset.

P. (CCAP): I'd like to hear from CCAP comrades about what Ro. (USU) and Win. (USU) have said.

K. (CCAP): I was one of the main people behind getting this written up, but I think I'm personally satisfied with what I've heard, and if in the coming months if we aren't we can bring it up. I'd like to move to a vote.

Z. (CLN): Can we just move to strike the vote and be done with it?

P. (CCAP): Yeah.

K. (CCAP): Motion to kill this motion.

P. (CCAP): Move immediately to a vote.

Passes Unanimously.

P. (CCAP): Fuck this resolution.

P. (CCAP): Since we have extra time, I would like to ask the delegates if we can open the floor for Z. (CLN)'s report.

Z. (CLN): Reads CLN Report.

P. (CCAP): 12 minutes of open floor discussion.

A. (CCAP): Clarifying question, really enjoyed the speech. It did illuminate a lot of how some marxists will hold these inherent ideas, especially if you're a settler in a settler-colonial society, you often carry previous positions and already formed habits within the society as it shapes you. You're saying that you need to be militantly anti-colonial first and foremost?

Z. (CLN): Kluxism is a lot broader than that, it refers to how whites will gather together to decide what is true, and that's how Black/native folks get chased out of town.

K. (CCAP): Curious about the methodology point

Z. (CLN): White papers, scientific abstract.

Ro. (USU): Earlier you suggested having better methodology, do you think that the brief report works?

Z. (CLN): Basically asking for an abstract. It doesn't have to be long. For a lot of people it's going to be their first time intellectualizing their own intellectualization

P. (CCAP): Do you think the abstract needs to be published?

Z. (CLN): What I'm asking for is a more open-source method of engaging with this, as far as opsec goes keeping everything internal just makes it harder for us to work together. Like PSL won't explain why they do what they do, why we should cooperate with them -- they just say you have to.

S. (CS): I was just discussing PSL with somebody, and one of my main criticisms is that keeping everything internal and not explaining things to people does not build trust.

Ro. (USU): FRSO also is like this, no transparency. It's also best for training new Marxists, for treating Marxism as scientific socialism. Biggest problems with USU is people don't know how to write, and people don't know how to do analysis. If we really want to build class consciousness

seriously and teach people to be scientific socialists, we need to be doing exactly what you're saying.

Z. (CLN): "On Ultrademocracy" by Mao talks about this. There's a tendency to abstain decision making to the group because we aren't confident in our own decisions. Executive dysfunction is a common disability with a lot of people in our movement. When we're organizing around disabilities, that's one we need to be organizing around. So many people don't consider that's something we have to do

P. (CCAP): Sometimes decisions need to be made, someone needs to be there making it. It's an opportunity for someone to step up. A lot of people might not feel confident in their ability or their reasoning, but if you have an idea and you aren't quite sure about it, sometimes it's really necessary to fight that feeling and bring that forward and take initiative and say "hey, maybe we try this" and introduce those ideas. Sometimes those third ideas are the ones that are most effective. Just want to give everyone a boost of confidence.

Z. (CLN): Oftentimes I'm sure you're thinking to yourselves "I wish somebody would talk about that more." You could be that person! A huge thing is being confident attracts people to whatever you're pushing. Salesman 101.

Win. (USU): This is about practicing leadership. That's what we're here to do: it's about vanguardism, developing your decision-making ability so you can make decisions when it counts.

Imr. (RVLO): Can you elaborate on how this was a criticism of the decolonial manifesto piece?

Z. (CLN): This gave an opportunity to launch everybody else off on a different point of departure. This doesn't have to be a critique of that, it's food for thought. It's a necessary shift in our milieu. By adhering to the scientific method that gives a lot of people a very clear point to live up to, that's universally applicable, that's in constant peer review, that we can back things up with science that we are correct. a lot of anarchist criticisms of marxists is they don't explain how they reach conclusions.

S. (CS): Is there a location where I can get this essay?

Win. (USU): We can publish it in USU.

A. (CCAP): I just wanted to second the idea of the abstract. It gives people the ability to trace your steps in how you wrote that piece. I think it would really help writers think about how they are coming to these conclusions. You may think that whatever essay you've made is structurally sound, no holes in it, but I think the abstract can really help in making sure it actually is.

Win. (USU): Thanks Z. (CLN) for being here.

A. (RHATX): Yeah, especially when you talk about the building of trust, by clarifying your methods. I'm a little too ignorant to start using words like methodology, but I'll talk about methods. I think when you start to do that you can establish genuine trust. One of the problems is that we need to start making it clear that we're no longer going to lean and depend on the

privilege of mediocrity.

Z. (CLN): A lot of it is a criticism of my own mediocrity. It's everyone I know that makes me sound smart. Serious people are not engaging online, it's bad opsec.

P. (CCAP): Are you sub-tweeting someone with that?

Z. (CLN): Myself if anything.

P. (CCAP): Let's move on to the next discussion topic. We'll have dinner soon. I want to wrap up our open discussion today with an appeal to our guests, to thank you all for coming. We appreciate it so much that you're willing to come and spend this time with us. One of the purposes of inviting guests was to help get word out there about what the League is doing, what the League is, because in its current state it's difficult to have a public presence and demonstrate what we're doing and why. Hopefully the discussions today helped illuminate these things for you, what our strategy is. We also invited people here who we felt were trusted comrades in the struggle: orgs and individuals that we think very highly of, and who we would be honored in the future if they and their orgs would like to pursue membership in the League. We hope that you got something out of this conference besides just watching us fumble with procedure for three hours today. Thank you for coming, I hope you all enjoy dinner.

Recess for Dinner

END OF DAY TWO

CONFERENCE MINUTES

DAY THREE: JANUARY 11, 2026

Call to Order at 1:01 PM

P. (CCAP): I suggest to the delegates that we move the order around for the agenda today. We haven't received RVLO's absentia election decision, so we can't start with the election.

Ro. (USU): Regarding the election of the Executive Committee, is it that RVLO has not formally submitted who their new EC member is?

P. (CCAP): Basically, the way the election is working is that each org has privately elected their own rep, and what we're doing today is the delegates are confirming that slate. Without Imr. (RVLO) here, I don't know who the EC rep is from RVLO, so I've asked them to send me a letter certifying who their choice is.

Ro. (USU): I do know who it is, but if you need to wait for a formal response I'll respect that.

N. (CCAP): It's Gra. (RVLO).

P. (CCAP): Delegates, how do we feel about doing it a little informal?

N. (CCAP): Let's just move it down and if we get a letter by that time, we get to it.

P. (CCAP): J. (RHATX) has to leave by 3 PM. I want to move this item out of the middle, combine the two on either side of it, and have an extended discussion on the plan for next year.

N. (CCAP): Let's do elections for everyone except RVLO.

Ro. (USU): I don't think any other member org has that formality, but we weren't given guidelines on what to do for this. In the interest of rectifying that issue, I don't think we should compromise our ability to come to that conclusion based on a weird formality that one member org came up with themselves.

P. (CCAP): I'll make an executive decision to start with the election, then we'll have an extended open-floor discussion until we're done.

P. (CCAP): Let's proceed with the election of the EC. I'll ask each org to certify the individual that they elected to be their representative. Then, the delegates will vote to confirm that slate.

CCAP has elected P. (CCAP) to be our EC member for the next term.

Red Help has elected J. (RHATX) to be the EC for the next term.

USU has elected Daz. (USU) to be the EC rep for the next term.

In absentia, RVLO has elected Gra. (RVLO) to be the EC rep for the next term.

P. (CCAP): Confirmation vote from delegates.

Passes Unanimously (RVLO Absent)

P. (CCAP): Jokingly. Fuck them.

P. (CCAP): This final discussion session will be an open floor, so there's no motion or resolution to vote on. I want to have this time be for us to reflect on the conference, reflect on the last year of work, and put together some action items for the next year. That could be giving suggestions/recommendations to specific standing bodies within the League, the League as a whole, specific member organizations; hash out our last thoughts and last things we want to cover; create some sort of plan/action items to direct the next year's worth of work for the League.

P. (CCAP): Before we do that, just for clarity's sake I want to talk about how the League is structured right now. We have four Member Orgs. Each of those orgs elects one individual to sit on the EC of the League, which kind of serves as the steward between conventions. The convention body is the highest body of the League. There are currently three standing committees. Membership, which manages outreach to other orgs, collaboration, and applications. We have a Social Media Committee which is supposed to manage our social media accounts – Twitter, Instagram, Bluesky. Then our Consultation Committee, which was recently established by the last EC and exists to provide services and coordinate consultation efforts for new organizations. Multiple member orgs receive requests from individuals/orgs requesting help with forming new orgs, or guidance. The idea was to formalize that function as part of the League and standardize that process between orgs, making this more formal as part of the League's purpose for existence. There's also one temporary body which is the Working Committee (WC) for the Conference. Each of these committees is staffed by volunteers from within the member orgs membership, and an officer is appointed by the EC to lead meetings, etc. for committees.

P. (CCAP): I would like to now open the floor to all of you for discussion on how this conference went, how we hope the next year will go, and planning on actions for us to take towards that end.

N. (CCAP): I have quite a bit to say. For the majority of the year, we felt like the labor for the League was very CCAP-heavy. P. (CCAP) was making the agendas and chairing all the EC meetings. Membership was supposed to be more people, but it was just me, Ro. (USU), and Sun. (CCAP). Rethinking the committees should happen. Obviously, a lot of the past few months has gone into planning the conference, it makes sense that since it's in Cincinnati, CCAP does a lot of the planning. But it felt at times like we were the ones keeping the lights on

K. (CCAP): I would say I noticed that with the WC, it was essentially just meetings between Sun. (CCAP) and I, and occasionally Ger. (USU) would join but not say much. I would also say CCAP was not doing much itself. It seemed like the EC was disorganized and we didn't get reports from the committees on what was going on very much. I do think things we're doing here will help, and I'm anxious in a good way to see how that's going to develop.

Ro. (USU): To mirror and agree with what was just said by N. (CCAP) and K. (CCAP), I'm viewing this conference as essentially holding ourselves accountable for a year of not doing much, and then us coming back together. Getting all together now, we'll put structures in place to ensure that it won't take a year next time to assess things. Just speaking from my experience on the former Outreach, then combined Membership Committee, rethinking the volunteerist basis is essential. Whoever is essentially not so busy, or masochistic enough to submit to peer pressure on the spot, is the one to do it. It needs to be a question not of, "let's ask and see who's available", it needs to be a question of the EC saying, "here's who would be good at it -- let's figure out how to make sure they can do it."

Ro. (USU): Re: Membership Committee, Outreach and Membership started separately. Membership didn't get any applications (except 1). Membership had 4 people on it to process applications when nobody knew who we were. Outreach was two people, myself and B. (CCAP) for a while. We didn't know how to do things. Eventually, we consolidated the two committees, added a few more people. Still didn't know what we were doing, except inviting people to the convention, which still didn't work. Anyway, committees need to be determined by ability, not volunteerism, and they need to be given clear direction. There were multiple times when we reached out for direction and didn't get much.

I. (CS): As a guest organization who hasn't engaged with the League, I'm hoping to propose this to the rest of CinSoc, on the potential of joining. One issue I can see: there can be difficulty in trying to juggle the local work that we're dedicated to as independent orgs, as well as trying to juggle who has availability and drive to really engage in League work in addition to the expectations that you have on your individual organizations. My thought is I think the League needs to be very strategic in what committees it has and the purpose of those committees, because if there's too much admin work you're going to have problems. Any way to reduce the amount of work, or find a structure that allows it to not feel like a downpour of responsibility on anyone who wants to engage -- we have to be aware of the capacity that we have. I think that would go a long way in making sure the work the League does is very direct and purposeful, without reducing the willingness of members to engage in the work. That might go a long way in convincing my comrades in seeing this as an option.

P. (CCAP): Well said, I. (CS), thank you.

Z. (CLN): Going to harp on the asset list again. Sounds like it will solve a lot of things being brought up. What they should include is people's motivation level, availability, skillsets, etc. There's a lot of contingencies you can design into it to prevent security issues. It will help a lot of direction. It will give a good foundation to move forward from; I think it's one of the main action goals the orgs should leave here with. I think there should be a lot of relation-building through work as well as social actions. Without that level of camaraderie, it's going to be hard to do anything together, because there isn't a sense of personal connection, so the empathy is lacking. Abstract community, rather than an actual community, is one of the big things that prevents effective organizing. A Party Planning Committee. We should show through action what it is this League could be capable of, which should attract more people that you want to attract.

P. (RHB): Z. (CLN) had a great point, particularly about the asset list as well as relation-building. As someone who has run an organization in the past and starting one with A. (RHB),

what is the purpose of a group like this? If I'm an outsider, what would make me want to join the League? It would be a repository of not just an asset list, but a repository of standard operating procedures as well as asset lists. A SOP is how to do things, asset list is what you have. If you want to set up a food distro, how do you do that? What is the best practice from groups actually doing that? From my organizing experience, a lot of people will want to go do things and not know how to do it. Lists of how to do things for every distinct line of work, and you can share best practices

A. (RHATX): As a rank-and-file member, I look at things like, these are our cell activities, the things we're doing these are our goals... and then there's the League. It's just one of our Discord channels. But being present here, like Z. (CLN) was saying -- you have to be present to start building empathy. And when I go back home, I'll be able to explain to my org how what we're doing is feeding into a larger process and larger phenomenon. We'll really benefit from seeing your Yearly Reports, realizing what we want to do to fill in the gap and hold ourselves to higher standards together. Going forward, I think it would be cool to figure out secure ways to digitally hang out, be buddies. We don't always have to engage in official functions. I think it would give a lot of energy to our respective orgs.

Win. (USU): Suggests asset list, recommends SOP, and asset lists as corporate tactics to study. Suggests combining revolutionary education and social events, e.g. Battleship Potemkin watch party.

K. (CCAP): I know each member org will create a report after this. I want to ask how people feel about this idea: Can we get the members of the former EC to make a report on what went wrong / what went well, etc. for future ECs?

Z. (CLN): Talking about the handbook. The SOPs should be a part of that. View it as an employee manual. When structuring it, I recommend looking into how restaurants do their SOPs, those are the most available and commonly understood ones.

K. (CCAP): You can always use the resources available to the League. Talking about examples of written out protocols and things, explaining how to do processes and what resources we have available. Ask CCAP, because we have resource lists, personnel lists, SOPs, etc. written out for our activities.

P. (CCAP): Your suggestion about the EC reflecting on the past year -- I'd like to do a little bit of that now, so we can talk about it. One of the difficulties for us and one of the mistakes we made was that we had the one conference for forming the League, but there was no plan made for planning development of that conference. Cel. (USU) mentioned to me that we should have had another conference to do that, and we've been floundering a lot since then. Win. (USU) echoed that idea on the first day when she said there's no way to figure out what structures need to be made when we don't have concrete goals. The EC was kind of figuring the way as we went along, which is difficult when there was no real idea of what EC meetings should look like, what kinds of practices there needed to be between the EC and other orgs. I agree with Ro. (USU)'s point about the dysfunction of the committees, which was a symptom of the EC recognizing that the League needed to be doing something, to have some function, so we tried to formalize those functions in the structure of the League, but there was no guiding strategy to how those things should work. J. (RHATX) may feel similar. I think that this conference has been really helpful if nothing else

but for the fact that it allowed us to talk about that stuff in a way that we didn't have to worry about meeting time limits and then having to meet again next month, or trying to get out loads of information over text. These criticisms are absolutely vital to how we need to change going forward. Another issue we identified last year is that the structure of the League as it stands didn't really set us up to succeed; it was difficult to make decisions and establish functions due to the decentralized nature of the League. We had questions about how we secure labor from other orgs. There are things that need to be done but every org just says, "We're too busy and can't spare any labor right now." what can we do when we don't have anyone to help? I'm hoping that as we focus on development, as we put a lot into this League handbook, it can help these organizations commit more labor to these League functions, and that way we can get more centralized. What are some strategies that we can implement to secure that labor?

Ro. (USU): I think the best way to think about the AEWL is: it was a criticism of the national parties as they currently exist. PSL, CPUSA, FRSO, the top-down development, abuse, lack of democracy, becomes a way to filter back in hegemonic functions about colonialism, imperialism, settlerism. The AEWL is meant to be the opposite of that, but there aren't many examples to draw on. We're discovering a lot of things on first principles, from distant historical study (e.g. the Russian Rev). The dialectic is now between decentralized vs centralized. I think this year we were all very disorganized, and the experiment was in extreme decentralization; and we should course-correct in the direction of centralization. We should attempt to give the EC the ability to make assignments and responsibilities and expectations from member orgs. At the same time, member orgs have to expect more from the EC. And the point about strategy, you said do we just flounder? Everything that's been talked about, from asset lists to formalizing SOPs, will allow us to become more efficient. A lot of our reports focused on inefficiencies. By standardizing procedures and centralizing communication, adopting firmer methodologies for practices, it opens the way for us to... I forgot what I was going to say.

P. (CCAP): Well said. You've helped me clarify a lot of thoughts. We've been struggling with the contradiction of cent. vs decent. in the current moment and to not recreate the mistakes of the existing anti-democratic parties, and navigate that contradiction. I think that is probably the underlying reason for all the issues that have been brought up over the past three days. I also wanted to say, just to put it out there, it sounds like every single one of our orgs, and every org that I've interacted with outside of the League, seems to be dealing with the exact same problems. It just seems like no one's really talking about that. I'm hoping that this conference and the conversations we're having can help us start to navigate those issues.

P. (RHB): The first thing about the directional shift about the top down national orgs, it's a franchise model. They're literally approaching organizing from a PB (petty-bourgeois) standpoint, handing out licenses to grow the franchise. I think there's some confusion here under the category of decentralization. There are two related and distinct concepts that are being confused: distributed and decentralized. My understanding from being online and reading the League stuff: a distributed org can still be centralized but is resilient to individual losses. If I'm understanding correctly, it seems like that is what the League is going for, and I do not think that's in contradiction to centralization. As Marxists, the language and epistemology we approach this from often gets lumped in. Leagues like this encourage local orgs to coalesce together in a way that lets them identify the best practices, like a "natural selection" process – A. (RHB)'s words. The value of the League is that these experiences accumulate until the best working configuration

can be discovered so that it doesn't fall apart when one or two people that the org relies on are gone. That's the value of drawing from the bottom up, and that's why the left orgs I've seen fall apart -- they become detached from reality. They don't have hypotheses to test against reality, and the orgs revert inward and lose that connection with reality. Make sure that you have objective metrics tied to external reality, that anyone can look at and they're all seeing the same thing.

A. (RHATX): I realize we're all still riffing off the first list item that N. (CCAP) had, so I'm curious to hear from the rest of that list

Z. (CLN): What P. (RHB)'s getting at is a lot of what I was talking about in my essay, our theory needs to survive contact with material conditions. that is the crucible of revolution. When we test it, we can't cope; we can't just keep trying and bashing heads against the wall.

J. (RHATX): Going back to our self-crit of the EC, I don't necessarily think that our experimentation was wrong, but the piece that was missing was that our experiments need to be constrained by the assets we actually have, so the asset list should be one of our biggest items going forward. Getting a realistic understanding of our capacity, and not trying to extend past that.

Z. (CLN): [Walter] Rodney has some great stuff on this issue, Groundings [With My Brothers].

N. (CCAP): I want to talk about P. (CCAP)'s issue of burnout in organizations

P. (CCAP): I wanted to put forward an open question to the room, and not just about your orgs and the orgs in the League, but all the primary orgs in the country that are presumably trying to do similar things. It seems like burnout, labor shortage, these are the things that are affecting every single organization and nobody knows what to do about it.

Z. (CLN): A lot of it comes back down to our capacity of empathy. Burnout happens because somebody is being overloaded and others aren't noticing. It's a give and take, the group has to have a culture that encourages helping one another, both local and national level. Ways to build camaraderie, like ACP does their hikes. I'm sure they have a lot of fun. [Everyone laughs.] But when we're building it, we need to do it in a more politically educational manner. Literally a lot of people do not have that in their life -- we lack relationality to one another. There needs to be an effort made to build kinship. We need people who are willing to die for one another. That's hard to do without having actual tangible connections.

N. (CCAP): Something quick about the burnout issue: capitalism has done such a good job of making us miserable, whether you're working or not, and I think A. (RHATX) has talked about this on day one, how covid has ransacked our brains, how many of us are neurodivergent; so I think that Win. (USU) has put some good ideas in my mind about how the revolution starts at home. I think fostering accessibility for each other and camaraderie and kinship are important. I guess it's hard to exist in a world that's so fucked up, and then do the work to try to make the world less fucked up, and it also might make you more fucked up in the process of doing that.

Win. (USU): We need to understand labor not in abstract terms, but in concrete terms. Labor is the product of labor, social reproductive labor, which we need to develop processes for

producing and reproducing more efficiently. Community, camaraderie, collectivization, etc.

Ro. (USU): Something I've been paying attention to over the course of this conversation and in conversations with Win. (USU), and my reading and studying -- especially in terms of an aid organization -- is how much of it is the people who can do aid work and are trying to pull recruits from aid work, they've found themselves in these crises of labor. They pull from waves of volunteers after, say, elections, and none of them can be made into communists. So, it essentially becomes the same handful of people, maybe 5 to 10 who are principled and keep showing up, and every few months one burns out and leaves, and then every few months another shows up. But the reason for this is we are doing aid work, the ways it's structured, the people we're pulling in aren't objectively revolutionary. They won't immediately benefit from the end of imperialism, settler colonialism. Our orgs are usually folks who are trans, neurodivergent, in tension with the system, but maybe not immediately benefitting from the overthrow of the system. We need to find more methods of connecting with objectively revolutionary bases, masses. It will give us more perspective, and more recruitment. Where it's life/death for these people. The contradiction between the objective and subjective revolutionary elements.

P. (CCAP): I wanted to say that I 100% agree, it's very clear that there's a contradiction between who we are trying to organize as our mass base and the class makeup of our organizations. There's a struggle that I've been puzzling over, and I don't feel like I have a clear answer. Part of the reason I think the makeup of the orgs are the way they are: these people have the most free time to spend the most time reading, writing, etc., and I've been thinking that's the reason the makeup is the way it is, and the cause of a lot our problems. The people who become communists now are people who choose to. They wake up and see the moral failings of capitalism, and the moral impulse behind that to do something right. But you can't structure a scientific ideology on morality. My thought is, the real serious movement may only arise when people stop becoming communists because they choose to and start becoming communists because they have to, like the vanguard has to be what people turn to in order to survive. How do we make it so the people we want to be our mass base make up our orgs?

Z. (CLN): By putting the colonial contradiction first. It's about our material conditions, by focusing on the science, rather than the ideology ("Are you Marxist?"). Who are you reaching out to in your orgs? Who are you reaching out to? I've witnessed anarchists, forced into scientific socialist frameworks, getting called crypto-Leninists. We need to be asking who are the non-revolutionary cadre who can do the important labor? Like communalized housing, providing jobs, etc. are concrete reasons people will join you. They care about material conditions. The ideology is important at the beginning, but you don't proselytize people. Who can be supported to do this important unity-building work? You should each have your own Z. (CLN) to travel around and do this unity-building work, and you should be paying them to do this.

J. (RHATX): Contradictions are sharpening, people are getting burnt out from life. That's the principle driving thing behind our labor shortages. We need to acknowledge that as a huge problem, and we need to work around it because that's a huge problem and we need to solve it.

P. (RHB): A lot of comrades have brought up what I was going to address. I believe it was Cde P. (CCAP) who asked, "How do we get our mass base into our orgs?" My theory is the probability of survival: Is your survival higher with the guaranteed perpetuation of the social order, or

higher with the possible chance (not guarantee) of revolution? Is your survival more likely by acquiescence to fascism, or higher by risking it with the revolution? I think a lot of the problem of Marxists in the settler colony of the US, we have been looking all too often in locations where, even if people don't like fascism, they can put their heads down, go to work, shut the fuck up, collect a check, and survive. And maybe we feel different, uncomfortable, etc., but we don't reach out to people whose objective survival is benefited by revolution. The US army has a counterinsurgent theory: they talk about the terrain of the battlespace of a counterinsurgency op is the "hearts and minds" of the people, to make themselves the legitimate authority in the eyes of the people. As fascism accelerates, there's been a slight modification to, "Which populations do we care about and which can be discarded?" Rather than winning over everybody, there's the settler base, then the queers, the Indigenous, Black surplus population to be warehoused and eliminated, by withholding access to resources, etc. Where the state has abandoned these populations, we have to fill in and demonstrate our authority through our actions.

Ro. (USU): Related to this stuff and concrete steps that can be taken, I think there was a proposal made internally in USU a while ago that we couldn't take seriously at the time due to professionalization constraints: reads excerpt from red aid proposal.

Recess.

Call to Order at 3:08 PM

Ro. (USU): Repeats red aid proposal.

N. (CCAP): What is anyone going to do with \$25?

Win. (USU): This points towards the necessity of income streams via fundraising/expropriations.

P. (CCAP): I don't think the orgs in the League have explored the question of funding yet. CCAP primarily operates based on dues payments from members, i.e. a vast majority of our operating funds come from dues payments. We have a minimum requirement of \$5 a month from full membership, but several members give much more than that, which has unfortunately become necessary to run our operations, and fluctuates with membership numbers. Difficult to maintain a continuous reliable stream of funds for the org. We get some donations, but it's insignificant. We've had trouble putting together other methods of getting funding. I'd like to call attention to RHATX's experience with fundraising, whether that could be recreated or a guide written on this. Generally, I'd like to open the question a bit about finances and how to procure funds.

A. (RHATX): We learned a lesson from our fundraising event, which was essentially a bake sale. We ran it at one of those tabletop gaming places. Before that, we had to reschedule about three different times, which sucked because we kept changing the social media announcement. There was hardly any turnout, we raised about \$500. It was pretty much all internal.

P. (CCAP): Org members were contributing?

A. (RHATX): Correct. What was great was we could redistribute the baked goods. We would have charged people \$25 for entry into one of the tabletop games. One of our members is a dungeon master. He was able to lead us, they were all great ideas, but we couldn't get a solid venue ("We heard you're communist"). As a follow-up, we thought it might be a good idea to start selling t-shirts. A comrade noted that the "Walmart model", Just-In-Time inventory, might be good.

Z. (CLN): CLN is the most experienced in fundraising here. Most of that is just me, reposting connections; in one year we were able to buy three people homes. Big part is it's a hard skill to teach. I'm good at begging because I had to beg on the street. You have to have a story to make people feel good. Whether it's true is up to you. We've had poor success at replicating what I do on an individual level. It's hard to say how to standardize something like that. Some of the varieties and methods I've used is terrarium plants, boutique market; Etsy people will buy a square of moss for \$20. You can just make money that way. There are advancements in home science that lets you take plant material and recreate the plant. Someone creating boutique plants are undercutting this, similar to China's caviar market (tariffs to keep it high priced). Out of the box methods. The idea that [someone] can't give a donation if you're not an NGO means they won't give it to you unless they can get a tax credit. Chastise them, make them feel bad. [Tell people to] expect to lose the money. This is going to build something that will hopefully last generations. Farmer's markets, craft selling -- you can save on groceries by growing food, or sell seedlings at a farmers market. We have a furry artist that [sends us] money.

Win. (USU): Read about Denmark's CWG and Torkil Lauesen, in the Unequal Exchange intro, as well as The Principal Contradiction.

P. (RHB): On that note, cryptocurrency. Don't use bitcoin, which is instantly traceable. Use monero, xmr.

Z. (CLN): Forgot to finish what I was saying. We tried a bunch of stuff. I'm annoyed that the form of work I have to do most is begging. We're working towards funding a food truck. Normally, this is a \$25000 investment, but it cost me a line cook's paycheck for a week. It's just luck that I was able to find such a good deal, but looking at more permanent structures that are legal. If meetings are in code and stuff the food truck is impossible to take down without galvanizing private property reactionaries. It's a slippery slope that requires a detailed plan from the outset, but every business needs this. We are interested in joining a League, but there are several Leagues forming around the country. This happens to be one in the Midwest. Are the resources CLN has been collecting able to be used by you effectively? I don't want to hand over a bunch of stuff we've worked very hard to establish to a bunch of white people who don't know what the fuck they're doing. That's why I'm really focused on relationship building, so that I can trust a group that can utilize my resources. There's not enough people in CLN able to dedicate themselves to CLN. So, the question is how to merge ourselves with someone who can better use those resources. I'd be willing to turn over the truck towards party use. It's a front for fundraising, mutual aid, meetings, etc. that we can set up anywhere. Because I've traveled around the country, there's a lot of people who are willing. There seems to be the resources, but not enough people who can manage those resources. That's why I'm so big on education. There's like 5 of us, none of us can constitute enough to form a working body -- we're more of a think tank.

Roa. (CCAP): This was an idea regarding fundraising that I had a while ago, probably

underdeveloped. There are certain state agencies (Ohio dept natural resources) that will pay you to manage invasive fish species. A lot of the times you can also eat the fish. Up to \$100 a fish. You can probably also, using neutral language, play into liberal sensibilities: you can ask for funding for travel etc.

S. (CS): My recommendation re: fundraising is, make sure the opportunities you have to fundraise currently are being exploited to their maximum possibility. Volunteers who aren't fully committed should be encouraged to donate if they don't care about communism. I think a lot of people are not aware that our orgs can receive donations. People are always talking about how pissed off they are at the Dems and might be happy to donate to communists.

P. (CCAP): I want to refocus on the question Cde. Ro. (USU) raised about the proposal. It seems like the question of gaining funds is still up in the air, and we haven't figured out how to do it. The best way to move forward is for individual organizations to continue to experiment. It doesn't seem like we've found a great answer from this conversation. There are not too many things that are replicable. It sounds like something we should task our orgs with exploring this. With the conversation around fundraising in mind, what do we think about the strategy of using funds to pay people for organizing?

K. (CCAP): I think the main issue I have with the proposal from USU is mostly that we're saying, "we'll give money to people who will do things as dictated by USU." it's better that the group comes to you with a proposal, because they have better knowledge of their own conditions.

P. (CCAP): Like a grant program.

Z. (CLN): It's better structured like a grant, and you should have criteria on how to integrate this into a fundraising opportunity so that this becomes more sustainable.

Win. (USU): What kind of work should professional revolutionaries be doing?

Ro. (USU): I was very fascinated by the context of CLN's fundraising, how it goes towards regular payments towards its membership. It's an interesting balance because it ensures people that are principled and educated are the ones doing the work -- it's the way professional revolutionaries have to emerge. This brings it back to how to get those funds in the first place. A good long term strategy is to look at who in our orgs could be free to do so much more if they could be freed from doing so much work. I think that's a good thing to work towards.

Z. (CLN): [I'll] explain more CLN experience, being the main person. Empowering an individual and holding them to account is one of the biggest issues. I don't have a boss. I ask CLN to hold me accountable constantly. I wish I was doing things like postmortems, methodology, from the start. I'd love to be able to take more of CLN's money, but I'm not confident in my decisions. There's a lot of ability in me; but as far as like structure, I never grew up with it, like in a colonial life -- it's hard to adapt. There's a degree of how I'm trying to conform with you, to fit in with you. We run things a lot more lax on the rez. On the rez, I see informal organization that's a lot more solid than what I see in Marxist circles, which is interesting because there's supposedly a great degree of organization in Marxist circles, but we all run into that same issue.

P. (RHB): I have a lot of experience with postmortems, report backs. In Kansas, [report backs were] one of the greatest things we were able to do and spread in the organizing community there. I borrowed the AAR (After Action Review) from the US army. What makes a good report back boils down to: what actually happened when we organized event X -- what happened, what was planned, what was intended? The last few questions should be: what should be improved upon? What could we sustain moving forward? What are things that can be repeated? It could be a templated format that the League should consider using.

P. (CCAP): USU folks, are you satisfied with that conversation?

Ro. (USU): I was hoping people would be meaner about it, but I suppose that's fine. I'm satisfied.

P. (CCAP): It is approaching 4 PM. I'd like to steer the conversation. We've had a number of suggestions about things we could implement, things we could do that would improve this or that aspect of the work. I'd like to take some time to write out some concrete action items based on those suggestions. SOPs, asset lists, AARs. I would suggest that we assign each member org of the League to create an asset list.

Z. (CLN): Asset lists shouldn't take that long. I doubt people have as many assets as CLN, and it took us like a day.

Roa. (CCAP): With all of our protocols and standards of procedure, we already have an asset list in the periphery. It just needs to be compiled into a single list.

P. (CCAP): I'm going to suggest an action item for all member orgs to create asset lists to present at the next Executive Committee meeting. Currently scheduled for the last Tuesday of this month. With the new EC it will be up to them to set a schedule that works for them. How are we feeling about this action item?

No Objection.

P. (CCAP): Next one I'd like to propose is that SOPs be added to the handbook that's in the works. Currently, we have the main body of the text and several appendices. We could expand those to include more example procedures; and through that conversation that we talked about yesterday through the distribution plan, orgs can tweak or add procedures and stuff to that list, which can begin standardizing procedures for the entire League. How do we feel about that?

No Objection.

P. (CCAP): I'm going to action item for the special committee responsible for continuing work on the handbook to expand the appendices with more examples of procedural documents, and that organizations pay special attention to this section during initial review.

Ro. (USU): I think an important part of that should be member orgs sharing secure (not risky) SOPs together, so as a part of the committee putting it in the guidebook, we'd have a more centralized source of what SOPs look like for all of us. So, for example: what does CCAP do for this?

What's Red Help do? etc.

P. (CCAP): I'd like to open the question about drive access. To me it seems like the clearest method of securely sharing those things should be through the proton drive the League already has, and there's questions about who should have access to those things.

A. (RHATX): J. (RHATX) And I walked away with an action item to mandate our members create proton accounts so we can manage those things.

P. (RHB): Related to sharing files, this worked for us in the Kansas book club: we have a repository with internal working copies which can be redacted for sharing with other orgs in public distribution.

Z. (CLN): That should be included in the handbook

P. (CCAP): We should talk about the best way to distribute proton drive access to League members.

K. (CCAP): The only people that really need access to the drive itself are people involved in committees and involved in the AEWL. Also, good to make a backup of the drive to avoid accidents.

P. (CCAP): It's not necessary for everyone to have access, but if individuals want access they should go through their EC representative or something similar?

Ro. (USU): Seems like there's two suggestions: everyone has access, or only liaisons have access. Between the two of them, I lean towards the liaison suggestion, but one of the biggest problems preparing for the conference was that not everyone had access. One of our SOPs should be that there is no bottlenecking. Having an open and closed repository would require a lot of labor to manage.

Z. (CLN): CLN has a publicly available repository of anything we feel is necessary to share, and it's not that labor intensive to maintain. It's just important not to put sensitive shit in there. We don't even take a vote at all and everyone has a conversation on it, and you empower somebody with the ability to do it who's accountable to the org; one of the people we pay, it's their job to do it.

P. (RHB): If you structure this right, you can actually run an entire website like that. I designed an entire system for this called DRUIDS. I can send someone an email about this.

Z. (CLN): Would an AI help solve the problem?

P. (RHB): Yeah, I used an AI to help build it. Basically, it's a solved problem.

P. (CCAP): P. (RHB), would you send an email?

P. (CCAP): Ro. (USU)'s idea about SOPs, formalizing processes for disseminating information

from the drive by reps or delegates, etc. A. (RHATX) are you in Red Help particularly passionate about everyone in Red Help having access to that drive?

A. (RHATX): Not absolutely necessary. The idea of running things through the EC member is fine. Can we create a channel on the discord for people to request knowledge sharing?

P. (CCAP): I'll give myself that action item.

A. (RHATX): The proton suggestion was more for our internal stuff.

P. (CCAP): I'd like to suggest another action item that a draft should be prepared for protocol for EC members in dissemination of information from the drive. This should probably be given to a person right now to work on so it doesn't languish. Is anyone available to try their hand at writing this?

Roa. (CCAP) volunteers.

P. (CCAP): I'd like to propose another action item just so that it's official -- there's consensus that we want these autopsy reports prepared, that detail the member orgs experience leading up to and planning the conference, their experience at the conference, and takeaways from the conference from review. I'd like to recommend that our guests who are willing also do that.

N. (CCAP): I think we should utilize the League discord more. there's like three channels in there and like. I feel like there's a lot of things that happen that we don't inform the other organizations about; generally small things, not necessarily groundbreaking. I feel like maybe we could make better channels for communication, and also for banter and camaraderie, whenever I want to say something to the League.

K. (CCAP): This is actually a question [I have] about one of the resolutions that we passed, which includes publications by member organizations that have to go through USU to be published by the Clarion: could we do that on the League discord?

P. (CCAP): What is USU's preferred method of submission?

Ro. (USU): It would be best if we just established individual channels for each member org of the League through our discord. That would be a good start.

K. (CCAP): Is that the USU discord

Ro. (USU): Would you prefer it be in the League discord?

S. (CS): Anyone remember when ch***** k*** got domed? the way they got access to the assassin's info was through discord. I recommend reconsidering discord.

Roa. (CCAP): Considering the existence of the proton drive and multiple orgs in the League having access, there should be a folder titled "Submissions".

P. (RHB): This is something I have direct experience with: being targeted by the state and extra-state actors. Whatever decision you make, don't make the mistake of just deleting. Be very cautious of how you do that. I'm going to call it "the Palantir" -- what the Palantir looks for is sudden changes from a baseline. Let's say you deleted your discord overnight. That in itself is going to be flagged as a suspicious event. It worked pretty well for us to leave the discord up and move operational planning off the discord. The state's wiretap -- twitter, facebook, etc -- leave it up like a ghost or something, so people can casually socialize and all that.

Ro. (USU): Right now, the USU discord is essentially... There's different gates of access. There's the half that's used for our editorial conversations, member talks; then there's the public community. Due to how much we've been floundering in terms of labor, we neglect the guest community and focus on internal stuff. Sorry, P. (RHB), you put a lot of really interesting stuff in there. I think, in that case, if we were to move away from discord, we could find an alternative for internal org communication and keep the guest community access; and because it's a security concern, that could be an incentive to us to engage with our guest community more.

A. (RHATX): If any more tech inclined people are interested in hitting me up to help with this, please.

S. (CS): To follow up on what P. (RHB) said about the type of information you have in discord: understand anything you put in there... Don't expect any amount of confidentiality. Whatever you put there is transparent to law enforcement. They can get access to it, if they want to see it.

Roa. (CCAP): On the element/matrix server front, when CCAP moved off Signal, that's what we moved to. Ask me for help/advice.

P. (CCAP): I'd like to come back to the point on submission to USU. Is there consensus that uploading to proton is the case? Please make a note of that Win. (USU), that there will be a folder Proton for submissions.

Z. (CLN): If proton is where submissions are sent, how do I submit my piece?

N. (CCAP): League proton email.

P. (CCAP): Email is on the linktree.

P. (CCAP): Any other action items we'd like to assign, or ideas for directions that the League should be developing in the next year? Specific instructions to give certain bodies towards those ends? Concrete assignments for elements of the League?

K. (CCAP): I would like us to pursue research and development for fundraising plans.

P. (CCAP): Are we satisfied with the level of communication and progress we've had? Anything we're missing?

A. (RHATX): I will approach people in person, not on discord, to exchange signals.

Win. (USU): Thanks everyone for being here.

P. (CCAP): We will close discussion and move to closing remarks.

Discussion Adjourned.