

1. NCP-OC Anti-Patriarchy Rectification Campaign

For release in July 2013

At our First Congress earlier this year, the founding delegates of the NCP (OC) adopted a Resolution Against Patriarchy and ratified our Principles of Unity upholding a proletarian feminist position. However, the passage of organizational documents is only a formal first step. They remain only words on paper if there are no actions to back them up.

Like other bourgeois and reactionary ideologies that must be continuously defeated through two-line struggle, the patriarchal values and male chauvinist practices that dominate this society have their reflection inside the communist movement and within communist organizations. They must be confronted and overcome through class struggle, inner-organization struggle, and inner-struggle. Like those who “wave the red flag to oppose the red flag,” groups, tendencies, and individuals can pose intellectually as feminists while at the same time failing to politicize women, commodifying and objectifying women, and engaging in abusive male chauvinist behavior.

Maoists are not afraid of criticism. Truthful criticism from others should be embraced without anger, in order to strengthen oneself, to improve one’s practice, and to better serve the people and the proletarian revolution. Self-criticism should be made openly and willingly whenever one has done wrong, without prompting by comrades and the masses. There is no place for the individualist ego, a belief in one’s own self-importance that throws up a defensive barrier in the face of truthful criticism, refuses to conduct genuine self-criticism and hides one’s mistakes, and evades rectification.

Practicing criticism and self-criticism, communists in general are guided by the principle that we do not fear criticism “because we are Marxists, the truth is on our side, and the basic masses, the workers and peasants, are on our side” (Mao Zedong).

For our anti-patriarchy rectification campaign, the NCP (OC) in particular is guided by our Resolution Against Patriarchy stating: “We call upon communists who have made patriarchal errors in their lives to carry out honest accounting, self-criticism, and rectification of their mistakes.”

In the inner-organization struggle and inner-struggle against patriarchy, we have noticed several manifestations of liberalism that must be identified and rooted out. We point these out here because they prevail among many communists in the US and are also by no means exclusive to communists.

-Failing to criticize male chauvinism among comrades when it appears that there are no immediate political consequences for lack of criticism or that there are negative social consequences for making criticisms.

-Consistently giving lower priority to the struggle against patriarchy, especially to the inner-struggle to transform oneself in practice into a proletarian feminist, even though this is a central and strategic question for the socialist revolution in the US. The communist movement in this country largely exists as a scattering of committees and advanced individuals. In such a landscape, unremolded male chauvinist thinking and practice in even a single individual has an exaggerated effect and can function as an obstacle to the immediate advance of the movement.

-Discussing the need for revolutionary women’s organizations in the abstract, or pointing to women’s mass organizations in other countries as models of what need to be built in the US, when the main problem in a particular situation centers instead on the thinking and practice of individual communists. This involves reducing the women’s question from a political matter into simply an organizational matter. It is an easy way to avoid the difficult process of reflecting on individual beliefs and actions, their origins in social practice and life experiences, and what needs to be done to consciously transform them.

-Posturing as a militant against women’s oppression and even verbalizing extreme positions when there is a broad injustice in society against women, but becoming guarded when one’s own practice is questioned or one’s own patriarchal privileges are at stake.

-Resting content with areas of political work that have over a period of many years achieved little to nothing in the development of women’s participation and leadership as communists. Justifying this prolonged stagnation with the notion that politics is traditionally an arena for men of the ruling classes and that it will take a long time to change this situation, failing to recognize that Maoists struggling in far more unfavorable conditions have

made far greater advances.

-Failing to study the Marxist position on the women's question, despite years of being a communist and gaining a theoretical and historical grasp of many other subjects.

-Resting content with having a familiarity with various contemporary feminist theories, which have little to do with the mobilization, organization, and politicization of the masses of toiling women from a Maoist perspective. Believing that theoretical familiarity with different feminist trends makes one a feminist in practice. Paying lip service to feminism while still using male chauvinist language.

-Promoting images of women engaged in militant struggles far away in other countries, but doing little to nothing to develop the capacity of the women around oneself to take up more and better political work.

-Viewing organizational work, planning, and logistics as "bureaucratism," preferring informality in their place. Using social settings for political strategizing and decision-making, leading to a "boy's club" of the self-selected. Consistently failing to follow through on organizational tasks in a timely fashion and being unable to meet deadlines. Consistently conducting work in a frenzied and last-minute manner, without the advance preparations necessary for those who have little experience in political work, have domestic responsibilities, etc. to become full participants.

-Finally, using the process of rectification, and its emphasis on remolding rather than strictly punitive organizational measures (e.g. suspension, expulsion), as a way to in fact evade rectification.

Each of these manifestations of liberalism must be identified by communists and uprooted through inner-organization struggle and inner-struggle. Some of them are likely to be familiar to other revolutionaries, such as anarchists and revolutionary nationalists. Problems of liberalism are compounded by amateurishness, a major shortcoming among communists in the US, many lacking developed experience in revolutionary struggle.

This is not an exhaustive list. It addresses only some of the main types of liberalism among communists and within communist organizations. It is not meant to assess the contradictions confronted in mass work among women, which have their own particularities and deserve a separate summation in their own right, investigating for example how the notion of "sisterhood" in capitalist society often covers up the reality of competitive individualism among women of the oppressed classes and determining how to fight against this.

As its first major internal campaign, the NCP (OC) carries out its Anti-Patriarchy Rectification Campaign to strengthen our organization along the line of Marxism-Leninism-Maoism and proletarian feminism. It involves regular criticism and self-criticism that examines individual thinking and practice, behavior in personal relationships, the impact of patriarchal values and male chauvinism on our lives from childhood on, the division of domestic work, and the division of different types of organizational work, e.g. administrative work vs. theoretical work. It also involves a renewed focus in the fields of theory, propaganda, agitation, and struggles on the strategic importance of the battle for women's emancipation.

As stated in the Resolution Against Patriarchy of our founding congress, "Women of the exploited and oppressed classes must be politicized and organized into a proletarian feminist movement. A revolutionary movement of women must emerge to play a decisive role in the struggles of the proletariat and the oppressed masses, and these struggles must make themselves into indomitable weapons for women's emancipation." None of this can be achieved if the initial accumulation of forces is carried out on a basis that allows patriarchal values and male chauvinism to fester and does not continuously wage struggle against liberalism in this area.

Central Committee, NCP (OC)

Women's and Queer Department, NCP (OC)

2. NCP(LC) Statement on Patriarchy and Rectification of Gender Practice

Feb. 4, 2014

The NCP(LC) seriously takes the issue of rectification on any given contradiction. It is important to rectify mistakes and errors before it becomes a problem that would be more difficult to deal with in the future if it hasn't been addressed. The NCP(LC) is making an attempt at building a Maoist party in the United States and one of things we need to do in order to achieve that is provide leadership on the women's question through proletarian feminist theory and practice. As a liaison committee the questions concerning proletarian-feminism are going through the process of line struggle as are other questions which are related to party building and developing socialist revolution in the US in the 21st Century. But what we do agree on is that proletarian feminism is a theory and a practice that puts the primacy of class struggle within the struggle for women's liberation and that if we don't aim to destroy patriarchy while fighting against capitalism we are not fighting for socialism. Therefore we must set certain standards for a correct communist practice on gender. This is something we are not perfect in practice. We must be honest to ourselves, and to the masses, in order to learn from our mistakes and gain respect from the people.

In society, patriarchy exists as a contradiction among the people that can lead to antagonistic contradictions among the masses if not solved. Patriarchy precedes capitalism, so it is not itself a mode of production, but it is an ideological structure which changes and adapts to specifically historical modes of production as well as different cultures. Patriarchy structures gender roles (especially the gender division of labor), kinship relations, sexuality norms, and the institutions in class society which relegate women to a status which is less than that of men. In capitalism women face: 1) Commodification, both in the various types of sex-work, as well as in courtship and relationships (ie; slut-shaming criticizes women for not valuing themselves as a commodity to be exchanged in marriage.); 2) the Gender Division of labor in unpaid domestic work child rearing, and family duties; 3) Super-exploitation in wage work where women are paid less than men (helps lead to economic dependence), and; 4) Violence against women, from interpersonal domestic violence as well as organized violence from the state (ie militaries). We can turn to the late Anurandha Ghandy of the CPI(Maoist) on the question of patriarchy in capitalism:

"The Maoist perspective on the women's question in India also identifies patriarchy as an institution that has been the cause of women's oppression throughout class society. But it does not identify it as a separate system with its own laws of motion. The understanding is that patriarchy takes different content and forms in different societies depending on their level of development and the specific history and condition of that particular society; that it has been and is being used by the ruling classes to serve their interests. Hence there is no separate enemy for patriarchy. The same ruling classes, whether imperialists, capitalists, feudals and the State they control, are the enemies of women because they uphold and perpetuate the patriarchal family, gender discrimination and the patriarchal ideology within that society. They get the support of ordinary men undoubtedly who imbibe the patriarchal ideas, which are the ideas of the ruling classes and oppress women. But the position of ordinary men and those of the ruling classes cannot be compared."

The NCP (LC) as a communist organization seeking to become a party is not excluded from patriarchy that exists among the people. This does not excuse comrades within our organization from participating in patriarchy and must be struggled out internally and among the people. Internally, historically, we have had problems with patriarchy and gender within the organization since we were in our predecessor organizations and failed to rectify collectives and specific individuals with practices that have been inconsistent with a proletarian feminist practice. In the New York City branch our gender practice has been poor impacting the development of women and the mass work overall. We had members criticized within the mass work and rectification processes for several errors in their gender practice. In the NCP (LC) and more specifically in the NYC branch we are still looking forward to not only rectify in practice but to undergo ideological development on the question of proletarian feminism.

A former comrade who was in the NCP(OC) and the NCP(LC), was expelled from both organizations. The OC had expelled this comrade for opportunist reasons because of political differences and holding a minority political line-along with their patriarchal practice and was brought into the LC along with a collectivity that initially had nothing to with the LC. This comrade was brought into the LC under the condition that he would

undergo rectification for previous patriarchal behavior. That said, this comrade has not once been part of the democratic process of the NYC Branch or the Liaison Committee process as a whole, only a nominal member under discipline to deal with his rectification. If this comrade would have enthusiastically and willingly shown initiative throughout the rectification process, he would not have been expelled because the comrade would have proved he rectified his patriarchal practice thus becoming a full member in good standing. Unfortunately, that did not take place. Not only did this comrade fail to rectify, but his patriarchal practice had become worse over time putting other women in similar situations that exemplifies his sexist practice. The comrade in question has had a history of patriarchal and/or sexual misconduct for a few years. And it hasn't been handled correctly for several reasons: 1.) criticism and rectification of this individual not on the basis of his practice necessarily but because he held a minority political line within communist organization; 2.) male chauvinism in the organization did not take the rectification at all times seriously enough; 3.) because the individual comrade has been seen as valuable and advanced on other questions except on the question of gender and; 4.) liberalism of friendships over politics. None are good excuses in the rectification of this individual are reflected in organizational liberalisms and not putting politics in command. If so we might have had the opportunity to "cure the sickness to save the patient". But the blame does not fall exclusively on the organization but also must fall on the individual in question for not taking the rectification in a serious manner.

These are some major trends of liberalism that have manifested in dealing with the contradiction this individual had with other women until he finally had done almost nothing to show he would like to rectify his patriarchal practice and thinking. This individual had mistreated women who he was intimate or aimed to be intimate with in various ways. Physical abuse was not prevalent in all aspects, or even primary with all the women, but it was existent-to the point that it kept some of the women in a fearful state of the individual. Emotional abuse was prevalent with the individuals, as there had been times that he made his partners feel personally inferior to him. Also, with this emotional abuse came the use of sexist language to denigrate them or make them feel poorly of themselves, sexual misconduct, making sexual advances to an individual that was unwarranted and/or unwanted after consent was not given, and using the personal/intimate relationship for his own political gain and agenda. There were instances of this comrade trying to skip rectification by attempting to use his partner for his own political gain or bypass his rectification rather than do it himself. As the New York City branch of the New Communist Party (Liaison Committee), to practice transparency, accountability, discipline, and rectification, we are asking that those around us to ask the NCP (LC) any questions concerning this directly or anything else at NCPLiaison@gmail.com.

3. NCP (OC): Self-Criticism and Summation on Patriarchy

March 5, 2014

SELF-CRITICISM AND SUMMATION ON PATRIARCHY

Since the First Congress ten months ago, the NCP (OC) has expelled multiple founding members in multiple cities for male chauvinism. The expulsions and related discussions consumed much of the internal activity of the organization. This rendered the central organs and particular units otherwise dysfunctional for substantial periods of time.

We are only now beginning to emerge from this crisis, which can be traced to our origins as an organization founded by members with political backgrounds in anarchism and social-democratic revisionism. The continued dominance of these ideologies allowed liberalism and low standards of membership to flourish. Women were relegated to a relative exteriority within the organization and its areas of work, the opposite of the Maoist organization dominated by women leaders and militants that is demanded by our time.

The expelled former members, all cis men, each engaged in the first or several or most of the following: 1) verbal and physical abuse of women, including violent grabbing or pushing; 2) failure to rectify for sexual opportunism and unwanted physical contact towards woman comrades; 3) alcoholism combined with harassment and sexual objectification of multiple women; 4) use of misogynistic slurs like “bitch,” “cunt,” and “hooker”; 5) discussion of women currently or formerly involved in mass work as sex objects; 6) refusal to accept responsibility, conduct honest self-criticism, and carry out rectification when confronted with the above; and 7) deliberate misrepresentation of the actual circumstances of expulsion, including downplaying instances of male chauvinism and explaining expulsions as if they were a matter of theoretical or political differences.

With considerable re-organization completed, the NCP (OC) is at a juncture requiring the initiation of a lengthy process of self-criticism on the problem of male chauvinism and a summation of its handling from which to derive lessons for the future. This is the beginning of a broader political and organizational review of the NCP (OC)'s first year of existence.

Hard lines must be drawn here: if the NCP (OC), prior to the multiple expulsions, had succeeded in growing beyond its initial numbers and becoming a political force—which would mean the recruitment of more cis men, the only people who in any likelihood would join—it would have to be smashed by working-class women. The organization would have functioned as yet another instrument of the bourgeois class enemy opposed to working-class women.

If the NCP (OC) in the current moment fails to conduct a thorough self-criticism at all levels and a proper summation that serves the struggle for women's emancipation, this must remain its fate. It is better to have no organization at all, than an organization that allows male chauvinism to fester and abusers of women to stay within or enter its ranks.

First self-criticism: The NCP (OC) was founded on the basis of a male chauvinist and misogynist liberalism toward patriarchy in practice.

Drafted principally by women and queer members of the NCP (OC), resolutions against patriarchy and on the queer struggle were adopted by the First Congress without substantive discussion—in other words, as formal gestures that had little to do with the practice of the organization.

Likewise, the anti-patriarchy rectification campaign passed at the First Congress was at best a toothless measure and at worst a hypocrisy. It remained a meaningless organizational policy until the first actual expulsion for male chauvinism.

The misogynist liberalism of the organization was reflected above all else in the initial ambivalence shared by many of its members on the question of expelling founding members engaged in male chauvinist practice.

Ambivalence in this regard was a fundamental liberalism: the failure to take a clear partisan stance on the participation and development of women in the organization. Liberalism was covered up by concerns of offering “rectification” to male chauvinists who indicated no willingness to transform, couched in “Maoist” phraseology,

but in essence reflective of a culture of men protecting other men from organizational discipline. Following the expulsions, liberalism here continued to find expression in a lack of clarity among individual members on the matter. There can be no compromise when it comes to fidelity to the principle of women's emancipation.

Second self-criticism: "Proletarian feminism" for the NCP (OC) has meant the theoretical liquidation of women's oppression.

While recognizing that the struggle of women must be integrated with the class struggle for political power, it is necessary to develop an analysis that grasps the particularities of women's oppression in a social formation where the capitalist mode of production prevails. This means analyzing women's oppression in terms of the gender-based division of labor within wage labor and between wage labor and unpaid reproductive labor, and in the capitalist commodification of women.

The contradiction between men and women has an antagonistic aspect and a non-antagonistic aspect. The assessment upheld by many in the US that this contradiction among the people is "non-antagonistic, except in individual cases of abuse" is a class reductionist and liquidationist position.

In the absence of a leading party guided by a revolutionary proletarian feminist line and in the absence of a revolutionary proletarian feminist movement, the antagonistic aspect here is dominant. It can be transformed into a non-antagonistic contradiction only in concrete conditions where the revolutionary proletarian feminist line is becoming dominant among the masses and proletarian women are developing toward a reality of possessing coercive force against their exploiters and oppressors. In other words, the contradiction between men and women has a relative character in relation to the principal contradiction.

Third self-criticism: "Rectification" for the NCP (OC) has meant the notion of keeping around cis men with male chauvinist practice and assigning tasks (e.g. write apologies, attend counseling, etc.) that did not transform their practice.

The notion that male chauvinists should be allowed to remain in an organization or on its periphery, in order to be "struggled" against, will only lead to an organization that no new women comrades would ever want to join.

Communist organizations must serve to organize women. It is only when women constitute a substantial part or majority of the leadership and membership that men will truly transform.

CAN THERE BE A MAOIST FEMINISM?

In the US, "Maoism" as the name of a *concrete* political tendency composed of real groups and individuals, is a patriarchal tendency. This has been made clear to us by our own experience. It is a tendency populated in substantial part by women-hating reactionaries, distinguished from the women-hating reactionaries of the broader society only by a semi-skilled usage of feminist discourse. Transformation is possible only through the deployment of Maoism as that which divides this situation.

As a beginning, there must be a refusal of the revisionist notion that communist organizations will inevitably serve as mirrors in which the objective contradictions of the existing class society are reflected. We have seen this take several forms:

-The notion that male chauvinism is dominant among the masses and will therefore be unleashed within the organization itself if the organization is truly integrated with the masses. The notion that expelling male chauvinists from a communist organization means that one is not properly "handling contradictions."

-The notion that the masses of women are dominated by male chauvinist ideas just like men, and therefore, it is implied, are oppressors themselves indistinguishable from men. While women also take up patriarchal ideology, there is no relationship of symmetry here.

-The notion that the masses of women are not interested in politics, as it is traditionally an enterprise for men, and therefore any political organization will be overwhelmingly composed of men at the outset, that this is not reflective of errors in theory and practice.

-The notion that the development of women as leaders and militants in a communist organization, and the implementation of policy towards this end, is not a political question, that it is a "personal" question or "identity

politics.” Reactionary ideas emerge in communist organizations, but there must be a continuous process of struggle against them and their unapologetic representatives to impose the proletarian line.

* * *

The preparatory period for the First Congress of the NCP (OC) was not a preparatory period of communist militants. Likewise, the Congress itself was not a congress of communist militants.

Both the preparatory period and the Congress were thoroughly defined by the political backgrounds of founding members in anarchism and social-democratic revisionism, despite a ceremonial adherence to “Marxism-Leninism-Maoism” (“MLM”) and an empirical assessment of the “contributions” of Marx, Engels, Lenin, Stalin, and Mao.

A clear opportunism in the theoretical sphere expressed itself in decisions to come to a superficial unity on fundamental questions in Maoism, including the Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution, the universality of people’s war, and the party concept. This is reflected in the organization’s Principles of Unity, a pronounced practicalist deviation among its members, and the absence of concrete analysis, which led to the severing of theory and practice, as only concrete analysis can mediate theory and practice.

“Upholding MLM” or claiming “Maoism” in the current US context is worthless without an analysis of the situation and an organized practice extending from such an analysis.

A key link in this organized practice today is the development of women as leaders and militants guided by a proletarian political line, the central criterion by which every organization and every individual must be judged.

Did the revisionist 1977 congress of the Chinese Communist Party not hail Mao Zedong as the “greatest Marxist of our time,” affirm his “immortal contributions,” and announce the importance of his “systematic theory of continuing the revolution under the dictatorship of the proletariat”?

Once we recognize that the advance of revisionism, even the restoration of capitalism itself, can take place under a red banner proclaiming Mao’s contributions, it becomes clear that one’s subjective identification as a Maoist and declarations of support for certain historical sequences and ongoing Maoist revolutions in other countries constitute only the most meager and ultimately vanishing basis for revolutionary work.

Just as one can say “continuing the revolution under the dictatorship of the proletariat” when one in fact means capitalist restoration, one can say “Maoism” and “proletarian feminism” when one means in actuality the oppression of women.

The entire membership of the NCP (OC) March 2014

4. Freddy Bastone and the NCP(LC), pathological liars and thugs

MARCH 7, 2014 (<http://pastebin.com/4SxLCsfh>)

1. Decision expelling a suspended member

To: All of the members of the organization

Date: 6/28/13

The organization is disciplining Freddy Bastone through expulsion for the following reasons:

1. Long pattern of male chauvinism and lack of interest in remodeling.

Freddy Bastone's patriarchal behavior continues. On Facebook, he posted "Smile My Dude," which means "Suck My Dick." On Facebook, he also made a remark, seen by a member of the WQD, supporting the view of women as property, "All I have to say is Ray J hit it first."

We spent a lot of time creating a rectification plan to address his male chauvinism, but he has made no serious attempt to remold himself or shown any serious interest in doing so.

1.

Freddy Bastone has a long pattern of male chauvinism.

- He pushed his most recent partner, a recruit of the group, and was verbally abusive toward her, calling her a "fucking bitch" and saying she was "fucking stupid."
- He called members of the group "cunts."
- He made an unwanted sexual advance toward another recruit, driving her out of the work.
- He behaved abusively toward a past partner, a member of our organization at the time.

Even while the organization was investigating his behavior toward his most recent partner, another recruit reported male chauvinist comments he made in an entirely separate incident, when he was talking about a woman they encountered on the street.

He has violated the terms of his current suspension by, for example:

- Speaking at a public event after being directed not to do so by local leadership.
- Attending a march in violation of his suspension.

These violations show that he does not recognize the importance of rectifying his male chauvinism.

2. Serious organizational liberalism.

On a Facebook wall, Freddy Bastone engaged in a heated argument with a Canadian supporter of the PRAC. Freddy Bastone then asked a comrade in VA over Facebook messages to block the Canadian, as a part of waging a campaign against the Canadian and others.

When Gene, the liaison to Canada, asked Freddy Bastone to apologize for his tone in the argument, he refused to do so.

Freddy Bastone used an open and permanently-recorded medium that is exposed to the State to deliberately try to escalate antagonisms with a supporter of the PRAC. He then refused to listen to Gene's suggestions to de-escalate the situation.

This is also not the first time that Freddy Bastone has outrightly violated security practices.

Freddy Bastone named a member of the organization over Facebook messages, speculating that this person wrote the organizational documents.

Freddy Bastone also called at least one individual who is not a member of the organization on the phone and discussed criticisms he had of the organizational documents.

After these incidents, both local leadership and the GS gave Freddy Bastone a warning.

This week, Freddy Bastone again named a different member of the organization over Facebook messages and said that he thinks they should be expelled.

In sum, all of these practices hand over information through open and permanently-recorded channels (Facebook messages and phone) to the State.

Not once did Freddy Bastone alert the organization in good faith that he made these mistakes. Each time, it had to be reported by another member. This makes it impossible for the organization and its leadership to assess our level of exposure.

Any individual who engages in these practices, despite being given a warning, is a liability to the organization. These practices have already done irreparable harm to the organization through the exposure of its members.

10:19 REPORT TEMPLATE

-Yes, the NCP(OC) is not "safe" for any particular oppressed group. In fact, it is a revolutionary organization aiming to overthrow oppressive behaviors and systems, to abolish capitalism and pave the way for socialism and eventually communism. It is not ideal by any means; we are all a product of our conditions, but we are also in a dialectic relationship with them in that we can and aim to change our material reality. No organization should be considered a "safe" space; that is idealism that actually harms the people who believe that. However, we ought to be a "safer" space in which we commit to line struggle and rectify incorrect thinking and behaviors. In that regard, the CC, the WQD, and all other members must be, and are, constantly working to abolish patriarchal, homophobic, and transphobic attitudes and behaviors and replace them with feminist and queer liberating ones. This is the only thing we can claim: we are not "safe," but we want to get there.

-It is factually incorrect that all women in the organization are involved in sexual relationships with men in the organization. But even if that were the case, that does not inherently imply oppression. It is one thing to raise sexual/romantic relationships between comrades as a concern; indeed, they should be openly discussed. Since the breakup between Joey and Freddy Bastone (among the other problematic relationships we have been struggling with), we have implemented a relationship criticism/self-criticism to minimize the amount and magnitude of problems that may arise in the future. It is another thing to assume that sexual/romantic relations are oppressive, and that women, in particular, are oppressed by such relations, as if they were perpetual victims, without any agency, which is a patriarchal assumption in itself.

-Some structural issues Ariel pointed out, such as not having a recruitment study on patriarchy or an adequate way to respond to patriarchal behavior, were true in that moment. But he knew that the organization was only beginning to get off the ground at that time. The Liaison Committee, responsible for launching the First Congress of the NCP(OC), chose five studies to start recruitment, with the understanding that the studies would become more formalized—and would likely include a study on patriarchy, as well as the national questions—after the NCP(OC) got established. Along those lines, we all knew that the WQD was going to be one of the leading bodies in the organization, and it was going to be officially established during the First Congress. But because the Joey-Freddy Bastone breakup demanded an immediate and effective response to patriarchal behaviors, the WQD hit the ground running prior to being officially established. Ariel was aware that we were just building the organization, yet he presumed that structure would not take time and intentionality; he assumed that structure would just be magicked out of thin air.

-Prostitute-jacketing is certainly patriarchal. That needs to be rectified, without a question. But Ariel had perpetuated the prostitute-jacketing himself, spreading misinformation to be a "devil's advocate." To (1) engage in such deception with others and (2) to avoid self-criticism after having done so are both patriarchal and uncomradely behaviors. To criticize and expose prostitute-jacketing is a good thing. To avoid one's responsibility in fueling prostitute-jacketing is not.

-Finally, Ariel had sent this letter through unsecure channels, putting individuals unnecessarily at risk, when he could have easily hit a button to make the message "off-the-record." This shows blatant disregard for organizational security and individual welfare and must be criticized.

As a response to the urgency of the Joey-Freddy Bastone situation, as well as the ongoing masculinist behaviors the WQD had observed, the WQD proposed a thorough Rectification Campaign Against Patriarchy.

It is of such importance that the CC is directly handling the work plan and timeline of the rectification campaign to make sure it remains one of the organization's biggest priorities to carry it out effectively.

Ariel did not remain in the organization long enough to hear of this progress. We believe that due to his inexperience in a communist organization and his reliance on partial truths, he foreclosed on his ability to rectify himself as well as contribute to the development of the organization. For that, we are truly regretful that he left.

In struggle,

The Women's and Queer Department

5. Preliminary Statement of the NCP(LC) Regarding The Split With The NCP(OC)

MARCH 7, 2014 (<https://maosoleum.ncp.lc/2014/03/07/preliminary-statement-of-the-ncplc-regarding-the-split-with-the-ncpoc/>)

THIS AN OFFICIAL STATEMENT OF THE NEW COMMUNIST PARTY (LIAISON COMMITTEE). WE WILL PUBLISH MORE STATEMENTS IN THE COMING DAYS.

On February 17th, our faction resigned its membership in the New Communist Party (Organizing Committee). Our resignations came with the sharpening of the line struggle in the OC to its sharpest point, in an attempt to resolve contradictions which we believe will not allow for the NCP(OC) to become a party. While we share unity on many matters and questions with the NCP(OC), the areas of our demarcation from them are fundamental and warrant a critical summation.

THERE IS AN INABILITY ON THE PART OF THE LEADERSHIP OF THE NCP(OC) TO HANDLE CONTRADICTIONS

First, an ex-member of the OC harassed several Maoists in the US, for which the OC only issued apologies to the victims they were favorable to, neglecting to take responsibility and apologize to those they personally disliked.

Secondly, emergency meetings were held and the OC was in a panic when it came to handling an antagonism with another ex-member, after a plan action had been already been agreed to. The OC failed to handle these contradictions and turned the non antagonistic contradictions antagonistic. *If the NCP(OC) is unable to handle qualitatively low level contradictions of a personal nature, then it will be ill equipped to handle contradictions among the people, as well as contradictions between the people and the enemy.*

THE OC DID NOT ORIENT ITSELF TO THE MASSES

For the bulk of its existence it acted as a clandestine organization and objectively set on the path of building a militarized party. Clandestinity of such caliber is incorrect, as communists must nor orient ourselves to state repression but principally to the masses. *The support of the masses is the surest line of defense for revolutionaries.* The other part of this objective process of militarization is the practice of an undemocratic relationship of the OC to the mass organizations under it. For example, the RSCC had provisions for proletarian feminist work to be done this semester, yet the OC chose to generate a whole new proletarian feminist committee altogether. An OC member sat in on and participated in an entire RSCC meeting without being a member with democratic rights in the organization. The mass organizations, while correctly under the leadership of the party, still have a right to their own democratic processes. In Ignite, members were expected to sit through study after study without an orientation towards doing actual mass work, effectively separating theory from practice. *The issues here are militarization of the party and its mass organization, and an inward focus instead of an outward orientation to the masses.* This is the error of neglecting to practice the mass line.

While comrades in the OC are making these errors which led to our faction's resignation, we have been careful to identify the principal contradiction so as to avoid making these mistakes in the future. The issue is that the mass leaders, all of proletarian background, were subjected to the incorrect line of the formal leadership, who are of petit-bourgeois backgrounds. While we all constitute the vanguard of the proletariat, our social classes will inform our political lines. Thus, the leadership put into command the politics of a Gonzaloite deviation (which failed in Peru).

THE POLARIZATION OF THE CONTRADICTION BETWEEN THE FORMAL LEADERSHIP AND THE MASS LEADERS

The line struggle between the Gonzaloites and our faction, is reflective of the gap between mental and manual labor that exists in the OC. However, when our faction raised these criticisms of the class contradiction being the principal contradiction we were ignored and made out to be apologetic for male chauvinism (which was held by leadership as being the principal contradiction). This is the error of petit-bourgeois chauvinism.

As our faction sharpened the line struggle of which it was a product, we understood that action had to be taken to steer the NCP(OC) back onto the course of constructing a communist party. We could not, without being opportunists, submit ourselves to democratic centralism under an erroneous political line, so we raised a proposal:

That the OC revert to the form of a Liaison Committee that would integrate other Maoists in our locality as well as around the country, to begin struggling to set an ideological line that would be the basis of a new OC in which errors had been rectified. This implied a liquidation of leadership as it was, as well as opening up line struggle.

While our proposal called for the rectification of those comrades making the errors outlined in this document, we made sure to be self critical of our own errors too. *However, this proposal was rejected (not unanimously) in the OC.*

The rejection by the Virginia branch was *left opportunism*, as they were not intending to rectify their incorrect line, and the rejection by the NYC branch was *right opportunism*, as they sought to protect their relationship to Virginia. The general leadership rejected the proposal as it meant the loss of their positions in the OC. Thus we have resigned and initiated our own process of building a *Liaison Committee for the New Communist Party in the US.*

OC members in our mass organization, the Revolutionary Student Coordinating Committee, have resigned their membership and have been attempting to recruit some of our members and from the periphery of our mass work. In the weeks since the split, we have begun establishing branches of the Liaison Committee in several cities, as well as had a proletarian feminist orientation to cultivating non-tokenistic leadership of oppressed nationality, proletarian women, both in the Liaison Committee and in our mass organization, the Revolutionary Student Coordinating Committee.

We have dared to struggle, and we will continue to dare to win.

The New Communist Party (Liaison Committee)

6. NCP-LC: A response to the NCP(OC): Gender Whateverism is not Proletarian Feminism

MARCH 7, 2014

Recently, the New Communist Party (Organizing Committee) NCP(OC) released a declaration named Self-Criticism and Summation on Patriarchy, which is apparently part of their previously declared Anti-Patriarchy Rectification Campaign. We republished the Anti-Patriarchy Rectification Campaign here, as well as the connected On Standards of Feminist Conduct by the Center for Marxist-Leninist-Maoist Studies. We stand in unity in the spirit and words of these last two documents, and consider them to be significant contributions regardless of their shortcomings in theory, a result of the lack of real summation of proletarian feminism at the level of theory (something we will address in unity with the topic of the lack of a Party soon).

As we approach the emergence of a split from the NCP(OC), the *New Communist Party (Liaison Committee)*, we must place this document in that context. The NCP(LC) is a split from the NCP(OC): the rump leadership and membership are the ones publishing this material, not the organization who started the rectification process, and none of the comrades who lead the NCP(LC) were the target of this rectification in any harsh way. They were not expelled, contrary to what the purposeful obscurity of the “Self Criticism and Summation” seems to imply.

ACCOUNTABILITY IS ANTI-PATRIARCHAL, AND LACK OF ACCOUNTABILITY IS PATRIARCHY

We took at their own words the allegations of the form of liberalism going on. Yet, this benefit of the doubt was also accompanied with a process of investigation on these matters, to confirm these allegations, to study how they were true or not, and how it was carried out in practice. We will not go into details here, not out of an unwillingness to do so, but a lack of space and time at the moment.

We are dealing with the concrete consequences of the NCP(OC)’s leadership refusal to pursue democratic centralism and instead institute a dictatorship of the leadership of a commandist nature – as evidenced by this and other documents they have released recently.

These expulsions show an unwillingness to adopt a perspective of collective responsibility around patriarchal behavior and the line struggle for the supremacy of proletarian feminist line over more traditional approaches to patriarchy. They were also accompanied with the spreading of rumors, rather than direct political denunciations of those involved that would subject them to a process of accountability by the political spaces they occupy. The fake clandestinity pursued by the NCP(OC), one that is central to the reasons for the NCP(LC) to split, leads paradoxically for them to depend on innuendo and rumor-mongering when dealing with these matters. While certainly one should always have a respect for confidential processes, these more often than not result in a lack of accountability that is utilized in patriarchal ways.

For a document that proclaims itself to be a self-criticism, it actually fails to be self-critical. In fact, it presents the typical view – formed, in an ironic twist, by patriarchy – of gas lighting and reality distortion. This what patriarchy consistently does: it lies and misrepresents people, it tells them the temperature is perfect when in fact it is too cold because the gaslight is set lower.

While the words presented ring true, they are simply form that is contradicted in practice – and more so, the same allegation is made by the NCP(OC), yet we are supposed to take them on their word, with no evidence presented, no process of accountability, with a fake clandestinity meant to protect leadership from criticism and keep members in an informational diet.

For example, in the first “self-criticism” this claim is made:

“First self-criticism: The NCP (OC) was founded on the basis of a male chauvinist and misogynist liberalism toward patriarchy in practice.

Drafted principally by women and queer members of the NCP (OC), resolutions against patriarchy and on the queer struggle were adopted by the First Congress without substantive discussion—in

other words, as formal gestures that had little to do with the practice of the organization.”

This is true – but this is also true of all other documents approved in that congress, and furthermore, the congress itself was formed to the exclusion of Maoist forces (Such as those that went on to form Maosoleum, or the MLMRSG) in the USA. This is not the practice a real Organizing Committee should form. So this self-criticism finds a problem in how the Resolution Against Patriarchy was approved, but doesn't make the same self-criticism of how other documents which were also approved with a lack of discussion, of how the First Congress composition itself was flawed, and how other processes since the Congress were carried out.

It is fundamentally seeking to frame the NCP(LC) as being a continuation of this practice, when in fact, it makes the same self-criticism, and then also extends it to all the other spheres of the organization. NCP(OC) is using this self-criticism to hide the lack of self-criticism in other matters. That is gender opportunism, using feminism as shield to avoid dealing with other matters.

It fails because we unite with this first self-criticism, and unlike NCP(OC) are collectively figuring out the actual root of this limitation, as well as doing a complete self-criticism in the whole of the experience, not just on gender, but on class, on the nature of the Party, on the position towards imperialism, and other related matters to the anti-patriarchal struggle.

We see, tacked on to the end by the NCP(OC) an actual addressing on the of this situation, which requires a step by step examination:

“The preparatory period for the First Congress of the NCP (OC) was not a preparatory period of communist militants. Likewise, the Congress itself was not a congress of communist militants.”

This is extremely surprising, taking into account that the existing leadership of the NCP(OC) was elected in this congress. So we can conclude, if we trust the NCP(OC)'s present assessment of the First Congress, that the NCP(OC) is not currently led by communist militants, no? Most likely, what they mean by this is that anyone who doesn't agree with this unaccountable, cultish, “leadership”, is not a communist militant. The echoes of all the failures of the past, of the New Communist Movement imploding, of the self-destruction of the Black Panther Party, of the emergence of the Revolutionary Communist Party as a cult centered around the figure of Bob Avakian, of the demoralization of revolutionary communist forces into social democrats etc, are all here. When you have decided that you are the sole arbiter of who is and who isn't a communist militant, when you have absolutely no social force behind you whatsoever is not only self-delusional, it is actually patriarchal: one of the oldest tricks in the patriarchal handbook is the process of denying people's validity, as is done here.

“Both the preparatory period and the Congress were thoroughly defined by the political backgrounds of founding members in anarchism and social-democratic revisionism, despite a ceremonial adherence to “Marxism-Leninism-Maoism” (“MLM”) and an empirical assessment of the “contributions” of Marx, Engels, Lenin, Stalin, and Mao.”

A clear opportunism in the theoretical sphere expressed itself in decisions to come to a superficial unity on fundamental questions in Maoism, including the Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution, the universality of people's war, and the party concept. This is reflected in the organization's Principles of Unity, a pronounced practicalist deviation among its members, and the absence of concrete analysis, which led to the severing of theory and practice, as only concrete analysis can mediate theory and practice.”

Which examples, where? These claims are false. While the current leadership of the NCP(OC) was busy purging people and wallowing in their petty power, we at Maosoleum took the task of examining these questions in front of the masses. We provided militants with guidance when the present leadership of the NCP(OC) remained quiet. When MLMs in the USA sought guidance on Syria, we provided it, when they sought guidance on questions of the Mass Line, on National questions, and on a number of other questions, we provided them. The NPC(OC) refused frontal line struggle and instead engaged in a consistent and unprincipled line of rumor mongering and personalistic attacks – some of which were of a patriarchal nature. That is the track record. The present leadership of the NCP(OC) wants to argue they present the correct line, when in fact, they are the opportunist line.

“Upholding MLM” or claiming “Maoism” in the current US context is worthless without an analysis of the situation and an organized practice extending from such an analysis.”

Tautologies are tautological. Yes – we agree – but who has this correct analysis and you has this organized practice? Who is the determinant? The NCP(OC) calls itself an Organizing Committee, but it acts like a monolithic Party, and talks like one too. It claims Maoism, while adopting the self-aggrandizing tones of the Trotskyists and their toy Bolshevism. It claims others are worthless, but what does it say about its own worth?

This arrogant perspective that considers the matters of line and how to build the Party a settled question which the task is solely one of gathering soldiers around a leadership is Gonzaloite commandism. A process of a Liaison Committee is what was needed, and the adventurist/commandist perspective still expressed even in the name NCP(OC) is actually an impediment to the development of women’s leadership, by creating an environment of macho secrecy that creates an unsafe space and obscures transformation of militants and cadre alike.

“A key link in this organized practice today is the development of women as leaders and militants guided by a proletarian political line, the central criterion by which every organization and every individual must be judged.”

To the exclusion of all other matters? So we play oppression olympics, the ones where even the winners lose.

Tokenization cannot be mistaken for development. Leaders are not born, they are trained, and patriarchy doesn’t train proletarian women for leadership even at the level it trains proletarian men. We need to develop women as leaders, not parachute them in and setting them up to fail, or to delusionally claim that the incompetence and inability in leadership is compensated by the fact they are women. Or worse, become Svengali figures for men with skill and charisma to project their own leadership into women, while behind the scenes manipulating the rightful impulses towards leadership of women to impose line. This has been the history of this line.

“Did the revisionist 1977 congress of the Chinese Communist Party not hail Mao Zedong as the “greatest Marxist of our time,” affirm his “immortal contributions,” and announce the importance of his “systematic theory of continuing the revolution under the dictatorship of the proletariat”?”

Of course, and the NCP(OC)’s “Self-Criticism and Summation on Patriarchy”, a document of much less historical significance and much less historical reach also announces itself to be “proletarian feminist” while rejecting proletarianism and class perspectives, proclaims itself “self-critical” while in fact being a criticism of people who left it (not that were thrown out righteous or not, but who left as a political split).

“Once we recognize that the advance of revisionism, even the restoration of capitalism itself, can take place under a red banner proclaiming Mao’s contributions, it becomes clear that one’s subjective identification as a Maoist and declarations of support for certain historical sequences and ongoing Maoist revolutions in other countries constitute only the most meager and ultimately vanishing basis for revolutionary work.

Just as one can say “continuing the revolution under the dictatorship of the proletariat” when one in fact means capitalist restoration, one can say “Maoism” and “proletarian feminism” when one means in actuality the oppression of women.”

This is all true, and it is a sad irony that this “self-criticism” is an example of both. The NCP(OC) in their petty bourgeois chauvinist position, in their anti-proletarian feminist position, and in its embrace of bourgeois and petty bourgeois cultural feminism and radical liberal refiguration, liquidates the struggle of Maoism and proletarian feminism into a “*shining road*” of class treason and patriarchal women’s emancipation. We explain this more fully (albeit not exhaustively) ahead.

PROLETARIAN FEMINISM IN COMMAND

The second self-criticism is not a self-criticism at all, but an admission of the actual liquidation of Marxism-Leninism-Maoism and Proletarian Feminism as applied to the concrete conditions in the USA:

“The contradiction between men and women has an antagonistic aspect and a non-antagonistic aspect. The assessment upheld by many in the US that this contradiction among the people is “non-antagonistic, except in individual cases of abuse” is a class reductionist and liquidationist position.

In the absence of a leading party guided by a revolutionary proletarian feminist line and in the absence of a revolutionary proletarian feminist movement, the antagonistic aspect here is dominant.”

At a time where even radical feminism is moving away from such positions, from rejecting gender essentialism, from examining patriarchy as a system that does not exist in isolation, we have the NCP(OC) turning back the clock 40 years, and while using the label “proletarian feminism” actual re-inserts the cultural feminist narrative on antagonism, a patriarchal women’s emancipation that ignores the history of struggle against patriarchy that has happened in the USA in the last 40 years, ignoring the social basis of gender, the struggles of radical feminists (as opposed to cultural feminists), the struggles for queer and trans liberation, and the significant gains made by petty bourgeois women at the expense of proletarian women.

Again, we see the thread of tautological platitudes connected haphazardly and without logic to unsubstantiated theoretical formulations divorced from practice, and accusations of liquidation when actually doing the liquidating.

Basically this is a patriarchal negation of non-white existence, of genderqueer existence, of queer existence, and of patriarchy as a system of oppression based on ideological need to organize labor rather take the cultural feminist view of patriarchy as a system of sex oppression in which its principal contradiction is that between women and men, biologically defined. This is unfortunately a line in the International Communist Movement and within MLM, but framing this line as a self-criticism of patriarchal practice is a trite attempt to dress up patriarchal chauvinism, heterosexism, and homophobia as somehow becoming “feminism”. Paying lip-service to the language of queerness by using the term “cis-men” and then negating the fundamental scientific and political struggles that lead to the understanding of what a “cis-man” is, becomes a language ploy to obscure actual reactionary heterosexist theoretical, practical, and analytical perspectives which are actually in need of self-criticism and rectification. It is again a masking of the actual dynamics at work in the decimation of the NCP(OC), of using gender as a shield to avoid dealing with gender correctly, and with all other matters worthy of criticism.

To this we must defend and uphold a proletarian feminism that struggles against patriarchy, that defines women as much more than the sex, and that understand that patriarchy is not a system of oppression parallel to that of class society, it is not some sort of “special” oppression, but an integral part of how class society functions and has functioned – as an inseparable part of the primary contradiction. The NCP(OC) pays lip-service to these tasks, and then proposes and “self-criticizes” an opposite path. Sort of exactly what they bring up as a criticism of the rest of us. This lack of self-reflection is in itself patriarchal – gas lighting elevated to political speech.

PREFIGURATION IS NOT A COMMUNIST PRACTICE—OPPOSE GENDER WHATEVERISM!

In this document the allegation is made that one of the root cause of the founding members patriarchal practices and expulsion is their origin in social-democratic and anarchist formations. Yet, the leadership that threw them out also shares this history. Are they not also formed in the same deviations? What makes them above reproach in this sense? Nothing.

And here lies the flip side of the coin: prefiguration. Social democratic and anarchist formations are imbued with a sense that it is possible, in the now, to free oneself of all the ideological constructions of capitalism, that somehow the individual can be freed, by sheer will and correct leadership, from the ideological and systemic oppressions of class society.

This is false, and history has proven it false. It also stands in the more than 160 years of Marxism theory, practice, and analysis. And this is repeated by the NCP(OC) at the same time they pretend to be negating this. The phantom of radical liberal prefiguration permeates the entirety of this document, but it is most strong in its call for prefiguration.

Prefiguration is trying to live today as if we lived under communism – a futile thing that has more in common with the religious mysticism of Gandhi than with the proletarian feminism of Ghandy.

This is not just a form of liberalism, but it is the form of liberalism that contaminates and liquidates the theoretical proposition that the emancipation of workers will be the task of workers themselves. The task of turning women into leaders and the task of making men follow women’s leadership is not an overnight task that gets resolved simply by expelling any man who doesn’t follow a woman’s leadership, and by tokenizing women who are unprepared for leadership (of men, in particular) and setting them up to fail, and then refusing to criticize the token, because doing so would be patriarchal!

The NCP(OC) brushes this aside with a tautological platitude:

“The notion that the masses of women are dominated by male chauvinist ideas just like men, and therefore, it is implied, are oppressors themselves indistinguishable from men. While women also take up patriarchal ideology, there is no relationship of symmetry here.”

Without getting into the straw-man argument (no one argues that women and other oppressed by patriarchy are indistinguishable from men – and to be clear anyone who does is wrong), lets examine the theoretical and analytic poverty expressed in that quote.

Women are treated as some sort of homogenous mass of people, unaffected by structural divisions: oppressed nationality women, working class women, immigrant women, trans women, woman-spectrum genderqueers, etc, are all treated as one single entity, with no intersectional approach. And in the context of proletarian feminism, no focus on the primary contradiction in class society, the contradiction between the proletariat and the bourgeois.

That is not the Maoist and proletarian feminist approach:

“The Maoist perspective on the women’s question in India also identifies patriarchy as an institution that has been the cause of women’s oppression throughout class society. But it does not identify it as a separate system with its own laws of motion. The understanding is that patriarchy takes different content and forms in different societies depending on their level of development and the specific history and condition of that particular society; that it has been and is being used by the ruling classes to serve their interests. Hence there is no separate enemy for patriarchy. The same ruling classes, whether imperialists, capitalists, feudals and the State they control, are the enemies of women because they uphold and perpetuate the patriarchal family, gender discrimination and the patriarchal ideology within that society. They get the support of ordinary men undoubtedly who imbibe the patriarchal ideas, which are the ideas of the ruling classes and oppress women. But the position of ordinary men and those of the ruling classes cannot be compared.” -Anuradha Ghandy
“Philosophical Trends in the Feminist Movement”

The NCP(OC) claims that a false symmetry is made between the patriarchal formation of women and the patriarchal formation of men is being made. They provide no evidence of this claim.

However, they do engage in a false symmetry, that of comparing “*the position of ordinary men and those of the ruling classes*”. This self-criticism is not self-criticism, but an embrace of a petty bourgeois cultural feminism that sees proletarian men (“ordinary men”) as antagonists in the same way as ruling class men. This is their line, and we oppose it and stand with Ghandy in this opposition, not out of dogmatic adherence, but out of agreement with the basic method of Marxism-Leninism-Maoism and not its liquidation as a proletarian revolutionary science.

The NCP(OC) puts itself outside of proletarian feminism to embrace a rejection of it, but tries to call it “proletarian feminism”. Avanti spins in her unfortunately early grave, betrayed by those who claim to uphold her.

The correct line on handling the contradiction between proletarian patriarchy and proletarian feminism inside of communist cadre formations is principally a question of practice itself, but we can make concrete proposals:

Women caucuses that engage not just on “feminist” issues, but become leadership schools in which women develop free of men’s interference (but with men’s cooperation) to both deal with their own patriarchal upbringing and to develop the skills and self-confidence required to become successful leaders.

Avoid tokenization but recognize the primary task of male leadership is to develop women who can replace them – ensure affirmative actions such as “shadow leaderships” (ie women who are invited to be present in leadership processes while still developing) as well as power-sharing and dual leaderships when necessary.

Recognize that petty bourgeois chauvinism, national chauvinism, heterosexism and heterosexual chauvinism, educational chauvinism, and other forms of chauvinism exist alongside and in intersection with gender chauvinism.

The NCP(OC) instead takes a line of tokenization, of punishment instead of transformation (we must note, however, that punishment is indeed necessary and that transformative justice in small sects such as ours is an exercise in folly), and lack of intersectional analysis in which gender, and specifically the woman-man binary, is the principal contradiction. This is made explicit in their proclamation:

“Hard lines must be drawn here: if the NCP (OC), prior to the multiple expulsions, had succeeded in growing beyond its initial numbers and becoming a political force—which would mean the recruitment of more cis men, the only people who in any likelihood would join—it would have to be smashed by working-class women. The organization would have functioned as yet another instrument of the bourgeois class enemy opposed to working-class women.”

This is gender whateverism: whatever a woman leader says. That is not feminism, that is petty bourgeois individualism of a woman elevated to organizational form. If the NCP(OC) were an organization that claimed a different ideological perspective, we wouldn’t even bother. Yet they claim to be an Organizing Committee for an MLM formation – this is a serious claim that is laid false with this perspective. The NCP(OC) actually damages the struggle for proletarian feminism by setting back the process of developing a collective anti-patriarchal leadership – because their gender whateverist line actually alienates proletarian women as it is also a patriarchal practice. Not to mention, the NCP(OC) is still dominated by cis-men, which makes it ironic indeed.

A QUESTION OF LINE AND A QUESTION OF PRACTICE

The NCP(OC) has been decimated and rendered invalid as a real Organizing Committee, and instead has alienated and isolated itself from the masses, including the masses of women, queers, and other people directly oppressed by patriarchy, not principally because it incorrectly handles the contradictions among the people, but because it has assumed a line of whateverism and commandism in its internal functioning, refuse to make self-criticism in good faith, and uses the communist struggle against patriarchy as an opportunist shield to avoid dealing with all other questions, including the patriarchal behavior on the part of its leadership on the basis of alleged allegiance to proletarian feminism.

Patriarchal behavior that endangers the security and the ability of women and queer cadre to develop as leaders cannot be tolerated within communist organizations. In this we agree. Yet, this principle must exist and go hand in hand with political accountability of the leadership via democratic participation of the membership, via the correct understanding of the dialectical unity of democracy and centralism, and by the understanding that the semi-formal nature of an Organizing Committee – in which by definition matters would be more open to struggle than in a Party. Patriarchal leadership in the hands of a woman is indeed symmetrical – for communists – with patriarchal leadership in the hands of a man.

It is in the realm of this practice where the NCP(OC), while paying lip-service to proletarian feminism, actually fails. In trying to frame this line struggle as one over patriarchy and feminism, we have shown ways in which the NCP(OC) actually does a disservice to the development of independent women’s leadership, to proletarian feminism, and the goal of full proletarian command of the communist organization.

We have seen members and leaders of the NCP(OC) refer to other trends, such as Maoists (Third Worldists) “M(TW)s” as charlatans and as liquidationists, because they take an incorrect view on the contradictions among the people. The NCP(OC) in this document and in its actual internal and external practice is no better,

with their focus being on gender as their wedge. In claiming to give gender and anti-patriarchal struggle its due, they actually are doing the opposite, much in the same way that M(TW)s claim to advance Third World struggles, but actually advocate a line that weakens this struggle.

We believe that line struggle is necessary and healthy and part of the process towards the construction of a unified headquarters. However, for this to be a process in which actual unity and trust is built, there needs to be an honest accounting of contradictions, an honest representation of line differences, and the understanding that democratic struggle is primary over centralism at this present juncture. The quantitative takes precedence over the qualitative because the quantitative does acquire a qualitative nature in itself.

NCP(OC) wants to operate as The Party. It is not The Party. And today it has more members in the leadership than out of the leadership because of this incorrect self-image leading to this. It is a question of practice, and solely of practice. As we have shown, in words there is really no fundamental differences. And this is why the patriarchal lack of accountability is the method of this leadership: the narcissism of the petty difference is a patriarchal behavior hard to escape.

Empty and delusional triumphalism in a matter of central importance to the communist struggle such as the anti-patriarchal struggle is not only incorrect, but it is an attack on actual proletarian feminism, it is in fact, patriarchal. We need to reject patriarchal women's emancipation, and struggle for proletarian feminism, for the reforms necessary under capitalism that weaken patriarchy, for the reforms necessary under socialism to overcome patriarchy, and for permanent cultural revolution until the overthrow of patriarchy. We need to make our organizations safer spaces for women and queers in a continuous process of rectification based on good faith transformation of cadre and the masses, the development and ruthless separation of those guilty of gendered violence, partner violence, and rape, and the theoretical, practical, and analytical elevation of gender contradictions as part of the primary contradiction.

NCP(OC) stands against this in deeds, when it claims to stand for this in words. They can rectify and self-criticize – but their patriarchal misrepresentation of the issues at hand speaks to them not yet taking the first step necessary in this process: recognizing their own gender whateverism, commandism, and identity politics based on the logic of patriarchal women's emancipation and not the attack on patriarchy itself.

This is not to say that the call for a rectification set out by the NCP(OC) and the Standards of Feminist Conduct by the CMLMS are incorrect in principle and spirit. They are not. The NCP(LC) needs to embrace these. Yet it needs to also engage in the correct self-criticism that makes the struggle of patriarchy not just a matter of individual struggle, but also a matter of collective struggle in which the leadership is not only not immune, but should be the harshest in their self-criticism. And it also needs to sum-up the experience of the NCP(OC) in the harshest light possible, including its own role in the development of these deviations, so as to keep them from happening again.

We are hopeful this process of unity can start again with the correct lessons and summations, and not the self-serving, self-justifying platitudes of a clique bound on clique rule. And we are also hopeful that they themselves can see their error and rectify. We need to unite all those that can be united – yet this requires a willingness to reconnect with concrete reality, and not just be another paper sect mired in self-righteous play-acting instead of organizing for revolution.

And certainly, utilizing the righteous struggle against patriarchy as a shield from criticism, and utilizing the necessary method of criticism/self-criticism to make a mockery of it, is an antagonistic perspective that we cannot be liberal in overlooking. The NCP(OC) has much more rectification to make than this fake, opportunist, one – to walk a truly shining path of liberation, instead of a fake *shining road* of liquidation.

7. On Rectifying Past Errors: Document by the New York City Branch of the New Communist Party (Organizing Committee) Regarding the Recent Split in Our Organization

During the months of December 2013 and January 2014, it became apparent that a contradiction internal to our group between, on the one hand, our pre-party formation—the New Communist Party (Organizing Committee) (NCP(OC))—and other hand, NCP(OC) affiliates leading our (former) mass organization—the Revolutionary Student Coordinating Committee (RSCC)—tendentially began to take on the contours of a *division* of the organization. Indeed, the contradiction soon led to a split.

The faction that split ascribed the contradiction principally to authoritarian control of RSCC by the NCP(OC). This summation of past errors is incorrect. Rather, the basis of the contradiction that led to the split was a bureaucratic-technical separation between the pre-party formation and the mass organization, dogmatically produced by the organization itself. In this way, the split only formalized a separation that already existed in reality.

NCP(OC) affiliates in RSCC leadership and the NCP(OC) have manifested symmetrical deviations:

(1) *'left' opportunist* deviation on part of NCP(OC) (=petty bourgeois adventurism): no directives, secrecy, leadership divorced from the masses. This left opportunist line has (i) not regarded the leading body of the party-formation as the concentrator of the will of the whole organization and (ii) has not regarded the party-formation as concentrator of the will of the masses. The 'left'-opportunist line rejects the thesis that it is the masses that make history, and in this way rejects the Mass Line.

(2) *right opportunist* deviation (=bourgeois revisionism) on part of NCP(OC) affiliates in the leadership of RSCC: unwillingness to disseminate the political line of NCP(OC) in the mass organization, a 'big tent' politics of pluralism-cum-activism, spontaneist interpretation of political directives as 'militarism.' The ultra-democratic right-opportunist line rejects the thesis that the class struggle is the motor of history, and in this way rejects the Mass Line.

This might seem like a case of theoreticism versus practicalism, but to characterize it this way would be too hasty. Why?

(*internal reversal 1*) The NCP(OC) has not engaged in genuine theoretical practice: so the 'left'-opportunism of the NCP(OC) is at the same time revisionist spontaneism.

(*internal reversal 2*) RSCC has not effectively engaged the broad masses: so the right-opportunism of NCP(OC) affiliates in the leadership of RSCC is at the same time 'left'-opportunist adventurism.

These internal reversals indicate that the symmetrical deviations of the NCP(OC) and RSCC have a common basis. Indeed, as we know from Lenin, in general we can say that economism and voluntarism are twin expressions of a profound economism. The fundamental form of opportunism in the history of Marxism is neither 'left'-opportunism nor right-opportunism (=revisionism), but an 'opportunism of the center,' whose extreme deviations only represent so many effects and variations. The theoretical foundation of opportunism resides in economism itself—that is to say: in the mechanist-evolutionist (=non-dialectical) interpretation of historical materialism. 'Left'- and right- opportunisms are reversals internal to this economist kernel, the one seeking to think class struggle without mass participation ('left'-opportunism), the other seeking to think the existence of classes without the political class struggle that produces them (revisionism).

To paraphrase Mao: both lines have *divided the universality of MLM* from the concrete practice of the mass movement—that is, the specificity of the political conjuncture; both have *violated dialectical and historical materialism* and have expanded partial-relative truths into universal-absolute truths; and the thinking of neither line corresponds to the *actual, objective situation as a whole*.

The resolution of this problem would have had to begin with sincere efforts to implement the dialectic between the mass organization and the party formation that Maoists call the 'Mass Line.' This would have entailed the following:

(1) within RSCC: a partial systematization of the mass ideas of the general body through ideological struggle among the masses themselves;

(2) the NCP(OC) recollects and systematizes the correct ideas of the masses in light of Marxist-Leninist-Maoist class analysis;

(3) the NCP(OC) formulates a central political directive with a revolutionary orientation that aims to transform the concrete situation in light of the class analysis carried out by the NCP(OC);

(4) the NCP(OC), as vanguard of the mass movement, leads the application of the directive by the entire body of the group;

(5) RSCC assesses the correctness of the directive through the results effectively obtained in their application. This summation produces new correct, but dispersed, ideas;

(7) we thus begin a new cycle that transforms the directive (self-criticism and rectification).

The role of the pre-party formation is to formulate slogans and directives that the masses can seize themselves, in elaborating an adequate tactics and strategy that will help the masses organize. The organized proletariat must lead the masses without commanding them—i.e., centralize mass initiatives in order to help the masses bring unified political battles.

This resolution of the contradiction would have necessarily involved drawing the NCP(OC) and RSCC *closer* together. However, we must not replace the dogmatism of bureaucratic-technical separation with a dogmatism of proximity. The sole guarantee of avoiding economism is to conduct a concrete analysis in each new situation, always different from all others. *We must let the conjunctural analysis determine our organizational structure at each moment, rather than engaging in a sterile repetition of rote formulas.*

In sum: the problem of our lack of effectiveness was referable to a bureaucratic-technical separation rather than so-called 'militarization' or 'authoritarian control.' And this bureaucratic-technical separation is in turn a product of a profound economism against which we must struggle. How, then, do we resolve the split that has broken the unity of Maoist forces in New York City? How, in other words, do we achieve a genuine *principled unity*?

The resolution of a contradiction is never simply an inversion. To resolve a contradiction in the manner of an inversion is to see the contradiction simply as an external relation between two terms. In fact, Mao argues in *On Contradiction*, it is the internal nature of the terms of the contradiction that must be taken as primary: only then can we begin to address what must be born and what must disappear in resolving the contradiction. The faction that split, prior to the split itself, proposed liquidating the organizing committee into a liaison committee. This is a resolution of the inversion-type, and (if adopted) would only have reinforced their right-opportunist line. Thus we would leave the *shining path* only to find ourselves marching along the *freedom road*. Only a genuine effort to implement the Mass Line will allow us to begin the long and difficult march towards communism.

NEW YORK CITY BRANCH, NCP(OC)
March 2014

8. RGA: WE WILL NOT INTEGRATE INTO A BURNING HOUSE

(<https://docs.google.com/document/d/1mYxGhudlgDP-43tBqmsl2Fsoxufam0LeK-P88nnfVJg/mobilebasic?pref=2&pli=1>)

Polemic on Bad Gender Practice in the Liaison Committee for a New Communist Party (NCP-LC)

Red Guards Austin are not supporters of, members of, or affiliated with the NCP-LC.

(Note: This statement is also posted on Red Guards Austin's Facebook page here.)

INTRODUCTION

For the past year and a half we have been in contact with and struggling with the Liaison Committee for a New Communist Party. We have been trying to build strong, comradely relationships with them, as we understand the necessity of uniting with all who can be united with and of building the Maoist party. We have reached the unanimous decision that we do not wish to continue this process. We can no longer stand as supporters of the project and have no desire to unite with them in any foreseeable future. We do not seek integration or the continuation of communication or relationships of any sort. This document outlines the reasons why and how we came to those conclusions.

Red Guards Austin has since its inception remained an autonomous formation accountable to no one but the masses. We have no outside leadership and are not subject to the so-called “democratic centralism” of the NCP-LC. It was our hope that through good faith and mutual support/struggle we could unite together as comrades in the interests of building the party. This vision was not shared among the leaders of the LC in New York City, who viewed the process as our “integration” into their preexisting outfit. For the reasons laid out in this statement, all efforts of uniting together have been futile. We feel that it has become useless saying the right things to the wrong people. Simply put, we are sick of banging our heads against their stubbornness in an effort to help the organization in NYC rectify. Let us also be clear that this is not leveled against every rank-and-file member. We have hopes for them as comrades—that they will get out of the mire that is the LC in due time, by breaking with bad leadership and refusing to follow bad directives. This polemic is directed primarily at the LC’s leadership and their clique that rules as an ‘independent kingdom,’ passing orders down from on high. It is through close and direct work with the NCP-LC that we have reached the following conclusions.

We had reached the decision to be abandon attempts to unify with their party-building effort months ago but continued to give the issue some time to let it clarify and allow whatever struggles might occur to take place in hopes that the LC in NYC could make at least some minor rectifications or a show of some effort that would allow us to continue some relationship between our organizations. This never materialized. We did not come to this decision easily, as we feel the need and desire for Maoist unity within the United States. As desirable as Maoist unity might be, we can no longer be idealists about it, nor will we ignore what we consider serious errors. While this is not a split, due to the fact that we were never part of the LC, we take the matter seriously nonetheless and we feel a loss. There are good comrades within the LC who hold correct lines and we do not wish to give up on those comrades or abandon them on a sinking ship. However this ship was one we could not and will not board. As outsiders whose support was often taken for granted, we are aware that it is not within our scope to join the LC just to back up those comrades who hold correct lines within it. We instead offer them support as non-members. We hope that their line wins but are realistic that it is highly unlikely due to the undemocratic control coming from the NYC branch.

We wish to self-criticize for our hesitation. While we wanted to give them as many chances as possible, we clearly should much sooner have issued polemics and public criticism of what we identify as major errors and an outright dishonest presentation. For too long we sought to handle matters privately between RGA and the LC, in branch meetings, which we were at the time attending in an effort to “build unity.” We were hopeful that we could exert some positive influence on them, which it seems we have failed to do. Any changes in the NYC branch are minor to nonexistent and at this time insufficient to justify continued support from RGA. We apologize to all for the tardiness of this statement and hope that the matter will be put to light in plain view of

the masses as well as of supporters.

INDEPENDENT KINGDOMS, CLIQUISHNESS, AND BUILDING THE PARTY WRONG

The party-building efforts of the LC have major defects, each error compounding and reproducing the other. This problem is universal within the organization and is allowed to persist due to wrong methods and poor structure. They recruit individuals instead of collectives, while allowing collectives to continue existing in NYC and LA, giving them a material advantage over individual LC members elsewhere, who have no collectives to hold them accountable or to back up their line struggles. The LC does no service to party-building with this method of recruiting only individuals who have no power to change the existing collective branches. This has—in our analysis—diminished any chance of party-building the LC once offered. We hold that all efforts should be centered on mass organizations guided by revolutionary collectives (cadre organizations held to higher standards of conduct and guided by communist principles). These collectives should be part of the greater party-building organization. It is our position that the LC's structure serves to insulate NYC, and only by extension LA, as independent kingdoms. These independent kingdoms can muster far more influence and pass policies that were never struggled out within the LC as a whole, let alone voted into being. To negate two-line struggle, rather than to promote it, is to turn one's back on Maoism entirely and sink into revisionist thinking and practice.

Because of the poor construction of the LC, we focus our criticisms primarily on the NYC branch and secondarily on the LA branch, as the other “branches” from our understanding have only one official member each, and we largely support the work of these individuals. These individuals located in both Philadelphia and Kansas City have not had their mass work tainted with the bad gender practice that grows like weeds among the NYC branch.

GENDER PRACTICE AND THE MISHANDLING OF OFFENDERS

Over a year and half ago when we first began communicating with the LC in a small and infrequent capacity, we were approached with rumors about bad gender practice on the part of the LC's NYC branch. These rumors, however, were seldom substantiated and most often came in the form of “I heard this from someone who heard from someone in NY.” In cases where warnings could be corroborated, we naively thought those who warned us were just engaging in sectarianism.

These allegations were usually centered on the handling of a patriarchal abuser who used to be in the LC. We know well how rumors and gossip can serve only the enemy, while truth alone can serve the people. So we proceeded in good faith and did our best to investigate the situation by making sure to ask LC comrades directly to clarify some rumors or allegations. At a few points in time we were slandered due to our support for the LC, though we were never in the organization. The questioning on our part received only partial or conflicting answers. Nothing added up, and it became difficult to tell what was the truth and what was half-truth twisted and used opportunistically. Due to the conflicting positions and recollections of those within the LC as well as from other comrades, all we could do was be patient.

Our first struggle once we became in communication with the LC was to push them to issue a public statement so the alleged opportunism could be put to rest and at the very least would not make us seem unprincipled for seeking to work with them. The statement was issued eventually after a lot of foot-dragging. When it was released, it was insufficient and glossed over the matter, because it refused to name the offender and failed to explain how they were going to isolate him—reproducing the liberalism that they sought to self-criticize for. According to Mao, one type of liberalism is “to touch on the matter lightly instead of going into it thoroughly, so as to keep on good terms.” We felt that in spite of this contradiction, it at least showed an ability to move on and start owning some errors, on this matter especially; we were painfully wrong. The process of unity is often painful. Unity must be earned, and we determined to continue trying in spite of growing reservation. The LC seemed rife with errors but we did not see them as insurmountable and had hopes that through criticism and proving ourselves we could help them improve in some areas. We were overconfident and carried this on for too long, thinking in terms of ‘a few bad apples.’ It is from our attempts at struggle with the NYC branch that we

have learned better.

Since before there was an LC, there were issues with one member of their precursor organization, the New Communist Party Organizing Committee (NCP-OC), who went on to be a founding member of the Liaison Committee—Freddy Bastone. We knew of several smaller allegations against Freddy but were not aware of the depth of his predatory actions and transgressions. We were largely kept in the dark on the matter, which was hesitantly discussed at most. When we began to suspect that some of the rumors were in fact closer to the truth than the official explanations we received, we stalled on integration but continued supporting the mass work that LC members and affiliates were engaged in, uniting where we could on the issues we could support. Upon one of our confrontations we were finally informed that Freddy was no longer a member of the LC and that he had been kicked out due to refusal to rectify for “patriarchal behavior,” a description we understand now to be a downplaying of the transgressions, attempting to portray them as nothing more than machismo and oppressive language. We see this as a rightist error. Presenting an antagonist contradiction as a non-antagonistic contradiction allowed these NYC LC members to treat enemies as friends.

We were disturbed that we had to wait so long to get any explanation on the matter and that no public statement had been issued, even though Freddy was commonly associated with the LC and was (and still is) active in online spaces in which LC members have control, even supporting arguments and being supported by LC cadres in NYC. Freddy would post from fake accounts (London Faust), which LC cadres in NYC were aware of. When one of our women members called this account out for dismissive gaslighting, cadres in the NYC LC sided with Freddy. He would commonly post on their walls, and photos would emerge of him hanging out or having drinks with LC members. They had failed on all accounts to hold him accountable or rectify his errors but continued what appeared to us to be friendly relations and allowed him to remain in their social circles.

When we pressed the issue of dishonesty and called it liberalism, we were told by two different NYC LC members that they did not work with him politically but that they had been friends a long time, that they were not ready to completely give up on him, and that rectification could not happen “overnight” (we now see this as both harboring and liberalism). Our concerns were ultimately framed as ultra-leftism, and we considered this to be possibly true and trusted the comrades on the ground who could survey the situation better than we could. It seemed neither we nor they were willing to give up on folks easily.

Matters with Freddy escalated and got worse, as we predicted they would. We have been fed drastically different and conflicting stories on the matter and so we cannot claim to lay out a full picture here. We will do our best to present the facts as we have come to understand them. Long after we had been told that some of them had personal friendships with him (they even invited him into online conversations, which prompted our members to leave those conversations), they reversed the “friendship” position in an act of opportunism, saying that they were not friends but were “keeping an eye on him.” This farce was developing into what we consider complacency in rape culture.

Only recently has the severity of Freddy’s abuse come to light. The fact is, Freddy has assaulted more than one person and in fact there are multiple survivors of his attacks that we know of, though in the interest of respecting their wishes we will not mention them nor describe the incidents. The worst part is that some of these sexual and non-sexual assaults occurred after Freddy had been kicked out of the LC!

The last time the NCP-LC had to defend their unwillingness to improve their gender practice, they had this to say about their precursor organization the NCP-OC’s expulsion of offenders:

“These expulsions show an unwillingness to adopt a perspective of collective responsibility around patriarchal behavior and the line struggle for the supremacy of proletarian feminist line over more traditional approaches to patriarchy. They were also accompanied with the spreading of rumors, rather than direct political denunciations of those involved that would subject them to a process of accountability by the political spaces they occupy. The fake clandestinity pursued by the NCP(OC), one that is central to the reasons for the NCP(LC) to split, leads paradoxically for them to depend on innuendo and rumor-mongering when dealing with these matters. While certainly one should always have a respect for confidential processes, these more often than not result in a lack of accountability that is utilized in patriarchal ways.”

Here they take the position that offenders and potential security risks should be reformed, and we agree in theory. The problem is that the LC lacks both the willingness and the ability to reform said offenders (contrary to their idealism and overestimation of themselves), proven by the fact that Freddy Bastone has accrued more survivors since they attempted to “rectify” him. We have seen absolutely no self-criticism for their failure to provide “collective responsibility.” In fact they have not even discussed this festering wound and instead just masked its stench. We do not fully unite with the self-criticism or the polemics issued by the former NCP-OC against the LC, but we can say that the allegations made on drunkenness and bad gender practice have in time proven true and even worse than the original allegations.

Let us be very clear: at the current stage of struggle the Maoist movement in the United States lacks the ability to reform sexual predators and patriarchal abusers. It is our responsibility to do what we can, exposing and isolating them. Any posturing that we could exceed our own realistic ability puts women comrades in extreme danger, as indicated by the mishandling of Freddy. Ideology must be utilized to transform, and before the LC tries to reform these serious offenders they need to clean house and be transformed themselves by principle and stop calling abusers “comrade.”

Failure to isolate predators leaves them free to target comrades. It leaves them access to social venues where they still hold social status, which gives them an opportunity to continue their abuse. Though it has been pointed out that members of the LC have taken steps to protect the survivors of Freddy’s abuse, our primary criticism of the matter falls on their inability to isolate him and thereby prevent the accumulation of survivors of one individual’s abuse after others had come forward to shed light on his abusive attacks. He was not held thoroughly accountable, and there was no community awareness that was raised to protect other comrades from him or even to give them fair warning. We hold the leaders and decision-makers in the LC accountable for this. Freddy is in fact a serial abuser of women, whom he preys on through political activism. The internal “disciplining” or silent “expulsion” of serial offenders puts the community at large at risk, a reality that the NYC LC branch has to face every day.

Comrades who were “childhood friends” with Freddy should have been able to see his macho and arrogant behavior, abusive language, threats he may have made, and so on as warning signs. However, hypermasculinity is endemic in the LC-NYC founding branch, and they have yet to deal with this fact. Inability to look more deeply into the lives of individuals with alarming behavior creates serious security risks and opens a door to infiltration, as proven by the case of Brandon Darby and his general misogynist conduct before he turned into a state informant and provocateur. Studying the case of Darby has influenced us to handle predators and abusers who emerge in our circles more seriously. Steven Walters no longer shows his face, and we encourage the left to use a similar method of mass struggle to isolate offenders: make them known to the public and seek mass participation in the campaign against them. This includes holding folks accountable who still continue to have friendly relations with these people.

One of the most recent tales we have been told when our struggle became most exacerbated is evidence not only of rape culture but also of a revisionist tendency among LC leadership. We were informed that publicly going against Freddy would not only put women survivors at risk of Freddy retaliating but could also result in the loss of their chairman’s job: “it’s the men too who are at risk.”

This line of reasoning suggests two big errors. The first is believing that if a perpetrator has significant social status and clout it is not wise to hold him accountable to the people, that it is too dangerous for them personally to go against him in the interests of women in general, whom this serial predator targets. The second is specific to those claiming to be Maoists: they are placing material incentives and union status for one member above their politics. This is revisionism of the Deng Xiaoping variety and a despicable, indefensible move to put job security ahead of politics. Maoists must have the courage to destroy all monsters and hold these predators accountable. They must at all times put the interests of the people before their own financial self-interests. We must never be controlled by fear of prison or death, and we cannot put our own jobs before our political principles. We have serious issues with this line of reasoning and with the excuse that we were offered up. Even with those issues we do not feel that this is the truth or at least not the whole truth on the matter. We believe that the truth has been withheld or, more likely, that we have been lied to.

Speculation as to why LC men remain friends with Freddy on Facebook and will make no decisive moves against him will do us no good. The fact remains that we cannot unite with liars, opportunists, and those who sweep sexual assault under the rug by quietly kicking out offenders, refusing to name them and/or continuing

association with them. This appears to us to be a break in name only at this point.

The mishandling of the Freddy Bastone fiasco is their most serious error in gender practice, but it is also just the end result of various bad gender practices quantitatively accumulating into crisis. Bad gender practice, though manifested in crisis in NYC, is not exclusive to that branch but was seen in RGLA as well (the only other “branch” with more than one member at the last meeting we sat in on in an effort to build unity).

RGLA

Three of our members went out to LA, two of whom spent more than three months living with and working alongside Red Guards Los Angeles (NCP-LC). We built strong bonds with the members of this collective and are grateful for their hospitality and the opportunity to have worked with them. We have a much deeper understanding of this branch and much more hope for their ability to rectify. We began noticing male chauvinist attitudes among several members, which we call patriarchal thinking. We found this gender disparity unacceptable and saw that it was connected to bad gender practice among certain members, who persist in what we can only refer to as ‘brocialism,’ ‘mactivism,’ and a sort of hazing of a new member who was still being vetted. RGLA behaved at times like a boys’ club, and this behavior is reproduced due to the lack of women leadership and it in turn creates obstacles to women joining the group. We gave our criticisms more than 6 months ago and repeated them throughout our time there. Only recently, policy has been made and members have started trying to hold each another accountable for their patriarchal behavior, an effort that is too recent to see the results.

One example of bad gender practice is RGLA cadres engaging in talk casually about how attractive women activists and comrades they meet are as well casual discussion on who they want to sleep with. This has reached a point where we have witnessed some of RGLA joking about ‘claiming’ women they have met through activism: “She’s mine, I saw her first!” Members of RGA witnessed firsthand and criticized this type of activity among almost half of their membership. This behavior even in jest alienates women activists, who are not struggling in this movement in order to find dates. The issue with this specifically is rooted in patriarchy via an engrained view held by society regarding women as property.

Women comrades and activists experience the abuse of mactivism all the time. By ‘mactivism,’ we mean the act of utilizing one’s activist credentials to meet romantic and/or sexual partners, usually at protests, demos, or activist spaces. These individuals, almost always men, mobilize their social status to seek personal gratification as well as to ice their targets out when things go badly (which they will, due to the ulterior motives of the men in question). These types of men are not there to serve the people—they are there to use social status and “revolutionary” bravado to advance their own sexual agendas. The prevalence of mactivism means that women comrades cannot escape the harassment of men even while struggling for their own liberation.

The lack of women membership in RGLA is caused in part by the fact that these same cadres tended to seek romantic relations with women comrades as a priority over involving them in the work of RGLA. These cadres are doing harm to the movement by using their political work and mass work for personal gratification, even if they are not fully aware of it. As struggles on gender practice have mounted they have informed us that measures are being taken to correct this. Serious effort has been made on their part to rectify these and other issues and we have confidence that they are both identifying and addressing their errors.

RGLA has existed for well over a year. The fact that they could not maintain women cadre, let alone develop women leadership, has set them back greatly. All communists must seek to learn from women, who constitute half of the masses.

RGA members pressed RGLA on this, and our initial criticism was on their gender disparity. We pushed for a rectification campaign and a cessation of all brocialism and mactivism. The lack of women causes a certain level of ‘boys will be boys’ thinking and manifests in what we called a locker-room mentality. Our criticisms were taken and a rectification campaign is underway. We believe that time and effort must result in notable improvement and that this rectification must be made their highest priority.

Bad gender practice affects women, non-men, and agender people in a way that can easily become antagonistic. Men like Freddy Bastone can go unchecked and emerge from such poor practice, one error

feeding another while communist proletarian feminist principles are rejected in practice but broadcast loudly in words. This is dangerously misleading to the people who enter such organizations, who hear one thing but experience another. Education on the matter and on proletarian feminism in general was unacceptably low among RGLA, who have since taken up the task of correcting this theoretical deficiency.

Bad gender practice can negatively affect male comrades as well, in the form of promoting disunity, competition, and resentment but also in the form of hazing, bullying, and abuse, all of which we saw within RGLA. Communist organizations should not conduct themselves like fraternities, and vetting should look nothing like hazing. Comrades who engaged in this activity should self-criticize, with the understanding that this is the reason they have not seen a better rate of growth and that this behavior is not fitting of anyone, let alone revolutionary communists.

NEGATION OF LINE STRUGGLE

In our experience dealing with the LC, line struggle has been carried out only as a hollow gesture. Two-line struggle is the core of Maoist organizational development, and to neglect this or substitute it is to cease to be Maoist. Without having a complete picture, let alone honesty in communication, line struggle becomes impossible. Democratic centralism means that decisions should be struggled out, that ample time must be given to discussion, and that line struggle should take place between left and right as many times as possible. We hold that through poor communication and dishonesty, line struggle was negated, forcing the domination of a right-opportunist line in discussions of gender practice, emanating from the situation in NYC.

The LC has failed to prioritize line struggle between our organizations or internally. This has doomed the project to being the stunted small org that it is. Without line struggle there can be no unity! Line struggle is the precondition for any collaboration. We feel that it is precisely the LC's refusal to line struggle that has resulted in their cliquishness and right-opportunism and the hostile relationship between our orgs.

Refusal to line struggle internally has resulted in RGA being forced to struggle externally in front of the masses and all comrades who are unaffiliated in the form of polemical exchange. We demand that the LC respond in kind to this document. We are prepared to engage in fierce ideological struggle with these errors and all those who support them, for as long as it takes—forever, in fact. We will not give lip service to Cultural Revolution without ever seeking to enact those principles.

We have experienced nothing but poor to nonexistent communication from the LC's liaison officers for the better part of our involvement with the LC. In spite of the replacement of the old officer with a new one (a decision we were not informed of at the time it was reached, which kept us reaching out to the wrong person). The damage from bad communication had already taken a toll on our ability to work with the organization.

The LC has shown a lack of unity and displayed little desire for its branches to reliably operate with each another, let alone with RGA. While the work of the LC's new liaison officer showed a marked improvement over the previous officer's work, we feel that new appointments in a bad structure will be unable to transform the overall project.

Important matters and decisions that affect our relationship have been hidden from us, and we came to know of them only through third-party sources.

In spite of this neglect and roguish behavior, they still present our groups as being mutually supportive, both to the public and to their supporters. The only thing we have been offered is discussions in which they hold all control, outnumber us, or can impede our ability to struggle. At best this is due to them being poorly organized, due to a lack of discipline. At worst, it is conscious maneuvering to avoid us, coerce our support, or opportunistically attach themselves to our work. Ultimately they are using our work to make themselves look good by positive association, dishonestly concealing the contradictions from supporters looking on from the outside. It was an error on our part and our liberalism toward certain supporters of the LC that led us to concede to the requests that we wait to issue a statement. The request came from outside supporters who were in better communication with the organization than we were. As a result we have withheld issuing anything to this point. We have given them notice of everything we are saying in this document and have not received any official response.

On more than one occasion the LC has treated friends like enemies. In our capacity as supporters we were often treated as inferior to their own small project. When we would err, we were socially isolated or privately denounced instead of being criticized as comrades. Both we and others have been treated as disposable parts of an all-important “party,” which is a delusional perspective on the part of the LC. This is of particular concern because we have seen women suffer this treatment for making allegations against cadre online for their bad gender practice in NYC, where critics were bombarded and slandered by friends of these men.

REFUSAL OF CRITICISM AND INABILITY TO SELF-CRITICIZE

Self-criticism from NYC has been nonexistent in our dealings with them. When criticized by us they have “only accepted part of the criticism,” as if criticism were anything but a gift from one comrade to another to improve our collective work. RGA has been met with arrogance and vulgar pride from a couple of college activists who have yet to prove themselves as leaders we would ever follow, as if their student work within mass orgs could erase our own experience in proletarian class struggle. Students’ role in the revolution is not to look down on workers.

Chairman Mao encourages revolutionaries to disobey and resist directives from the top that go against the revolutionary project. We uphold this idea put forward by Mao against the Liu Shiao-chi gang of revisionists, and in that spirit we have stopped listening to the LC and refuse any directives or rules they would like to place on us. After all, we are Red Guards.

We have always had issues with LC NYC’s online conduct but recently have been criticizing them more heavily (as part of our own reformation/rectification campaign), specifically for the internet conduct of the person we believed was still the liaison officer. His online posts had recently taken a turn for the worse, becoming jaded and admittedly nihilistic, marred by consistent sexual posts that women cadres of RGA criticized as being gratuitously sexual and alienating. These posts amounted to propagating patriarchal thinking and ideas. According to Mao, “whenever [one] speaks to others, [one] is doing propaganda work.” The posts gave us concern that much deeper issues were going on with this LC member. When we reached out to leadership in NYC we were dismissively told that “that’s his personal business.” If we are to be quite blunt, such attitudes among cis-hetero men—the oversexualized posts and so on—are not only alienating to women comrades but outright indicative of more serious patriarchal thinking and behavior that go well beyond the realm of “personal business.”

As mentioned before, Freddy was allowed in online spaces where LC members had control, namely on specific LC members’ Facebook walls and posts. One instance of him entering a conversation was especially disturbing, as we were criticizing an NYC member on what we saw as a subjective patriarchal outlook. When Freddy entered the thread only to offer support to the person we were criticizing, we took serious issue with it. When we pushed for Freddy to not be allowed a platform to speak on matters of patriarchy via NYC members, one of our members was opportunistically bad-jacketed by an NYC member who has shown a continuous tendency to antagonize others on the internet. (Specifically, this person stated that if Freddy were to lash out, it would be the fault of the member of RGA for talking about the issue, in essence removing all responsibility from the abuser and deflecting it onto our cadre.)

When we criticized the LC for allowing one of their members in NYC to bad-jacket a comrade in Austin, we were again dismissed. No word was given that they would discipline this member, and they suggested that we proceed forward not with a disciplinary hearing but instead with a general discussion that that member “didn’t have to be there for.” We have no faith in an organization that allows their members to alienate a whole collective, that allows this same member to go unchecked, making antagonistic comments and leaving a bad taste in the mouths of many they come into contact with.

To make matters worse, the contradiction between these two cadre was treated as nothing but interpersonal disagreement and was framed as the primary reason for RGA’s grievances, which is not the case. We have made clear the danger of this person’s actions in a thorough document, supported with evidence, which we submitted to the LC, and this document has not received a response. The primary disagreement we have with the LC is not the online bad-jacketing conduct of this member. Our primary issue is with the overall bad gender practice and the disgraceful handling of serious offender(s) by the LC in NYC.

When criticized, members of the LC tend to reverse and deflect the criticism, claiming they are just misunderstood or that we “have no sense of humor.” We can only address this by saying that whatever their intentions, intentions are secondary to the consequences of actions. It is not up to those being criticized to pick and choose which criticisms they will accept! Theirs is not the MLM method of criticism and self-criticism; it is not the prerogative of those being criticized to cherry-pick from their errors which ones they will address and which they will evade. Even now we do not make any criticism a witch hunt, nor have we ever (which is why we have left individuals’ names out of this document entirely). We still wish to see them cured of their bad practice, in service to the people and the revolutionary cause. Since we have passed the point of internal discussion, we present it to all so that they will be encouraged to make public their errors and grievances alike.

ON THE REFUSAL TO CRITICIZE RGA

We have continuously requested detailed criticisms of our work, a request that to this day goes unanswered. Are we to believe that RGA has made no errors? That is impossible due to the truth of Marxist philosophy, dialectical materialism. We like all comrades and collectives make errors, and a failure to provide us with criticisms, when requested, is further neglect of their duties as a liaison committee. That failure shows a lack of comradely relations on their part. We are still waiting! In our entire year-plus of seeking to build unity we have not received any formal criticism of our work from them, be it internally or externally—more liberalism that is enshrined in the practice of the LC.

The inability to take and make thoroughgoing criticism/self-criticism is rooted in liberalism and a petty-bourgeois aversion to discipline; it undermines all sound communist practice and allows things to fester out of control, forces splits, and turns all relationships into quarrels and disputes—into what can only appear to the people as sectarian infighting and bickering instead of a conscious effort to improve. One must divide into two when opposites contend in the form of left and right two-line struggles. We hold that they are the ones representing a rightist line.

Perhaps they are only waiting to directly or publicly criticize us after the fact, when they can no longer hide behind our support? From the start RGA has regularly and publicly invited criticism from the people as well as from the left, and we have self-criticized publicly for our numerous errors.

We believe that the lessons of the Cultural Revolution are universal—that unless we are actively strengthening revolutionary ideology within ourselves and our organizations, then we are actively succumbing to the liberal, bourgeois mindset that confronts us from every direction, a mindset referred to as bourgeois inner self. There is only one way to strengthen proletarian communist principles in this way and defeat internal revisionism and liberalism: all-around, frequent, deep-going criticism/self-criticism combined with collective struggle.

If we want to stand a chance of overturning capitalism-imperialism in the belly of the beast, we must become revolutionaries who live and breathe a revolutionary culture. We must be, as Mao urged us to be, modest and prudent, and guarded against arrogance and rashness.

When the masses look at us, it is absolutely essential that we set striking examples as committed, principled people whose very way of existing in the world shows the bankruptcy of bourgeois society—by living in stark contrast to the narrow self-interest derived from capitalism. We must be people whose very way of existing in the world shows that another world is possible, because it is right in front of them, living and breathing and walking on this earth today. Only then will the masses trust us to be, as Lenin described, the tribune of the people. Only then will the masses believe we are sincere and dedicated enough to be worth teaching and trusting with their ideas and demands, and only when we take this attitude will we truly be able to learn from them.

We must actively rely on the example set by the people’s liberation army guided by Comrade Mao, which was a shining example of what it means to be realized servants of the people.

At times when we have criticized the conduct of members of the LC, we have heard from them that these criticisms were not worth considering because they concerned a personal matter, not a political one. When we have made this type of criticism, we have been called cultists, and obsessed with ideological purity. We insist that it is a virtue, not an error, to strive to make ourselves and our movement a just and thoroughlygoingly

communist one. We must seek the eradication of our own egotistical, selfish bourgeois thoughts as much as possible. We believe that a committed communist cannot see themselves as divided between a private persona and a political persona—to the contrary, everything within a committed communist's life and mind must be subordinated to the goal of achieving communism. We do not demand and can never expect constantly flawless behavior from anyone at all, but nor can we accept any excuses for failing to pursue self-rectification of any and all errors as vigorously as possible. Nothing at all should stand in the way of our attempts to constantly remake ourselves as better servants of the people through criticism/self-criticism. This task cannot be understated or neglected. We do not clock out from being communists, and our principles must always be evident. We must also assist all genuine comrades in the task of becoming communists in the true sense. This is politics in command of all things, including our “personal lives.” While this would be an unrealistic order to expect the masses in a capitalist society to fill, we expect nothing less from those cadres who consider themselves revolutionary communists.

As Chairman Mao has expressed in his moving tribute to Comrade Norman Bethune, “We must learn the spirit of absolute selflessness. . . . With this spirit everyone can be very useful to the people. A [person's] ability may be great or small, but if [they have] this spirit, [they are] already noble-minded and pure, a [person] of moral integrity and above vulgar interests, a [person] who is of value to the people.” Communists without exception must seek to embody such character, for we have the most ambitious project at our feet, the full transformation of all people and the achievement of an equal society. We seek the creation of new human beings.

POLITICAL EDUCATION AND BAD LEADERSHIP

Ideological consolidation is an ongoing process; due to the lack of internal line struggle within the LC, they remain sadly stunted on this front. Ideological development is uneven, and wide disparities exist. Maoism is so powerful because of its ability to be grasped by the masses. It places political development above productive forces. The spread of philosophy among the people is the crown jewel in the history of our ideology. There is little excuse for the disparity and uneven development among the LC. While some have a deep grasp and high level of theoretical development, other comrades are neglected. Political education is not taken seriously enough between the branches or within each collective branch. It is left to the work of individuals to advance their theory on their own, which is the bourgeois method of learning, the opposite of the Maoist method.

The branch leader in NYC is the worst of the lot, and from our experience in the past year he seems to be unaware of the internal issues within the LC and of how quickly relations between the LC and RGA had deteriorated. He is on the capitalist road, by holding the position that it is acceptable to fail to hold offenders like Freddy Bastone accountable if their positions of power mean potentially compromising material concerns and positions at a cadre member's place of employment (according to the excuse we were given). Ultimately it is the dishonesty, lack of principle, distrust, and outright lies that have destroyed the ability to unite and cemented our decision to discontinue relations.

In all things, Maoists must consider the masses as central. While we are saddened by the loss or potential loss, and though the process of struggle is painful, we take great comfort in the truth—that it is through the masses that we will build the revolutionary party and that the preexisting leftist formations are inconsequential comparatively. The small group of leftists that constitute the LC is less important than seeking the support and participation of the masses. We will continue in that effort and break all the relations with those who would hold us back or corrupt our efforts. In the case of revisionism from the top down in such a small organization, that type of corruption spreads quickly and is not worth our continued participation. We know that we have supporters within the spheres of influence of the LC, who in all likelihood have also had important facts concealed from them. This reality means one thing: line struggle will continue to erupt until either the revolutionary line or its opposite wins out.

TRAJECTORY OF THE PARTY-BUILDING EFFORT

All of the criticisms made in this document have been presented to the LC. How different branches have chosen to act upon them is wildly uneven. While we hold that the errors presented in this document are concerning and we stand by the criticism put forward against LA, we must also state that these criticisms have been taken by LA and they have self-criticized on some points and have taken the first steps toward rectification of these errors. It is still our position that the roots of the errors within the LC stem primarily from the NYC branch and that NYC's errors reproduce bad practice and harmful thinking among all branches. We regard RGLA as comrades even though we are not—nor will we ever be—part of the LC's party-building effort. We see improvement and would like to state that they are taking this matter very seriously. We do not expect an instant fix, but we have enough faith in them to say that they can rectify all major errors as they go forward. We hold the position that poor leadership from the NYC clique has had a negative effect on RGLA. We feel that if they continue accepting the bad leadership from the NYC clique, no good will come of their efforts. We hold affection and respect for the efforts they have put forward to genuinely change, and this document is intended to encourage the furthering of their efforts.

We cannot speculate as to whether or not our criticisms of the NYC branch are shared among other LC organizations outside of NYC. We have faith in comrades to investigate and reach their own conclusions on the matter, and through the publication of this document we hope to see line struggles erupt. In our analysis it would be criminal to remain silent and revisionist in order to adhere to some metaphysical loyalty to a small pre-party formation such as the LC. We hold that these errors are deep-rooted in the project started by LC founders in NYC. The LC must dissolve (as we know it now) in order for the Maoist movement in the United States to avoid the snares and pitfalls of the LC and to struggle for principled unification in the future.

It must also be addressed that the NYC "leaders" kept RGLA in the dark on much of the Freddy situation for a long time after RGLA had integrated into the LC. We therefore do not blame RGLA for what they did not know—we will hold them accountable for what they do with the knowledge they now possess. While certain excuses have been revealed in time to be lies, we still have not gotten an acceptable explanation. Suffice it to say that an organization that cannot stand up to and isolate Freddy Bastone is not one we would ever sit with again. They would crumble under the least amount of repression from the state. The LC clique in NYC has no teeth and it is in all respects a paper tiger, falsely presenting itself as leadership for the movement.

We invite criticism of our work from our friends, our supporters, and even those who ideologically oppose us. We encourage participation from all in the realm of ideological struggle and engagement with this document. We discourage centrist positions or placing friendship before politics. Communists should earn the title and all that comes with it—through the practice of their principles and purification of themselves via intense struggle. This document does not contend with differences in theory but with matters of practice. Correct practice guided by a correct theory is how the revolutionary party will be built, never through a peaceful series of events or continued unprincipled unity. We intend to be open and honest with answering questions or addressing concerns. We will not repeat the mistakes of the LC. This is part of a continued effort on our part to help build the party through struggle.

We encourage all who are seriously committed to the formation of revolutionary collectives who will engage the masses to reach out to us in their party-building efforts. We cannot do it alone. We know well that it will take many collectives like Red Guards to build the party, and we claim no authority but would be glad to share our experience or offer advice to those wanting to organize something similar. We hope that through collective struggle with revolutionary organizations we can all put forward a party-building organization that can fulfill the tasks that the LC has failed in. We hope that this future organization can unite all genuine Maoists in principled unity through struggle.

Whatever party-building efforts take place must be put forward only by those who possess true and developing communist principles, first of all a willingness to learn from mistakes and apply those lessons to bettering themselves and their work. In the process of seeking unity with the LC, we have faced lies from "leadership" in NYC but have seen genuine efforts from other branches. We feel that the contradictions inherent in the NYC branch, and especially their mishandling of the Freddy Bastone fiasco, indicate that their party-building project was doomed from the start, and we unite with many of the diverse criticisms that have emerged and are emerging regarding their bad gender practice. It is this birth defect, their refusal to rectify, and their deflections

of criticisms aimed at them indicate the LC should be dissolved. We self-criticize for being complacent in propping up such a band of rogues that constitute an undemocratic, independent kingdom—a patriarchal boys' club.

We encourage our comrades who have kept us moving in a revolutionary direction, both within the LC and the mass organizations where they have influence, to join in a rectification process of their own. We all must seek to save the new U.S. Maoist movement from decay. We feel that our work has generated mutual support, and we are confident in the revolutionary commitment among those affected and sometimes infected by LC backwardness. We are done with the NCP-LC in order to break with old ideas and combat bad gender practice. We invite all who will to struggle alongside us and build the party.

We must make party-building through mass work our principal task and never lose sight of that goal. To do that we must not view any party-building effort as a monolithic organization that is beyond fail. We must seek constant correction and only unite through struggle, attaining principled unity with revolutionary, proletarian feminist Maoists and fully end the boys' club that stifles and limits the roles of our great women leaders. If we felt that the NYC branch was at all capable of accepting such criticism we would continue to struggle, as we have for over a year, to unite with them. We have become like many others before us fully convinced that this effort has failed and that we all must emerge to build the party. We can no longer be haunted by the skeletons in the closet of the LC—skeletons that they will only discuss after a collective or individual has joined, withholding information that could influence collectives and individuals not to join.

There are two roads, one that will build the party and another that will reproduce bad gender practice and give cover to abusers, manipulators, and predators. We have seen allegations arise online publicly against members of the LC's NYC branch only to see those seeking support iced out of mass organizations and movements by these very same men the LC has surrounded with "credibility," constructing an image that these men use to manipulate and disrespect more women. The LC in NYC will officially take only "partial" criticism and hide their errors from outside supporters. This is rape culture. This is male chauvinism and misogyny. Proletarian feminist in name only! MLM in name only! We repudiate them and ask all who have suspicions and facts to come forward and unite with this polemic. In such cases where individuals would prefer to reach out to us directly in private, we encourage them to do so.

THE WAY FORWARD

In order to build the party we must take seriously the need to form revolutionary collectives that can initiate and guide revolutionary mass organizations, seeking to build up revolutionary sentiment among the people. We will offer any experience or guidance we can to comrades seeking to form revolutionary collectives similar to Red Guards Austin. One way we propose to do this is through the formation of cadre schools, which we will be organizing this summer. These schools will be laid out in further statements in detail, but in short they will serve as both a means for us to learn from cadre students and a method of sharing what we have learned in our efforts and struggles to help form and become better communists. We will send instructors to help with efforts countrywide, in the formation of both RGs and STPs, which will be treated as equals in the monumental task of building the party and marching forward to a communist society.

In our proposed strategy for party-building, revolutionary collectives, each with a minimum of three members, will serve as the base units for what will replace the disorganized and backward efforts from the LC in NYC. These collectives should hope to implement democratic centralism once we have grown in many locals. Before then, we encourage autonomy with support and guidance to each other. These collectives can seek to build a genuine united front with non-Maoist revolutionary orgs and progressive mass organizations, especially in regard to national liberation struggles in New Africa and Atzlan. These collectives must seek a high level of discipline and a commitment to communist principles. We should all seek to improve daily and fear no criticism.

In our analysis of the movements and organizations that are part of the current LC structure either as members or supporters, the only way forward is to cease the project, dissolve the organization, and seek rectification independently of NYC—whose misleadership is a disservice to the people and the revolutionary project.

We desire no division among Red Guards and have faith in the comrades in LA to challenge their thinking

and rectify, setting an example of how Maoist ideology can transform people and organizations. All of us have been warned of things that go on in NYC when we first began comradely relations with them, and we made the error of thinking that these warnings were only opportunism. Time has proven that they were more than that, and we sincerely self-criticize for our inability to detect the truth of the matter far sooner. In regard to the other branches, they must not let their honest and principled revolutionary work conceal a clique of men who will hide behind them in order to deflect criticism and fuel their own agenda that essentially postpones dealing with predators and uses the excuse of protecting leadership's economic positions. We call upon revolutionaries to bombard the headquarters and throw out the capitalist roaders in key positions. Do not let our colors change, lest we become our opposite.

We proceed modestly in hopes that our example is taken up and in good faith that genuine Maoists will engage in fierce line struggles that allow us to set improved standards of gender practice among the left. Together we will build the party; we will combat the chauvinism in the movement and seek better standards for communist organizations. This struggle is not over. It is just the beginning, and missteps now will topple us before our long march to victory. Marxism holds that true change develops from ruptures and crisis. This holds true for all things. Our commitment is to the people, to our friends, and to our comrades who struggle on. Long live Marxism-Leninism-Maoism!

Become revolutionary communists!

Build the party, build up the Red Guards!

—Red Guards Austin, April 3, 2016

9. RGLA: STATEMENT ON DISSOCIATION FROM THE NCP-LC

April 5, 2016 (<http://redguardsla.org/post/142300004599/statement-on-dissociation-from-the-new-communist>)

As a collective, Red Guards- Los Angeles is committed to developing our understanding of proletarian feminism, and to combating all manifestations of patriarchy and male chauvinism, especially where they appear within ourselves, our collective, and our movement.

Our own process of criticism/self-criticism, and the welcomed criticisms from other collectives associated with us, have illuminated these tendencies within our organization, have helped us to identify their sources, and have led us to embark on the path of rectifying these tendencies within our organization and its membership.

As part of our struggle against patriarchy, and the broader struggle associated with our political development as a group, we have concluded it is necessary for us to sever ties with the New Communist Party- Liaison Committee (NCP-LC), due to persistent engagement in patriarchal behavior, intraorganizational secrecy, and extreme liberalism regarding the rectification of these errors among key members and a central organization in the LC apparatus.

This decision was reached by our collective after months of struggling with the New York-branch of the NCP-LC over our concerns, and what we perceive to be an inadequate path moving forward to address them. In the coming days we will release a document that further details our criticisms of the New York-branch and the NCP-LC more generally. This document will also begin work towards a path for rectification by which we could envision future unity with the comrades in New York, much of whose work we still hold in high regard. But we found it important to release a statement immediately expressing our intentions.

Our criticisms are primarily focused around three issues:

- 1) Failure to effectively isolate a known patriarchal abuser from revolutionary spaces, endangering all women and non-men in our movement
- 2) The ensuing secrecy, lies, and omissions surrounding this situation, both publicly and to other organizations within the NCP-LC
- 3) Persistent unwillingness to rectify these patriarchal behaviors, or to address the errors in leadership that allow them to propagate so rampantly in their spaces

While the unification of advanced forces in the fight for proletarian revolution is an historical necessity, some circumstances require ruptures and disunity to push forward the process of building a genuine revolutionary party: due to the aforementioned criticisms, we believe these to be such circumstances, and therefore our commitment to building the party also dictates that we split from an organization and a mode of organizing that is detrimental to that process.

The establishment of a party-building apparatus independent of the NCP-LC will create opportunities for new political alliances and sites of struggle, and we welcome all revolutionary organizations in the United States to join us in this effort, join us in our revolutionary obligation to smash patriarchy everywhere that it exists, and join us in our historical task of building the Party!

In Struggle and Solidarity,

Red Guards - Los Angeles

10. Saint Louis Unites With the Red Guards

April 6, 2016 (<https://docs.google.com/document/d/1Exb3iPtyYzNTE5mvt8ZuYAsRvxu8DFX62U1HWDbJJUY/edit>)

The Liaison Committee for a New Communist Party (henceforth NCP-LC) was a group that I, a Marxist-Leninist-Maoist in the Saint Louis area, was definitely interested in and extremely proactive in struggling for unity with on a political and ideological basis since when the National Liaison contacted me in December, 2015, asking had I ever heard of the NCP-LC. I had already been in contact with various individuals (most of whom are in Austin, Kansas City, and Los Angeles), supporting and being members of this group, and I greatly admired and supported their work. The fact that the NCP-LC branch located in New York City had arrogated for itself the leadership of Maoist struggle in the United States also served to lead me to struggle for unity with them, being impressed as a political novice and one who had, at the time, just recently come to recognize the correctness of MLM from my experiences with members of other tendencies and study. I was simply anxious to apply myself to the historic work of building the party, and was overanxious to unite with those who, after reading the polemic from comrades in Red Guards, Austin, I should not have sought unity with. This I self criticize for. I should have done sufficient and thorough investigation, spoken and listened to comrades who had experience with members of NYC clique and their broader circle, not have been liberal and naive, afraid to antagonize and upset people and ask open questions, wanting to remain on good terms with everybody. Party building without two line struggle means that there is no unity and there can be no party. There can be a dogmatist-sectarian, revisionist cult centered around one or two aloof and distant “great men” halfway across the country, but no living party, certainly not a Maoist one. The leadership in party building efforts has passed from the hands of the bankrupt NCP-LC in New York to the Red Guard comrades in Austin and those in Los Angeles who are in the process of rectifying bad practice, whose efforts helped drew me to the parasitic and opportunistic NCP-LC in the first place. In this two line struggle, I fully unite with the true rebels and look forward to struggling for unity in the historic work of building a revolutionary party through mass work, led by revolutionary collectives guided by Marxist-Leninist-Maoist theory and practice.

GENDER PRACTICE/MISHANDLING OF OFFENDERS:

The most pressing and glaring issue, obviously, is that of the handling of the toxic and dangerous Freddy Bastone and the patriarchy run amok in New York City branch. which was covered excellently in the Austin paper. Blatant dishonesty, lying to the masses and to supporters like myself regarding him, allowing him access to online spaces when non-men are present, grievously mishandling the problem out of liberalism and self interest and keeping on good terms with those who behave like and are enemies of the people, are indefensible, especially from “proletarian feminists”. People who do such as this, and refuse to rectify and correct their extremely bad practice, are simply unqualified to lead any party building project at any level. To go against the interests of women and non-men out of liberalism, and compounding this by lying to supporters, the masses, and comrades, again shows incompetence to lead any LC, and I certainly will not unite with such people. To do so would be to spit in the face of proletarian women and non men, who make up half of the masses, hold up more than half of the sky and hold down more than half the work in society as a whole and in the communist struggle especially and whose leadership we must accept. We can't do without these comrades! To non-men comrades in NYC branch who have to deal with this behavior on a constant basis and have suffered from the right opportunist, misogynist, rape culturist line on gender practice and isolating abusers, you have my utmost and most communist solidarity. To hide things from the masses and from the people places one on the revisionist and capitalist road. To obfuscate, mysticise and play down situations is Deng Xiaoping, Liu Shaoqi, Nikita Khrushchev style treason to the masses and to comrades. Eternal shame and hot coals on the heads of those that engage in this and see nothing wrong, and refuse to rectify their behavior. I seek to be a proletarian feminist, a servant to the people, and a communist, a Marxist Leninist Maoist in essence as well as in form, and have taken measures to internally change my own backwards and poor gender practice in the past and struggle within myself to eradicate bourgeois, backwards styles of thinking and work in regards to the masses of non-men and comrades. I actively seek and ask for criticism from non-men comrades and the masses in rectifying behavior. When I see backwards gender practice or behavior in my own work or circle locally, I criticize it sharply. To do less is not consistent with Maoist practice. Marxism-Leninism-Maoism in the United States and in the world owes too much to those who are not men, to throw them under

the bus simply will not do. *To refuse to accept sharp criticism and leadership from non-men comrades, playing it down and making light of these situations is not Maoist. Criticism is a gift that improves our collective work, to refuse or only accept part of it means to fundamentally express the wish to no longer really be involved in work! To refuse to rectify when several comrades raise issues and demand self-criticism is to express the wish to no longer be involved in party building work! Down with right opportunism and the ghosts and monsters' boys club! Down with those who refuse to accept criticism and leadership from the non-men comrades that hold up more than half the sky!*

NEGLECT OF SUPPORTERS, DEVELOPMENT, AND BUILDING STRUGGLE ACROSS THE COUNTRY:

After contacting me in regards to the NCP-LC, the individual that was the National Liaison in December, 2015 said nothing else. No check up on the work in Saint Louis, no criticism, no guidance, no offers of assistance, no interest in development, no anything. This is an odd "liaison" and "Maoist". This he attributed to a personal situation that he's been dealing with. I have not talked to this individual since January 14th, and news of the change in regards to the liaison/etc. came late. Supporters interested in affiliating with your organization and uniting with your efforts to build a party should not have to chase you down or ask others, some who aren't even in the NCP-LC, who is who and who does what. When somebody has a question, seeks criticism, has criticism, or anything else, you should be prompt in answering it, if you are a comrade and not a bored king that gets to things "when he feels like it", or places priority on their own local work in their own independent kingdom. This is extremely sloppy, liberal, bourgeois practice, and a Communist Party run with such practice would fall apart within weeks. I have had other supporters describe the behavior of certain highly placed New York NCP-LC people as "being on a high horse", secure and arrogant. I unite with this sentiment. This is not how a liaison acts, this is how a Czar or a self proclaimed "great man" acts. The strength of the party and the organization is from the masses, not from puffed up, wet paper tigers with Jupiter sized egos that treat comrades in other parts of the country as "junior partners", take supporters for granted, and see others' work as inferior and secondary or tertiary to their own local work. In regards to organizing efforts and building struggle with the mass organization in Saint Louis, Progressive Students Organization, of which I am Chairperson, most of the advice, assistance, and solidarity has come from comrades in Kansas City, Austin, Los Angeles, and Salt Lake City. I have talked seriously to exactly two comrades from New York City, receiving decent criticism and advice regarding the work in Saint Louis. But this still pales in comparison to others. If you're a Liaison Committee and people from other revolutionary left formations and other NCP-LC members are better at reaching out to, criticizing, and helping your supporters than you are, you have a problem! *I unite with the rebels who refuse to accept the bad leadership, if it can even be called leadership, of the patriarchal, practically incompetent yet still arrogant NYC clique that opportunistically saps and takes credit for the work of revolutionary formations across the country after struggle has been waged and into which they have put no work themselves. This is not service to the people. This is a clique of right opportunist ghosts and monsters usurping leadership and using the people. Not worthy of unity, and not a liaison committee!*

MOVING FORWARD:

I uphold Marxism-Leninism-Maoism, and unite with those who genuinely seek to do the same. We must build the revolutionary vanguard party guided by the revolutionary theory and practice of Marxism Leninism Maoism. We must build revolutionary mass organizations to struggle in the student, anti-police, anti-gentrification international solidarity, labor, and anti-war movements that are guided and initiated by revolutionary Marxist-Leninist-Maoist collectives. We must establish firm links with and depend on the masses, as Chairman Mao taught us so long ago. We must build unity and establish correct lines through principled and constant unity-struggle-unity and application of the mass line. We must build up Red Guard and Serve the People type collectives in as many cities as possible, and establish links of support and solidarity on a basis of organizational equality. It is obvious that the NYC led NCP-LC is not willing, not able, and not qualified to lead this process. Illusions must be cast away, and struggle must be prepared for. The forces of fascist reaction and capitalism are uniting, as they sharpen their swords, we must sharpen our own. Games, jokes, and frivolity

must be done away with. Unity without struggle, unity for unity's sake, is a joke, and a disservice to the people. Refusal to rectify, cop-outs, refusal to accept criticism as the gift from one comrade to another to improve our work is a game, a plaything. Treating others' work and struggles as inferior to your own, or isolating/ignoring errant comrades and discussing comrades' errors in secret amongst yourselves to maintain a false unity instead of making open criticism is a game. We can't afford this, not if we really want to build a party, fight for national liberation for New Afrikan, indigenous and Chicano people, seize the time, and make revolution! - C.W.

Long Live Marxism-Leninism-Maoism!

Build the Party! Seize the Time!

Long live the Red Guards! To rebel is justified!

Dynamite at the Throne: A Summation from the Philadelphia “Branch” of the NCP-(LC)

The summation provided by the Philadelphia branch of the Liaison Committee for a New Communist Party (NCP-LC) must start by clearing the air of any remaining confusion or doubt about the nature of this so-called branch. To begin, there’s is no such thing as a single-person branch, so there will be no usage of a royal “we” to describe what is the experience of one individual except in reference to activity in an affiliated mass organization. A branch must contain a minimum of three people to have any remote semblance of democracy or centralism. I would not even call myself a cadre. A cadre is a member of an immediate regional collective that can carry out democracy and centralism towards at least one area of mass work. A cadre collective must be training, guiding, and disciplining each other. They must be engaging in thought reform and collective study together. Individuals must be accountable to one another, and existing within as intimate of a physical setting as possible. There was no such collective, therefore there was no such thing as Philadelphia branch except in the minds of a few people. My task was to build this collective, ostensibly from within a mass org that I had been a leader of since its inception, Revolutionary Student Coordinating Committee - Philadelphia (RSCC-PHL). Instead I remained what Lenin would probably consider a “foolish victim of deception and self-deception.”¹

My summation will necessarily be short and probably not very satiating for the reader. This is mostly due to the fact that I was only a member for 5 months. I was never able to advance from the stage of perceptual knowledge of the NCP-LC into the leap of conceptual knowledge of the NCP-LC (henceforth simply “LC”). The extent of my participation was a few national coordinating calls, a small contribution to an internal bulletin, a contribution towards a blog statement, editing the branch manual to use gender-neutral pronouns instead of exclusively male pronouns, trying to mediate disputes between LC members and Red Guards Austin (RGA), but mostly trying to hand-pick individuals in RSCC-PHL that I deemed “cadre material.” It must be noted that in my eagerness to complete the latter task, what ended up happening was attempted “cadrefication” of a mass org which has historically

¹ <https://www.marxists.org/archive/lenin/works/1913/mar/x01.htm>

ended in disaster. This process resulted in ideological, physical, and emotional strife that has beat down largely petty-bourgeois students more often than it seems to have built them up into potential servants of the proletariat. This summation itself will not replace the immense self-criticism I owe my comrades in the revolutionary student movement. Many of us did and still do have a real burning desire to link up with genuine proletarian movements, to embed ourselves in their struggles and to act as their insurgents to smash the ivory tower and liberate ideas to be used as weapons. The shaking off of the LC has rid the revolutionary student movement of an unnecessary burden and freed us to pursue that task.

“The class struggle, made historical fact and not theoretical assertion, is reflected in feminist terms. Women, like men, are reactionary, centrist, or revolutionary.”

- José Carlos Mariátegui

It is only now that I realize I was a token. Not for any single reason, but several enticing ones for the NYC branch (which is the one who heavily courted me in particular, I had very little informal interaction with the KC or LA branches.) For a communist organization in a patriarchy crisis, a transfemme figurehead is an excellent tool to temporarily flatten gender contradictions in your own branches and mass organizations, even for RSCC-NYC that was approaching or had reached the lauded “gender parity.” This phrase is a joke when a number of gender-nonconforming RSCC members were afraid to come out and sought counsel from the women and trans people in our region. They were also not worthy to boastfully claim this phrase when an anti-patriarchy gender struggle ends up ripping the entire formation and its central mass orgs apart in a matter of days when women and trans comrades placed it in its rightful prominence as an antagonistic contradiction in these conditions. RSCC-NYC has openly revolted against all former LC members and the boy’s club clique, many of the recent recruits didn’t even know that their student movement chapter even had a parent organization. In RSCC-PHL, line struggle over issues of domestic & sexual partner abuse spilled out in the open and decimated the chapter, certainly due to very weak internal democracy. I am not certain to what extent this reverberated in Kansas City & Los Angeles. Only honest and open

summations from those branches can reveal to what extent this played out internally and why.

I can claim no innocence in any of this. At one point the leader of the Student Fraction of the NYC-LC branch, Tafadar Sourov, actually badjacketed a member of RSCC-NYC to me, who I had clearly seen as someone who was most likely not cisgender. It turns out that she was no snitch at all and did indeed come out as trans, she just obviously hadn't been eager to ride with the boy's club on all matters to gain their stamp of approval. They read her as a man and treated her as a man. When she came out, it was easy to just claim ignorance and offer support from that point forward. This is actually systematic de-transitioning (it should require no explanation that she knew well before being open about it,) and I could have stopped it. Instead I took the rightist line and did not expose this disgusting practice out of fear of losing the acceptance they had granted me. Another gender-variant RSCC member was initially dismissed as an "internet Maoist" but has actually been embedding themselves in many local struggles in their region (and was subsequently recruited after this was proven and vetting could begin.) Machismo blind spots mistook humility for weakness. As mentioned earlier, members in the Philly chapter of RSCC would often be reached out to by many women and trans members from NYC to vent their frustrations and seek counsel, which we willingly obliged. In retrospect, my own efforts to aid them were no doubt fueled in part by guilt I had over many similar situations of me enabling the boy's club leadership out of cowardice.

"We must practice revolutionary democracy in every aspect of our Party life. Every responsible member must have the courage of [their] responsibilities, exacting from others a proper respect for [their] work and properly respecting the work of others. Hide nothing from the masses of our people. Tell no lies. Expose lies whenever they are told. Mask no difficulties, mistakes, failures. Claim no easy victories . . ."

- Amilcar Cabral

Recruiting me was also a good look for the LC to be able to present the appearance of gaining wider regional hegemony within the revolutionary

student movement in the northeast. The problem is that this has to be real. It has to be demonstrable before the masses, yet most of our boldest and most noteworthy initiatives in this area of work occurred *before* my personal integration with the LC, not after. Since that time we stopped focusing primarily on rocking the universities with spectacular actions and instead pursued a long-term vision of base-building and linking up with, and being subordinate to, the real proletarian struggle. I still stand by this pivot in orientation, and it is in no small part due to dialogue with my former LC comrades. However everyone is still grasping in the dark as we chart this unfamiliar course, and we have no guarantee of success. We've been successful in pulling revisionist organizations we are in united fronts with a tad bit towards the left, but other than that, we have been left staggering. For my part though, I'm perfectly content with the universal dialectical materialist truth that external factors are only the conditions of change, and it is up to us to drive our own internal contradictions forward to overcome all obstacles. In the revolutionary student movement here, we have more experience turning setbacks and repression into weapons to advance our own cause more than anything else. However I cannot deny that my stubborn association & loyalty to the LC was indeed one of those setbacks. This is not to say that my relationship with the LC before and during membership was entirely bad. There were some very good comrades that I learned a great deal from, who taught me new ways of thinking and helped transform myself and others into Maoists. I will cherish our relationships forever and look forward to uniting with them again in the future. Some I held in very high regard and whom I now know to be absolute fucking bastards. Nevertheless from the point of membership status forward, while some good advice was transmitted through me, so were the very negative and secretive styles of work.

People have been hammering LC for its pathetic handling of gender contradictions pretty much forever. Online posts from RGA members in particular that attempted to expose this further had recently caused quite a stir. Them and countless others have been helping to usher in the external conditions for all of this to come to a head and lead us to the point where we are today. In fact, I welcomed the external pressure on us in the hopes that it would create more favorable conditions to force line struggle on the matter internally. I would also be the one to bring forth the allegations of sexual assault against Tafadar that were revealed to us by RSCC-NYC members. When it was mentioned in the beginning of a national conference call the

very next day that he was being considered for promotion to branch leader, I interjected with this information immediately. It turned out that this actually not new information to anyone in NYC-LC at all. The (former) NYC branch leader appeared flabbergasted and expressed shock as he understood these allegations to have been “dealt with” before. I’m still not sure if he was really that stupid or if this was the fallout from an intentional cover-up, but a national investigation process to look into a possible cover-up was initiated right away, only to be cut short by the dissociation of Red Guards - Los Angeles (RGLA). I’m inclined to think it was a bit of both on his part, after all he was part of a clique of inflated egos who seem to prefer Machiavelli to Mao in handling contradictions. This is not even a joke, it is fashionable among some of them to post realpolitik toughguy quotes online which does indeed reflect a preference for cold calculation and blackmail in dealing with interpersonal matters rather than anything that resembles Maoist practice. These styles of work were picked up by opportunists in RSCC-PHL as well, contributing significantly towards internal distrust and antagonism. Communists should never adopt this kind of empty posturing, the masses can and did pop these balloons in a split second.

In reading many criticisms toward the former national liaison officer and NYC boy’s club all-star Khalil Vasquez, who NYC-LC has also put under investigation for abusive gender practice², it seems that I am quite a rare case. After roughly over a year of open support for the LC and leading efforts in the building of a functional student-oriented mass organization, I was finally reached out to for “the conversation.” He was friendly, cordial and direct as I had always known him to be in person. He gave me a few documents and talked to me for a couple hours, and so I was then a member. But in light of what other collectives and individuals have repeatedly insisted, this was indeed a particular occurrence and probably due in no small part to the fact that I was only a bus ride away. This is also to say nothing of his online practice, and second-hand accounts of his interpersonal practice, of which I can only echo RSCC-NYC member’s accounts confided to me and RGA’s masterful polemic.³ My story is often one of being treated very kindly by all these men who have been revealed to be horrifically abusive and predatory

² <https://www.facebook.com/NCPLCMLM/posts/1134034239982672>

³ <https://docs.google.com/document/d/1mYxGhudlgDP-43tBqmsl2Fsoxufam0LeK-P88nnfVJg/edit#>

to the women in their immediate surroundings. However at the time of this writing many of these allegations are “pending investigation”, which I can understand the necessity of, but at the same time loathed to participate in as I was personally receiving the cries for help from survivors and witnessing their rage spill out in the open. Do we need to investigate whether or not the sun rose yesterday too?

This also necessarily raises some points regarding fights that I was enlisted for without my knowledge that I should and very much could have been primed on beforehand. Yes, this means the struggle to isolate the well-known & well-documented terrorizer of women Freddy Bastone.⁴ I’ve been lied to and deceived and told so many different things about this guy from people I was supposed to trust, at this point I’m relying on the facts as they appear and my intuition. What I was told over time roughly unfurled as this: he was never a member of LC, then it was clarified he was a member-but-also-not-member of LC without democratic rights pending rectification, then kicked out of LC upon refusal to rectify, but somehow this all still meant he was never a member. The guy had more mysterious forms than the triune God itself. So while they variously claimed they never associated with him anymore and he was out of the picture, he then would pop up in pictures repeatedly on social media with (at the time) LC & RSCC-NYC leaders, freely comment on their social media statuses, participate intimately with them in political events as recent as 2015, and continued to appear at their personal social gatherings to this date. Despite the obvious and against what should have been my better judgment, I (very mistakenly) trusted that my comrades on the ground knew better and believed in their repeated insistence that maneuvers to isolate him were on the way soon. This example set forth led to huge errors in dealing with a similar situation here (although on a much smaller scale.) I have not been permitted by the survivor to provide further information and regrettably but respectfully must omit the details here, but the end result has been a similar failure to isolate the individual that needed to be. This fact itself speaks to the level of our own ignorance and the painful consequences that come with this work when you fail. It is also representative of the weakness of the organized communist movement in general, as none of this is even unique to our former fledgling MLM formation. Until we gain the trust of the masses, with vigilance and personal transformation through mass line

⁴ <http://pastebin.com/4SxLCsfh>

practice, fusing revolutionary science with the ideas and initiative of the proletariat and their allies, we will continue to learn from negative example.

“If we have shortcomings, we are not afraid to have them pointed out and criticized, because we serve the people. Anyone, no matter who, may point out our shortcomings. If [they] are right, we will correct them. If what [they propose] will benefit the people, we will act upon it.”

-Mao Zedong

There was also no criticism from the leadership other branches of the practice of its fellow LC comrade in Philadelphia and the mass organization I was working in. They did not inquire at any point and so if they ever took note of what was going on it was through social media. NYC leadership (who I often reached out to since they ran a branch which principally does student work too) gave out advice only upon my insistence. If the rest of leadership were ever taking me seriously, they rarely fulfilled their duty of honestly criticizing my work which is an absolute necessity for every revolutionary communist. They had 5 months to do so. My efforts engaging with them felt like it was mostly spent trying to learn the theoretical language required to be respected when speaking to these men in leadership before I could begin to line struggle with them. But it was not always like this, at one point the final national liaison officer (who had replaced the previously notoriously unresponsive one and was indeed a remarkable improvement to his predecessor in fulfilling his duties extremely promptly and with great diligence at the national level) did challenge me to write for a blog piece. I refused at first and considered the idea ridiculous out of my nervousness, the result of a level of intimidation that came from a feeling of incompetency in comparison to these important men who were leaders in real branches with real cadre (with the exception of Kansas City, where there was no real branch as I have defined it but is the site of an increasingly strong revolutionary communist movement.) I quickly reversed my position and contributed what ended up in a larger piece as a small and mostly poetic cry for help to other women and gender-nonconforming people in a desperate effort to convince them to perhaps join our ranks and strengthen the genuine proletarian

feminist line struggle. They did struggle and smash patriarchal line and the entire LC itself to dust, and did so from outside of our ranks just fine.

The phrase “proletarian feminist” must be clarified again as a theory which is still developing, and therefore often liable as any other to be used as a weapon by men to beat other men over the head with rather than as a weapon for proletarian feminists. In the LC, it simply could not be the latter. There were some earnest efforts by men to step down and follow revolutionary women and gender-nonconforming people, which should be pursued with great urgency – we have a greater material interest in revolution and against revisionism than they do, period.

In the end I feel that at this time I am practically and intellectually incapable of fully addressing what successes or errors I have contributed to in the revolutionary student movement and which of those were attributable to the LC and which were in spite of the LC. Any bad directives followed, harmful methods of work, insufficient struggle against counterrevolutionary lines, enabling of abusers, and all the damaging consequences that I facilitated are attributable to my own incompetence. It is also unfair to completely paint the LC, even the NYC branch, with a single brush which even the fiercest polemics have avoided. In any case the struggle ahead for them to rectify & carry forward is immense, and they will not regain my trust for quite some time until I see the work.

Corruption is always coupled with dissent, and in this case it was the dissent that became the decisive factor that finally tore the LC to shreds. In the final days, it was incumbent upon me to outwardly declare a side, and resigning is the only clearly correct decision I ever made. My own process of introspection will be ongoing and only fully come to light with new practice and new qualitative leaps in understanding, along with vigilant criticism from my comrades locally and abroad. Although the LC was a small project of a small group of people, I am filled with optimism and hope in the face of the overwhelming power among the people within its orbit that upended the very foundation of what was not exactly a burning house, but something far more dangerous, an abusive home that covered its windows with red curtains.



12. Statement on the Status of the Former NCP-LC New York City Branch:

(<https://www.facebook.com/NCPLCMLM/posts/1140831002636329>)

The collective that was the New York City branch of the New Communist Party - Liaison Committee (NYC-LC) is no longer what it once was. Prior to the statement published by the Red Guards Austin (RGA) at the beginning of this month, we were an organization operating with a democratic centralist practice among various mass organizations and coalitions in the New York City area, and shared a certain level of ties with other cadre organizations under the LC banner nationally. In this abstract form, those of us who are signatories to this statement continue to uphold the practice of developing a disciplined political organization of cadre who seek to develop strong ties with the working and oppressed people around us, and with similar cadre organizations nationally and internationally.

With any form of political organization there emerges within it a structure of leadership, regardless of whether it is formally recognized or not. In our practice of democratic centralism, we had a clearly defined leadership with whom we, the signatories below, have now severed ties. The reason to part ways is largely due to the reaction of the former leadership to the recent collapse of both the NCP-LC and a large portion of the New York City Revolutionary Student Coordinating Committee (RSCC). We feel their reaction represents within them a rightist deviation that not only refuses to acknowledge errors in their general leadership practice, but also refuses to acknowledge the existence of patriarchal tendencies of superiority and entitlement.

After the publication of RGA's criticism, the former leadership failed to recognize the extent of the damage that was caused by a style of leadership that utilized bully tactics and a lack of transparency to stifle dissent and keep both mass and cadre membership in various states of political underdevelopment. It is clear this was done in order to maintain a relationship of dominance. It is this reason that they resort to crude, opportunistic snitch-jacketing accusations when trying to digest the full scope of which over four years of political work was lost -- of their, and by extension our own doing. Regardless of any lip service the organization paid to Proletarian Feminism, reconcilable patriarchal practices lied at the foundation of its work. It was the continued refusal to reconcile these practices, whether it was done overtly or subtly, consciously or unconsciously, that allowed the internal contradictions of these patriarchal practices to sharpen to an antagonistic level.

A prime example of this process was found in the possible act of former leadership Khalil and Taffy to crash the gender struggle session during this crucial conjuncture. To provide a background, Taffy had been placed under investigation for allegations of patriarchal misconduct prior to the publication of RGA's criticism. At the same time, he and the branch leader of the NYC-LC, Ateo, were placed under investigation for the potential cover up of the events leading to these allegations. This was a process of investigation that was started in conjunction with the national branches located in Los Angeles, Philadelphia, and Kansas City. Not only was the objective to this investigation to uncover the truth around the initial accusation and the possible cover up, and to subsequently implement whatever justice deemed necessary by the parties involved, survivors and lead investigators (whom for NYC were Toussaint and Anais) included, but there was a secondary objective of establishing the initial framework for how these incidents can be properly handled in the future. Under the terms of this investigation, Taffy was instructed to cease all mass political activity, not engage in any form of contact pertaining to his roles as leadership in RSCC or in the NYC-LC student fraction, not to engage in contact with any of his former partners, and was not to intervene in any activities relating directly or indirectly to the investigation. Likewise, on the day RGA published their criticism, allegations began to emerge against Khalil, who was immediately suspended pending investigation on the same terms as Taffy.

Moving forward a few days from the publication of RGA's criticism, word began to circulate among RSCC membership that the two of them had begun contacting mass members, stating that the shakeup in RSCC stemming from the dissolution of the LC and the questions that event raised was being caused by State infiltrators. Furthermore, it was stated by credible sources in RSCC that the two of them planned on intervening in the Gender Struggle Session planned by RSCC on April 10 by locking everyone in the room and demanding that a full investigation into the allegations brought against them be conducted on the spot.

This is a gross demonstration of patriarchal entitlement if there ever was one. Not only did they choose to violate directives issued by the organization they claimed to have principle unity and upheld democratic centralism with, but they arrogantly assumed they could strong-arm a political solution to save themselves from

the public disgrace that was already inescapable to them. They believed that by snitch-jacketing people they could divert attention from their own patriarchal tendencies. They are an archetype of men in denial of their own fall from a political high horse, grasping at straws to try and save themselves on the way down.

We would like to make a point about the process of investigation, its abandonment, and NYC-LC's deferral to the decision and judgement made by RSCC-NYC on the status of Taffy and Khalil's membership in the organization. There is a correct aspect to the claims that no proper investigation was carried out to determine the innocence or guilt of Khalil, Taffy, or the former NYC-LC branch leader. And in the abstract it is a mistake to simply expel comrades from organizations on the basis of mere suspicion or accusations alone. However, their expulsion from RSCC and our collective did not occur in isolation of their behavior as leadership in the run up to their suspensions. The fact that the allegations were brought against them was only the proverbial 'icing on the cake.' Their leadership as a whole has since been brought under heavy criticism by the mass membership of RSCC, particularly from women and non-men comrades, in that Taffy and Khalil fostered an environment where dissenting lines against the leadership's were regularly ridiculed and dismissed out of hand, where women comrades in particular were held to a higher standard of expectation to learn political theory in both speed and depth, and where women comrades in particular were consistently underestimated and dismissed in their capacity to act politically. This created an environment of doubt, mistrust and fear within the organization which, when the internal contradictions came to their boiling point, made a proper investigation impossible. In other words, while it is unfortunate that a thorough investigation did not take place, the contradictions fostered by the very people under investigation negated the possibility of one being carried out in the first place. These cases and investigation process should not be looked upon with bourgeois legality or moralistic measures.

The other issue to be addressed is the one relating to the relationship of NYC-LC to the patriarchal abuser, Freddy Bastone. As it is already out in the open, Freddy's mother is a labor union shop steward in NYC, and so the decision to maintain a certain level of communication with him was based on using this connection to get cadre a way into the union. This is an issue that was debated internally prior to some of the signatories' involvement in the organization, but the topic of Freddy's actions and the ongoing relationship maintained for the sake of union salting is one that came up over and over. There was a conscious effort to keep Freddy in the dark about the internal strategy of the NYC-LC, even using lies and misdirection to keep his continual prying into mass work at bay. By no means was he in regular communication with the NYC-LC body as a whole, and in fact many of us had no contact with him whatsoever. The NYC-LC relationship with Freddy was mediated through the former NYC-LC leadership.

This, of course, is no excuse from guilt on our part. Rather than seeing the situation for what it was, and struggling against the labor strategy line internally to the point of there being either an earlier split or the complete isolation of Freddy from the NYC-LC, it's mass work (including facebook), and the mass organizations around us, we allowed the opportunist, "deal with the devil" line win out in practice. As it was stated in previous statements, our rectification on this serious error can only be carried out in practice. We hold no illusions that a whimsy statement will correct what was done wrong on our part, and so we will make no attempt to absolve ourselves in that way at this time. Only when we feel we have rebuilt the trust of women and non-men comrades necessary for a meaningful rectification will we make such a statement.

Finally, and as this relates to the opening of this statement, we are openly criticizing the former NYC-LC branch leader Ateo for the following:

1) An opportunist lack of engagement with the remainder of the collective during this crucial conjuncture.

Regardless of the fact that they were voted out of their leadership position during this political struggle, this does not absolve them from the responsibilities to engage with the organization in good faith and according to the will of the majority. In this regard they have failed, and have also failed in publishing a public statement of their own as former NYC-LC branch leader on the events that unfolded this month, as they were instructed to do so by the collectivity.

2) The opportunist propagation of the state intervention red-herring line along with Taffy and Khalil

In truth, it is likely that there were/are infiltrators by the state or other organizations due to the level of public visibility the Revolutionary Student Coordinating Committee achieved through the years of political campaigns the organization was involved in. RSCC was and still is no friend to the US Imperialist government, Zionists, and the bourgeois class as a whole, and for this reason is a prime target for infiltration. However, the time they

the three of these men are choosing to highlight this issue is very convenient in trying to misdirect attention from their own patriarchal tendencies. This is nothing but shameful opportunism in an effort to save face.

3) The continued refusal to see the situation for what it is

It is true that Ateo was better with their own gender practice, and they continue to protect people harmed directly or indirectly by Freddy Bastone. However, in the process of this crisis they have expressed to the present leadership of the collective an understanding of the situation that is irreconcilable with all we have written above. We feel they propagate the red-herring, snitch-jacketing line because they refuse to let go of the labor strategy, knowing that openly trying to isolate Freddy will result in great difficulties of even getting work as a booked union member. Personal safety is also at risk here, and we are willing to work with the former comrade and his loved ones in ensuring their safety. However, we must take the hard line here and say that any protection must come on the terms of the abandonment of the labor strategy as it relies on the connections of Freddy Bastone and his mother. If the former comrade wants to discuss this further, they know to whom they should reach out.

4) The operation of former leadership as a faction

As more information is being revealed through statements from individuals and groups formerly associated with the LC, the former NYC branch leadership appear to have operated as their own faction. This is shown through their concealment of important pieces information from the general membership. Any revolutionary organization which aims to practice the principles of Democratic Centralism must be open with political information so that the organization's body is fully equipped to make democratic decisions. There was trust by the general membership to the leadership that information was being communicated, and this turns out to not have been the case.

For the above reasons the NYC-LC branch is no more. As it was said in previously released statements, we are continuing to operate as a loose collectivity of comrades dedicated to building the Party and making revolution in the United States of America. We are focused on rebuilding the trust with the mass membership we've worked with in the past, and developing a means by which we can meaningfully rectify the opportunist engagement with the NYC-LC labor strategy (and our practice in general) in a way that we are accountable to women, non-men, and fellow Maoists. In the interest of self-criticism in the near future we will also address RGA's criticisms in a more thorough statement. Those of us involved in issuing this statement are signing it with our cadre names - the last time we will use these names in any capacity.

Red Salute to our comrades and to our former comrades whom we've lost through this struggle.

- Toussaint, Laura, Forge, Anais

13. MCG: ON SELF-CRITICISM AND PARTY BUILDING

April 23, 2016 (<http://www.signalfire.org/2016/04/23/on-self-criticism-and-party-building/>)

“As for criticism, do it in good time; don’t get into the habit of criticizing only after the event.”

—Mao, On the Question of Agricultural Co-operation

These past weeks have seen numerous statements of regret by organizations and individuals formerly associated with the now-defunct NCP-LC. However, the weapon of self-criticism in the Maoist sense is not a belated statement of regret.

Materialist self-criticism must be understood as one aspect of a dialectic whose other term is *criticism*. It is criticism that links genuine self-criticism with the real movement. Grasped unilaterally, self-criticism becomes a sterile form of *confession*.

The criticism/self-criticism dialectic qualitatively determines a process (= a system of contradictions) as a *process of self-criticism* when it becomes principal in relation to secondary contradictions. When the state project of the proletariat in the mass movement stalls, then systematization of experience – theory – can become principal in the movement of knowledge defined by the dialectical movement practice-theory-practice. The becoming-principal of the criticism/self-criticism dialectic is in this way itself prescribed by its links with practice – that is, with the real process whose rational synthesis is concentrated in the moment of criticism.

The Maoist Communist Group (then the NCP-OC) summed up the problem of patriarchy in March 2014 in the form of a self-criticism that was at the same time a criticism of the minority fraction of four men that had split to form the LC.

We published our criticism two years ago. No one can credibly feign ignorance of the problems that it addressed. At the same time, the ultimate failure of the LC was not principally determined by the gender contradiction, but rather by the party-building process as the LC conceived it (although it should go without saying that the gender contradiction is the principal contradiction *in the conjuncture*).¹ This conception continues to be shared by certain of the organizations and individuals that – correctly – have split from and criticized the ex-LC for its harboring of male chauvinists. They fail to grasp a simple truth: unity can only result from ideological struggle around summations of protracted sequences of real interventions in concrete struggles with clear material stakes against specific class enemies.²

The minority fraction that formed the LC had split after the OC rejected two of its proposals:

(1) *for unprincipled unity*: to bring as many Maoist small groups as possible into the organization, materially laying the foundation for a federalist (apolitical, mass) conception of the party as a center where local activists converge;

(2) *for reintegration of male chauvinists*: to bring back two male chauvinists in two different cities who had previously been expelled from the organization for their patriarchal practices. One of these chauvinists, discussed at length in the documents linked below, was swiftly incorporated by the Maosoleum collective following his expulsion from the OC in June 2013.

The gender contradiction was the principal contradiction in the conjuncture (and what is more: antagonistic), in relation to which the two-line struggle over the question of building a Maoist party of a new type was secondary. At that time, it was necessary to resolve the gender contradiction – by summing up experience and then forcing an organizational split – in order to be able to begin the task of materially posing the question of the party.

The party as the leading core of the entire people does not yet exist, but in order to construct the party, we must make the *process* of the party live. It is our task as Maoists to systematize the orientation of the mass movement in a living fashion.

Our March 2014 criticism was a synthesis of practical experience with a view to advancing in the line of our strategic task: to fuse Maoism with the real movement, to bring forward the question of the party of the proletariat to the broad masses. Prior to the expulsion of the abusers and the departure of their protectors, the work of the organization was exhausted by internal struggles around issues of personal behavior divorced from

politics and the mass movement.

The summation on patriarchy was necessary in order to make an advance. At those moments when practice is stuck in ceaseless repetition, we must systematize our experience in order for the new to emerge. It was only after March 2014 that the MCG was able to clear the path to the question of a Marxist-Leninist-Maoist party of a new type by engaging in protracted sequences of mass work in concrete struggles with specific material stakes.

Our critique was decisively rejected both by the leadership of the LC and by its cultish acolytes on social media. The LC advanced its project of immediately incorporating as many individuals and collectives into its organization as possible. And yet, although our March 2014 document was well known and public, none of these collectives even once bothered to contact us to investigate the merits of the criticism we had elaborated.

Let there be no mistake about it: the moment for self-criticism demanded by our criticism was passed over by the LC and its supporters.

Meanwhile, the NYC LC engaged in spectacles divorced from concrete organization in the mass movement beyond the student front. Their work did not contribute in any way to the building of the party. Indeed, the LC conception of party building was marked by a classic 'leftist-rightist' deviation that proceeded from the forgetting of two symmetrical but opposed principles:

(1) *No self-proclamation of the party outside the masses.* We cannot exclude the proletariat and the masses from the party-building process. No 'party' outside of the historical processes among the broad masses, outside class reality. A party is not simply an apparatus. We must draw our force from our links to the real mass movement.

(2) *No liquidation of the question of the party in mass struggles.* The party centralizes mass struggles: it does not simply coordinate them. As soon as we think the party as a federation of struggles, as a convergence of social forces, then we are in fact negating Marxism, replacing the party of the proletariat constructed into a political class and the dictatorship of the proletariat with a mass party and a democratic-revolutionary mass politics.

A process of self-criticism, unlike a statement of regret, is fundamentally oriented towards the future. It must indicate the changes that it makes possible in the subsequent return to practice through the process of *rectification*. At present, rectification for the LC and its supporters must above all involve expelling male chauvinists in order to make possible an effort to build the party in the mass movement.

This party-building process will require constructing mass organizations led by communist cores on a number of fronts. It will also require intensive study of Marxist theory and history, which has been displaced on much of the Maoist left by petty-bourgeois identitarian moralizing of the college-student type that operates at a distant remove from dialectical materialism. Finally, it will require ideological struggle over public summations of experience both between and within small groups.

At the time of the split, we characterized the gender contradiction that divided our organization as antagonistic. To say that a contradiction is *antagonistic* is to say that its resolution entails the disappearance of one of its terms. We are thus glad that the LC has disintegrated. It is the task of all militants of good will to make sure that its legacy remains in the dustbin where it belongs.

MAOIST COMMUNIST GROUP

New York City

Endnotes

1 *Conjuncture* = the present moment grasped as a synthesis (i.e., systematization) of contradictions (primary, secondary, antagonistic, non-antagonistic).

2 Mao is clear that ideological struggle is the decisive instrument for guaranteeing unity within the class organization. Its absence can only yield a unity without principle: "We stand for *active ideological struggle* because it is the weapon for *ensuring unity* within the Party and the revolutionary organizations in the interest of our fight. Every Communist and revolutionary should take up this weapon. But liberalism rejects *ideological struggle* and stands for *unprincipled peace*, thus ... bringing about political degeneration in certain units and individuals in the Party and the revolutionary organizations." (Mao Tse-tung, "Combat Liberalism," in Selected Works, Vol. 2 (Peking, 1965), 31. Our emphasis.)

.....

14. MCG (Boston & Virginia): The externalization of the anti-revisionist struggle is the negation of proletarian politics

April 23, 2016

In reviewing the collapse of the LC, the MCG has come to the realization that there exist fundamental political differences within our own organization.

The NY Branch has sought to promote its initial admonitions against patriarchal behavior, issued in 2014 as the correct basis for resolving the contradictions that surfaced in the LC prior to its recent dissolution.¹

The branches in Boston and Virginia hold a fundamentally different position. Instead, we believe that the primary contradiction within the LC is internal to our grouping as well. A few members of the NY Branch suppressed discussion within the national organization on this matter. The prevention of internal debate has been justified by terming ideological struggle “excessively tedious,” and by saying it prevents “intervention in a timely way in a concrete situation,” presumably to communicate with the small group left following the dissolution of the LC. This argument violates the MCG’s stated emphasis on the primacy of mass work and principled ideological unity.² The NY unit has used bureaucratic maneuvers and other unprincipled tactics to suppress dissenting views. As a result, the VA and Boston branches are publishing a joint analysis of this situation, separate from New York’s.

Disagreements with NY revolve around the question of metaphysical purity. This is articulated along the lines of the male-female/mental-mental contradiction as the reflection of its material reproduction in thought. It is our view that NY is operating on the assumption that they possess the correct ideas congealed in a relatively static “class position,” which causes them to repeatedly foreclose on criticism and the key principle of unity-struggle-unity.

The position held by the NY Branch is fundamentally incompatible with communist politics, and continuously impedes the key task of furthering the democracy of the masses. This concept is elaborated in the following two quotes that emphasize the imperative of continual ideological revolutionization and struggle against the reproduction of the patriarchal-capitalist division of labor internal to communist organizations:

“That is why today it is of fundamental importance for the leap to the Party to recognize that there is no separation between cultural revolution in the metropolises and civil war, neither temporally (that is to say as two separate phases), or spatially. Civil war and cultural revolution are two aspects of the same process: the total social war. It is by placing that consideration at the center of the activity of the Party that the correct basis is established for the construction of the system of red power and at the same time the war for transition to communism is placed on the agenda.”

-Walter Alasia Column of the BR, 1983.³

“Internal to the capitalist mode of production, the technical division of labor appears within the relations of production as a political separation between manual and mental labor, which is identified with and polarized between different social figures who contend with one another for power. We must conduct an incessant battle against this separation, against its residue in every militant, in every site of politics, every variable of the proletarian system of power, until the appropriation of consciousness, mediation and mental processing, can be produced as necessary and recomposed steps of the daily practice of revolutionary transformation of the present state of things.

Our criticism towards militarism, that it surreptitiously reintroduces the separate forms, on one side of knowledge-power (politicians, theoreticians, spiritual fathers..) and on the other side the combatant executants (the fighters) is not tactical but involves the foundations of the metropolitan revolutionary process.

The expropriation of knowledge from the proletarians of the metropole is much deeper than a limited education, because it [knowledge] states a decisive condition of their subordination. Knowledge is opposed against them as power, command embodied in machines, command hierarchy, the rule of the

intellectuals and technicians and moreover the most perfidious form of the leadership of the ‘organic intellectuals’ and the ‘new political class.’

The reappropriation of knowledge is the result of revolutionary practice and no organization calling itself communist can underestimate it. The reconstruction of social individuals through the recomposition of their practice is not a problem to be solved in the future. It concerns us today and develops along with the process of revolutionary struggle, which transforms the objective world at the same time as it transforms those who carry out this transformation.

Communists and the development of communism are not two separate processes.”

–On A Discussion About “Subjectivism” and “Militarism” Palmi prisoners collective of the BR, 1980.4

THE SPLIT WITH THE LC: SECTARIAN HISTORICAL “RECONSTRUCTION” IN THE STRUGGLE FOR CLIQUE LEADERSHIP

The statement of the NY Branch of the MCG on the recent self-dissolution of the so called “Liaison Committee” is not a materialist analysis of the sequence of events in question. On the contrary, it is a sectarian polemic which serves to reaffirm the unchanging correctness of the static “pure truth” in the hands of a given faction (the NY Branch of the MCG). As a result, it obscures an understanding of the actual course of events in question. Contrary to this assumption of purity, it is necessary to affirm the universal application of the principle “one divides into two” without any exception whatsoever.

The primary contradiction driving the split of the LC from the OC, which led to the formation of the Maoist Communist Group (MCG), was the refusal of the LC to accept the expulsion of individuals guilty of misogynist violence. This formed only the most apparent aspect of a fundamentally reactionary and patriarchal political and ideological line, which has now resulted in the implosion of the LC.

It should be noted that this runs contrary to the claims of the NY Branch. It is therefore necessary to clarify that the split with the LC was not driven by a contradiction between an idealist party building line (that of the LC) and a materialist party building line (that of the OC, as precursor to the MCG). Rather it was the case that at the time of the split both organizations had party building lines of a comprehensively idealist character, symptomatic of the weakness and disorientation of the proletarian left in our current national conjuncture.

For the LC, party building was to be accomplished by the rapid amalgamation of individuals willing to express a discursive adherence to the preexisting cut and paste “program” of the NCP-OC. This was to be accomplished via “spectacular” small group actions (such as the sporadic harassment of Petreaus at the CUNY campus) in combination with the use of social media to generate “hype.”

This deviation had its roots in the idealist “anti-economist” line of the RCP-USA which—instead of asserting the imperative of carrying out the fusion of concrete struggles for material demands with proletarian politics—preached a sectarian politics of self-promotional advertising at a distance from the real mass movement.

We must be clear here that, prior to the split by the LC, many of the comrades who went on to form the MCG were some of the most enthusiastic supporters of the idealist practices of sectarian advertising occurring on the student front. We need only refer our readers to a careful study of the “left” opportunist formulations contained in the September 2013 text *From the Ground to the Sky* which was authored by comrades currently constituting the NY Branch of the MCG.⁵

At the time, a “commando” action of a type familiar to those with a background in the “direct action” politics of the petty bourgeoisie did nothing to further the initiative of the masses at the moment. And yet, it was mischaracterized in this piece as a “qualitative rupture with the revisionist protest-structure, and beyond that, with existing social relations.”

The NY Branch is effectively maintaining that their (supposedly) unchanging and correct orientation upholds the synthesis of mass knowledge as the only base of a materialist unification process. Yet, *From the Ground to the Sky* closes with a drastically elitist and hyper-Leninist formulation:

“In order to begin the exceedingly difficult task of opening up a new revolutionary path, we must divide ourselves from all forms of so-called ‘spontaneous’ popular consciousness. The masses live in a society dominated by bourgeois ideology, and without proper leadership, they lapse into reformism. Our action of September 9 – and all actions to come – can thus only be understood in reference to a definition that is at the same time a directive: To be a revolutionary is nothing less than to be able to seize the future within the present itself.”

Implied in this statement is that proletarian politics are not based on the consciousness of the masses. Instead, the correct ideas are portrayed as coming from a party or political organization exterior to the masses and their struggles.

In opposition to this synthesis, we must assert that the correct ideas come from the masses, and that the role of the party of a new type is to concentrate those correct ideas and put them into practice with the masses. The goal of any Maoist political organization must always be the furthering of the democracy of the masses, and this can never be accomplished from a position of exteriority to their struggles.

The (May 2014) founding document of the MCG runs counter to this imperative:

“Our new name reflects the central task of the moment: ideological consolidation, and in particular, the forging of a principled unity regarding what we mean by ‘Maoism.’ Only in this way can we lay the foundation on which a Maoist Communist Party can be built...We are currently developing our political line on the national question and the question of women’s oppression, among other issues. We will carry out a conjunctural class analysis of the US in the future.”⁶

Here the central task is defined as a scholastic “ideological consolidation” isolated from practice in the mass movement. Despite the fact that most of the text in the founding statement consists of a ritualistic reaffirmation of the mass line, the concrete self-conception of the MCG at the time of its formation was a negation of Maoist political principles in favor of an Althusserian revisionism of “theoretical practice,” at a distance from the mass movement. Ideological consolidation in isolation from the masses is abstract and only further reinforces the hyper-Leninist gap between cadre and the masses.

Thus when the NY Branch declares with reference to the collectives splitting from the LC that:

“They fail to grasp a simple truth: unity can only result from ideological struggle around summations of protracted sequences of real interventions in concrete struggles with clear material stakes against specific class enemies.”

They refrain from noting that we, as the MCG, shared in this failure for a protracted period following our own formation. When the NY Branch goes on to observe:

“It was only after March 2014 that the MCG was able to clear the path to the question of a Marxist-Leninist-Maoist party of a new type by engaging in protracted sequences of mass work in concrete struggles with specific material stakes.”

Here they fail to clarify that there was no break with idealism on March 2014. In fact the MCG at its founding was characterized by a unity of petty bourgeois intellectual sectarianism (NY) and right opportunist and economist mass work (VA). What changed in March 2014 was a break with open violent misogyny, which should be a minimum standard for any progressive-democratic, let alone communist, organization. It was not a rupture with idealist conceptions of party building. It is this wrong idea that must now be put squarely on the table to avoid endless repetitions of the same mistakes of history.

In short, the NY branch of the MCG continues to hold onto an idealist and bureaucratic conception of party building. This is evident in practices within the MCG, as well as in their mass work. It should be understood that there is a continuity of idealist and sectarian practice running through both the MCG (at all levels) and the LC, which has as its common root the shared experience of the NCP-OC. This continuity is a manifestation of an idealist epistemological deviation from which we must continually break if proletarian politics is to remain congruent at every moment with the communist objective: the furthering of the democracy of the masses.

THE PERSONAL AND THE POLITICAL: THE RESOLUTION OF THE GENDER CONTRADICTION IS NOT ACHIEVED SIMPLY THROUGH THE EXPULSION OF OPEN REACTIONARIES

We agree that the policy line enunciated in the August 2013 text *Standards of Feminist Conduct* entails an important line of demarcation.⁷ All the more so in a context where many organizations in both the North American small group left and the international movement continue to operate according to a discourse of “rectification,” which serves as a framework for the reproduction of male violence and female subordination internal to the communist movement. However, the implementation of such a policy cannot in anyway be equated to a decisive resolution of “personal problems,” as is alleged by the NY Branch in their document on the dissolution of the LC:

“Prior to the expulsion of the abusers and the departure of their protectors, the work of the organization was exhausted by internal struggles around issues of personal behavior divorced from politics and the mass movement.”

It is in the implications of this superficially innocuous formulation that we begin to approach the heart of the contradiction. The formation of the MCG is articulated as an absolute break with reactionary ideology embodied in the pair “patriarchal subjectivity”—“idealist conception of party building.” Once the MCG separated from the “impure admixture” represented by the elements who went on to form the LC, it supposedly became a pure repository of the correct line. An indivisible unity, a concentrated point of “qualitative rupture” able to “seize the future within the present itself.”

It can thus be seen that the NY Branch of the MCG is entrenched in an idealist deviation, in which it posits itself as the “correct leadership” of the masses and thus the source of pure “class ideas.” However, in order to maintain such a deviation, it is necessary for comrades in NY to distance themselves from the materiality of their own actions. This is accomplished by the NY Branch via the oft-repeated assertion of a separation between the personal and the political.

To claim that violence against women is a question of “personal behavior” and not a cardinal question of political and ideological lines is to negate the materialist truth well grasped by Marx and Engels that violence against women is the original and foundational class politics. Therefore a political organization that reproduces the oppression of women is not “divorced from politics” (which is impossible) but is actively serving the class politics of the bourgeoisie by reproducing the patriarchal inequality constitutive of bourgeois society.

The conception that the perpetuation of patriarchal relations internal to the communist movement is a matter of “personal behavior” which can be “resolved” by standards of conduct was aptly criticized by comrades from Germany and Austria when they noted:

*“Those in the ‘left-wing scene’ who reduce the struggle against patriarchy to a fight against ‘sexism’ and who believe that it is sufficient to have codes of conduct, which say that as long as men do not watch pornography or beat women, everything is fine and women have ‘equal rights’ have understood nothing from the standpoint of Marxism and are in fact defenders of patriarchy, its apologists in the revolutionary movement.”*⁸

The man-women contradiction is not a “personal” matter, and therefore cannot be resolved simply by expulsion of the most openly reactionary elements. When “struggle against patriarchy” is only taken up in response to extreme incidents of misogynistic violence the question of the liberation of women and destruction of patriarchy is effectively liquidated in favor of a revisionist political line. To imply otherwise is to negate the imperative of continual ideological revolutionization internal to political organizations in favor of the sanctification of the organization as an indivisible source of truth.

Against this, we assert that the one divides into two. It can never be assumed—as the NY Branch of the MCG does—that we have resolved the questions of patriarchy and party building. There is still patriarchy and there is not yet a party of a new type. Thus, these are still both open questions, to be posed to the masses (as opposed to simply being studied by petit-bourgeois intellectuals). As Maoists, we must always seek to further the democracy of the masses at all times, and thus the questions of patriarchy and party building must be constantly posed to the masses in relation to this task. This can never be accomplished through a position of (supposed) exteriority to the masses.

Against the apologist formulation of the NY Branch of the MCG, it is necessary to assert that the question of patriarchy is a cardinal question which divides the entire international communist movement, just as it divides the trends of thinking within every single militant, and this unity of opposites will continue until the man-women contradiction is overcome on the basis of communist relations of production.

Furthermore it is a serious deviation to consider that the question of reproduction of patriarchal ideology can be resolved by simply carrying out mass work among women, or ensuring the predominance of women in cadre structures or leadership organs. These measures are a necessary precondition for such a process of resolution, but are by no means sufficient. On the contrary, the question of the reproduction of patriarchal ideology is a fundamental one of style of work, methods of leadership, and division of labor and therefore inextricable from the struggle against idealist epistemology.

As comrades of the Turkish MKP have observed:

“Marx says the contradiction man-women is the essence of the general contradiction. The liberation of women progressively frees men and women up to the final stage, the liberation of humanity; that is why the women’s liberation movement is essential and indispensable for the revolution. The women’s movement has to be developed and organized at the ideological level as well as in its practical application.” 9

THE TWO-LINE STRUGGLE: AGAINST A METAPHYSICAL UNDERSTANDING OF “CLASS LINE”

All of this circles back to the supposed purity of the NY Branch. Our fundamental disagreement with them specifically pertains to the question of the consolidation of mass power. In their assumption of purity, they have prevented expansion of the membership of the MCG, both by other branches as well as amongst the masses with whom they work. In doing so, they have attempted to preserve a supposedly pure core of cadre and a subjective hierarchy in leadership based on a metaphysical understanding of the concept of class line. Idealist deviations of this kind never work to consolidate mass power, but rather only serve the interests of the petit-bourgeois bureaucrats.

This idealist deviation is further evidenced by a near total lack of self-criticism by the NY Branch, and their tendency to foreclose on line struggle with other branches, over which NY asserts its command. Ideological struggle has been dismissed by the NY Branch as “excessively tedious” because—according to them—we already have a political line to which we supposedly all agree.

From this we have come to the conclusion that NY holds an idealist conception of political line that assumes that it only divides according to its being (the fact that there is a class line) and its application in a given situation. This is an instrumental understanding of political lines (based on an assumption of metaphysical purity) that fails to realize that a political line divides again in the situation—which is what we call two-line struggle—and in its very being—which is the impurity of any line whatsoever and the fact that they all must change in the process of political practice.

The NY Branch holds their supposedly pure “class line” in abstraction from the concrete nature of the class struggle. Against this deviation it is necessary to understand that impurity is absolute and purity is only relative.¹⁰ Hence every communist political organization must always serve the class struggle and seek, in all their actions, to further the democracy of the masses. Any recourse to a pure “class line” formulated at a distance from the masses can only serve the interests of a bureaucratic elite in the consolidation of their power.

The question of mass power, of the furthering of the democracy of the masses, must be posed at all times. It cannot be delayed until a later time, but rather must be the basis for communist politics as such. The putting into practice of communist politics is nothing less than this. And this must be done through the continual struggle—internal and external to all communist organizations.

The effort required to simply get the NY Branch to engage in conversations over these issues has drained the energy of other members of the MCG. It has impeded our ability to focus on political and ideological work amongst our branches. This document is both an attempt to expose clearly the key contradictions at play in the sequence “NCP-OC→NCP-LC—MCG,” and an attempt to prevent this dynamic from repeating itself within the

emerging Maoist movement in the U.S.

We end with a final provisional thesis on the universal political importance of the Cultural Revolution:

The basic political question is how such a trajectory can advance towards communism with a protracted continuity. The question of state power when it is posited in relation to the realization of the communist objective at every moment and not autonomized by a instrumental stage theory is a dependent variable in relation to this question of how to launch and develop this living identity of cultural revolution and civil war.

ENDNOTES

1 NCP (OC) “Self-Criticism and Summation on Patriarchy,” March 5, 2014.<http://www.signalfire.org/2014/03/06/ncp-oc-self-criticism-and-summation-on-patriarchy/>

2 “In order to forge a principled unity, we must—on the basis of a concrete analysis of the concrete situation—contribute to the political and ideological arming of the masses,” from “Founding Statement of the Maoist Communist Group, May 7, 2014.<https://maoistcommunistgroup.com/2014/05/07/founding-statement-mcg/>

3 Brigades Rouges (Colonne Walter Alasia) : Encore un pas ,*Ligne Rouge* no. 4 February 1984.

4 <http://www.signalfire.org/2015/11/28/on-a-discussion-about-subjectivism-and-militarism-1980/>

5 See “From the Ground to the Sky,” September, 24, 2013,<http://www.signalfire.org/2013/09/24/from-the-ground-to-the-sky/>

6 <https://maoistcommunistgroup.com/2014/05/07/founding-statement-mcg/>

7 <http://www.signalfire.org/2013/08/18/on-standards-of-feminist-conduct-cmlms/>

8 From “Towards March 8th! Fight Patriarchy and Imperialism!” Red Women’s Committee Hamburg, February 2016. <http://www.signalfire.org/2016/02/12/towards-march-8th-fight-patriarchy-and-imperialism-2016/>

9 See: “Honor to the Comrade Rosa, Leading Member of the Communist Party of Turkey and North Kurdistan (MKP), murdered by the Turkish fascist regime of the 16th of June 2005 with other 16 communist leaders and fighters,” Movimiento Feminista Proletario Revolucionario, <https://scioperodelledonne.files.wordpress.com/2013/01/2005-rosa-inglese.pdf> p. 21

10 “Inner Party Struggle and Party Development,” *Hongqi*, No. 7, 1976,<http://www.signalfire.org/2015/01/09/inner-party-struggle-and-party-development-chih-heng/>