

BAP-MLM Final Statement

03.29.2026

Comrades,

After our recent suspension and removal from BAP's signal chat, we wanted to provide some final summations of our experiences in BAP before separating from this organization entirely. Black Alliance for Peace – Marxist-Leninist-Maoist (BAP-MLM) was a contingent of communist members of BAP-Midwest (BAP-MW) forged out of the embers of the 2025 Oklahoma campaign against Westwin Elements.¹ We have been members of BAP for 3 years and have been active in this organization up until our recent removal. One of the members of BAP-MLM (Kodjovi) was in leadership as a Co-Coordinator for the BAP-MW region for almost two years alongside Nick up until the Fall of 2025. Throughout our time at BAP, we have worked diligently and at great personal sacrifice to build the organization and to drive forward the struggle for Black liberation. Over the course of the Oklahoma campaign, we came to realize that both our campaign and the organization generally lacked a clear direction. It was in this context that we took up the study of Marxism, and found in it a clear path forward. At the time, we did not know that our taking up Marxism would be hostile to the interests of BAP leadership, but it did not take long for this to become apparent.

After leadership's refusal to sanction our Fall 2025 dialectical materialism study that we pitched to the BAP-MW membership, we mostly stepped back from our regular participation in BAP-MW meetings and campaigns due to our being disheartened by what we correctly identified as a reactionary turning away from Marxism. As communists, there can be no compromise on the need to study and apply Marxism and to engage in ideological struggle. The leadership of BAP has made clear that it has no interest in consolidating any form of communist politic and has no clear prescription for the Black working class struggle. What follows are some of our final summations of our experiences at BAP.

¹ The campaign against Westwin Elements was a pragmatist organizing effort independently decided upon by members of BAP-MW and the All-African People's Revolutionary Party (AAPRP) who were active in the region. Westwin had built a large nickel refinery in Lawton, OK that was drawing feedstock from the Congo and was slated to increase the scale of its facilities.

Struggle over China's nature as an imperialist country

As communists, the need for principled ideological struggle and for combating reactionary ideas is absolutely inescapable. If we are to turn away from ideological and theoretical struggle, our practice will forever be condemned to confusion and irrelevance. This is a basic Marxist principle. It was in this spirit that we initially raised our criticisms of the ideas put forward on imperialism in China. The ensuing struggle revealed some real disinterest (particularly amongst the leadership) in actually challenging and heightening our understanding of the nature of imperialism, of socialism, and of what it is that we are actually fighting for.

For the comrades in the chat, hopefully you have now had the opportunity to reflect on some of what was said, as there were some pretty revealing statements made that illuminate some of the greater difficulties BAP is met with at this moment. On the question of China, comrades can come to their own conclusions, and we know not everyone in BAP considers themselves a Marxist, but for those of us who do, we should seriously wrestle with what Nick brought forward and ask whether we are actually internalizing the principles of Marxism and applying the lessons of class struggle, or setting them aside when they become inconvenient. In the final analysis, *what is the essence of Chinese society today, and whose class dictatorship is in command?*

In his final message prior to our removal, Nick asserts that “billionaires that are in the CPC are there by requirement in order for them to be under tighter control and regulation.” This is a patently opportunist² and reactionary statement that displays some pretty fundamental confusions on the nature of the dictatorship of the proletariat and of dialectics. One of the main reasons for the dictatorship of the proletariat is the suppression of the bourgeoisie, and yet here Nick is asserting that somehow the best way to do this is to invite them *into the halls of power*, and—if we look materially at what is happening on the ground—*into the leading organs of the party*, shaping the policy and direction of the country. This is plainly absurd, and clearly a line that serves the interests of the bourgeoisie.

² “The opportunist does not betray his party, he does not act as a traitor, he does not desert it. He continues to serve it sincerely and zealously. But his typical and characteristic trait is that he yields to the mood of the moment, he is unable to resist what is fashionable, he is politically short-sighted and spineless. Opportunism means sacrificing the permanent and essential interests of the party to the momentary, transient and minor interests.” V. I. Lenin. “The Russian Radical is Wise After the Event” Oct. 18, 1906, LCW 11:239.

Too Black repeats this error in his recent Black Myths podcast episode on Iran when he insists that “there’s either imperialism or there’s anti-imperialism” yet fails to divide the Iranian people from their ruling class. To be truly anti-imperialist is to champion the interests of the working class and oppressed masses *to the exclusion of those of the ruling class in all corners of the globe, including inside Iran*. This of course does not mean endorsement to any degree of US imperialist overtures toward the country, but insists that as we are waging struggle and identifying our allies that it is the Iranian working class and oppressed masses who we are united with, not their ruling class. It would be plainly unscientific to imply that the Iranian state is anything but an oppressive bourgeois regime that has, in the present moment, come to play a progressive role in opposing US imperialism.³ This presents opportunities for the Iranian working class to unite temporarily with these forces, but for those of us outside the country we must be absolutely clear that Iran's government is no dictatorship of the proletariat and is therefore, by the laws of dialectics, a dictatorship of the bourgeoisie.

Such temporary united fronts have been successfully demonstrated by the Chinese Communist Party's (CCP) first and second united fronts with the nationalist Guomindang. These temporary alliances with the national bourgeoisie in China allowed them to oppose the main enemies – the feudal warlords backed by various imperialist powers, and later the Japanese invasion of China. This did not mean that the CCP thought that the Guomindang was a pro-people force, but that the Guomindang had its own interests in joining these united fronts and which the communists used to advance these struggles which would have been impossible had they not been in place. But it should be emphasized again that these were *temporary alliances*, and that the principal error in the CCP's first alliance with the Guomindang was that they remained in that alliance well after it had been demonstrated that their ability to unite had fallen apart after the expulsion and suppression of imperialist forces.

Lenin articulates this basic confusion about the nature of the state and speaks to the need for the working class—led by the communist party—to firmly establish the dictatorship of the proletariat:

“The state is a special organization of force: it is an organization of violence for the suppression of some class. What class must the proletariat suppress?”

³ And even this opposition to the imperialist ruling class of a particular country (the US) does not mean opposition to imperialism *in general*. China is not against imperialism as it itself is imperialist, but it's certainly opposed to the hold of US imperialism around the world.

Naturally, only the exploiting class, i.e., the bourgeoisie. The working people need the state only to suppress the resistance of the exploiters, and only the proletariat can direct this suppression, can carry it out. For the proletariat is the only class that is consistently revolutionary, the only class that can unite all the working and exploited people in the struggle against the bourgeoisie, in completely removing it."⁴

If we fail to divide the Iranian nation into two, and to understand it correctly as a class society, we will see only the external forces acting on the nation (imperialism) and miss the internal contradictions (between the working class and the ruling class) which are emerging inevitably from their primary contradiction as a society with capitalist relations of production.

In his message, Nick also offers "another interpretation" (and this framing alone is similarly clearly opportunist, reflecting that he is not even putting forward a singular coherent analysis, but really anything that will convince the target audience of his reactionary line!) saying that "the CPC's development path necessitates permitting some level of capitalist relations in society". Why should this be the case? By the late 1950s, the Chinese communists had already eliminated private ownership of the means of production and thus established a socialist economy with public ownership of the means of production in agriculture (collective ownership by peasants organized into communes) and industry (mostly by the state, secondarily there were small collectives which owned some small-scale industry). It was not until 1978 when Deng Xiaoping (who we should remember was widely criticized as a capitalist roader and allied himself with the obviously reactionary camp of Liu Shaoqi and others who Mao was criticizing right up until his death)⁵ went about confiscating public property en masse and selling it off to private owners for their own enrichment. Whereas peasants' standard of life had gone up significantly with the socialist transformation of agriculture, after the coup in the Party and the restoration of capitalism,

⁴ V.I. Lenin, *Lenin Collected Works*, Volume 25, p. 381-492.

⁵ "The number of intellectuals who are hostile to our state is very small. They do not like our state, i.e., the dictatorship of the proletariat, and yearn for the old society. Whenever there is an opportunity, they will stir up trouble and attempt to overthrow the Communist Party and restore the old China. As between the proletarian and the bourgeois roads, as between the socialist and the capitalist roads, these people stubbornly choose to follow the latter. In fact, this road is impossible, and in fact, therefore, they are ready to capitulate to imperialism, feudalism and bureaucrat-capitalism." (Mao Zedong, "Speech at the Chinese Communist Party's National Conference on Propaganda Work". Selected Works of Mao Zedong. 1957)

agriculture was privatized and broken up which impoverished the peasants. People were left with 'noodle strips' of plots on which they couldn't produce enough food or even use a tractor. Were these advances toward socialism? What contortions of logic must we engage in to arrive at that conclusion?

It is true that in building socialism there will necessarily be a transitional period where certain capitalist relations will have to be allowed to persist in the early stages of the transformation of the relations of production. We cannot take the anarchist approach of simply transforming wholesale everything all at once. But we should be absolutely clear that these relations are only to be permitted under limited circumstances *and that we are actively doing away with them*. As Mao outlines in his 1953 piece "The Only Road for the Transformation of Capitalist Industry and Commerce":

"Some capitalists keep themselves at a great distance from the state and have not changed their profits-before-everything mentality. Some workers are advancing too fast and won't allow the capitalists to make any profit at all. We should try to educate these workers and capitalists and help them gradually (but the sooner the better) adapt themselves to our state policy, namely, to make China's private industry and commerce mainly serve the nation's economy and the people's livelihood and partly earn profits for the capitalists and in this way embark on the path of state capitalism."⁶

Mao wrote these words in 1953 four years after the revolution. They were already educating the masses on the need to do away with these relations as they increasingly turned toward public ownership. And yet somehow we are finding that since 1978 there has been A) a decrease in public ownership of the means of production from nearly 100% down to 55% in 2018,⁷ B) that the share of China's national income earned by the top 10% of the population has increased from 27% in 1978 to 41% in 2015 (nearing the U.S.'s 45% and surpassing France's 32%)⁸, and C) that certain private owners have managed to accrue \$50 billion USD in private wealth by selling bottled water and medical supplies.⁹ This is clearly far beyond the pale of what even the most astoundingly incompetent communist

⁶ Mao Zedong. "The Only Road for the Transformation of Capitalist Industry and Commerce" *Selected Works of Mao Zedong*. 1953.

⁷ <http://piketty.pse.ens.fr/files/equality/pdf/F40.pdf>

⁸ <https://sccei.fsi.stanford.edu/china-briefs/rise-wealth-private-property-and-income-inequality-china>

⁹ <https://www.scmp.com/magazines/style/entertainment/article/3302786/5-chinas-richest-men-2025-net-worths-ranked-founder-tiktoks-parent-company-tencents-pony-ma-and-ceo>

party could permit three-quarters of a century into the building of their revolutionary proletarian state. Nick's assertion that public ownership in China remains the principal aspect reveals a total lack of investigation into the reality of what is going on in China. *State ownership is not public ownership*. It is not public ownership if the state represents an exploiting minority class. These facts were clearly demonstrated in the notes Kodjovi shared in the chat that Nick and others, unsurprisingly, either did not read or did not understand.

To the petty-bourgeois fantasy that "multipolarity is factually a tool for many in the Global South", this is precisely the lazy and unserious attitude that was being criticized in the piece on Pan-Africanism that was shared earlier in our Signal chat.¹⁰ It is social chauvinism¹¹ of an externally-facing variety. The petty-bourgeois third worldists have no clear, concise plan to win socialism domestically. Instead, they prefer to disengage from building a communist movement within the United States, cheer-lead others struggles, and offer little more than an unending stream of inane webinars on struggles in the global south while condemning the US working class as "just too reactionary" to win socialism. We should be working to support the struggles of the people to overthrow *all* imperialist countries, not just the most powerful one. It is not a good thing for the people of countries in Latin America and Africa to be exploited and oppressed by Chinese imperialism or any other imperialism just because it comes with slightly better interest rates or slightly less exploitative mineral extraction agreements.

These errors in understanding of the nature of the state and the irreconcilability of classes rest on a singular philosophical confusion that any real study of dialectical materialism would quickly reveal. This is the revisionist viewpoint of dialectics that "two combines into

¹⁰ K. Kpachavi "Pan-Africanism in Error" <https://cosmonautmag.com/2026/02/pan-africanism-in-error/>

¹¹ "By social-chauvinism we mean acceptance of the idea of the defence of the fatherland in the present imperialist war, justification of an alliance between socialists and the bourgeoisie and the governments of their "own" countries in this war, a refusal to propagate and support proletarian revolutionary action against one's "own" bourgeoisie, etc. It is perfectly obvious that social-chauvinism's basic ideological and political content fully coincides with the foundations of opportunism. It is one and the same tendency...The idea of class collaboration is opportunism's main feature." V.I. Lenin. "The Collapse of the Second International" *Lenin Collected Works*, Volume 21, p. 205-259.

one" (rather than the correct and scientific understanding of "one divides into two")¹² which was thoroughly refuted by Mao's close associate, the Chinese philosopher Ai Siqi:

"'Combining two into one' is a theory of reconciliation of contradictions and classes—a revisionist viewpoint disseminated by Comrade Yang Xianzhen. For some time some people were unable to see its erroneousness. A very important reason is that the theory of 'combining two into one' is cloaked in a false outer garment of dialectics... Is there any point of accord between these dialectical theses on objective things contained in Marxist-Leninist works and Comrade Yang Xianzhen's idea of 'combining two into one'? No, not only is there no point of accord, but they are basically opposed to each other. Comrade Yang Xianzhen's idea of 'combining two into one' merely stresses 'the inseparable link between the two sides of a thing,' while Marxist-Leninist dialectics stresses the 'ceaseless struggle' between the opposites, 'the movement produced as a result of the opposition,' and the 'mutually rejecting, opposing tendency' of all phenomena and processes."¹³

To put it plainly: two aspects of a contradiction cannot be reconciled. The interests of the bourgeoisie and the proletariat cannot be reconciled any more than oil can mix with water. *They are fundamentally opposed to each other.* For the leaders of the working class to suggest otherwise would inevitably lead to brutal defeat, and the history of communist movements have routinely demonstrated this. *All countries are made up of distinct classes with distinct class interests, and we cannot flatten those class contradictions.*

For those of us standing outside of Iran, we should be clear that there's no revolutionary movement or organization inside Iran able to play a leading role in the struggle against US imperialism and Zionism. Currently, there is in fact a good deal of mass support for the Iranian state including amongst those who have participated in protests against the state, given the progressive role the government is playing insofar as it is successfully fighting a war of national defense against the US and Israel. Nonetheless, blindly allying with one's ruling class just because they oppose *one particular* imperialist power would be a suicide

¹² "One dividing into two and cognition of its contradictory part...is the substance of dialectics... The identity of opposites...means the recognition (discovery) that all phenomena and processes of Nature (including both spirit and society) have contradictory, mutually rejecting and opposing tendencies." V.I. Lenin. *Lenin Collected Works*, Vol. 38, p. 407-408.

¹³ Ai Siqi, "Surreptitious Substitution of Theory of Reconciliation of Contradictions and Classes for Revolutionary Dialectics Must Not Be Permitted" *Renmin Ribao*, Beijing. 1965.

mission. This was exactly the lesson of the Chinese communists remaining in their united front with the left-wing of the Guomindang and the ensuing treachery of Chiang Kai-Shek's forces in 1927 when they slaughtered communists, workers and peasants after the Japanese imperialists were forced out of the country.¹⁴ The united front in such a context was not in itself an error, but in failing to recognize the irreconcilable nature of the classes and by remaining in the alliance for too long, the communists unnecessarily exposed themselves to a dire situation.

Struggling for correct ideas in BAP

There is an apparent tendency in the orientation of BAP's leadership toward shutting down and refusing to struggle for correct ideas. BAP's leadership prefers instead to present ideas to the membership and for them to be taken up uncritically. This is a bourgeois tendency and reflects a commandist approach to leadership, which is both highly unproductive and unusual for a mass organization like BAP.

When disagreements over theory and practice have arisen within BAP-Midwest, it has been the tendency for leadership and many consolidated to their line to turn away from principled struggle. This was demonstrated over the course of this latest struggle over the question of China and its nature as an imperialist country where Traik and Kodjovi were removed from the Signal chat for simply presenting ideas that conflicted with those of BAP's leadership. The bar for this standard is so low that Traik was summarily removed from the chat without warning after having contributed *only a single sentence*, highlighting that one of the texts that had been shared contained evidence to support the statements being made by BAP-MLM comrades. Similarly, Kodjovi was indirectly told by another BAP-MW member "to just go ahead and shut the fuck up" and the struggle was generally condemned by another as comrades "having a smart guy pissing contest".

These highly unprincipled liberal tendencies were also reflected in earlier struggles. In Fall of 2025, members of the BAP-MW signal chat dog-piled another comrade for expressing that they felt uncomfortable with people making jokes and celebrating Charlie Kirk's shooting. Rather than attempt to win this comrade over to their line, many instead proceeded to engage in idealistic moralizing arguments¹⁵ about how bad of a person Kirk

¹⁴ See episodes 43-49 of Matthew Rothwell's "People's History of Ideas" podcast for a brief summation of these struggles (<https://open.spotify.com/episode/04M0BbcPPFTnkGKTGm1G6G>)

¹⁵ Any true materialist should recognize that moralizing and arguments based on individual morality are manifestations of idealism and are wholly incompatible with communism. The reason we as communists

was in an attempt to shame the comrade into silence. This eventually had its desired effect when the comrade left the chat. When Kodjovi criticized these behaviors¹⁶ and later began raising BAP-MLM's criticism of Pan-Africanism, he was shortly thereafter removed from leadership as a BAP-MW Co-Coordinator and told by Nick that leadership had decided to "go a different direction".

These are all reflections of a starkly liberal tendency within BAP where struggle is actually discouraged in preference for uncritically tailing whatever inane petty-bourgeois drivel leadership is putting forward.

What is BAP?

There are actually serious communists in the US driving forward the working class struggle, and it has been truly inspiring to be engaged in that work in this moment. But frankly, BAP is totally divorced from that struggle and the working class is almost nowhere to be found in this organization or in its prescriptions for how to drive forward the struggle for socialism. The leadership are more interested in book publications and panel speaking opportunities, and prefer instead to launder Black rage through an endless cycle of MOST-planning sessions,¹⁷ administrative meetings, survey assessments, and aimless informational webinars that have failed to produced any discernible quantitative or qualitative growth to the organization.

We would encourage the comrades in BAP-MW to really push Nick and the rest of the leadership to offer a clear answer to the question that they frequently weaponize against dissenting voices: ***what is BAP?*** What is its theory of change? For the 3 years we have been a part of it, BAP has achieved zero ideological consolidation nor moved even an inch forward toward revolution. We have not seen any serious BAP-wide, direct engagements

are opposed to certain things like patriarchy and adventurist violence is that they do not serve our class interests and reflect bourgeois ideology. In making moral arguments, one can claim any sort of moral subjectivity and thus evade any kind of scientific analysis or criticism.

¹⁶ The main content of this criticism was: "I think we should work on how we're delivering and receiving criticism in this space. BAP is an alliance of people of a range of political beliefs united by the principles of unity. There are bound to be people here with differing ideas about what is correct for our movement. It is of course also absolutely essential that we struggle for correct ideas, and that incorrect ideas be liquidated for our movement to advance. On a regional level, BAP is not engaged in collective study, so it is difficult for us to have real substantive political struggle in this space. This is something being worked on both regionally and nationally, but in the meantime I think we can use this space in a limited capacity to struggle in a manner that is principled."

¹⁷ Mission Objectives Strategies Tactics (MOST) – BAP's pragmatist organizing framework.

with the working class in the United States. This does not surprise us, as this is wholly a function of the opportunist leadership's total disinterest in any serious, direct form of struggle. This was clearly represented by leadership's arbitrary and inarticulate suspension and removal of Traik and Kodjovi from the BAP-MW chat after the latest struggle over China and the PBSP's statement on Iran.¹⁸ BAP leadership has no desire to advance in the struggle because in reality, the leadership of this organization is overwhelmingly petty-bourgeois in character, and are actually quite content to utilize BAP as a vehicle to supplement their resumes and advance their careers. *There is no genuine desire to advance the proletarian struggle amongst the leadership because to do so is actually opposed to their class interests.* Comrades should have no illusions about this.

As a demonstration of this, we felt it was appropriate to share and reflect upon a few attempts that were made to drive BAP in a more revolutionary direction. The first of these was the Socialism POU that was presented to leadership last summer. The document is still in the BAP-Midwest drive¹⁹ as it was drafted by Too Black and Nick and brought to BAP-National for consideration. There are some serious shortcomings to the POU draft, but it would have at least represented a concrete step toward consolidating the membership around a clear political goal: socialism. And therein lies the problem. *BAP-National was and is totally disinterested in such a prospect.* The Socialism POU was summarily refused for consideration, and the reason they provided for why we could not put it to a vote was that "half of the membership would leave." This is an obviously reactionary take and was clearly intended to scapegoat their own hangups about charting a clear path forward onto the shoulders of the membership whose voices they were not even interested in considering. To suggest that we should not even subject the prospect of ideological consolidation to a democratic process is a slap in the face to the membership, many of whom are actually quite serious in wanting to drive forward the struggle. BAP-National is willfully withholding this opportunity from them, condemning the organization to stagnation.

This tendency was similarly reflected in their refusal to sanction our study on dialectical materialism last Fall. When a few of us began to take up a serious study of Marxism, after being frustrated by yet another floundering BAP campaign, we found that through our study we were making huge ideological leaps, and we were very excited to bring such a study to the broader Midwest membership. We were however told explicitly by Nick on numerous occasions that we could not run such a study in the formation and that we

¹⁸ <https://www.bannedthought.net/Bangladesh/PBSP-General/2026/PBSP-Iran-Mar26.pdf>

¹⁹ <https://docs.google.com/document/d/1kNla3pidMkObl0l4l1s47Q6XnjZznUKXd5ijhktcRY>

should instead focus our efforts on producing a webinar on a data center in Chicago. When we insisted that we had no interest in such a project and asked why we should host yet another informational webinar instead of seriously taking up study, we were provided with no clear answer. It was only when Caleb asked Nick explicitly if he was forbidding us from running the study that he relented (in name only, as he proceeded to provide no support and ran interference as we promoted the study in the chat).

At the same time, Nick and others who are consolidated with BAP's opportunist line frequently invoke quotations from Mao Zedong and other communist revolutionaries with little understanding of their historical context or of their immediate application.²⁰ If these were simply confusions, BAP leadership would have been open to discussion and debate about what Maoist politics actually are. Instead, they are willfully misrepresenting Marxist-Leninist-Maoist politics for the explicit purpose of shutting down ideological struggle without any deep investigation.²¹ Serious study of the works of Mao and other communists is *actually discouraged* by BAP leadership because it would provide a real concrete means of advancing the struggle of the working class and prevent leadership from weaponizing revolutionary phraseology as a battering ram to oppose any who might challenge or criticize their opportunism.

BAP is a stagnant organization—and this is a demise solely of the leadership's making. It is a purgatory for would-be revolutionaries to be subdued by the honeyed phrases of a comfortable academic leadership totally disinterested in driving forward the working class struggle. As it stands now, BAP will never be a champion of the communist movement, and

²⁰ And indeed, these misrepresentations should not be surprising coming from Nick, who is presently employed as the Deputy Chief of Staff of a bourgeois democrat mayor (<https://www.aurora.il.us/Government-and-Engagement/Staff-Directory/Mayors-Office/Mayors-Office-Staff>).

²¹ "What is now happening to Marx's theory has, in the course of history, happened repeatedly to the theories of revolutionary thinkers and leaders of oppressed classes fighting for emancipation. During the lifetime of great revolutionaries, the oppressing classes constantly hounded them, received their theories with the most savage malice, the most furious hatred and the most unscrupulous campaigns of lies and slander. After their death, attempts are made to convert them into harmless icons, to canonize them, so to say, and to hallow their names to a certain extent for the 'consolation' of the oppressed classes and with the object of duping the latter, while at the same time robbing the revolutionary theory of its substance, blunting its revolutionary edge and vulgarizing it. Today, the bourgeoisie and the opportunists within the labor movement concur in this doctoring of Marxism. They omit, obscure, or distort the revolutionary side of this theory, its revolutionary soul. They push to the foreground and extol what is or seems acceptable to the bourgeoisie. All the social-chauvinists are now 'Marxists' (don't laugh!)" V.I. Lenin. "The State & Revolution" *Collected Works*, Volume 25. 1915.
<https://www.marxists.org/archive/lenin/works/1917/staterev/ch01.htm>

so will never be anything more than purveyors of petty-bourgeois opportunism. As Lenin correctly points out, "by following the path of Marxist theory we shall draw closer and closer to objective truth (without ever exhausting it); but by following any other path, we shall arrive at nothing but confusion and lies." Because BAP does not agree with the necessity for the working class to lead the struggle for revolution, and has repeatedly shut down discussion of what socialism actually is, it cannot actually fight for the liberation of Black people in the US as this will never happen without first socialist revolution and then a continued struggle under socialism against all forms of oppression such as racism.

To our comrades in the organization who have to varying degrees taken up the struggle and are truly seeking a way forward, the communist movement is yet in embryo, but is growing and eagerly awaits you! When you tire of this organization's wallowing and its leadership's blatant opportunism, we look forward to meeting you on the front lines of the working class struggle, so that together we can finally smash the terrible paper tiger of US imperialism and firmly establish the dictatorship of the working class.

If you want to get in touch, you can reach out to us at: kodjovik@protonmail.com.

Red Salute!

Signed,

Black Alliance for Peace – Marxist-Leninist-Maoist
(OFFICIALLY DISBANDED)