

# Communist Methods of Organization:

## Notes on the Cell, the Mass Party, Autonomy, & Political Suicide

### Introduction

*“The reigning paradigm of organization among the autonomous revolutionary current today is the “milieu,” or radical scene: a mode of organization premised upon small groups of friends who stand apart from society and attempt to intervene within social struggles...By refusing to stake out a place within the ideological pantheon of existing political forms, by asserting its position in the mode of a non-position, the milieu functions as an axiomatic default that has excused itself from the realm of critique on the grounds that it proffers no ‘models’ of its own: ‘autonomy’ becomes a stand-in for the milieu itself. Yet the organizational form of the milieu stands in the way of its revolutionary potential in a variety of ways. While it imagines itself as standing outside society as a space of purity and safety from the bad ways of society, the milieu continually recreates a tyranny of structurelessness, as its informal organization reproduces existing social hierarchies. While its naive politics of friendship has certain advantages in terms of fostering political intensities, it tends toward a form of cultural and racial closure that prevents political relations from being fostered across social differences. Finally, with the milieu we lack the means to foster the capacities of our comrades. On one hand, we tell ourselves that we are all equal, while at the same time vast differences in experience and inequalities in our relations speak the truth of our situation.”*

- Kevin Suemnicht <sup>1</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> Suemnicht, K. (2021, December 22). *Vital Cells*. • Ill Will. <https://illwill.com/vital-cells>

If we have inherited anything from our milieu's tradition, it is nothing. Or rather, the absence of any codified idea or tactic, frozen in time for our repeated use. We do not fear organic manifestation as much as rigid ideological premise. We represent the movement of whatever works, at any time, to advance the most radical pole in the movement of communism; This amounts to nothing more but the call for immediate communism itself. This lack of marriage to any born concept rests on the premise of fluidity in struggle, that we must behave like water. At various points in struggle it is necessary to expand, contract, as what matters is not form but the motion of radical content.

From this vantage point, we are disturbed by a lack of obvious formation to come, and question how to tackle organization as a social, rather than political, question. We write this piece to share recent discussions within the movement of our day, as well as to open up a dialogue amongst comrades.

This piece deals with the most popular and fetishized methods of organization of our day: the Cell, the Mass Party, and the varying Autonomous infrastructure projects tucked neatly within the confines of every city. What characterizes our conception of each is their collective gasps for survival after shaky births, nestling within the bourgeois world from different ends of a *conservative spectrum*, attempting to carve out social, rhetorical, or physical niches to stay alive. Thus, we will recount the current position of each, their appeals and developments, and offer our own thesis on the matter: That we must embark on a political suicide, i.e. an overt renunciation of politics and economics, and break with remnants of half-baked Blanquism and Leninism in the building of a visible communist pole.

### **Social Conservatism: The Cell in Retrospect**

There is nothing more mystified than the modern communist Cell, born in such an epoch of fear and anxiety. An eternally young form, its tracings are minimal, relations typically insular projects of affinity, and its site is implanted at the heart of the mass movement. We strictly refer to the Cell as the construction of a clandestine, self-limiting affinity-based organization with the intent to influence wider ranging social movements. Cells seek the outward imposition of revolutionary ideals and tactics, correcting their own growths for this very reason. While the popularization of insurrectionary Anarchist groups has led to a narrow image of Celldom, such a structure may even swallow the wandering liberal, and not all follow the same guidelines for they make up wide-ranging groups of ideologues. A Cell today can be hierarchical or horizontal, formal or informal, Anarchist or Leninist, and may operate under any medium under the sun; The Cell is not ideological but social-survivalist in nature. They also tend to cast aside any exception of mediation for struggle in immediacy, an enticing proposition for the ultra left.

What further unites our conception of the Cell is an emphasis on directly influencing, or “revolutionizing”, the broader social movements, and at least a sole point of immediate unity on which this rests. In the anti-ICE movement, this may mean concentrating proletarian creative expression on the entire State apparatus, rather than just one federal department. It could also be a tactical point of unity, such as the building of street militancy and physical confrontation with the State. In either example, the Cell is also an attractive option for those in our movement who seek to avoid State repression, Far-Right reprisals, or a far more likely outcome at this time: A betrayal on part of the liberal bourgeoisie and petit-bourgeoisie. This practice also allows for a wider range of tactics and rhetoric to be used, as the public-facing mass organizations typically cannot make calls for revolution without their bloody dismemberment. As the communists’

social world in embryonic form, these layers of protection and mobility provide a quaint picture of the Cell. Truthfully, it has just as many glaring weaknesses.

Cells in Chicago's variational anti-ICE movement have performed to mixed success. Autonomous groups were able to direct movement traffic and build small links with one another, in tandem causing a mass effect where they outpaced liberal representatives of the movement and forced their hand. At forbidden sites of circulation where the sacred was intact-migrant processing centers, courthouses, and federal buildings-liberals dragged their feet in the face of new possibilities, ultimately giving way to Cell-led moments of struggle. *The bourgeois* had to catch up to the work of the meager Cell, in a game of cat and mouse which temporarily decentralized the former's monopoly of power.

As it often is, many of these efforts ran dry. Cells set a physical pole and defended it on their own, hoping for a wave of mass energy to crash behind them. At various locations, this never happened. Here, the site of Cell activity became something of an *infrastructure project*, which we will elaborate on in the 4th section. But for essential context, the Cells were forced to stake out on their lonesome at these sites, recreate autonomous infrastructure reliant on tedious labor, with their own turnout relying on what essentially became shift schedules. This recreated social divisions and a division of labor that saw a propulsion of young activists or student types who had little work, thereby influencing a drain of any *class* element in the struggle.

At sites where mass energy would follow, like the Broadview Immigration Processing Center, the Cells' own tendency toward embedding and social survival limited the function of its rhetorical devices. Cells pushed the movement forward by holding a tactical pole at this chokepoint, and this time the mass did come to them, yet the Cell could not find a means to propagate revolutionary consciousness. Their rhetorical pole here was relegated to insular

debate, almost invisible to any proletarian. A wave of nationalists thus proceeded to launch an offensive, and the scene of this crime is still being tampered with today. Local “community leaders”, including politicians and Church hierarchy, were able to identity-politic their way into center stage. While radicals attempted to divert course in large movement assemblies, they found themselves undermined by a star-studded cast and quickly drowned out in these pop-up shops of democracy. Furthermore, Cells and their frequency to lose an immediate point of tactical unity meant they were consistently at odds with their own existence. As the movement was further declassified, some grouplets formed with overt liberal elements confused by the communist position. Or rather, the lack of social understanding amongst Cells and their emphasis on minimal points of immediate practical unity (i.e. taking X tactic to the streets) instead of a long-term revolutionary consciousness proved fatal.

What the experiences of Broadview point to is that radical communists must decisively, *collectively* act before the mobilizations occur, before makeshift democratic organs are injected, before tactics are debated frivolously, to propagate their pole as widely as possible. We point to a September piece on Crimethinc, where a severe gap between frontliners and the critical mass helped shatter what could have otherwise been a swelling surge, instead resulting in a spectacle of unanswered State violence.<sup>2</sup> This documented lack of mass understanding is a relatively frequent occurrence, compounded by the liberals’ contradictory framing and information. In situations of crisis, the chasm between independent, radical Cells and the masses cannot always be crossed by the immediate experiences of struggle and repression like many insurrectionists have theorized. More likely, it is that the radical grouplets need to expand and provide an alternative to the *day-to-day* of the liberal bourgeois representatives. The Cell, in at least this

---

<sup>2</sup> CrimethInc. (2025, September 9). *Ice Out of Illinois, Ice Out of Everywhere*. CrimethInc. <https://crimethinc.com/2025/09/23/ice-out-of-illinois-ice-out-of-everywhere-a-report-from-the-blockades-at-the-broadview-facility>

conception, fails to provide a tangible functioning outside of its milieu. Its members stick their heads out of the herd to offer saliency, before digging deep inside the Earth to withstand the impact.

Reality is ironic. This phenomenon of conservation which safeguards the social life of the Cell just as likely carves up the willing radicals to atomization. With little coordination or visible signs of life, communists cannot even build a clear pole amongst *themselves*. This remarkable state of confusion can be found in another Crimethinc piece released in November. It documents another Cell of radicals who entered the fray more recently and miscalculated the trajectory of the Broadview and Rapid Response networks. Despite waves of unsuccessful Rapid Response struggles (led by controlled opposition) and mass kidnappings (see our recent submission, ‘*White Collaborators*’, for the full context), despite all evidence pointing that Broadview had been lost to the Illinois State Police and the controlled opposition, these radicals called for a return to recycled tactics, their thesis on recent events boiling down to the reintegration of radicals into these bourgeois neighborhood watch groups.<sup>3</sup> This is not so much to critique their own findings in isolation, struggle against pluralism, or to reemphasize the failings of the anti-ICE movement, as much as to emphasize a stark lack of coordination that can occur between different Cells *within the same milieu*.

What appears to be missing is interaction with the real movement on a mass level (the communication of communist opposition), coordinating amongst both the ultra left and the proletariat. In this climate it seems the Cell is either unable or unwilling to build a radical pole and challenge the bourgeois world outside of the immediate tactical struggle.

Courage is needed to break with lone Cells, but courage for what?

---

<sup>3</sup> Collective, CrimethInc. (2025, November 20). *Resisting Ice in Chicago*. CrimethInc. <https://crimethinc.com/2025/11/20/reflections-on-resisting-ice-in-chicago-the-view-from-broadview>

## **Rhetorical Conservatism: The Mass Party & Its Discontents**

The modern mass Party is simply the inverse of the Cell. In staking out its own pole for all to see, it gestures to the public fervently, shouting to the world to recognize itself for what it is. An immediate justification of its life. Unfortunately, in the public sphere of politics and economics, the fledgling Party subsequently trips over and embarrasses itself. Its decision to adhere to liberalism is conformist, our milieu offers, but we must likewise recognize it is a tactful decision of survival; *The nature of the mass Party must conform to live another day.*

Much of our work already contends with this dynamic, and our readership at large is so overwhelmingly critical of the traditional Party that we feel no such need to launch into lengthy diatribes. Of what must be said: We hold no such gripes with the mass Party as an eternal truth, either positive in the lens of the Leninists or negative in that of the Anarchists. We do hold gripes with politics and economics, which the mass Party must adopt in order to seem sensible to the masses it must meet. As such, we are concerned with the question of its relevance in setting a pole beyond what is possible within capitalism.

In analyzing the role of the mass Party form within our midst, it is of course apparent they have not been able to accomplish the former. No, there is a decisive social penetration on part of the bourgeoisie which distracts the Party and detracts from its revolutionary potential. The Party is forced to act within the real world as it really exists, forced to chalk up real demands and find real bones for the proletariat to sustain its social reproduction as slave. Slavery is comfortable, it sells, it lives on.

The Cell is comfortable from this purview: To act inside the mass movement from an insular outside is a rather warm proposal. But likewise, neither are on profound footing. Whereas the Party barges in with brute force, guiding the mass movement from a formal context,

including a formal division of labor and needless hierarchies, the lone Cell attempts to sneak by unaccounted for, recreating social divisions of labor and a tyranny of structurelessness which itself results in the very chain of command it claims to despise. Both are dishonest for both assume the role of the communist to be in opaqueness, which only leads to the implicit or explicit recreation of bourgeois society.

In summation: The Party insists on meeting the masses where they are, and in doing so establishes a political-economic line. The proletariat can then become accustomed to this Party. Yet in extreme crisis the Party is now a conservative element which the proletariat is forced to leapfrog for their abolition. At that, we are not convinced a mass Party is to save us from our troubles.

## **Physical Conservatism:**

### **Infrastructure Projects & Autonomous Zones**

Lastly, we point our criticism toward the physical conservation of spaces in which many a communist has engaged in. This spawns from a dilemma amongst communists on how to approach the masses, and the question of flexing our own muscle in relation to the proletariat. A relatively potent view can be found in *'Hinterland: America's New Landscape of Class and Conflict'*, where author Phil A. Neel surmises that it is strength and infrastructure, not ideas or political programs, which will win the poor masses.<sup>4</sup> He discussed this through the lens of Far-Right activity in the rural West:

*"By providing material incentives that guarantee stability, combined with threats of coercion for those who oppose them, such groups become capable of making the population complicit in their rise, regardless of ideological positions. In fact, Kilcullen points out that in*

---

<sup>4</sup> Neel, P. A. (2020, May 1). *Hinterland: America's New Landscape of Class and Conflict*. University of Chicago Press. <https://press.uchicago.edu/ucp/books/book/distributed/H/bo28433484.html>



*such situations (epitomized by all-out civil war), support for one faction or another simply does not follow ideology. People don't throw their weight behind those they agree with, and often many in a population can't be said to have any deep-seated ideological commitment in the first place. Instead, support follows strength, and ideology follows support. Political or religious attachment is often an after-the-fact development, preceded by the capable intervention of a pragmatic, functional partisan group that begins as a small minority of the population.” (p. 32)*

Neel embellishes further here:

*“There are a few simple lessons that might be drawn from all of this. The first overarching observation is simply that the future of class war in the United States is beginning to enter a period of severe polarization and extreme contingency. More and more people are becoming aware that liberalism is a failed political project. The ability of partisans to succeed in the environment of competitive control opened up by this failure will correlate to their ability to offer strength and stability to populations in the midst of crisis.” (p. 86)*

This view is attractive, as it falls in line with Marxist developmental theory at large, rejects the conception that ideas move history, and so on. We meet the workers, we feed them, house them, provide them dignity, and in return we hope for some signal of social validation. This is a process that requires communists to build strength and exert it as such, with an emphasis on meeting the workers' material conditions in immediacy, as an input to revolution, and expanding on the revolution later as we build capacity. There are concerns we have with this methodology, both practical and historical.

This incremental strength built on purchasing loyalty requires a reinforcement of preexisting social relationships in the insular. We have seen this time and time again through a variety of mutual aid programs. In a community center on Chicago's Southwest Side, for

example, an autonomous group delivers food, drink, clothing, masks, whistles, handwarmers, and a slew of resources and information at all times. Next, there were large bursts of activity and it gradually became more and more extensive in scope. Establishing links between immigrant day laborers, a local encampment, local workers, and even small businesses who provided aid, it served as sorely needed community defense infrastructure. Yet even this project, which has existed for almost 4 months, has employed fewer and fewer committed activists as winter onset and time pushed on. Even as masked federal agents frequently attacked the site and kidnapped immigrants, the activist presence simply could not sustain itself. For them, they still have to face the music and return to work eventually; All of this labor is just energy expended that could be bringing themselves sustenance. Naturally, then, the project lends itself to fewer and fewer people, typically slanting young/student-based, white collar professionals, and/or remote/part-time workers who can clearly make an excuse to maintain the infrastructure. In the grand scheme of things, this is neither a large nor reliable group to build the machines to feed the masses. The movement naturally becomes further declassed, as described with the autonomous zones in *'The Cell in Retrospect'*. It is no surprise then that after some time, these projects often go stillborn; The litany of autonomous zones in the Occupy Movement, 2020, and various other historical moments reflect the insulation of capitalist relations. If they carve out a niche longer, they are repurposed within capitalist life as to be so thoroughly void of radical content.

We are generally skeptical of the *occupation* of spaces as a real means to achieve revolt. When the Palestine Solidarity Movement tested its strength in the epoch of 2024, its primary method of expression was the Encampment. These Encampments of course differed around the country, but almost all existed as a physical space and social hub where literature and information was exchanged, with various developments in regards to mutual aid, community

programming, and so on. The remarkability of these Encampments to spring up so quickly papered over how quickly many ruptured over the question of physical conservation. After dozens of parks and campus lawns were taken across the country, what was next? The student uprising had to feed itself, but it did not know how. We had declared that the university was ours, but what this meant for the reproduction of our identities within society, we had no answer. We remained as social inputs, as workers to-be, just with a communal twist.

And while we do not pretend that this was the only reason the Encampments collapsed-let alone the primary or secondary cause-there is something to be said about the role of physical conservation in this mess. Many Encampments quickly became wrought with fear and suspicion due to the political circumstances of the time, causing a ripple effect in which they fiercely guarded their zonal borders. Instead of attempting to swing the revolt throughout or even off-campus, the primary antagonism *became what waited off-campus*. The proletariat, the bourgeoisie, all of it. As the dust settled, it meant so much more time and energy would be relegated to patrolling a patch of grass; The revolt would be dead. A product of dreams, the cushy insulation of the autonomous zone was exposed as a wretched child of capitalist alienation. This is not specific to the encampment: The autonomous zone itself is a rejection of the world, yet the world turned inward. This is not satisfactory to do away with any class relations.

The last great hope truly is in a revolutionary explosion, where the need to return to work can visibly be annihilated through the expropriation of both commodities and the means of production. The possibilities are endless as rents start to slowly go missing, the revolt targets mass infrastructure, and shops are raided in the interim. This allows autonomous centers and various grouplets dedicated to providing services to form with less structural pressure. But within

a capitalist relation, we fear these heroic structures typically bend, deform into radicals hunting and gathering for scraps, and the limit of their lifespans make them undependable for the working class.

Due to these factors, we are skeptical of the ability of infrastructure projects and acts of physical conservation, especially those that exist outside of a violent setting of mass expropriation. Which of course, would bleed revolution itself rather than the task of an “infrastructure project”. We understand the immense work that these projects are when undertaken correctly, and criticize with the intent to generate other outcomes.

This places us in a uniquely horrid position where we not only recognize the apocalypse of raw tactical immediacy or rhetorical slyness, but also in the long term fate of grassroots activism.

We must look beyond the immediacy of day to day life to seek social revolution, but in day to day life find the spark to reproduce a social revolution, so it goes.

### **A Test of Political Suicide: The Formal & Informal**

In much of our writing we refer to the “real movement” for communism, which is simply the sum of the contradictions of class society and their continuous struggle against one another, regardless of any mediatory attachments. Thus we have spoken against activism and spectacular protesting. We have wrung our hands on the topic of democratic centralism. In this piece, we have criticized the reproductive nature of infrastructure projects, Cells, Parties, at which point we have seemingly left no place for communists to do anything. We are not making a caricature of our position as much as illuminating a partial truth: Capitalist spectacle infiltrates and reproduces absolutely, with every protest or infrastructure project bearing its resemblance. So, is it that

communists actually do anything, or are we awaiting a mass death before allowing ourselves to poke around in the wreckage for a communist utopia?

What is imperative is not to glorify action for its own sake, but to both think and act in the understanding of the movement in which we reside. This includes the heightened contradictions of Capital's overbearing police State, and the corrective measures on the labor supply. As such there are several methods we suggest moving forward. *The priority is first political suicide*, i.e., a rejection of all political and economic mediations and mediatory mechanisms. Neel is right in his assessment that the masses do not prioritize ideological clarity as much as material sustenance; We would be chauvinists to assume anything else. Likewise, we do our own understanding of capitalist society a terrible ill when we confine our observations to the laws of the time. Whether it is a strategic alliance with the petit-bourgeoisie, the quest to reallocate capitalist society for the benefit of exploited cogs in the machine, or the popularization of bourgeois regimes: Communist internationalism supersedes these laws, is incompatible with them, and therefore should not be confined to them.

What must be done is to establish a communist pole *on the brink of reality*, which marks a clear, distinct change in social life while remaining completely impossible under a capitalist mode. This is a stark rejection of mass politics, and meeting masses where they are entrenched by bourgeois ideology. Practically, it may look like the following process, in which we use the anti-ICE movement as a real example:

1. The advent of increasingly militaristic raids bring to light contradictions of State violence and the conceptual border itself. ->

- 1.1. Splits within bourgeois representatives and an overbearing military industrial complex imbue further chaos into daily capitalist life, and its ability to reproduce itself. ->
2. The real movement naturally expresses itself in opposition to these raids. ->
  - 2.1. The response from the proletariat is mixed, infused with courage and widespread hysteria. They set the initial pole of what is possible through their own action and self-organization. ->
3. The bourgeoisie is split over support for this opposition. Tentative factions make abstract appeals for reform, or simply make complaints. The banners of anti-Trumpism and civic nationalism are raised. Civilians are told to stand down, and are made aware of the reprisals if they do not. Various poles of obedience and faith are set by warring factions of controlled opposition, pulling back the initial pole of the proletariat. ->
  - 3.1. Faith fails to resolve any quantifiable amount of violence nor contradiction, and appears only as the bourgeoisie closing its ranks. ->
4. *Communists set a rhetorical and physical pole that is both quantifiable, imaginable, yet impossible:* To abolish, say, the police-State apparatus itself. ->
  - 4.1. They will hold out on this front for as long as possible. If it succeeds, the proletariat has the potential to push the pole beyond the communists and disintegrate the social fabric. If it fails, it will resemble similarly the nature of the autonomous infrastructure project.

Now, how do we *organize* during the setting of this pole? In the setting of an impossible objective, communists immediately break the conservative rules of both the Cell and the Party.

That is, in order to agitate around communism, the Communist Cell cannot parse through a piecemeal survival tactic: It must learn to trust both other Cells, and to offer some level of coordination with them in defense of the pole. Likewise, the docile Party conserves public energy on a political-economic basis as its lifeforce. The sheer possibility of the Party to do so makes it all the more conservative, and historically, it must act outside of conservation for communism to survive.

In order to defend the pole, communists have to defend themselves. Through affinity groups and the act of struggling alongside new comrades, a semblance of this defense exists. In order to not only cling for survival but tilt toward the erosion of capitalist society, we recommend the following various steps. These are not to be taken as prescriptions for any terrain, but as a loose guide.

1. Genesis. The primary work is to be done within a communist's closest affinity and social family with the task of building a critique of the mass movement. Thus, it is easiest to begin at the lone Cell, or small group of shared vision and milieu which may be formed. It must contain a mutual delineation of both revolutionary sentiment and genuine ambition to revolutionize daily life. This is not a sweeping mass Party, and as such members should agree upon realistic expectations prior to beginning work within the Cell. If contradiction of interests extends (simple apathy amongst communists is a common one), members should always stay fluid and be open to the formation of new Cells.
2. Through the study and formation of this Cell, the members should leverage their social contacts in the creation of a network. The transcription of sentiment and ambition amidst the network allow the original Cell to visualize an informal

organizational structure. This is such that it is noncompulsory, non-public, and individuals are free to enter and exit one or two Cells at any given time, provided that they share some degree of affinity with the network.

3. Intermission. The informality of this communist network is guaranteed to be immiserating. It takes extensive patience to transcribe social expectations even just one degree outward from the original Cell. This period is not about recruiting promising individuals to uplift the lone Cell, but to bring communists both within and outside of the milieu together to theorize the practical setting of a visible, rhetorical pole. We encourage the rhetorical pole to fall under one impossible banner, i.e., “Abolish the Police-State”, “Abolish Work”, and so on.
4. As this public practicality is born, it necessitates the formation of further Cell-groupings of people and resources. Independent but related tasks may give rise, such as prominent single issues that we seek to unite under a sole rhetorical pole (anti-ICE, anti-cop, and anti-surveillance sentiments, for example). The responsibility here is to stave off impatient desires to federalize all practical work amongst the founding Cell(s), which risks the multiplicity of the movement (due to risk of repression, and likelihood of Cell growth). In this, we mean that as ideas take shape, we communists tend to conserve them at all costs, often in the shape of the Party form and program. We must understand we are not to *conserve the pole* and its implications, but to seek its obliteration by the proletariat on the edge of possibility. In summation, as practical steps are taken, this must coincide with new growths or reformations of Cells.



5. Multiplicity. With the patient formation of new Cells and movement amidst the network, this allows a formation to take shape that adheres to neither the informal nor formal, central nor decentral. Rather, *it is the centralization of isolated sentiments amongst decentralized groupings, and the formal protocol of revolutionary content within informal, or non-programmatic, anti-political settings*. Assemblies, to a degree of formality that relies on judgement of the purveyor, can then proceed in which the Cells discuss the defense of the pole and tinkering with its magnetism. *Specific tasks or actions of individual Cells are not to be discussed in large assemblies*, as much as the general success of the pole and its position. This process can be continuous as long as it is productive and to some degree of social security, i.e., does not openly compromise the immediate tasks of the Cells and the pole at large.
6. In the Streets. We favor operating in *clandestinity on a mass level*, sharing ideas and tactical information which take the language of our pole, while acting together in a way that pushes physical boundaries. The banner is thus public for all to see, while the network behind its genesis remains fluid and opaque. Workshops can be held, anti-political campaigns federated under the pole and pushed, independent actions taken, all with this in mind. It is important that we do not fall victim to mass politics in this attempt, but rather *encourage the masses to leap beyond us*.

Consider another approach to the “*vital cells*” phenomenon:

“Vital cells are formed with a small number of comrades: we suggest 5-10 individuals within a cell. Each person should participate in two cells simultaneously. The first cell is the

‘primary’ cell and is composed of members already within the milieu or is the cell that you initially join. Having found a home cell, each member of the vital cells should strive to create a second cell composed of participants outside the milieu (or who are not currently organized). The home cell should communicate with its members to promote the organization of the second cell. Having organized two cells, the individual should cease to expand quantitatively and should instead grow qualitatively. This prevents a “growth-at-all-costs” mentality, while still allowing particular cells to expand. Once a cell reaches its maximum capacity it should split into two or more cells. Through this process, the cells can expand in each direction. Over time, connections between groups of cells will change, and we can imagine several ‘sections’ of cells emerging over time. Finally, cells should incorporate expiration dates at which the cell disbands, and a new cell is formed out of its pieces. This serves to prevent stagnation, promote opacity, thereby making them illegible to the police, and to form a greater number of intensive bonds among other comrades” (Suemnicht).

## Conclusion

We have no choice but to wave the banner of communism. What this looks like, how, and where, is specific to the conditions to each grouplet of radicals. Yet as with recent developments, conservatism will get us nowhere. We have to break with social, rhetorical, and physical paralysis, actively seek our comrades out, and build a *visible pole* through clandestine means. This pole must be impossible and only accompanied by revolution in its content. Of course, if this task was easy the revolution would have already subsumed us.

Long live the movement to communise.

## References

- Suemnicht, K. (2021, December 22). *Vital Cells*. • Ill Will. <https://illwill.com/vital-cells>
- CrimethInc. (2025, September 9). *Ice Out of Illinois, Ice Out of Everywhere*. CrimethInc. <https://crimethinc.com/2025/09/23/ice-out-of-illinois-ice-out-of-everywhere-a-report-from-the-blockades-at-the-broadview-facility>
- Collective, CrimethInc. (2025, November 20). *Resisting Ice in Chicago*. CrimethInc. <https://crimethinc.com/2025/11/20/reflections-on-resisting-ice-in-chicago-the-view-from-broadview>
- Neel, P. A. (2020, May 1). *Hinterland: America's New Landscape of Class and Conflict*. University of Chicago Press. <https://press.uchicago.edu/ucp/books/book/distributed/H/bo28433484.html>