

In our cover letter to "A Beginning Analysis" passed out at the September Conference, we stated that "without further investigation of the SCLC any conclusions drawn about the SCLC experience will neither be accurate nor instructive". We hope to contribute to such further analysis, investigation, and the drawing of useful conclusions through this document. Our purpose in examining the SCIC, is the same now as it has been since the beginning of the open meetings of the Local Center and that is to make a full evaluation and summary of the Southern California experience in building a LC.

We support the concept of a single Ideological Center, the development of Local and Regional Centers as a form for building the I.C. center and for developing the ideological struggle. The national should lead the local. In this moment in time it is not correct for the I.C. to guide practice. We do feel however, that there is the need for practical work to be centralized and guided systematically and we feel this need must be addressed by the OCIC with recommendations made. We support the idea of a national pre-party org(s) within the OCIC. We have concerns about the danger of separating theory too far from practice during the process of establishing the I.C., though we agree that at this moment theory is primary, again we feel this is a question that should be addressed and an overall perspective given that shows the relationship of these aspects both in the immediate period of time and in the forthcoming periods.

We agree that one of the tasks facing the OCIC is the period of transition from a body of predominantly small local organizations to tendency wide formation that allows for open ideological struggle. There is a need to break out of localism and the restraints that are inherent in small localized organizations. We see this as a process that will unfold as the I.C. develops and LC's are established and functioning. In this process we must also watch out for another danger which is to prematurely negate and dissolve local organizations out of fear of being federationist. We feel that it is necessary to address the question of how local organizations should function in this period of time in a positive manner and that guidance should be given to these forms in how to move toward a national perspective.

The task of unraveling the history of the SCLC and analysing it is by no means easy. What might have begun as a relatively straight forward task has become complex and convoluted by the layers of confusion, misrepresentation, and misinterpretation. The manner in which the struggle has been conducted in the SCALC has only contributed to this situation. In fact the methods used have given birth to some of our deepest concerns.

Whatever criticisms are raised in this document are raised in the spirit of accepting each other as comrades with the commitment to overcome differences through correct methods of struggle. All of us have to learn how to use criticism/ self-criticism as a tool to correct errors and not as a method to smash and destroy each other. We see criticism/ self criticism as needing to first take place in the context of unity- struggle- unity, seeking always for greater unity on a principled basis.

No one set of errors, or "one prevailing line" accounts for the problems of the SCLC. The process of development that has taken place did not start with clear direction and of necessity grew out of trial and error. The SC cannot be faulted for not knowing how to build a local center from the beginning; how could they? Nor can the SC be faulted for

changing directions a number of times- such changes were often a positive sign of development. We are not critical of the SC making errors; that was to be expected and should be learned from- but we are critical of the SC's ability to understand the effect of their errors and counteract them. We are critical of the SC's inability to deal with those who questioned their decisions and the SC's tendency to respond to differences by considering all differences to be line struggle. But if we are to make an honest attempt to evaluate this experience we must face this squarely and attempt to understand what role we each played in bringing us to this situation, if we are to move forward in a stronger not weaker state.

We must be dilligent in our efforts to investigate all that has taken place and to do this we must not hold anything sacred, not to be questioned or looked at. It is only from this kind of investigation that what is true will be verified and what is false will be exposed. In order to do this we must start at the beginning..

As a whole we must assess the reality of our situation clearly and begin to sort out what went wrong and how to again begin to move the process forward. This document is just one part of that process.

History Of The Local Center Process.

One of the underlying errors that existed in developing the LC in SC was the lack of a serious investigation of the objective and subjective conditions that existed and the inability to draw a correct conclusion and analysis as to what was to be done. The subjective desire to wish something or a process into being is a product of idealism.

If the conditions of this area were actually the way they were portrayed by Pat. Fry last Dec., then perhaps the development of the LC here might have been different.

In Dec. 78, Pat Fry addressed a letter to the co- chairs of the SC. which read as follows. pagel. para. 2.

As you probably realize, your area of the country is "made to order for the SC conception of how a local center should develop. You have several OC organizations which are being brought together for the first time. You have independent study groups; you have other forces outside of the O.C. which should be inside the OCIC, i.e. the Guardian Club, you have a proliferation of anti- imperialist formations which are not dominated by the dogmatist groups(in Detroit we have a workers viewpoint controlled A.L.S.C.) All of this makes excellent ground for your local center work. And by all indications, you all are seizing the opportunity with all deliberate speed."

Such was the analysis of the NSC in the person responsible for the direction of this work on a national level.

All things in nature, including political life must be viewed as a process of coming into being, of development through inner contradiction and its final dissolution into some higher form. Truth is concrete, and to understand the history of the formation and evolution of the SC. Calif. Steering Committee and later the LC it is imperative to have an understanding of the living forces that played a history in that process. The history of the SCLC cannot be understood unless there is a real knowledge of what proceeded the SCLC in the first days of Sept. 1978, that is the constellation of OC forces in So. Calif. and their history itself.

First, let us look at the reality here. Historically this is a city that has had a long and at times intense history of communist activity. It has most recently seen the development of several of the anti-revisionist party building movements. CLP, CPML and ATM, all of whom have since moved their central bodies elsewhere. The history of the smaller groupings has been a history of splits of more smaller and smaller groups rather than the consolidation of larger groupings. The city lends itself to this development by its very fragmenting and isolating nature.

If compared to cities in the east and midwest, LA is more similar to a region, than to a city and it perhaps would be most effective to continually approached it as a series of smaller cities. In this area a local regional center could possibly bring together and overcome some of the fragmentation and isolation that exist.

At the time that the SCIC was initiated, more than one year ago, it was very clear that the groupings in LA were not viable organizations and were in the process of dissolving and joining the small organization in the area.

LAOC, a group of three people who had recently moved back to LA, had formed themselves into a unit that joined the OC. The LAOC had attempted unsuccessfully to unite other people they knew into developing an organization in this area. While they knew the people in the LAWG, there was no opportunity to unite with them as they were still involved in their internal process.

LAWG, a group of four people who remained together after the LAWG had split two years before. They had maintained a presence within the OC through their documents. They were in the process of a period of self evaluation and had made a decision not to seek out local forces but to maintain their contact with the national center of the OCIC due to their small size and special family commitments.

SOC, a small local organization located some 35 miles from LA in Orange County. It's principles of unity published in Notes From Orange#1 in 1977 stated " help build a new genuinely democratic- centralist communist party in the U.C." and joined the OC in late 1977. The SOC membership had observed at close hand the formation and destruction of the RU(RCP) cadre in Orange County and had gained some insight into the nature and character of the dogmatic anti-revisionist movement. It also had the additional experience to observe at close hand the birth and death of the ATM formation in the area, which reinforced its understanding of the ultra left.

SOC had no knowledge of other OC forces in So. Calif. in this first period of late 1977 and began to devote serious attention to contacting all know forces in So. Calif. that it believed could be won to the OCIC, including political contacts in the Bay Area.

SOC has no knowledge of other OC forces in So. Calif. in this first period of late 1977 and began to devote serious attention to contacting all known forces in So. Calif. that it believed would fit into the anti-left movement represented by the OCIC, including political contacts in the Bay Area..

These formations were the LA Guardian Club, Pasadena Workers Collective, a very small grouping, and the Pasadena Community Information Center, a Black community group moving in the direction of Marxist- Leninist ideas. The political work of SOC consisted mainly introducing these groups to the OCIC, sharing OCIC documents and encouraging these groups to further investigate the OCIC.

In Dec. of 1977, SOC made contact with the LAWG and our delegates to the Feb. 78 OC conference went with the LAWG comrades to this event.

In March of 1978 SOC sponsored a gathering of all OC forces in SO. Calif. to hear a report from the Feb. OC Conference. SOC invited not only all OC forces but also the Pasadena Workers Group and a rep. from the Bay Area who were involved in the building the Bay Area Socialist Organizing Committee.

SOC invited a rep. from the Oakland OC force to visit us in the spring of 1978 and SOC established a relationship with this OC force.

In June of 1978, the leadership of the BASOC formation invited SOC to attend its first conference and one SOC member addressed this conference and urged that BASOC conduct an investigation of the OCIC and its political line. A joint meeting between SOC and Oakland comrades took place during this event to establish better ties between our respective OC organizations.

SOC took the initiative to begin a process of involving the LA OC comrades in its practical work. In early June of 1978 a joint committee the TCC, Tri Communications Committee was established for the purpose of exploring joint work and establishing political ties and relations.

Contradictions emerged within the TCC concerning the direction of the LAWG. Some members of the LAWG didn't know if they were to remain in LA and had expressed doubts if the OCIC could establish a base in LA. In addition contradictions emerged between one LAWG member and a member of the LAOC. Soc undertook a struggle with the LAWG to remain in LA and attempted to solve the internal contradictions within the TCC.

Despite these problems, joint work was undertaken first by all OC forces participating in an anti-police terror demonstration in LA.

In late Aug. the LA Guardian Club contacted SOC for the purpose of sponsoring a debate between Clay and Silber. The TCC immediately grew together to develop this important political event for our common movement.

SOC kept in contact with the NSC about our political work in the Bay Area, sought advice and input from Clay.

In late Aug. and early Sept. of 1978 Clay spent a week investigating OC forces in SO. Calif. giving helpful guidance and inspired us all in developing our work. Clay's visit served to consolidate the view that joining SOC was the only logical step to make, at least for the 5 OC members in LA. Clay's visit did not create that decision although he encouraged that decision.

The above represents in brief outline, the OC forces that existed in SO. Calif. some of the contradictions and sets the stage for the beginning of the LASC.

ha The Clay-Silber Debate did not produce the results all OC forces had anticipated. A good part of the audience of 200 left the meeting during the break because they were confused as to what the issues were. Comrade Criste of the LASC summed up the analysis of many So. Calif. OC comrades in her three page feedback she sent to Clay "... didn't situate the strategy in terms of the U.S. - no mention of particularities of the US in relation to the importance of fusion."

It was clear that at the time the LCSC was initiated the two groups

the LAWG & LAOC were not viable organizations but were in fact in the process of disbanding with an eye to unification with SOC. Los Angeles was void of a single OCIC organization that could systematically direct and sum-up practice in the LA working class and mass movement. This was the case, despite the fact that in LA there existed several dedicated OCIC comrades who shared unity beyond the 18 points and agreed in general on party building.

It is that the formation of the LASC came to partially fill this void that another key source of future problems can be located. The Local center SC became a rather closed inclusive group which, with the exception of one SOC delegate, took on its own internal life and dynamic, and in fact began to function as an political unit itself. The dynamic of the SC turned inward, rather than reaching out to encompass the rest of OCIC members. This negative dynamic was unchecked by outside sources. The NSC was not providing needed guidance. On the local level the EC of SOC failed to provide its delegates to the SC with guidance and to demand reports. In addition no reports were communicated by SOC delegates to SOC. The SC in turn allowed this separation between itself and the remainder of the OC to continue.

It was positive that the SC realized this error and moved to open the LC to all OC members. However, the SC failed to assess and compensate for the divisions that had been developing during these several months of separation. When the process finally did open, most previously uninvolved OC members encountered a situation already filled with tension and division. One of the key founding members of SOC, a comrade with whose politics many SOC members identify, had already been labeled by the SC as having a different party building line from the OCIC. These conditions were more than just a natural result of the self-containment. They were a direct consequence of a bad method of struggle which had manifested itself in the SC and emerged full blown into the larger LC.

Methods of Struggle.

The incorrect method of struggle referred to is one that continually pulls differences out of their context and forces them into the arena of battles over line. Those who use this approach believe that to get to the root of issues remains dealing with opposition or differences by prematurely unearthing lines. This approach forces "lines" to emerge not as a developed analysis but only in defensive reaction. This is an approach which in fact gets so occupied with constructing a neat line struggle that it misses and distorts what is really being said.

Such a method of struggle was first evident when Comrade L raised questions concerning 1) who was to be in the LC, there was no mass base only a steering committee. 2) There was no cadre organization in LA and how would the nature of the LC be changed if all except one joined SOC, and 3) to whom was the LC accountable. This comrade also suggested that a sum up of the TCC be made taking lessons from that experience to contribute to the construction of the LC; and that the LC start with a meeting of the whole OC in the area to present the suggested plan for an LC and receive feedback from the body. All of these suggestions were rejected most on the basis of their reflecting a different line on building the LC than the NSC had presented. This reflects a mechanistic view of the concept that the national leads the local. It denies the dialectic relationship between a leadership and its base. The sum up of the TCC was rejected because it wasn't relevant, would slow down the momentum of building an LC, and would only stir up the past.

It was the SC dealing with Comrade A that this form of line struggle

again stepped forward. Comrade A raised issues concerning leadership of the LC, the relation of cadre organization to the SC, the educative and ideological function of the SC and cadre organizations - issues which were far from clearly defined when they were raised and are still definitely on the agenda for discussion today. The real significance of comrade A's statements and suggestions within the context of the SCALC was not brought forward in the struggle that ensued. Instead the specters of federationism, localism, and organizational hegemony were invoked and the discussions filtered back to the rest of the OC members cast in sharp terms of different party building lines.

To be clear, we in the minority are not opposed to struggling out real line differences, but we are tired of pseudo line struggles. By the time the LC broke out of its self inclusiveness, after several months of separation from the remaining OC forces, the lines were drawn. The first full local center meetings represented more the negative situation described in the Draft Plan for an Ideological Center than a healthy ideological exchange.

" Small groups of leaders would probably advance a " leading" political line - a line whose very formulation is developed in the context of small circle discussions and advanced publicly only when fully consolidated. The struggle to win other communist over to this line would become characterized by a " mountain- stronghold mentality" with the circle trying to brand all its opponents as consolidated opportunists regardless of the significance of their divergence with its line. Polemics would be entered into not from the standpoint of clarifying genuine differences, estimating their real import and elucidating the context in which they become obstacles to common work, but from the narrow perspective of scoring points against one's opponent. 'Ideological struggle' waged in this manner does not allow for the assertion of the interests of the communist movement as a whole and can only lead to fragmentation and circle- warfare." (Draft Plan)

Some specific examples of incorrect methods which were used in the SCIC process even after it was opened up are illustrative of this 'mountain stronghold mentality.'

One; identifying tentative ideas or questions put forward as evidence of or inevitably leading to a full blown ' line'. In addition these ideas were not just identified as another line but were to be nipped in the bud before they had a chance to develop. Prior to a very few weeks before the National Conference, there was no consolidated minority position. Individuals within the local center raised questions and objections to views being put forward. However they did not consider these questions or statements to represent any line, much less a different line from the OCIC. For example, at the first LC meeting opened up to all OCIC forces in Southern California, some comrades raised questions about the history of the LC process put forward by the LCSC and these ideas were immediately identified as right opportunist and backward. It was concluded by some who had opposed A that these represented A's incorrect line and these ideas must be struggled against before they led to errors. This shows that in ideological struggle eliminating individuals who hold ideas does not eliminate those ideas.

Two, ideas were identified or labeled (federationist, localist, hegemonist, empiricist, racist, right opportunist, backward, obstructionist) without foundation of content. Very little education or even discussion was conducted around the general and historical content of these concep-

tions or specifically why these particular statements (of the minority comrades) were examples of these errors. For example, at one meeting a position held by the minority was called racist. When asked to explain why, the other comrade replied that it was a general principle and to have to give examples would be empiricist. Needless to say, the comrades from the minority left the meeting with no understanding of why or how they were being racist. We are not arguing generally or specifically that ideas should not be identified if they are incorrect (especially if they are racist, sexist, or anti- working class). However they must be clearly shown to be incorrect. In this case, the connection between the general principle and the specific position (even when asked) was not made.

Three, positions held by comrades in the minority perspective were distorted to such an extent that they could be defeated with ease. This is the method of " building straw men in order to knock them down." IM presentation at the National Conference is an example of distortion of the minority position. She began her presentation of the minority views with cheap shots against an opponent who could not defend himself (" He attended meetings inconsistently, came poorly prepared, and didn't make fundamental differences clear.") This was intended to prejudice those attending the conference against any views the minority might put forward. However, she put those positions out for us. Most of the alleged principles of the minority put forward by IM would be rejected by us. For example, one of our positions is supposedly the primacy of practice. No one in the minority would ever put this forward, Why would we support the building of an I.C. if we held this position? We have said that practice plays an important role in developing the ideological center. All the other positions put forward as the ideas of the minority are examples of taking statements out of context and trying to make them principled differences. The result of this form of struggle is that the minority will always be on the defensive in answering question and accusations, instead of putting forward clearly their positions in a positive way. Another result is that it inhibits free discussion..It creates an atmosphere of fear to put forward ideas lest one will be labeled. This is the opposite of open ideological struggle.

The end result of the ways in which questions and differences were dealt with in the LC process is that the LCSC and the individuals around it guaranteed that there would be a " fragmentation and circle warfare" instead of struggle toward greater unity.

In addition the closure of the SC to all but its loyal supporters has contributed to a circle warfare situation in Southern California; those that hold the majority position versus those that hold the minority. Thus the SC and its supporters denied the development of principled ideological struggle within the LC in the interest of promoting it's own small circle's ideas. The result is a split in the OCIC forces in Southern California.

Suggestions To Promote Principled Struggle.

One, correct ideas emerged in struggle with incorrect ones. When differences arise in the beginning of a struggle they are usually not fully developed positions. Therefore they should be encouraged to be fully developed. In the course of struggle, only time and social practice will prove who is right and wrong. Differences, questioning, criticisms should be encouraged to grow and should not be suppressed.

Two, " ideological struggle is not like other forms of struggle. The only method to be used in this struggle is that of painstaking reasoning and not crude coercion." Mao- On the Correct Handling of Contradictions among the People.

Accusations should be avoided. Words and phrases should be given ideological and educative content. When someone is accused of right opportunism, etc we must take pains to explain why positions they hold are examples of these errors. Three, in the history of the communist movement minority views have many times turned out to be correct. Therefore minority positions inside and outside of organizations must be encouraged. Minority positions can be put forward until these questions are put to a vote at a national conference (struggle around point 18 is a good example of this method). After a vote is taken the minority must be subordinate to the majority in practice. However they must not be asked to give up their ideas. If there is a change in the objective situation which warrants discussion, the opportunity must be given to those holding the minority view to again raise them. In order to ensure that organizational maneuvers are not used against a minority, those holding minority views must not be removed from responsible positions or political work. Finally, as much as possible minority positions should be put forward by the minority themselves. They should not be characterized by someone who holds a different position.

Local Centers and Cadre Organizations.

The specific process of development of Local Centers is going to vary in different parts of the country according to the concrete conditions involved that on a very basic level, the processes and problems faced in a city with a number of OC organizations plus OC individuals will be somewhat different from those faced in a city with several OC individuals and no OC organizations. The nature of the organizations and individuals involved will also affect the process. In parts of her address to the National Conference, Pat Fry uses the Detroit IC experience (involving two cadre organizations and a number of OC individuals, many of whom are minorities) to draw several important lessons. We wish to draw some conclusions from a very different situation and experience in Southern California.

The Local Center in LA began in a city which had seven white OC individuals and no OC organizations. The nearest OC organization that could possibly conduct practice and sum it up was SOC, a small growing (still all white) cadre organization located primarily some 35 miles outside LA. The SCIC experience has shown us that the development of a LC in an area without a single cadre organization will produce a distorted formation that cannot fulfill one of the LC functions, i.e. the involving of all possible members in the broader tendency as participants in the building of the IC. We believe that the prior existence of a cadre organization in the area (or rapid development of a cadre organization along with the LC is necessary for the following reasons 1) a Local Center composed of individuals none of whom belong to an organizational form that guides or summarizes practice, will more than likely transform the LC into a separate political unit or circle, 2) theory developed in a LC composed of all individuals (theory developed on the national level as well) can't receive even the most basic testing in the local area, 3) without an OCIC organization in the area that in practice can demonstrate the OCIC's pro-working class, anti-racist, and anti-sexist politics, many advanced workers and minority comrades will remain outside of our movement.

The LA experience is a prime example of the first problem, that without a cadre organization the LC did take on characteristics of a separate unit with its own internal dynamic. This was very much the case of the LASC in the past, and will remain the case until a cadre organization is established in LA and proper elections of LCSC representatives by the OC as a whole takes place. It is not surprising that the SC turned inward

and functioned as a separate entity- in fact, under the objective conditions it would have been surprising if this didn't occur. To believe that it is possible that individuals with no other organizational relationships can exist in some independent relationship to each other while at the same time relating as a committee or center to the NSC, is not to have a grasp of the real dynamic involved. The individuals in LA did not stand as individuals who refused to participate in an organized form. They were willing to participate organizationally with the national and had begun a process of unifying with SOC. As the SC turned more inward, and the SOC unification process dragged on, they assumed more the characteristics of a separate organization than a group developing an open LC.. The resulting form is an organization with no base in the area, suspended by ties to the national.

There is another counterproductive result that can flow from the situation outlined above. If individuals come to use the LC and SC as half way stations which afford them the opportunity to still be part of the mainstream(and even occupy leadership positions) while ignoring practical base building, then the whole plan of the local centers will begin to work against the future of the OCIC. If LC are permitted to be convenient resting points for individuals (especially white OC members who have a strong tendency toward academicism, then local centers will come to exist, less as a means for overcoming decades of the left's racism, sexism and sectarianism, and will, in fact, encourage scholasticism and individualism we have seen so often on the left.

Some form in which theory can be tested should exist in the local area. The communist theory of knowledge realizes that the true test of theory lies in practical class struggle. Clearly, no single incident or isolated local can accurately test theory. In fact, short of the establishment of a well developed party, the results of our testing theory in practice will most often approach approximations of correctness or incorrectness, rather than absolute answers. None the less, the testing of our developing theory through our beginning ties with the working class and mass struggles will play a crucial role in our advancement. The formation of a LC in an area void of a cadre organization poses the problem of how even the most preliminary testing of theory could take place. We realize that it is not the duty of the IC to guide practice, but it certainly would be correct for the OCIC to encourage organized practice especially when it is a clear possibility, and none exists.

To allow a LC to form and function unaccompanied by a single organization actively building bases in the working class and ties with the mass movement is to condemn us to our present state of separation from advanced workers and minorities. Many advanced workers, minorities, and independent leftists will judge the OCIC by the ability of its members to lead the class struggle, and fight racism and sexism. Because of the history of racism and sexism within the left, and our low level of fusion today, most of these forces will remain isolated from the theoretical discussions in the OCIC unless efforts are made to win them to the OCIC by means of both our theory, and just as importantly at this time our practice. In the realm of winning adherents thought practice a LC in an area without a cadre organization is hamstrung. Such a LC would have to rely on the dedicated yet spontaneous, unguided and unorganized efforts of individuals. We want to include advanced workers and minorities not only as participants in our discussions but in the process of deciding the nature of these discussions. In order to win advanced workers and minorities total amateurism in practice must be avoided as much as possible. The OCIC should encourage the building of the most advanced forms for OCIC practice possible in any area.

In situations such as we face in LA, organizational forms for practice on the level of a cadre organization have been and are now possible. Realization of such a form should be strongly encouraged.

Local Centers and Building the Multi-Nationality Of the OCIC.

Pat Fry in her speech to the convention states the following:

One of the most glaring conclusions made in summing up the national minorities ML Conference held in June was that most organizations in the CCIC have effectively cut themselves off from the most advanced comrades in our movement. Many of the participants at this national minority conference had politically distant relationships with the OCIC organizations even in the same city. Most participants at the conference still would have known little about the OCIC had not this conference taken place. We only bring this out here to underscore the importance of building local centers in relationship to the tasks of building a multi-nationality of the OCIC and taking up the struggle against racism in our movement.

As a matter of record the SCLC was in direct contact with the SMG since the formation of the LC, later with the PCIC, both of which are multi-national groupings. Our point of departure is that there are no simple solutions and answers to the problem of changing predominantly white character of the OCIC. We again return to our conclusion of the necessity of building a local organization in LA. as a necessary base for conducting a serious and protracted struggle in changing the character of the OCIC.

We have concluded from our LA experience that the formation of a LC in an area devoid of any cadre organization should not be encouraged. If a local center is formed in such a area, than steps should be taken to immediately develop an organization that can engage in systematic practice, summing up of that practice, and the testing of theory.

Our conclusions do not come out of a fetishism for the cadre organizational form nor organizational hebemonism on the part of our small Orange County organization. Our conclusions come out of our living experience with SCALC. We have a strong desire to maintain the proper relation between theory and practice and, the belief that advanced workers and minority involvement in the building of the IC is absolutely crucial. We believe the OCIC has these goals also.

Summary.

One, the Steering Committee became a closed unit with its own internal dynamic separate and apart from the majority of all OC forces in the area. It did not understand the necessity to involve all OC comrades in the process of constructing the LC, and only opened up the LC after 9 months of its existance. The Steering Committee was never elected by all OC forces and this circumstance only fueled the SC inward development and outlook.

Two, the Steering Committee adobted methods of internal struggle which attempts to continually pull differences out of context and forces them into premature battles over line. Such methods of internal struggle do not lead to real political understanding, but to unnecessary divisions and splits.

Three, after the 14 month experience of the SCLC, we have concluded that a key weakness is the absence of a local cadre organization that can serve as a base for the SCLC, unite theory and practice for the cadre of all OCIC forces in this area. Untile this conception is recongnized, we feel that real forward motion in the building of the Local Center will be held back. We also feel that to consolidate workers and oppressed minorities, a local organization is required.

This paper was written as a contribution to further clarify the disputed issues concerning the history of the Southern California Steering Committee and Local Center and to identify problems that all OCIC comrades may well confront as they develop Local Centers in their respective areas.

10/ 26/ 79

From: The SCLC minority: R.S.
K.S.
L.S.
P.B.
A.A.
P.S.
M.F.
T.S.