

WHAT HAPPENED TO THE OCIC?

Parts II and III: A Critique of the Ultra-leftism of the OCIC  
and Its Relationship to the Fusion Partybuilding  
Line.

October 1981

By Dave Forrest  
Vickie Kawakami  
Tyree Scott  
Beverly Sims

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Introduction.....pp 1-3

Part 1

The Fusion Line Prior to the OCIC.....pp 3-6  
Strengths and Weaknesses of the Fusion Line.....pp 6-10

Part 2

Ultra-left Errors At the Time the OC was Founded.....pp 10-11  
Consolidation of Ultra Left errors in OCIC Line.....pp 11-15  
FWOC's Organizational Opportunism: The Secret Pre-Party..pp 15-19  
OC's Idealist Conception of A Leading Core.....pp 19-20  
Lack of Internal Democracy, and incorrect approach to  
Cadre Formation.....pp 20-23  
Left Sectarian Conception of Single Center.....pp 23-25  
The OC's Campaign as a Shift in Partybuilding Line.....pp 26-28  
Ultra-Left Roots of OCIC Degeneration.....pp 28-33  
OC Epitaph: Fusion Abandoned, Ultra Leftism Firmly in  
Control.....pp 33-34

## INTRODUCTION

This paper is designed to sum-up both the partybuilding line of the OCIC and relate the OCIC experience to the original fusion line. We have combined what were to be the second and third papers in order to show more clearly how we view the OC experience in light of the original partybuilding line and practice of the PWOC.

In the first paper, which summarized and critiqued the OC's Campaign Against White and Petit-Bourgeois Chauvinism, we argued that the Campaign while addressing a real problem in the communist movement, failed due to an ultra-left deviation. The Campaign incorrectly repeated the ideological struggle among communists around problems of white chauvinist ideology from the more general struggle for a political line and mass work for the democratic rights of minorities. This detached ideological campaign continued without a clear anchor, line, and disconnected to communist practice. It produced idealist definitions of both white chauvinism, and capitulation to white chauvinism, as well as ultra-left and idealist methods for combatting the problem. During the Campaign the bulk of OCIC comrades left or were driven out of the organization, it became the immediate cause of the OCIC degeneration.

In this paper we argue that the Campaign developed in the idealist fashion that it did, because it took place in the context of an idealist partybuilding line which made a principal of the separation of theory and practice. The OCIC's partybuilding line, embodied in the Draft Plan for A Leading Ideological Center, called for the separation of the Ideological Center from the Centers for guiding practice (cadre organizations). In addition, it gave primacy to the ideological center process throughout the whole period of partybuilding. As an effort to unite the broadest number of Marxist Leninists to struggle over and develop political line the OCIC was a failure. Though the original goals which the OCIC set out to accomplish remain important goals, our summation of the OCIC experience is that we cannot develop political line, nor unite Marxist Leninists based on the separation of communist theory from communist practice. We feel that the OCIC was essentially an ultra-left, and idealist attempt to take up these tasks.

Many comrades within our tendency, most notably the Line of March Editorial Board (LOM), have argued that the OCIC's failures stem from the right opportunist, or economist, fusion partybuilding line. They argued that the OCIC was guided by the fusion partybuilding line which downplays the struggle to develop political line and unification of Marxist Leninists, to communist work ~~and~~ in the trade unions and in efforts to win the advanced workers to communism. While there has been some recognition on the part of these comrades that the form of the OC's errors were at

times "left", they maintain that the OCIC flowed directly out of a "rightist" fusion orientation.

The perspective of this paper is that this is not a correct analysis of either the OCIC or the fusion partybuilding line. In the first section we trace briefly the early development of the PWOC and the fusion line prior to the formation of the OCIC. We argue that while the fusion line did contain certain errors in both formulation and practice, it generally was a correct principal for partybuilding. It correctly argued that the Vanguard Party must develop on the basis of the fusion of communist theory with the advanced workers. In the second section we trace the origins of the OCIC. Here we argue that the basic partybuilding line of the Draft Plan represented a fundamental departure from the earlier fusion strategy. The OCIC was based on an incorrect strategy which prioritized the uniting of Marxist Leninist into a single center. The original conception of the OCIC did not include either communist practice, nor the struggle to win the advanced workers. In fact it subordinated the tasks of building practical organizations, and a pre-party, as well as efforts to win the advanced workers to secondary status.

In essence we argue that the founding of the OCIC meant the liquidation, and subordination of the PWOC's original partybuilding line to a broad 'single center conception.' While PWOC and other fusion forces ~~initially~~ felt the OCIC was consistent with ~~the fusion~~, in reality the fusion forces more and more abandoned their original goals and strategy for partybuilding. In our opinion, a more correct partybuilding line, consistent with fusion, would have meant that at the time of the founding of the OCIC the PWOC would have put out its partybuilding lines, and other political lines in the tendency and struggled to unite all who could be united into a national pre-party. Such a pre-party would have been democratic centralist in character, and had as its goal the development of political line and practical efforts to win the advanced workers to communism. While the PWOC would have also had to participate in a broader, federated form, with other ~~the~~ M-Leninist forces to ~~struggle~~ engage in theoretical struggle, this would have been subordinated to the pre-party's own efforts to develop political line and 'fuse' with the class.

The roots of this abandonment of the basic principles of the fusion partybuilding line lay primarily in a 'left idealist' strategy for party formation. Therefore we try and critique the OCIC's partybuilding line and its various approaches to developing theory, developing a leading core, democracy, and cadre formation. Organizational opportunism of the PWOC, and the NSC of the OCIC also played a key role in how the OCIC developed, and eventually degenerated. Therefore we will look more closely how the left-idealist strategy, and the organizational opportunism lead to a partybuilding process which was yet again another ultra-left approach to partybuilding. In the last section, we try to summarize what we feel are the most important lessons for Marxist Leninists that can be drawn out of the OC's experience.

Part 1: The Fusion Line Prior to the OCIC

The fusion line was first presented publically in 1975 in the pages of the Organizer. The PWOC argued that the ultra-leftist had errored in believing that a Party could be build simply by uniting all Marxist Leninists around a correct theory, or party program. Instead the article stressed that the basis for a party must be layed. Key to laying the basis ~~of the~~ foundations of th Party was the development of workers communism, or the 'development of Marxist they applied to the US', and the winning of the advanced workers to this theory. in the words of the Organizer, "Thus by mefging workers communism with the advanced workers we can lay the foundations for a real revolutionary party. We will have a tried and tested theory(workers communism) which has proven itself directly in class struggle. The advanced workers will have been won over to socialism and socialism will thus have roots in the working class movements. And finally, our years of struggle to bring about the union of communism with the workers movement will have provided us with experienced and hardened revolutionaries to make up the Party." (Jan-Feb. Vol. 1, No. 1)

The PWOC implemented this partybuilding line throughout the early years. In 1971 PWOC was formed with the bulk of its members integrating themselves within the trade union struggles in Philadelphia. Simultaneously with this integration was the development of the trade union position of the PWOC in order to guide their cadre's work. In 1973 the PWOC political committee fought for the importance of revolution ry thoe ry, by stressing that in the period of partybuilding the theoretical struggle, must be primary over the political and economic struggle. This lead the local collective to put thier most advanced eadre, and organizational resources into the development of theoretical positions on the international question, black liberation and national question, and later on in areas of women's libasation, united front, nd Independent Political Action. In 1975 the PWOC launched the Organizer, a a vehicle to present this analysis to the advanced workrs. Even in its early period the PWOC also saw the imporatance of uniting with Marxist Leninists. In 1976, a year after their article on fusion, the PWOC printed their Resolution on Partybuilding. This article stressed the need to develop a movement in opposition with ultra-leftism, or 'dogmatism.' It highlighted the need for a center in order that , "the fevolutionary trend struggles to publish and distribute its contributions from isolated localities, while the dogmatists have established national networks." It also stressed that a center must be built with, 'several local organizations htat are united around a firm understanding of the main lines of battles. They must also be organizations which are rooted in the owkring class movement.' Based on th s conception the PWOC committed itself to distributing its papers and positions to Marxist Leninst around the country. It was this effort that lead to PWOC members traveling and aiding in the formation of local democratic centralist organizatons around the country.

The history of the PWOC has been distorted by the LOM. They have painted a picture of PWOC as an organization of militant trade unionists, as narrow economists, with no real grasp of the need for political line and the unification of Marxist Leninists. True enough the PWOC did see the need to integrate the bulk of its cadre into the trade unions, as a key arena for winning the advanced workrs to communism. But this was a generally correct and healthy policy given the sperattion of Marxists who grew up in the ~~the~~ radical movements of the 60's from the working class movement, particulary the industrial proletariat.

The important point to stress is that integration of cadre into mass struggles does not equal economism, as long as there is a continual effort to simultaneously develop political line. Any concrete study of the PWOC history shows that this was the case.

As with any organizations, particularly a young organization, the PWOC made errors. In the early period the predominate errors were rightist in character. For example, the political committee of the PWOC identified that in its earliest period cadre downplayed the struggle against racism in the shops, and tended to elevate purely trade union issues. This was partly due to the predominately white composition of PWOC cadre, their ideological weaknesses, but also a rightist political line. The rectification for this was the development of the Black Liberation Commission, the publishing of the agitational piece, Racism in the Workers Movement, and a campaign within the PWOC to vigorously take up the struggle in the shops. Later on in the history of the PWOC, they expanded their work into the women's movement, black liberation movement, and movement for independent political action. They saw developing the political side of their work through campaign issues such as the Stop Rizzo Movement.

Through out the history of the PWOC their organization has stressed the need to propaganda with the advanced workers. Though many cadre suffered from rightist weaknesses, called face hiding. The organization did make a systematic attempt to bring communism to the advanced workers through workers forums, Organizer Circles, and most importantly the distribution of the Organizer. While Economism downplays bringing advanced workers into the political struggle, and the need to take up Marxist-Leninism, the PWOC did stress the importance of these advanced tasks in consistency with their partybuilding line of winning the advanced to communism.

Our point in reviewing some of this history is to emphasize that while rightism was a problem in the PWOC, and many economist errors were made, we cannot agree with the LOM that PWOC practiced a rightist partybuilding line. A concrete historical treatment of the PWOC as an organization shows that LOM must resort to ahistorical assertion, and dogmatism to establish their critique. This has been done most recently in the LOM article, Fusion and Its Present Day Distortions. Here the LOM likens PWOC and OC comrades to the Economists of Lenin's day. They argue, whereas Lenin stressed the need for political line and organization in What is To Be Done, the Economist tailors the narrow practical economic struggles of the Russian proletariat.

The theoretical underpinnings for the critique of fusion is fundamentally Dogmatist since Lenin's writings on economism were ~~from~~ under different historical conditions. Lenin argued that the task of social democrats must be to involve the workers in the political struggle against the tsar, develop propaganda and agitation among all strata of Russian society, and to build an all Russian political organization of the working class. These were the tasks in 1902, and yet 8 years earlier Lenin was stressing the need for Russian Social democrats to involve themselves and lead the rapidly growing Russian Strike movement to take up leadership in the economic struggle of the working class. All of this is in the context of a rapidly growing and militant Russian workers movement, a relatively high degree of fusion between the social democrats and the workers, and

a consistent right deviation within the Russian Social democratic movement. And yet LOM's 'economists', the PWOC were building their organization in the context of a relatively depoliticized working class in a period of capital stabilization, a low degree of fusion between the workers and communist movement, and a legacy of ultra-leftism within the anti-revisionist forces. Clearly the tasks, the pace of development, and the obstacles which an organization faces in two such different conditions must be recognized. Lenin himself was very clear on the different stages of partybuilding in his own experience where at different periods practical, theoretical, and organizational tasks must take differing relationships to one another. For example, in arguing with the economists that the social democratic forces had sufficient forces to direct agitation and propaganda among all classes in 1902, he argues with the economists by saying,

" Our economists, frequently inclined as they are to deny this, lose sight of the fact of the gigantic progress of our movement has made from 1894 to 1901. Like real 'tail enders' they frequently live in the distant past, in the period when the movement was just beginning. At that time, indeed, we had astonishingly few ~~extra~~ forces and it was perfectly natural then to devote ourselves exclusively to activities among the workers, and severely condemn any deviation from this. The whole task then was to consolidate our position in the working class. At the present time, however, the gigantic forces that have been attracted to the movement... (whereas in 1894 you could count the social democrats on your fingers.) " What is To Be Done , pp. 107

Undoubtedly the LOM would have criticized Lenin for his economism in going to the workers movement during the strike movements, and making this aspect of social democratic activity primary during a period in party building. And yet Lenin did not build the bolshevik party according to the idealist recipe of the LOM, that Uniting Marxist Leninists around Correct Political Line, or Line Rectification is the essence of partybuilding. Nor did he ~~view~~ view his seminal work on partybuilding, What Is To Be Done, as a blueprint for other experiences. In 1908, in the preface to 10 Years after, he comments that in fact What IS To Be Done must ~~be seen~~ not be seen as a universal set of principles but as a particular historical piece, with particular aims in the context of the Russian experience. Lenin based his partybuilding strategy on the need to fuse marxism with the emerging industrial proletariat in Russia. And this involved both the development of a party Program, but also extensive practical work among the advanced strata of the Russian population.

We must conclude then, based on a concrete historical materialist methodology, that the PWOC did not simply integrate its cadre, but developed political line. It did not simply build the united front, but attempted propaganda and agitation with the advanced. It did not simply remain an amorphous collective but developed a leading core, and a democratic centralist organizational structure. It did not simply develop its local work, but extended its outreach and helped to build a national network of communist collectives built on its model. In fact, it is based on the PWOC doing all of these communist tasks, which put it in the forefront of the emerging anti-revisionist, anti-left opportunist tendency. It is precisely because it was not economist, because it had a broader vision and partybuilding strategy that was the leading force for a number of years. This is a valuable experience that must not be lost, based on shallow, dogmatist critiques. Our task must be to go much more in depth to summarizing both

the advanced experiences of the FWOC, and its shortcomings as well.

Strengths and Weaknesses of the Fusion Line:

As a general principal of partybuilding the fusion line remains a correct principal or orientation. The development of a revolutionary Vanguard Party must emerge based on the fusing of communism with the advanced workers. The task of fusing Marxism-Leninism includes both the tasks of elaborating Marxist theory to US conditions as well as winning over the advanced workers to a revolutionary program. These two tasks proceed in tandem, that is dialectically, so that revolutionary theory is tested, refined, and re-elaborated in the social practice. A general line, or Party program, cannot be forged full blown simply through the summation of indirect experience. While this is an important aspect in the development of theory, a correct theory must also be based on an extensive summation of direct social practice. Therefore, both direct and indirect summation of social practice will be necessary to develop a correct independent elaboration. The winning of the advanced workers to this theory is an important part of the partybuilding process. Those who are the most militant fighters for the working class and who are open to socialism: once won to communism provide a key element of the revolutionary Vanguard. They are the forces within an organization who make Marxism a concrete force within the broader workers and people's struggle. For all these reasons the emergence of a truly revolutionary "advanced detachment of the working class, depends on the fusion of revolutionary theory with this strata of workers.

We say that this is a correct principal of partybuilding, particularly in the context of an incorrect, and ultra-left conception of partybuilding which has been dominant in the US anti-revisionist movement. This partybuilding line sees the vanguard party being formed by the unification of Marxist-Leninists around a correct general line. It stresses that a vanguard party need not win the strata of advanced workers in order to constitute itself. It is for these reasons that the CWP, for example, can presently call itself the Vanguard Party because it has a "correct political" line, and a national organization of Marxist Leninists, despite its own admittal that it does not broadly influence the advanced workers. Or in a similar vein, the LOM while presently not comprising a Vanguard in its view, believes that it can do so once it has ~~finished~~ finished elaborating the general line and won the honest Marxist Leninists to that line. Both variations negate the necessity for the present day Marxist Leninist movement to have won, or have a strong influence among the advanced workers.

Such partybuilding lines are voluntarist and ultra-left. They collapse the distinction between an organization of revolutionary intellectuals united on their 'correct' revolutionary line, with a vanguard organization of the working class. They collapse the ~~the~~ distinction between a national pre-party and a Leninist vanguard. The failure of anti-revisionist organizations to establish a vanguard relationship with the working class movement, yet to declare themselves vanguard is a ~~20~~ 15 year legacy in the communist movement. ~~While all of these organizations try and argue that their vanguards in embryo or revolutionary core's will inevitably lead~~ Yet the mistake of organization's self-proclamations has had some very serious effects in retarding the actual struggle for a truly genuine vanguard.



First, ultra-left overestimation of their own forces have lead them to seriously downplay the development of revolutionary theory. In the earlier days of the anti-revisionist movement this meant that parties were formed on the basis of some very dogmatic, untested political lines adopted primarily from past correct policies of the communist international but not elaborated or applied to US conditions. More recently this has taken the form of groups, such as LOM, believing that the general line can be forged primarily through the study of indirect experience, without sufficient emphasis on the summation of social practice. Very general political lines can be united around by Marxist Leninists, mainly through debate and theoretical struggle, without their refinement, testing, and relaboration through social practice. The disdain, for "narrow" practical experience, or direct social practice leads to overestimating the correctness or strategic ability of a general analysis to provide a actual concrete guide for social practice. The fusion lines envisions a more long term, and dialectical process of developing political line.

Secondly, the ultra-left partybuilding line leads to a sectarian policies towards other genuine marxist leninists who are not prepared to unite with a national organization that declares itself the vanguard. Premature party formation assumes that the party program has already been developed, and therefore assumes that those who disagree with this program, or fail to join an such organizations are opportunists, either revisionists or ultra-leftists. Such a policy tends to overestimate the differences between Marxist Leninist forces making each political or tactical differences into a full blown ideological difference. Such an organization, such as the CWP at the time of its formation, or the CP-ML, RCP etc. inevitably cut itself off from other genuine marxist leninist who are capable of making real contributions to a partybuilding effort.

Thirdly, the ultra-left partybuilding line is both based on and leads to the overestimation of Marxist Leninists to actually assess their real influence and leadership among the advanced workers and in the mass struggles of the class. Those who give some lip-service to building the Party among the class (RCP) have to ~~manufacture their own existence in the class~~ manufacture 'influence in the class, and distort their real isolation from the class. Others who do not make winning over the advanced a criteria in their partybuilding strategy ~~inevitably~~ bestow their 'correct general line' with the magical quality of assuring that their small but correct sect will inevitably be capable of winning over the advanced workers once their party is formed (eg. LOM).

The Fusion partybuilding line is consistent with the basis leninist definition of the Vanguard Party as being both 'advanced' as well as a detachment of the working class movement. Our ultra-left's may create 'advanced' organizations of revolutionary intellectuals, but this cannot substitute for the actual development of a detachment of the working class movement. Therefore, the advanced detachment can only be build based on the fusion of communism with the advanced workers and this will mean that we will have taken a step forward away from the present isolation of the communist movement from the workers movement. This remains the correct kernel of the fusion partybuilding line. It is a general principal of partybuilding that we should not easily forget, nor abandon especially given our ultra-left legacy.

it is of the utmost importance that during the partybuilding stage a national organization of Marxist Leninist, as yet unfused, builds itself so to more effectively take up these tasks. Such an organization is a national pre-party which the PWOC envisioned in its second stage of partybuilding.

Thus while the PWOC did see the importance of this stage they did not sufficiently emphasize this point in their theoretical work. They left many in local organizations around the country with the impression that fusion was the process of winning the advanced on a one to one basis. This in turn left anti-theoretical, localist, and ultra-democratic prejudices intact. A rightist orientation toward partybuilding, associated with the PSO, became associated with the fusion line because of this weakness. This rightist orientation corresponded to the concrete conditions within the localities where very few circles had cadre who were theoretically developed, nor as integrated into mass work as the PWOC. This became the straw man which the Guardian forces chose to attack as the fusion line. And while the PWOC never held such an evolutionist orientation to partybuilding tasks, its failure to really elaborate this point meant that many of the concrete criticisms of the Guardian forces were correct in the context of localist, and anti-theoretical prejudices in the fusionist circles.

We have identified the main rightist errors of the fusion forces both in this and the previous section. What has not as well been identified has been the history of 'left' conceptions which also entered the fusion partybuilding line. The first left error of the fusion strategy was the tendency to elevate the national center, or ideological center process above the development of the national pre-party. In the period between the 1976-1978 this ~~was~~ meant putting the development of a national center of all anti-lefts above, the development of a national pre-party in the second stage. Later on after 1978, when the Draft Plan became operative this meant putting the development of practical centers and the pre-party subordinate to the development of the ideological center for the whole period prior to the formation of the Vanguard. The essence of this deviation was putting the uniting of Marxist Leninists above the development of a concrete political line and organizational forms necessary to win the advanced. It was this left deviation which inevitably developed into a full blown theory of the separation of centers in the Draft Plan, and meant the actual abandonment of the fusion strategy.

Before moving on to an analysis of how this left deviation from the fusion line led to the eventual abandonment of the fusion line during the OCIC period, we want to mention one more very important aspect of the 'left error' in the early period of the PWOC: This was the left idealist conception of how advanced workers would be won to communism. While the rightist error of face hiding hindered much of their work, when propaganda was done it tended to assume that advanced workers would be won through good ideas alone. In the early period this expressed itself in rather elaborate study plans which were geared to petit-bourgeois intellectuals and not workers. The PWOC had problems getting workers to consistently attend worker circles, forums and organizer circles. Very few advanced workers were actually won to the organization. In the bulk of cases, this was primarily due to the fact that PWOC cadre had been deeply involved in practical struggles with advanced workers, taken up in communist agitation, and gained the confidence of advanced forces through

this work. The advanced workers were not mainly won through the propagation of advanced ideas, but the ability to see the strengths of communists in the day to day work, and their willingness to fight. The social basis of the PWOC cadre often made this a difficult process, since the cadre tended to be better at propaganda than agitation etc. And it was precisely this left idealist orientation toward the advanced workers which also led later on to some very extreme cases of 'left idealism' in bringing advanced workers to 18 point study groups during the OC process. We will discuss how this occurred later in our analysis.

## Part 2: The Fusion Line and the OCIC

### Ultra-Left Errors At the Time of the Founding of the OCIC

In February, 1978, local collectives from around the country committed themselves to the process of forging a leading ideological center. The purpose of this ideological center would be to forge a party leadership and revolutionary theory necessary for a new anti-revisionist, anti-left opportunist Vanguard party. A leading ideological center, which was the ultimate goal of the OCIC process, would be preceded by a national center. This national center would begin to centralize debate around key questions of political line. The first question taken up in this process was finishing the struggle over point 18 which saw US imperialism as the main enemy of the world's people. It would go on to do an all sided critique of ultra-leftism, develop a deeper theory of party building and other political line questions. Not only would the OCIC process centralize ideological debate and theoretical work, but it would also seek to be a single center designed to unify all forces within the anti-revisionist, anti-left opportunist tendency. For this reason the basis of unity was the 18 points, which were mainly designed to demarcate from the ultra-left trend, and only had very beginning political line. The center would not be built on the basis of a particular organization's developed political line, or party building line.

At the founding of the OCIC the bulk of organizations united on three main points: 1. the national process must lead the local process 2. the theoretical struggle must be primary over the practical work 3. the center should not be a federation of local groupings. The main disagreement with this perspective came from El Comite who was also a founding member of the Committee of 5, which was the predecessor of the OCIC process. MINP argued that the local organizations were not sufficiently developed, either ~~theoretically~~ ideologically, or in terms of their integration into the class struggle, to move to a nationally centralized process. Instead they argued that an attempt to make national theoretical work primary would lead to the development of an incorrect separation of theory from social practice. It would leave the cadre of the lesser developed organizations in a flunkeyist relationship with the PWOC, or the more theoretically developed forces. In place of the proposal to forge a leading ideological center, they proposed centers for coordination, cooperation, and communication. They prioritized coordination between Marxist Leninists at a local level for both theoretical and practical tasks. They envisioned regional and national centers being established but not which lead the local processes. They emphasized the study of the fundamentals of Marxism, and the development of local mass work.

Much of the discussion centered around what the actual level of development of local organizations were. The PWOC in a preliminary paper to the February conference argued that local organizations were sufficiently rooted in mass work, and organizationally developed to make the movement to national. Using the criteria which Lenin used in looking at local circles at the time of the formation of the Iskra, PWOC similarly argued that local circles had sufficiently matured. This criteria was important to them given their earlier resolution on partybuilding which stressed that the center must be built with, "several ~~organizations~~ local organizations that are united around a firm understanding of the main lines of battle. They must also be organizations rooted in the working class." (Resolution on Partybuilding, Jan. 1976)

The PWOC made a serious left error in their assessment of local OC forces, by overestimating the actual level of theoretical understanding of the main line of battle, and the extent to which they were rooted in the working class. The bulk of organizations implicitly united with PWOC's position on partybuilding, and the trade union question. But on the whole these positions were understood in a very shallow fashion, and we a far lower of theoretical understanding. The development of political line among these forces was almost non-existence, as groups had almost universally relied on the theoretical work of the PWOC political committee. Secondly, none of these organizations could have been said to be very deeply ~~rooted~~ rooted in the working class movement. A few years of trade union, and mass work does not really qualify as rooted. The PWOC ~~itself~~ itself, which was 7 years old by 1978, had not had much ~~success~~ success in winning the advanced workers, although they were developing as a political force in Philadelphia. If we were to compare the ~~quick~~ development of local circles in Russia at the time when Lenin was to form the Iskra, we would see that they had a far higher level of fusion with the workers movement, than any circle, including the PWOC. ~~We fundamentally overlooked the fact that the PWOC realized the development of development of local OC forces, and they argued that the national center was a necessary condition for the development of the working class movement.~~

The PWOC did see the weaknesses of many of the circles, even though it really overestimated them in the context of the criteria that it was using as the basis for forming <sup>a center</sup> ~~circles~~. In fact ~~the~~ PWOC argued that key to overcoming localism, theoretical underdevelopment, and organizational amateurish was the development of a national center. We must agree that PWOC was correct in seeing these weaknesses of the local circles. They were also correct in realizing that some more developed, national process was necessary to overcome these conditions. They did not, however, correctly target what that national process should be and ended up making the ~~development~~ development of a national theoretical center primary, instead of a process to build a national pre-party which could combine both theory and ~~practice~~ practice.

This was their second left error. In addition, to overestimating local groupings, the PWOC proposed a left idealist national center, to unite all the anti-lefts and to do theoretical work. In proposing a single center, they downplayed and liquidated their own political line development for a broad effort to unify all Marxist Leninists. The rationale for this was based in the OC, and PWOC's assessment of previous ultra-left partybuilding efforts. We argued that the RU, OL had moved systematically to develop their own national D-C organizations, moved to consolidate ~~the~~ their Parties, without an open, and broad struggle to unite Marxist Leninists. The OC was viewed

as a corrective to this sectarian procedure. Yet in the PWOC proposing making the single center concept primary, and establishing the broad 18 points of unity of this partybuilding formation, they were forced to push their own particular lines into the background.

The first line to go was the fusion partybuilding line. Whereas the PWOC had been polemicizing against the voluntarist partybuilding line of Irwin Silber and the Guardian Clubs, instead ~~the~~ the polemic ~~focus~~ shifted to the small circle mentality of the Guardian for not joining the OCIC or uniting with the need for the single center. Whereas the early debates had taken up the questions of the role of the advanced workers in partybuilding, the role of practice in the development of theory and other concepts key to the fusion line, now the polemic focused on the Guardian's small circle stand in relationship to uniting marxist leninists. More and more the struggle over uniting marxist leninist took center stage, while the question of fusing with the advanced ~~workers~~ receded into the background.

While the elevation of a national process for uniting marxist leninists, the OCIC, represented the main 'left error', the organizational opportunism of the PWOC played a role from the beginning as well. It is clear that the PWOC was confident that it would win all forces to its political lines, or isolate incorrect lines more easily in the context of the OC or single center. Once it could insure the Guardian ~~workers~~ and later the NNMLC were in the common process with forces which mainly held a fusion line, it could maintain its hegemony in the theoretical struggle. Thus the organizational hegemonism of the PWOC played an important role in why the PWOC argued for a single organizational process, rather than a free wheeling theoretical ~~struggle~~ struggle.

Thus even at the founding of the OCIC and soon after we ~~could~~ see the seeds of the ultra-left line in the plan to emphasize uniting marxist leninists, downplaying above board theoretical struggle and the drive for PWOC hegemonism. And yet the left tendencies were not yet dominant, especially since the OCIC played the very positive role of ~~uniting~~ uniting the vast bulk of anti-ultra ~~socialist~~ ultra-leftists, pushing against some of the most rightist and localist orientations of fusion forces. And most importantly, the OCIC was the focal point for finishing the demarcation with the left international line which was absolutely essential to pave the future road for the development of an anti-left alternative. In addition, the OCIC was correct that it is positive to try and have the whole Marxist Leninist movement systematically address questions of political line, although we will argue later that this need not happen in the OC's single center conception.

#### Consolidation of the Ultra-left Errors into a Left Partybuilding Line: The PWOC's Self Criticisms and the Struggle Against Federationism

Whereas the forces who founded the OCIC were somewhat confused as to what particular relationship practice and mass work had to the national theoretical struggle, this soon became clear. The struggle over point 18 was designed to demarcate with the ultra-lefts, but did not attempt to deepen political line development around the international question. For example, the PWOC did not advance its more correct position on the socialist character of the Soviet Union, in taking up the three world's theory. One's position

around the Soviet Union was not the issue, so as not to compromise the broad character of the center. In fact at the 2nd national conference, the chairperson, Clay Newlin even argued that comrades who did not see the need to demarcate around point 18 could remain in the OCIC ~~xxxxx~~ as long as they agreed with the content of point 18. This provoked much disagreement, but was eventually united on based on the logic of not compromising the broad anti-sectarian character of the center.

More importantly, during this period the NSC took a stand against the coordination of mass practice in the OCIC. For example, those who wanted to meet simultaneously with the 18 points conferences around their international solidarity practices ~~xxxxx~~ were not encouraged to do so. Nor was the lessons of this work systematically incorporated except around Aggola somewhat.

Yet the ~~struggle~~ separation of the theoretical struggle from the practical centers became fully matured as the result of the PWOC's self-criticism, and the OC struggle against federationism and to build local centers. The PWOC's self criticism stated that they were incorrect in their earlier views of the national pre-party coming after the ideological center. They argued that the ideological center must be made primary to any practical organizations during the whole period of party building. This was to insure that all of the genuine marxist leninists could be united into the party/ pre-party, necessarily being limited in its political line, would always exclude some genuine marxists and therefore could not be made primary during any stage of the party building process. Of course this also meant, the PWOC argued, that the pre-party would not have to wait until after the ideological center was forged but could begin at any time before. While making no public announcement that they were forming a pre-party, they did lay the whole rationale for this position by arguing that the OCIC and pre-parties could develop simultaneously with the pre-party always remaining subordinate to the OC process.

The NSC then adopted a clearer and sharper formulation around the correctness of the separation of ideological and practical centers. The Draft Plan, and Draft Plan study guide argued that the separation of theoretical and practical centers would not necessarily mean the separation of theory from practice. The most advanced lines and experiences from the practical organizations would find their way into the OC process, where they would be scrutinized to the theoretical and ideological struggle among a much larger group of marxist leninist, thereby refining the theory, which could then be reapplied in the practical centers. In this best of both worlds approach, the theoretical struggle would be advanced along with the practical work of the organizations.

In order to insure that this separation of centers was achieved the NSC called for the building of local centers separate from the cadre organizations. This would insure that people, Marxist leninists, broader than members of cadre organizations would have equal weight in the theoretical struggle. It also stipulated that cadre organizational members must participate in the OCIC as individuals, and that all members must not be bound by their organization's democratic centralism. Key to the whole perspective was that the local centers must be made primary over the practical centers, cadre groups.

Some comrades protested this idealist separation of theoretical struggle from practical work. The SOC ~~xxx~~ refused to make the local centers primary.

They argued that the fusion line demanded practical centers, and mass work be primary. They refused to have the bulk of their members of be participating primarily in a process designed to unite Marxist leninists while neglecting their mass work tasks.

Looking back we must unite with those members of SOC who pin pointed this stage of the OCIC process as a deviation from the fusion partybuilding line. Their final expulsion and document Where SOC stands targets very clearly the ~~max~~ idealist abandonment of the fusion strategy for an effort to unite all marxist leninist into a single center. Fusion force who remained in the OCIC focused on the fact that we had never said we were an organization designed to take up fusion. At a deeper level, among fusionists, we argued that the OCIC was consistent with one aspect of fusion which as the need for the independent elaboration (workers communism) while not taking up winning the advanced. We argued that SOC had an empiricist bent, or a right fusionist bent because they liquidated the need for theory, and therefore the struggle to unite Marxist Leninists in theoretical work. It is true that some of these comrades from the SOC held a more right opportunist interpretation of fusion which emphasized local mass work, and downplayed the development of political line. Nevertheless the arguments which the fusion forces who remained within the OCIC, were ultra-left. A rightist line cannot be combatted with a leftist one. The primacy of uniting marxist leninists was absolutized, over the winning of the advanced workers.

In practice, the OC's line of trying to forge a single theoretical center, separated from practical organizations lead very quickly to the severing of theory from practice. First, and foremost, the OCIC failed to prioritize those questions of political lines which were most necessary to win over the advanced workers. This had been the strength of the PWOC's theoretical work on trade Union question, black liberation, united front, etc. Yet the OCIC demanded that these political lines be withdrawn, receded into the background for a general unity of the 18 points. We explained how this first happened with the fusion line, but also point 18 and international line. But beyond that the OCIC failed to prioritize developing political line around trade union questions, black liberation, women's liberation, united front, the relationship between mass work and advanced tasks etc. None of the strategic line questions were addressed. Even the OC's critique of ultra-leftism, although started, was never finished and this was today the basis for political line work on other questions. This was an abandonment of the basic approach to theoretical work which the PWOC had begun. Whereas in the early period of the fusion line, theoretical work was developed directly to cadre's intervention in the mass work, and social practice was continually summed up to contribute to theory, in the OCIC these political questions were neither prioritized nor taken up.

Secondly, the whole draft plan strategy was predicated upon the assumption that local cadre groups would contribute their independent political line work, and summations of practice to the theoretical struggle and ideological center process. But the bulk of local circles in the OCIC, with the exception of the PWOC and a few other circles, were not theoretically, nor organizationally capable of doing independent line developments. As the OC moved to consolidate its members around the primacy of the OCIC, over their local mass work, more and more resources were drained off of the local cadre organizations. The most theoretically advanced cadre moved into positions of leadership within the OCIC.

Leading mass activists found their time split between OCIC responsibilities and their mass work. These once 'rooted' ~~mass organizations~~ local d-c organizations which the OCIC had argued were the basis for the national process, in many cases became less rooted, more isolated from mass struggles and the advanced workers. In many cases, during the struggle against federationism local organizations became split up, or incapacitated in ability to function. The separation of centers line, thus moved to destroy the local organizations, while replacing them with a system OCIC local centers. While many localities could not possibly see how they could maintain their local organizations, and develop them, with the OCIC agenda primary, a handful of cadre organizations did develop. These organizations became the core of the PWOC's secret effort to forge a national pre-party. We will discuss this next.

We must sum-up the OC's attempt to separate theoretical and practical centers as a failure. El Comite had been correct in arguing that local organizations were not sufficiently developed to sustain a national effort, and remain rooted and developing. They were also correct that such a process necessarily must lead to deepening flunkeyist relationship between local organizations and the PWOC. In the absence of independent theoretical bearings, nor time to develop them, the bulk of organizations uncritically adopted PWOC's positions on a number of questions. And yet there was never a national process for systematically studying, and struggling over them, and hopefully deepening them. In addition, El Comite was correct in seeing that the OCIC would lead to an idealist partybuilding strategy, which would separate the development of theory, and cadre from social practice. The OCIC pursued the ultra-left policy which El Comite argued against in their pamphlet Partybuilding and its Relationship to the Masses, by ~~representing~~ making the process of partybuilding something 'wholly external to the masses.' Thus while much of their critique remains correct and very insightful, its weakness was in its proposal of how to advance the communist movement. The El Comite comrades still tend to downplay the need for political line as necessary to advanced, even local work. Local centers of coordination in our opinion would not have been sufficient. Instead we feel that there was a basis for PWOC to move to consolidate many of the local organizations to take up study and struggle around their particular and more developed political lines. This would have to have been done in the context of presenting their political positions to the whole tendency for theoretical struggle. Through a process of presenting these lines to the tendency for study and struggle, the PWOC could have consolidated those local organizations with basic unity. These groupings, in turn, could have laid the organizational basis for a national pre-party.

#### The PWOC's Organizational Opportunism Consolidated: the Secret Effort to Forge a National Pre-party

The PWOC put emphasis on the development of the OCIC, but at the same time it did try and develop national forms of organizations devoted to practical work. Thus once the basic local centers were consolidated in the localities, the PWOC along with a few other cadre organizations moved to establish national communist fractions in the areas of Auto, Health, Education, Phone etc. These national fractions sought to unify communist activists from particular industries into democratic centralist fractions designed to carry out mass work and advanced tasks. Like the OCIC these formations



were built on very broad unity of the 18 points. In addition, they made as a point of unity the necessity of people to want to fuse communism with the advanced workers in their industry, although did not demand a adherence to the fusion partybuilding line generally. With the exception of the Auto Fraction that did some concrete analysis of the auto industry, and developed propaganda around the contract, most of the fractions never developed a concrete analysis, or political line for their particular industry. In an effort to make the fractions non-sectarian, the fractions leadership once again downplayed the elements of political line. Also like the OCIC the fractions were based on an ultra-left overestimation of the actual development of the number and influence of the activist involved. BASOC, Bay Area Socialist Organizing Committee, correctly pointed out that in many cases there were not really a national representation of activists, nor was the level of practice necessarily very high. The fractions life were short lived, never developed a national political practice, and were eventually torn apart with the rest of the OCIC during the campaign against white chauvinism.

Simultaneously with the OCIC, and the national fractions, was a secret effort of the PWOC to form a national pre-party. In 1979, beginning after the Labor Day conference, the PWOC circulated a Draft Program for a national pre-party. This was circulated secretly to SUB, BOC, and SWG who were three other cadre organization with a high level of political unity with the PWOC. Later in the process, individuals from other cities including Detroit, New Bedford, Bay Area were told about the process. Well after the process of political study and discussion had begun, members of the national steering committee were informed, although not all members were participating in the process.

The strategy was to unite these organizations, and a few other individuals nationally in secret around the program, and to emerge later on publicly with a national organization, which other OC and Marxist Leninists could be invited to join later on. This would provide a stable basis for the organization whose main purpose could be to further elaborate the political program and work to fuse these lines with the advanced workers. The secrecy was designed to avoid ~~criticisms of the OCIC and the PWOC~~ "ultra-democratic" criticisms within the OCIC, and ~~sectarian~~ "sectarian" accusations of hegemonism by the Rectification forces. Perhaps some comrades thought that it was also in the best interest to avoid state 'manipulation.' In any case, the PWOC embarked on a fully consolidated organizational opportunism.

In building the secret national pre-party the PWOC was forced to violate almost every principle which it had established within the OCIC process. First, it made the struggle for political line secret, rather than an open struggle among the whole tendency for political line. This was a basic violation of OC principle. Secondly, it opportunistically fooled OC cadre as to the PWOC real intentions for pre-party formation. During a whole period of the struggle against federationism, many OC members and observers had wondered if this type of organization was in the works. The PWOC consciously avoided honesty in putting its views forward. So too did it fail to address forthrightly the political criticisms of this form presented earlier by rectification comrades. While it justified this in the name of protecting such an organization against ultra-democracy and sectarianism, it was itself

a profoundly sectarian, ~~independent~~ and organizationally hegemonist process. Thus while the PWOC, forces in the various local groups, and members of the NSC subordinated the struggle for the pre-party to the OCIC process, they also systematically pursued their plans for a national pre-party without political explanation or accountability to tendency comrades.

The national pre-party never actually materialized, while the first program was discussed, and rewritten, the second draft was never adopted. The 4 organizations who made up the planning committee for the process put the pre-party process secondary to their OCIC tasks, so to a certain extent it never flew due to lack of prioritization and interest. Finally, the political basis of unity was destroyed inevitably, along with the OCIC, factions, etc. by the campaign against white chauvinism.

Finally, the PWOC's own effort to remain the center of the party building processes, including the OCIC, factions, and pre-party lead them to violate the organizational requirements of the OCIC to build a local center. The PWOC did not build a local center during the period when the other localities. Thus while all other localities were sacrificing their practical organizations, and mass tasks, the PWOC maintained its cadre form in tact. This was due to a federalist approach, but more principally due to its organizational hegemonism. The NSC did not criticize the PWOC until very late in the game. This was due to the liberalism, flunkeyism, and the conspiratorial aspect which the NSC members maintained in their support of the PWOC's pre-party building effort. Thus even when the anti-racism task force took up the criticism of PWOC for maintaining their small circle, keeping other genuine Marxists in Philadelphia outside the OC etc. it failed to target the central reason for the PWOC's federalism. This could only have been done by an exposure of the secret pre-party effort, and the organizational opportunism, and hegemonism that lay at the basis of the PWOC's actions. This was a criticism that the NSC was not prepared to make, given their own collaboration in this perspective.

These contradictions did surface most openly, although still veiled, in the conference on Organization held in Milwaukee. This conference was organized by the members of the organizations involved in the secret pre-party process. Its purpose was to spur on the development of local cadre organizations by discussing various aspects of organization building. During this conference the PWOC was criticized for not building a local center, and particularly for the position which its cadre held that it was correct to build OC fractions in local cadre groups. These fractions would supposedly organize the OD work within the cadre organizations. This was immediately criticized for its federalism, especially in the context of Philadelphia where they haven't even established a local center, why would they be talking about the development of an OC fraction. Critics argued that this could only serve to supplant the local center leadership, and would lead to cadre organizations' members being held to Democratic centralism of their group. PWOC members split over the question, but later it was a concept upheld due to the influence of Clay Newlin and his ability to win the NSC to this position. In any event the significance of the struggle was it more clearly exposed the contradiction between PWOC ~~pro~~ leadership in the struggle to separate centers, be anti-federalist, and yet maintain the hegemonism of their circle in the process.

It is important that we note a few points in ending this section on the secret pre-party plan that we address a few points. First, is the question as to whether the PWOC really did see the pre-party as subordinate to the OCIC process. In our opinion, the PWOC did actually see the pre-party as subordinate to the OCIC process. As far as we know based on the OC's chairperson's discussion in the NSC and the pre-party process, he always stressed that it must be built in second priority to the OC process. Thus even though it was built secretly, in an unprincipled fashion, it was not seen as either supplanting the ~~the~~ OCIC, or becoming primary to it. In the actual implementation, it was given second priority to the OC development. As one participant put it, it never really developed partly due to lack of interest. Thus, while the pre-party formation undoubtedly would have recruited from the OCIC, it never would have become the OCIC, or become the main form according to the leading members of the process.

~~Specifically, we should address the question~~

In our opinion, the fusion forces had a rather vacillating view of the role of a national pre-party. While in its earlier history the ~~the~~ PWOC would have given more importance to it given its role in winning the advanced, during the OCIC process the fusion forces really downplayed this strategy for its 'single center' conception. The failure to theoretically clarify this aspect of partybuilding became a key weakness in the fusion strategy and we would argue eventually lead to the abandonment of the line altogether.

We say this in order to address our second point, which is whether we disagree with the pre-party conception. ~~Exactly~~ We do not, we feel that a national pre-party should be a key feature of the fusion strategy. We do however disagree that this should have been a secondary aspect of the partybuilding strategy. In our opinion, the PWOC's desire to build a pre-party should have been put out, theoretically justified, and argued for in the context of their partybuilding line. It should have been debated openly with forces such as rectification who do not agree with it. On the basis of an open struggle in the partybuilding movement, the PWOC should have sought to unite those in agreement to work to develop such an organizational form. At the same time that fusion forces sought to organize their own organization primarily to ~~it~~ more deeply elaborate their political line and win the advanced, they should have entered into a national process of theoretical struggle with broader ~~the~~ Marxist Leninist forces.

Ideally, a broader organization of all tendency activists could have been created for just this purpose of line struggle. Yet unlike the OCIC it would have to be a federated form in order to involve the various political lines in contention. It would have had the organizational responsibility to organize theoretical struggle. In addition, fusion forces would not have made this broader form, developed to unite Marxist Leninists primary in relationship to the pre-party. Instead, it would have been secondary to their own efforts to pursue the fusionist political line and winning the advanced. ~~In~~ Even if such an overarching form couldn't have been created, which it probably couldn't, the fusion forces could still have actively engaged in joint struggle and discussion with other partybuilding forces who were not fusionist.

By combining into the efforts to build a national pre-party, with open struggle with the rest of the left the fusion forces could have been consistent with their partybuilding line which emphasized the development of political line in order to win the advanced to communism. Anti-federatist principals could have been applied to the struggle within the communist movement, allowing members of pre-parties to individually argue their positions, while not sacrificing democratic centralism in implementing organizational policy. Most importantly, by unifying at the highest possible levels with other marxist leninists that shared a similar political orientation, and not liquidating this organization to the broader organization of Marxist leninists with a lower political unity, the fusion forces could have advanced their particular partybuilding line in a non-sectarian fashion.

### The Ultra left Aspects to the OCIC Partybuilding Strategy

#### The OC's Idealist Conception of Forging A Leading Party Core:

In the past sections we spoke to the central aspect of the OC's idealist strategy for partybuilding: the separation of ideological and practical centers. Linked closely with this error, was the idealist notion that a leading Party core could emerge primarily through the ideological center process. The Draft Plan argued that no leading party core existed, but that it could be forged through the process of ideological struggle and the struggle to develop revolutionary theory. Thus while the NSC in no way represented a leading core, it was believed that through the process of developing the national center, elaborating and struggling over line, that eventually such an organizational leadership could mature into a leading core. Part of this process would be the advancement of some comrades from the ranks, and the fall of others according to the test of the ideological struggle.'

The main problem of this conception was that it dropped out the key role of social practice in the development and testing of leading cadre. The Draft Plan made the incorrect assumption that a leadership could develop in a process that was not designed, nor proved capable, of systematically tackling questions of political line, and summing up social practice involved in implementing those lines. This is a necessary aspect of developing leading cadre, particularly within our revolutionary process, where communist cadre have relatively little in depth experience in the mass struggle, and have not really been leaders within the trade union or progressive movement. Even to the extent that some cadre have had experiences of this nature, they have very often not provided their leadership in the context of putting forward a communist vision or strategy to the masses.

Since the OCIC was based on the separation of centers it used criteria for selecting leadership which bypassed key qualities associated with the fusion partybuilding line. For example, the NSC was chosen based on its general grasp of the 18 points, its consolidation around the single center conception, its willingness to struggle against opportunism particularly racism etc. It did not, however, use the criteria which a practical organization would use in choosing those comrades who are the most advanced both theoretically and practically in the key areas of mass work: trade union questions, anti-racist struggle, women's liberation movement, anti-war movement etc. One may argue that this ~~xxxx~~ criteria for leadership might have changed as the

OCIC process, more and more took up the process of the elaboration offline. And yet, we could argue that as long as the OCIC made a process of separating off the ideological and practical centers, there would be no organizational, nor materialist criteria by which to really judge the leading character of comrades. Leadership would be determined primarily by one's ability to be 'advanced' in the context of ideological struggle at meetings with other marxist leninists, but not in the context of the advanced workers, the mass struggle, and amidst the practical cadre organizations carrying out this work.

Cadre untested in this aspect of social practice cannot form a stable basis for a revolutionary core, who must be capable of leading the class struggle through its various twists and turns. This is not to say that every leadership person in a party must be an advanced mass activist, or heading up an area of mass work, people with key theoretical skills will also be included. But a party core must have a stable grouping of such cadre familiar, and leading the Party's areas of mass work as well.

The actual attempts to choose and develop leadership in the OCIC should illustrate our point. The OCIC was never able to develop a stable leadership grouping. First, because the theoretical and ideological leadership did not develop primarily within the NSC, but the PWOC. Secondly, because the OCIC did not have a good process of cadre development which systematically advanced their leading people. Thirdly, because the idealist political line which led the process was not a context to develop stable grouping of cadre rooted both in political line and mass work. Fourth, the campaign against white chauvinism later on, reduced people's 'leading qualities' to their ideological purity and their agreement with the campaign.

These errors lead to the growth of various forms of opportunism within the leadership, including individualism, careerism, dishonesty, flunkeyism etc. During the campaign, NSC members scrambled to maintain their positions, engaged in unprincipled attacks on cadre and dishonest maneuvering among themselves. These were not 'leading comrades' forged in the class struggle, tested leaders with independent bearings. They were comrades corrupted by an ultra-left campaign, and an idealist partybuilding line which tried to develop its leaders, almost solely in the 'heat of ideological struggle among the communists', without sufficient development and testing in the class struggle of the working class.

#### Lack of Internal Democracy and Incorrect Approach to Cadre Formation In the OCIC:

The partybuilding line of the OCIC did not encourage the development of cadre or democratic theoretical struggle in the OCIC process. Initially the OCIC had been based on a conception of centralizing the broadest number of Marxist Leninist Forces to debate key questions of political line. This perspective was implemented fairly well in the early period of the OCIC during the debates a round point 18. After this period, however, the OCIC never developed a healthy process of internal struggle and debate. The reasons for this were an incorrect approach to cadre formation and a non-democratic approach to line struggle within the organization.

Theoretically developed cadre are necessary to have good internal line struggle. The continual advancement of a membership of an organization is necessary to insure that the positions of leadership are critically analyzed, and other members may clearly put forward alternative views. The OCIC did not give sufficient attention to this type of work. The first reason is that the OCIC did not develop itself around more advanced positions of political line but a broad 18 points. Cadre who already united with the 18 points, but also the particular political lines of the PWOC were not developed to contribute to these other areas of political line. The pulling back of the PWOC's particular lines to the broad unity of the center meant that OC cadre with a fusion perspective, never formally studied, developed and debated the political lines that they were functioning ~~xx~~ under. Line unity became implicit without training ~~xx~~ and struggle. Thus the downplaying of theoretical formation of cadre was directly related to the development of the OCIC and the liquidation of deeper political line inherent in the process.

A more correct approach to cadre work would have been for the PWOC to circulate its political positions on various questions, both among fusion cadre and the broader movement. These lines should have been studied, and further elaborated. The OCIC did not make any attempt to draw cadre into the further elaboration of these lines. They began with the PWOC political committee, but never were developed beyond this. Even within the context of the OCIC's own ~~political~~ theoretical agenda, the NSD did not attempt to establish regional and local theoretical teams. Task forces that were established beyond the national steering committee, were not designed primarily to deepen the line development.

The main cadre work that the OCIC did take up was the 18 point study. This study suffered from a number of cross purposes. For many it was too rudimentary because it didn't advance people's theoretical development, but rather tied it to questions that people had already studied or were familiar with. For others, particularly the advanced workers comrades who were brought in during the campaign, the 18 point study failed to give the necessary attention to Marxist Leninist fundamentals. For example, the NSC incorrectly cut out any sessions on dialectical and historical materialism, political economy, or a more in-depth treatment of some of Lenin's basic writings. Many of these comrades criticized the study for skipping over a study of the building blocks of Marxism Leninism which are necessary for the development of political line. At any rate, while the 18 point study had value for people, ~~it failed~~ the OCIC did fail in really establishing a cadre policy which was geared to the particular level of development of the particular comrades.

There were a number of roots to this problem. In the case of the more advanced cadre, there was a failure to try to consolidate people around the most advanced line which they ~~xx~~ held: in this case the PWOC's positions. In the case of the 18 point study, there was an incorrect collapsing between the relationship of Marxist Leninist which the campaign promoted. There had also been a historical weakness of the PWOC to deal with cadre development within their own organization, and many of these weaknesses became reproduced in the NSC's approach to the question.

In addition, to weaknesses in theoretical training, the OCIC could not develop cadre in an all rounded way, give n the separation of centers. This meant that the OC could study and discuss, but not really practice. Cadre practical formation was left to local circles, or individual initiative. This cut off the material component of formation where a cadre must test his/her ideas in changing reality. Such a left approach to cadre work will never produce tested cadre.

The OCIC had a serious problem with developing healthy political line struggle within the organization. As we said the best effort was initially with the the struggle over point 18. The main problem after that was that the NSC did not really practice the stand that line differences should be debated out from the point of view of unity being primary. In the struggles around federationism, ~~Nationalist Minority Draft~~ draft Plan, and later around racism, the NSC always treated opposition lines as if the basic disunity of these comrades with the OC process was primary. An atmosphere was not really created in which people could clearly develop and struggle over differences. Inevitably, in such a sectarian atmosphere every line struggle ended in a split, as was the case with SOC, TMLC, BAWOC minority, and then in the case with the bulk of cadre during the campaign.

There were important formal and organizational weaknesses in the line struggle, such as the continual error on the part of leadership bodies to ~~not~~ fail to get out position papers soon enough ahead of time for conferences, weaknesses in really circulating information to different localities particularly the NSC minutes which were continually late. But these organizational weaknesses must be seen primarily as symptoms, and not the cause of this lack of democracy. One key weakness was theoretical sloppiness, or dishonesty on the part of ~~the NSC's~~ the NSC's approach to theoretical struggle. This was most evident for example in struggle over the draft plan. Here for example, the NSC changed its conception a number of times, particularly ~~but~~ during the campaign, yet failed to really explain how the line had changed and the reasons for this. For example, OC cadre were not given sufficient theoretical explanation why ~~we~~ had changed from an organization primarily geared to unite the existing left, to an organization primarily devoted to reaching out to the advanced or potential tendency. Such key changes in line, were rarely explain, and often not admitted, creating the impression that the NSC was always right, but others just hadn't understood.

Another key weakness was to corrupt the theoretical struggle by reducing line debate to the most crude forms of ideological struggle. This came out most clearly during the campaign, where too often theoretical arguments against the campaign were dismissed due to the particular racist ideological weaknesses of cadre. While it is perfectly correct to draw out the ideological underpinnings of any line, theoretical struggle cannot be reduced to an attempt to discredit the opposition through picking on particular ideological weaknesses. For example, one ex-NSC member argued that the campaign was ultra-left and drew out the theoretical reasons for this. The response of other ~~NSC~~ NSC members was to dismiss these arguments on their own merits and to lambast the individual for his capitulation to petit-bourgeois chauvinism. Such ~~was~~ was the general trend during the campaign.

But the ultra-left approach to theoretical struggle which ~~has been~~ emerged full blown in the campaign, also had its roots in earlier OC line struggles. For example, the NSC incorrectly took up the struggle with SOC around federatannism. While the NSC did make sincere attempts to really have SOC comrades develop their position which they were reluctant to do, once this began to happen the NSC expelled them for a violation of an organizational rule. The use of organizational rules to block the line struggle also became a hall mark of the OC steering committee. Thus BAWOC minority was expelled for failure to ~~xxx~~ speak to a criticism, Soc for failure to build local centers. And while these expulsions all had a certain logic in the context of the type of organization that the OCIC was trying to build, a single center based on the separation of centers, such a conception eventually lead to a bureaucratic centralist approach to line struggle. Too often organizational measure became substituted for ~~the~~ political line struggle. Today those who want to continue to struggle against the campaign and the Draft Plan within the OCIC, cannot get a national conference ~~called~~ because the NSC refused to do so. Even though we made a rule that 2 regions can call a national conference, the NSC now argues that they can set when it will be. They have done this arguing we can't meet until next year. The point is that one can make rules to govern the line struggle, but a bureaucratic leadership can also change them to suit ~~their~~ their own needs. Unfortunately this is exactly what the NSC continues to do.

~~Such a conception of the line struggle is not only a departure from the OCIC's past history but also a departure from the OCIC's past history.~~

### The Left Sectarian Conception of the Single Center

The OCIC was built to be a broad non-sectarian party building formation. Its founders hoped to avoid the sectarian legacy of previous party building attempts by involving all forces in a common organizational process of line struggle. It was correct to see that the best form of joint work and theoretical struggle could occur within the confines of a common organization, devoted to a common theoretical agenda. While this was ideal, it was not realizable at the time of the OC foundations. This was due primarily to differences in party building line which lead various forces to pursue particular theoretical, practical and organizational ~~goals~~ agenda (Guardian, El Comite etc.)

The Guardian had emphasized this point, in its decision not to join the OCIC. And while we can agree with them that different party building lines will lead to different theoretical and practical agendas, we do feel that their arguments downplayed the necessity of a common process for Marxist Leninists, and reflected a small circle approach to our party building tasks. The problem is that the OCIC did not correct conceptualize what such an organization might look like.

In our opinion it would have been correct to propose a single organizational center to coordinate the line development and struggle among Marxist Leninists. This would necessarily have had to be a federation, with a planning group representing the various organizations and party building lines. Secondly, it would have had to be secondary in character to the primary emphasis with organizations would place on the development of their own lines and organizations.



Thirdly, it would have only been able to centralize line development and struggle over a limited agenda, which would have been a compromise between various partybuilding forces. Through discussion forces would have to come up with a limited agenda that forces had agreed to work on. Finally, while the organizational form would have been a federation of various groupings, it could have implemented a policy of individual participation in the line struggle. Such an organization could have taken responsibility for developing theoretical teams, journal, forums, conferences on key questions of line debate and development.

But such an organization would have been different than the OCIC who made its single center primary, was not federationist, had a leading body united around a single line. Instead we have argued that the Fusion forces should have put their primary emphasis on the development of the political lines and organizational forms necessary to form a national pre-party. This other broader organization, would have been secondary to the pre-party but an important arena for line struggle among Marxist Leninists.

As conceptualized and practiced the OCIC version of a single center was sectarian. While it was correct for the OCIC to struggle with other forces in the movement to join in this process, once this struggle was taken up the OCIC decided to effectively demarcate with forces who refused to join. By making people's willingness to adhere to the OC's conception primary the OCIC repeated the ultra-left practice of elevating its own form, and writing off many of the other's genuine Marxist Leninist in the ~~the~~ movement. This took different forms with different ~~group~~ groups.

Originally the OCIC realized that El Comite did not have the political basis to join the OCIC given its different emphasis on partybuilding line to local development, and its opposition to a national center. But after this initial recognition the OCIC leadership did not aggressively pursue line struggle and joint work with MINP forces even though they disagreed. The first year of the OCIC meant mainly ignoring this organization. There were also problems on MINP's end, once the OCIC did get around to contacting ~~them~~ them since MINP did not prioritize discussion with the OCIC or national work given their localist orientation. But for our own party we tended to read forces such as MINP out of the partybuilding movement because they didn't share our assessment of the need for the single center.

In the ~~the~~ case of the Guardian and the NNMLC the OCIC emphasized struggle over the small circle character of these organizations, in relationship to the need for a common Marxist Leninist process. In this case the criticism did have validity that there was a 'go it alone' orientation of these forces in the context of the OC's effort to build a single center. We can say that both real political differences, as well as organizational opportunism (eg. small circle mentality) played a role in why they didn't unite with the OCIC. But a more serious error came with the OC's response to this situation. Rather than accepting that these forces would remain outside the OCIC for some time at least, the OCIC moved to effectively demarcate from them though its polemics around the 'small circle' character of these groups. This was a particularly sectarian act in the context of the Guardian's and NNMLC's willingness to take up theoretical struggle around the fusion partybuilding line.

The Guardian~~xx~~ NNMLC forces we e willing to organizational seperate on the basis of deeper partybuilding differences, fusion vs. rectification. Yet our forces submerged a more principled line struggle, for the struggle ainst small circleism. The struggle against ~~xx~~ small circlism was emphasized do to the NSC's ~~usc~~ and PWOC's shift ~~from~~ toward building the OCIC nd uniting Marxist leninists. But the polemic was also ~~fin~~ followed by a fairly systematic effort to pull back in terms of joint work andprjects. Even if the OCIC steering committee had wanted to pursue thisdebate, or polemic, it should have done so in the conext of maintaing joint work and struggle in varius areas. It should have ~~exx~~ realized that if you ~~xx~~can't hve a single center immediately you have to do as much joint work as possible, to hopefully lay the basis for unification down the road.

But the NSC made the typically ultra-left error in approach to theoretical struggle by takin the differences with rectification over partybuilding line, and exaggerating these differences into a full blown demarcation. Their stand became one of struggling to expose, rather than struggling to unite. But this 'left sectarian' approach to polemics is not unique to the OCIC it has a longhistory in the anti-revisionist movement. Thoroughgoing and principled struggle was often bypassed by the ultra-left in the hegemonist efforts of one organization over another. Every differences was elevated to a struggle between full blown opportunism and Marxism leninism. The OCIC continued this tradition of the ultra-leftsx, and is not alone today in the Tendency with such an approach to theoretical struggle.

The full degeneration of hhs left sectarian line is carried forward by Clay Newlin and Michael Simmons of the NSC. These comrades have adopted ~~The OCIC's Campaign Against the NSC and Petit-bourgeois Chauvinism~~ ~~to Shift~~ ~~the OCIC's Partybuilding Line and the OCIC's complete degeneration~~

the view that the whole communist movement, with the exception of a handful of comrades still in the OCIC, are essentially racist and petit-bourgeois. In thier opinion the whole prtybuilding movemenths been build primarily on these ideological deviations, and therefor sand fundamentally compromised antheir partybuidli gefforts. In this sense the demarcatinn has become complete. In the NSC's conception we have the large and dominant racists andpeti-bourgeois chauvi ists represented organizationally by the LOM, TMLC, and Ex-OC comrades, and the small but pproletarian 'core' of present OCIC members.

Unfortunately the OC steering committee carries themantel of ultra-leftism of its earliest formation, who as they became more and more isolated from the bulk of communists, and more and more exposed for thier sectarian and immature posturing, seem to yell louder and louder about the bankruptcy of other forces while heralding themselves as the 'true bolsheviks', proeltarian 'core' or the genuine communists. In the extreme subjectivism of ~~the NSC~~ Clay Newlin ~~xxxx~~ he sees himself as ~~ht~~ the lone voice of 'anti-racism' swamped in a sea of chauvinism. Such is the road to the dustbins of history unfortunately a number of comrades from the QCIC are now traveling.

The OC's Campaign Against White and Petit Bourgeois Chauvinism as a Shift in the OC's Partybuilding line: the Complete degeneration of the OCIC.

The OCIC was founded as an organization designed to Unite Marxist Leninists in an effort to develop political line. It was not, as some have argued, designed to take up work to win the advanced workers to communism. In the period between 1978-1980 the OCIC moved fairly ~~sky~~ systematically in this direction by focusing first on the struggle within the communist movement over point 18, secondly to construct 'tendency' wide local centers based on the single center conception. The Draft Plan and the Founding Statement were ~~both~~ both documents which emphasized this general direction. We have argued that this partybuilding line developed into a fairly consistent 'left' idealist strategy, making as its corner stone the separation of theory and practice.

During 1980 while the NSC was developing its Campaign Against White Chauvinism, the OCIC began to go through a shift in partybuilding line. The shift was a move away from uniting the existing stock of Marxist-Leninists towards what we called members of the potential tendency, advanced workers and fighters from the class that were not yet Marxist Leninists. The Steering Committee, which had previously identified members of the organized and ~~organized~~ unorganized tendency, now introduced this new grouping that the OCIC would do outreach to. The reasons for these changes in partybuilding line was never consistently elaborated. In general members of the National Steering Committee felt that in fact, the OCIC had been practicing a rectification partybuilding line by emphasizing uniting the existing stock of Marxist Leninists, but failing to grasp that advanced workers were capable of taking up partybuilding. The ideological roots of this partybuilding line deviation, in the eyes of the NSC, was the racism and petitbourgeois chauvinism of the OC cadre. Thus, whereas previously the OCIC had focused on struggle with Organized tendency forces (cadre organizations LOM, etc.), then later the unorganized tendency (individual Marxist Leninists organizationally unaffiliated, now the 18 point studies, and draft Plan conferences were to include members of the potential tendency.

The advanced experience which gave rise to ~~it~~ this line shift was the National Minority Marxist Leninist Conference, which had successfully united a number of national minority ~~workers~~ advanced fighters with the partybuilding movement. The conference had emphasized outreach to comrades who were not just Marxist Leninists, and made the central focus of speeches and discussions the need for partybuilding and the single center.

For many of us the shift was very positive, because it fundamentally brought back a key aspect of ~~the~~ partybuilding, winning the advanced workers to communism, which we had always felt was important, as fusionists. In many localities, the positive process of contacting these comrades and struggling over partybuilding took place. In many cases local centers brought these comrades into the local centers, or 18 point study processes.

While the NSC recognizing the rectificationist type approach of the OCIC and its new efforts towards the advanced were generally a positive corrective to the old line, it really failed to deal with the main problem of the OCIC partybuilding line: the separation of ideological and practical centers.

Thus the so-called step ~~xxx~~ back toward 'fusion', never was capable of really theory and practice back together. Instead it led to an even more consolidated left idealist approach to partybuilding which further liquidated the ~~xxx~~ role of social practice. This was because the NSC argued that advanced workers could be won to the OCIC's partybuilding process, in the absence of cadre organizations and social practice. Uniting with the advanced became mainly a question of ideological struggle with the advanced over 1. the OC partybuilding line 2. the 18 points 3. their ideological weaknesses around capitulation to racism and ~~xxx~~ petit-bourgeois chauvinism. Thus, the propagation of communist ideas became the basis for uniting with the advanced, and the element of winning the advanced in the context of common mass work, agitation, and political line development was dropped out completely.

The NSC moved quickly to consolidate this 'left idealist' conception of uniting the advanced, by attacking an amendment from Louisville which stressed the need for the development of a national pre-party. The amendment argued that while the OCIC should be primary, it was crucial to build a national pre-party which would be capable of developing a deeper level of political line, national agitation and propaganda necessary for fusion. The main thrust of the amendment was that national minorities and working class people will be won to communism primarily by being attracted to a fighting organization in class struggle, which leads with a revolutionary line. The NSC branded this approach as thoroughly racist and petit-bourgeois chauvinist. We argued that what underlay this argument was the chauvinist conceptions that advanced workers were only capable of practical work, and not capable of being in a primarily theoretical partybuilding process. The logic was that we could win the advanced through the propagation of the 18 points, and single center alone, as long as we dealt ~~xxx~~ with our individual ideological weaknesses which kept us from talking to the comrades, or forced them out of the process.

Looking back we can say that this is a thoroughly idealist conception of how the advanced will be won to communism. It will not be primarily through the propagation of a general 18 points, and partybuilding line, although this will play a role. Mainly the advanced will be won, through being attracted to a fighting organization, capable of leading struggles, whose political line has the ability to make correct assessments and win victories. This had always been the conception of the winning of the advanced which the earlier fusion line envisioned.

In fact, many of the advanced workers who joined the OCIC did so based on the previous contact they had had with OC cadre in mass work. By building respect in struggle, and being attracted to the ideas of Marxist Leninism, based on seeing its ability to analyze and develop strategy for concrete work. This is not to say that these forces were simply won on the basis of practice, or couldn't take up the development of theory. They could, and ~~xxx~~ have, but this cannot be the basis to drop out the materialist component of ~~xxxx~~ ~~xxx~~ showing the advanced character of Marxism Leninism.

The NSC's attack on the Louisville, whatever the particular weaknesses of its authors aside, represented a complete distortion of the fusionist strategy for winning the advanced. ~~In addition to the idealism~~ we could argue that it took the previous ultra-left weaknesses in the fusion organization prior to the OCIC, and raised them to a consistent left idealist line.

Whereas, groups such as the PWOC had made the idealist error of thinking that advanced workers could be won primarily through the propagation of advanced ideas, and downplayed united front and aifational work as part of this process, Now the OCIC steering committee made a principal of winning people on the basis of the most general and abstract principals of communism (18 points), and argued against those who ~~wanted to~~ see a national pre-party as key to this process. The result of this line was that many advanced forces did not join because they felt that the OCIC wasn't taking up the practical work, and was only a study and discussion group. Many advanced forces who did join out of a growing commitment to Marxism Leninism became discouraged due to the lack of focus on practice. The bulk of advanced comrades who entered the process were eventually driven out or left by an ultra-left campaign, in which every weakness was exaggerated into a full scale capitulationist trend to petit-bourgeois chauvinism. ~~Ironically, the step toward fusion was carried~~

Ironically, the step toward "fusion" which did lead to the participation of some advanced fighters from the class, also led to them being driven out. In the context, of an ultra-left campaign which separated the struggle against racism from mass work and political line, and focused almost exclusively on the weaknesses of the cadre, no real winning of the advanced could take place. It was in the campaign, that the left idealist partybuilding line and the left idealist ideological campaign came together. Together they marched hand in hand, destroying cadre organizations, driving out both the advanced and petit bourgeois comrades, and eventually destroying the OCIC. The lesson is that the NSC should not go back to fusion, away from a process which emphasized uniting marxist Leninists around political line, without summing up its original errors in separating the centers, and abandoning the full development of the fusion partybuilding line: the national pre-party. Thus, ~~winning the advanced in the context of the OCIC was~~ a full partybuilding line review and change would have been necessary in order to rectify the errors. Sadly enough, the fusionists, in the name of purifying the white cadre in order to unite with the advanced workers, did some of the most racist and anti-working class things. As we said in our previous paper, never has so much racism been carried out in the name of anti-racism, nor so much anti-worker actions in the name of workers. But the exaggeration of the existing ideological weakness of cadre, must be seen primarily as the result of an ultra-left partybuilding line, and campaign in the struggle against racism.

A final note should be made on the organizational opportunism, of the NSC and PWOC in attacking the Louiseville amendment. In the context of the efforts to forge a national pre-party secretly, whose purpose was generally the same as the Louiseville amendment, it was complete hypocrisy and organizational opportunism. OCIC cadre did not have the benefit of being able to openly politically analyze and criticize the pre-party initiative for any of the weaknesses which the NSC so vehemently attacked the Louiseville amendment for. What was worse the main thrust of the Louiseville amendment contained nothing that the members of the secret pre-party initiative did not agree with. This illustrates how deeply the leadership of the OCIC and the PWOC were into their organizational opportunism, as well as an unprincipled approach to the theoretical struggle.

## The Roots of the OCIC Degeneration: Ultra-Leftism Once Again

The OC's ultra-left campaign against white and petit bourgeois chauvinism ripped apart the OCIC. Comrade after comrade left or was driven out of the OCIC process due to the unprincipled character of the campaign, and due to political disagreements. Today the OCIC is almost totally demolished, with only a few remaining comrades left in cities which once had large groupings of OCIC cadre. The NSC has been completely demolished with only one original member still remaining, Clay Newlin. Clay along with Michael Simmons make up the OTEC steering committee, although it is not clear that they are really leading anyone. The practical organizations in many cases have also been demolished. The PWOC once a large organization with over 60 members is now down to less than 10 people. Other cadre organizations have been similarly depleted, and even those whose members have broken with the campaign, stand basically immobilized and divided due to the after ~~and~~ effects of the OCIC process.

In the context of previous partybuilding efforts, the OCIC was a relatively short partybuilding effort: with both a meteoric rise and decline in a period slightly longer than 3 years. The OCIC represents yet another ultra-left attempt to forge a vanguard party. What is distinct from previous anti-revisionist attempts is that it took place in the context of an anti-revisionist, anti-left tendency which had professed to demarcate from previous ultra-leftism. This highlights what a persistent problem the 'left' line is, even for those who seek to break from it. Although the OTEC has its particularities, relative to other ~~ex~~ experiences, we can highlight some key aspects of its work which are consistent with the ultra-left partybuilding line in previous experiences. These include:

1. A voluntaristic approach to developing revolutionary theory and a leading core which was based on the ~~separation~~ separation of revolutionary theory from practice.
2. An idealistic deviation in the development of theory which focused on downplaying the role of social practice, and cadre organizations, in the development and testing of practice.
3. A downplaying of the winning of the advanced workers in the actual struggle for political line ~~substituting political line~~, and an elevation of a the strategy of party formation which stresses uniting marxist leninists around political line.
4. To the extent, winning the advanced was taken up, a 'left' approach to doing propaganda of ideas, at the expense of developing correct social practice and a fighting organizations.
5. A anti-democratic, and bureaucratic approach to line struggle within the organization which forced opposition lines out of organization.
6. An organizational hegemonist practice on the part of the PAOC, and all those involved in the secret pre-party formation process, which involved closed struggle over line.
7. A sectarian stand towards forces outside of the OCIC, and the ultra-left tendency to demarcate completely over differences.

8. An overestimation of the actual development of local organizations and their cadre, and a subsequent downplaying of the need for cadre training, systematic study in cadre work.

9. Organizational opportunism ~~in the class struggle~~, and theoretical dishonesty in the struggle for political line.

~~xx~~

10. Ultra-left ideological campaigns which functioned on the basis of idealist definitions of white and petit-bourgeois chauvinism, and ultra-left methods for combatting them.

11. Overestimation of present members of OCIC in relationship to their actual role in the class struggle, and to other forces on the left. Therefore 'left illusions' over the ~~actual~~ actual role of the NSC and OC in the context of the revolutionary process.

These are some of the main forms that the ultra-left partybuilding line has taken in the communist movement historically, as well as in the OCIC. An important particularity of the OCIC experience was the initial decision on the part of the fusion forces, to withdraw their political lines from struggle in the interests of a broader 18 points, and a broader unity. While organizational opportunism of the PWOC played a certain role in this decision which is consistent with previous leading anti-revisionist circles, in general the strategy that the OC pursued in this regard was unique to the OCIC. Nevertheless, this particularity of the OCIC strategy does not fundamentally alter the fact that the main, or essential weaknesses of the OCIC line was a ultra-left approach to forging the revolutionary vanguard.

The Line Of March comrades would agree with some of the phenomenon that we have listed, and yet would argue that all of this was the result of an essentially ~~rightist~~ rightist strategy for partybuilding. In their view the OCIC represented the fusion partybuilding line. The fusion partybuilding line necessarily 'lowers the vision of communists' by ~~focusing~~ focusing on the winning of the advanced workers to communism. This in turns to an empiricist approach to theory by downplaying the summarizing of indirect experience and worshipping practical struggles and spontaneity. Politically, LOM argues this ~~leads~~ leads to rightist political practice and organizationally leads to amateurish methods of work and localism. In ~~summation~~ summation the LOM believes that the OCIC fell apart because of the implementation of the fusion strategy and its inability to unite marxist leninists around political line, which they view as the essence of partybuilding. Thus they would argue that problems of sectarianism, organizational hegemonism, are all problems that are equally applicable to rightist formations, such as the CP, and therefore do not necessarily constitute components of an ultra-left partybuilding. In fact, the LOM does not feel that there has been a consistent ultra-left approach to partybuilding by the anti-revisionist movement, solely an left opportunist political line. Let us deal with each of their arguments one by one.

First, the LOM assumes that because the OCIC was led by fusionists therefore the OCIC must have made the main emphasis on winning the advanced

First, we must address what has been historically correct about the LOM critique of the OCIC. The LOM comrades were correct in their critique that the OCIC could not forge a leading center without a leading political line. They correctly argued that it was incorrect for the PWOC to put the line struggles over fusion, and other political lines in the background and raise to the primary the struggle for a single organizational center. They therefore were able to see the contradictions that the OCIC would run into in trying to call for a single center, yet an unfederated center, which did not have a higher level of unity on line.

Secondly, the LOM were correct in various criticisms of the OCIC campaign against white and petit-bourgeois chauvinism. They correctly targeted the OCIC's failure to link the ideological campaign with the development of political line and mass work for the democratic rights of minorities.

Thirdly, they correctly targeted much of the PWOC hegemonism, and organizational opportunism that became a hall mark of the OCIC's internal process as well as its relationship with broader partybuilding forces.

The weaknesses of the LOM's critique is that it didn't really target so many of the essential weaknesses of the overall line. First, and foremost the LOM never took on sharply the problems of the OCIC separation of centers, particularly the tendency to downplay the cadre organizations and social practice in the development of theory. Secondly it never targeted the voluntaristic concepts of the OCIC which emphasized uniting marxist leninists over winning the advanced workers to communism. In this light, it didn't even recognize the more positive work that occurred in the OCIC during the campaign which actually brought a number of advanced forces to communism, since it viewed this as a diversion from partybuilding. Thirdly, it incorrectly assessed that the pre-party was the primary and determining element in the OC's strategy, when in fact this was the secondary and subordinate aspect of what the fusionists had in mind. And finally, it completely failed to grasp the actual historical development of the OC's abandonment of the fusion strategy as it unfolded, but instead maintained the historical assertion that all developments in the OCIC could be explained by the failure of the fusion line.

The reasons for the LOM's omissions on these points are clear, it is because in many ways the OCIC developed according to a number of the idealist and ultra-left principles which are also the basis for the LOM effort. Many of the basic principles of the OCIC including: the separation of centers, the emphasis on uniting marxist leninist to develop political line, the subordination of cadre organizations and winning the advanced, an idealist conception of forging a leading core, ~~and~~ the numerous aspects of downplaying social practice, and even certain elements of sectarianism which were all part of the OCIC, are part of the LOM partybuilding strategy as well. Therefore let us look more closely at LOM's critique that it was the ~~of the~~ fusion line and address each one of their arguments.

First, we disagree that the OCIC's downplaying of theory stemmed primarily ~~of~~ from an empiricist, or economist deviation. As we have said empiricist errors were prevalent in the fusion forces before the OCIC, and undoubtedly existing throughout the process of the OCIC. Yet despite



the continuance of pragmatic and empiricist errors, the leading line of the OCIC ~~downplayed~~ liquidated theory primarily in an effort to unite marxist leninists. As we saw in the actual development of the OCIC, the PWOC withdrew its leading lines, including fusion in order to create a 'broad single center' for the Marxist Leninist Tendency. Thus during the period of the fusion lines earlier development there was much more theoretical emphasis given in the development of political line (1971-1978), this theoretical development slowed qualitatively as the OCIC formed and emphasized a lower and broader 'nonsectarian' basis of unity.

This ~~actual~~ actual reality of the OC's development cuts against the main ~~assertion~~ assertion of the LOM that the fusion line inevitably lowered the visions of communists in the theoretical realm, because it workshipped the summation of direct experience and therefore was an empiricist deviation. Quite the contrary the PWOC's emphasis on winning the advanced lead to a much more vigorous line development, while the birth of the OCIC as an effort to unite marxist leninist retarded line development. We emphasize this point to highlight that the development of political line can be liquidated either from the 'left' or from the right'. An economist orientation, which fails to study the general lessons of the communist movement, and indirect experience because it is mired in the practical struggle and gives insufficient priority to theoretical study. Yet our ultra-leftist always downplayed theory from the 'left'. That is they retarded line development because they were satisfied for the most dogmatic recapitulations of old lines, and failed to study the concrete conditions and sum-up actual social practice as part of line development. We could argue that the founding of the OCIC, represented a liquidation of theory from the left, and was an ~~idealistic~~ idealist rather than primarily empiricist error methodologically. By focusing on lowering the level of line development and struggle, in order to unite the broadest number of marxist leninist in the single center as the main source for the liquidation of theory, particularly in the context of the theoretical emphasis that PWOC had given to this ~~work~~ previously. ~~Theoretical~~

Thus other phenomenon in the OCIC, such as the downplaying of cadre development, do not flow primarily from empiricism, but leftism in the failure of the OCIC to be built on the most advanced lines as would have been the case ~~if~~ had the national pre-party taken precedence.

Similarly the LOM argues that the fusion line necessarily leads to the rightist practical practice. This is harder to evaluate. In the first two years we could argue that the main process of the OCIC was to downplay the importance of mass work, and to pull cadre away from this work. Thus rather than being 'buried' in mass work which as also was LOM's characterization of the fusion forces, on the contrary the OCIC lead fusion cadre to ~~it~~ away from mass work. Undoubtedly the failure of the OCIC to elaborate political line for mass work, meant that existing rightist deviations remained in tact. Yet we can see by looking at OCIC forces in the 1st year, that many cadre moved decisively to the 'left' in their mass work as a result of the OCIC process.

This occurred, first, it the tendency of the OCIC to pull advanced workers toward the 18 point study groups in the absence of deepening the mass work. We have noted the OC's shift toward 'left propaganda' with the advanced. Secondly, the impact of the campaign as to have OCIC cadre move left and in their approach to mass struggles. For example, the PWOC's position on feminism, which emphasized the ideological weaknesses of the primarily white petty-bourgeois members of this movement, lead to a 'left critique' and attacking of the women's movement. This is not to say that the basic problems which the PWOC <sup>highlight</sup> ~~were not~~ correct, they were. But, like the campaign against OCIC cadre, the PWOC tended to elevate these ideological ~~weak~~ weaknesses over the strategic political questions lead to their isolation in the various women's movements. Their standing in the united front disintegrating as they took up a 'left' approach to tackling these real weaknesses. Similarly in trade union work many OC cadre began to judge workers primarily by the ideological weaknesses, rather than their political stands. This lead members of the OCIC in Seattle to refuse to work with various white workers, or white marxist Leninists in the Seattle building trade movements because of their 'racism'. This was a clearly ultra-left stand, given these same people could support the basic political demands of the black construction workers. Thus the line of the OC in both party building and racism lead mass work primarily to the left and not the right as LOM would assert.

Thirdly, the LOM critique distorts the actual OCIC process by saying that downplaying line development, and rightist practical work flow primarily out of the fusion line's efforts to in the advanced workers to communism. First, we say this is a distortion because, with the exception of the period of the campaign, the OCIC did not make one of its tasks winning the advanced workers. The LOM leadership is aware of this, although many rank and file comrades in the rectification movement are still confused on this point. Many people outside the OCIC still believe that the OCIC did practical work and didn't understand that the practical centered ~~work~~ were separate. The reality was that the founding of the OCIC represented a clear shift of the fusion forces by making primary the unification of marxist Leninists in the struggle for political line. Whatever the weaknesses in this line, it remained the central focus of the draft Plan. This is also represented in the PWOC self-criticism and the subsequent argument that the development of a pre-party would remain subordinate to the ideological center. This is clear evidence that ~~winning the advanced workers to communism~~ the fusion forces had downplayed the role of practical organizations and therefore the struggle to win the advanced.

The central problem with the LOM critique is that it starts from dogmatist premise that the ~~PWOC was the main force in the~~ fusion line is a rightist line, much like the economists of Lenin's day. Then without concrete analysis of the actual development of the PWOC, the birth and development of the OCIC, it argues that everything that happened must inevitably come back to the 'rightist' fusion line. This is not helpful in identifying the actual deviations that took place.

In addition, the LOM is limited due to its own 'left' voluntarist conceptions of partybuilding which keep it from forcefully critique the inevitable distortions that occur in a process which seeks to unite marxist leninists without an anchor in social practice, and ~~any~~ cadre organizations. They see only the differences, but not the unity of the OCIC with their own process. What compounds their failure to see the rampant 'leftism' and voluntarism of the OC process is their own summation of the partybuilding lines of the new communist movement. Essentially, they argue that you cannot ~~The OCIC Abandonment of the Fusion Strategy for Partybuilding~~ identify a consistent left ~~line~~ partybuilding line, with possibly a few minor exceptions. They tend to trade the development of lines as pure ideas, rather than the actual practice of the anti-revisionist organizations. For these reasons the RU is branded as having an essentially rightist partybuilding line for its earliest formulations that the ~~partybuilding~~ essence of partybuilding was forging the united front. These were clearly rightist lines put out at a time when the RU was not aggressively seeing the need for partybuilding. And yet less than two years later, RU flipped from this rightist approach to a ~~Marxist-Leninist~~ United Marxist Leninist approach in the form of the National ~~Communist~~ Liaison Committee. The process was destroyed by RU organizational maneuvering and hegemonism, but it hardly formed the RCP based on the actual 'forging of a united front.' Thus despite the ~~ultra~~ rhetoric of any of the ultra-left formations, their approach to partybuilding has neither emphasized fusion, nor actually ~~use~~ using the qualitative change in the relationship between communists and the advanced workers as the criteria for party formation. Whatever rightist theories have been initially ~~undeveloped~~, they have quickly given way to an actual process of trying to 'uniting marxist leninists around political line, in the absence of any real change in the level of fusion. To the LOM we must insist that the OCIC follows in this ~~tradition~~ ultra-left tradition, as does, unfortunately, their own organization.

#### OC Epitaph: Fusion Abandoned, Ultra leftism Firmly in Control

For those of us who lived the OC experience, saw the local organizations ripped apart by the National OC process, felt ourselves torn from masswork, ~~and~~ isolated from the rest of the partybuilding movement, degraded as a result of vulgarized ideological struggle, it is hard to feel that we traveled mainly down the road of economism, a la Rbochey Dyelo. Perhaps many of us ~~wish~~ wish that the OC had never developed and we had remained 'buried in our practical work', our 'visions lowered.' But this is not the right response either. We must gain clarity on our experience, realize our errors, and how quickly a revolutionary movement isolated from the the workers' movement, theoretically underdeveloped, and inexperienced practically can degenerate into ~~ultra~~ ultra-leftism. We have not been the first, but we can ill afford to go through this again.

The starting point for our rectification is to reaffirm what was correct in the fusion partybuilding line, and to reject the various ultra-left ways that the OCIC ignored some basic truths. First this means that a party can only be built, and here we mean a vanguard party, as a result of fusion of communism with the advanced workers. This means

that there must occur a qualitatively different relationship between the present communist and working class movements. The ~~xxxx~~ road to this goal will be long, and it will involve developing theory, uniting marxist leninists, as well as winning the advanced workers. But at the center of our strategy must remain the importance of Marxist Leninists developing their theory, developing themselves, and uniting with other marxist leninist in the concrete struggle to change the society: social practice. We can no longer accept the separation of centers, theory from practice, propaganda from united front work, ~~organizational~~ organization politics. Whatever our level of development, or forms of organization we must strive through all periods of the partybuilding process maintain the closest possible relationship with social practice. This is the essential principle of the fusion strategy which we must maintain, and which was the main 'left' abandonment of fusion by the OCIC.

At the same time that we are clear the the OCIC's clearly abandoned the fusion strategy in the context of how theory will be developed, how leadership will be forged, how cadre should develop etc. we must also realize that the fusion strategy was never a fully developed line on partybuilding. It remains more a principle which must be correctly elaborated and applied to US reality. Therefore we must be critical of our earlier understandings and articulation of the line, and be willing to rectify any weaknesses. Most importantly is the recognition that any real strategy must begin with a concrete analysis of the working class movement, the present period of US imperialism, and the state of the left. Without this analysis no correct principle for partybuilding can ~~max~~ create a real strategy for building a revolutionary vanguard in the US.

We will begin our efforts to re-elaborate the fusion partybuilding line, look at the workers movement, and the left, and try to outline what we feel are the main ~~xxxxxx~~ tasks for Marxist Leninists in our final paper. For it is mainly through a discussion of what are concrete tasks as communists that we will rebuild our unity, and hopefully move forward together.