

December 10, 1979

Dear Comrades,

The following paper is an analysis of what occurred in the Southern California Local Center from 1978 to 1979 from a minority perspective within the local center. It is addressed primarily to comrades who are considering taking up the building of local centers: however it raises other questions more general to all participants in the OCIC, namely, methods of struggle and treatment of minority positions within the movement.

THE OBJECTIVE SITUATION HERE

Los Angeles and Orange County has been one of the weakest areas of the country in terms of membership in the OCIC and also in political influence and visibility for the trend. After one year of attempting to build a local center in the area, the OCIC forces are badly split, and several people have left the Socialist Organizing Committee, the only OCIC organization in the area. Over the past year OCIC forces have become increasingly isolated from the working class movement here. The local center here also did not accomplish any of its goals set forth in October of last year. As of October, 1979 it had not recruited one single person to the local center outside the original OCIC members.

In this situation, a majority of the OCIC forces have decided to build the local center in Los Angeles as their primary area of work and a minority have committed themselves to primarily building the seriously weakened local organization and to building some small base in the working class movement. We feel that given the weakness and division in the area the SCALC should not be considered a model for other local centers, nor should Southern California have been the only area to experiment with this new form.

Several of us have chosen not to participate in the SCALC for at least a six-month period. The reasons are as follows:

- 1) As members of SOC one of our principles of unity was the conception of building a base for the communist movement in the working class. At this time since there is no viable communist party the best way for Marxist Leninists to do this is in small local organizations. Other members of the OCIC in the area considered building the local center to be the primary (if not the only - for some) work for Marxist Leninists at this particular time. Regrettably, we are extremely weak in both areas and over the past year these two tasks of our movement here came increasingly into conflict. Because we found that our participation in the local center and the struggle that occurred here left us little time for our trade union and mass work we have chosen to focus our attention on our mass work and building an organization that can make that work possible. Because there are so few of us here, we have to have time to build our organization; not because we fetishize this form but in order to build a base for our movement.
- 2) We find the concept of local centers as arenas for struggling

against small circle mentality and federationism attractive but abstract. Our concrete experience with the local center here has meant the near dissolution of our organization and its work. We feel that given the disastrous results in this area we need more positive examples to draw on for developint local centers. When a situation has become destructive and not constructive the solution is not to demand more of the same. We are asking for other areas of the country, where there are cadre organizations with more of a base in the class to build centers and sum up their experiences after six months to a year. Then on this basis, of more concrete national experience, we can base an attempt to build a local center here.

- 3) Finally, we found the most negative experience was the unprincipled methods of struggle used by the steering committee (and others) of the local center. We feel that a priority of the OCIC should be to develop guildelines for ideological struggle, and criticism/self-criticism which will make open democratic and comradely struggle a reality.

We welcome any questions regarding what happened here and our analysis.

Comradely,
SOC
Box 4252
Santa Ana, CA 92702

THE SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA LOCAL CENTER:
AN ANALYSIS OF A DISASTER

This document is an examination of the history of the Southern California Local Center, written out of the experience of what became through a great deal of struggle the Local Center Minority (and has now become a smaller, reorganized SOC.)

The SCLC experience was a disaster. No one should pretend otherwise. We began in the LA area with a situation of gradually developing unity, politically and organizationally. Almost overnight, with the creation of the local center, there was a turning inward of its steering committee and a hardening of incorrect methods of struggle. The result was what amounted to a bitter split that did a great deal of damage to what remains of the local center and what remains of SOC. The OCIC must not move on to encourage similar developments without examining carefully what went wrong in LA, and it certainly must not pretend that what happened here was "advanced experience."

INTRODUCTION

We support the concept of building a single ideological center in the U.S., and the creation of local and regional centers as a form for developing the IC and promoting ideological struggle. In this the national should lead the local. The national may not yet be equipped to guide local practice, but we feel the need for this as well, and we are concerned about the dangers of separating theory and practice during the process of establishing the IC. We agree that theory is primary at this period, but we urge the creation of a national pre-party formation within the OCIC to develop an overall perspective on relating theory and practice, now and in forthcoming periods.

We agree that in moving from small localized organizations to a tendency-wide formation there is a need to break out of the localism and other weaknesses inherent in local organizations. In this process, we must also watch out for the danger of prematurely dissolving local organizations, out of exaggerated fears of being seen as "federationist." It is essential to develop a clear guide to how local organizations can function positively and contribute to creating a national formation.

A concrete understanding of what happened in Southern California can contribute to this, but unravelling that history is not easy. The reality had become overlaid with layers of confusion, misrepresentation and misinterpretation, as all too many people crushed real problems and complex developments into pre-packaged, pre-labelled boxes. The manner in which the struggle was waged here only made the confusion worse, and this created some of our deepest concerns.

Our criticisms are offered in a comradely spirit, and we are committed to overcoming differences through correct methods of struggle--as we were committed throughout the struggle to preventing a split. All of us must learn criticism/self-criticism as a tool to uncover and rectify errors and not as a method to smash and destroy each other. And we hope to struggle in the context of unity/struggle/unity in order to build a higher unity on a principled base.

No single error, no "prevailing line" accounts for the problems of the SCLC. The local center was not born with a clear sense of direction and no one can be faulted for not knowing how to build what had never been built before. Nor can anyone be blamed for the changes in direction that inevitably occurred as we moved forward through trial and error. But we are critical of the steering committee's inability to understand the errors that occurred and counteract them. We are critical of their inability to deal with those who questioned decisions, and of their tendency to respond to all criticism as a matter of "line struggle." These problems have to be faced

squarely if we are to move forward in a stronger state.

BEFORE THE LOCAL CENTER WAS FORMED

One of the most serious problems at the birth of the local center was the lack of any serious investigation of the objective and subjective conditions that existed here. The subjective desire to wish something into being, without concrete analysis, is a product of idealism, and the SCLC was born out of subjective desire.

If the conditions in this area had actually been as portrayed by Pat Fry last December, the history of the center might well have been different.

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

[Letter to steering committee co-chairs, December 1978, page 1.]

All things in nature, including political life, must be viewed as a process of coming-into-being, of development through inner contradiction and its final dissolution into some higher form. Truth is concrete, and to understand the history of the SCLC it is necessary to understand what actually existed here before the fall of 1978.

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

Compared to cities in the East and Midwest, LA is more like a region than a city, and it makes sense to view it as a series of smaller cities. In this area a local center might well overcome some of the fragmentation and isolation that exist.

At the time the SCLC was initiated, the small groupings in LA were not viable organizations, and were in fact in the process of holding discussions to join the one small organization that did exist, albeit some distance away in Orange County.

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

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

SOC was a small organization located some 35 miles from LA in Orange County. As its principles of unity, published in "Notes From Orange, No. 1" in 1977 stated, SOC was committed to helping "build a new genuinely democratic-centralist communist party in the US" and SOC joined the OC in late 1977. SOC members had observed at first hand the formation and self-destruction of dogmatist organizations in the

county, including RU(RCP) and ATM. From the beginning SOC struggled to create an anti-dogmatist organization.

In late 1977, SOC had no knowledge of other OC forces in Southern California, and it contacted all forces that it believed could be won to the OCIC, including some political contacts in the Bay Area.

These formations were the LA Guardian Club, the Pasadena Workers Collective, a very small grouping, and the Pasadena Community Information Center, a Black community group moving in the direction of Marxist-Leninist ideas. SOC introduced these groups to the OCIC, shared OCIC documents with them and encouraged them to investigate the OCIC.

In December 1977, SOC made contact with the LAWG and our delegates to the February 1978 OC conference went with the LAWG comrades.

In March 1978 SOC sponsored a gathering of all OC forces in Southern California to hear a report from the February conference. Invited in addition were representatives from the Pasadena workers group and a representative from the Bay Area involved in building the Bay Area Socialist Organizing Committee.

In the spring of 1978 invited a visit from the Oakland OC group and established contact with this OC grouping.

In June 1978, SOC addressed the first conference of the BASOC group and urged it to investigate the OCIC. SOC also met with the Oakland group at this time to establish better ties.

At this time, SOC also took the initiative to begin a process of involving the OC comrades in LA in its practical work. In early June a joint committee was established for the purpose of exploring joint work in LA and establishing political ties.

Contradictions emerged within the joint committee concerning the direction of the LAWG. Some members of the LAWG did not know if there were to remain in LA and expressed doubts whether the OCIC could establish a base in LA. In addition contradictions emerged between one member of the LAWG and one member of the LAOC. SOC undertook a struggle with the LAWG to remain in LA and attempted to solve the internal contradictions within the joint committee.

Despite these problems, joint work was undertaken and all participated in an anti-police terror demonstration. In late August, the LA Guardian Club contacted SOC for the purpose of sponsoring a debate between Clay Newlin and Irwin Silbur. The joint committee grew together in making preparations for this event.

SOC kept in contact with the NSC regarding all these developments and actively sought advice and input. In late August and early September, an NSC member spent a week investigating OC forces in the area, giving helpful guidance and inspiring us all to develop our work. This visit served to encourage the view that the 5 OC members in LA should join SOC.

THE BIRTH OF THE LOCAL CENTER

This was the situation as the local center was formed. LA did not have a single OCIC organization that could direct and sum-up practice in the LA working class and mass movement, and the several dedicated OCIC members in LA were already engaged in discussions toward joining the nearby OCIC organization in Orange County. Into this political void in LA came the local center.

We believe a key source of future problems was the lack of an organization in LA, and the fact that the new steering committee of the local center quickly took on the character of a political unit. The steering committee rapidly became a rather closed group which, with the exception of one SOC delegate, developed its own internal life and began to function as a political organization--and one without common practice. The dynamic of the steering committee turned inward, rather than reaching out to encompass the rest of the OCIC members, and this development was not checked by outside sources, neither from the national level nor from SOC, which failed to provide its

delegate with guidance and failed to demand regular reports.

After several months the steering committee recognized what was occurring and moved to open the local center meetings to all OCIC members. However, a number of divisions had developed by this time and the steering committee failed to assess these divisions properly and move to overcome them. The situation was fraught with overwhelming suspicion and tension. In particular, one of the leading founders of SOC, a comrade with whose politics many SOC members closely identify, had already been labelled by the steering committee as having a different party building line from the OCIC. This was symptomatic of the incorrect methods of struggle that had developed within the steering committee and carried on within the opened-up local center meetings.

METHODS OF STRUGGLE

The local center struggles became very bitter and differences were continually pulled out of their context, labelled with the current negative epithet, and forced into the mold of a "battle over line" when no genuine line differences in fact existed. This method of struggle, so familiar to all of us from years of experience of the anti-revisionist movement, forces "lines" to emerge out of defensive reaction, and everyone becomes so busy constructing neat "lines" that the essence of what everyone says is distorted, and worst of all, open criticism becomes impossible. To be clear, we are not opposed to struggling out real line differences, but we are very tired of pseudo line struggles and name calling used to avoid or quash genuine questioning and criticism.

This method of struggle became evident when Comrade L raised a number of questions to the local center. 1) What is the character of a local center with no mass base and only a steering committee? 2) How would its character change if, as then projected, all but one comrade joined SOC? 3) To whom was the local center accountable? This comrade also suggested a sum-up of the period before the center was formed, and that the center should hold an open meeting of all OCIC members in the area to present a plan for the local center and receive feedback. All the questions were rejected, most on the basis of their reflecting a different line on building the local center than the national steering committee's line. We feel this was a grossly mechanistic view of the concept that the national leads the local, denying the dialectical relationship that must be created between leadership and base. The sum-up was rejected because it wasn't relevant, would slow down the momentum of building the center, and would only stir up the past.

This incorrect method of struggle showed itself again as the steering committee dealt with questions and criticism from Comrade A. This comrade raised issues concerning leadership of the center, the relation of cadre organizations to the center, the educative and ideological function of the steering committee and cadre organizations--issues which were far from clearly defined when they were raised and are still definitely on the agenda for discussion today. These are serious problems that we are going to have to face in moving toward genuine democratic centralism. We cannot wish away the immense dangers of bureaucratic centralism, or brand all concern that the base have a voice as some form of "small-circle mentality." The real significance of Comrade A's statements and suggestions was not brought forward in the struggle that ensued. Instead the specters of federationism, localism and organizational hegemony were invoked and the discussions were filtered back to the rest of the OC members in sharp terms of different party building lines.

By the time the steering committee broke out of its self-inclusiveness, the lines were drawn in concrete. The first full local center meetings were a perfect example of the negative situation described in the Draft Plan for an Ideological Center:

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

Some specific examples of incorrect methods of struggle, used even after the local center was opened up, are illustrative of this "mountain-stronghold mentality" as it existed in LA.

1) Tentative questions or ideas put forward were immediately branded as evidence of, or tendencies inevitably leading to, a full blown "line." These ideas were not just identified as an opposing line, but had to be nipped in the bud before they had a chance to develop. A very few weeks before the national conference, there was no consolidated minority position. Individuals within the local center raised questions and objections to views being put forward. They did not consider these questions or statements to represent any line at all, let alone a full-blown "opposing line." For example, at the first opened-up center meeting, some comrades raised questions about the history of the development of the center. (A thorough self-criticism was more than appropriate at this stage.) The questions were immediately branded right opportunist and backward, and some attributed them to the influence of Comrade A who was not present. These ideas had to be quashed immediately before they led to errors.

2) Ideas were labelled federationist, localist, hegemonist, empiricist, racist, right opportunist, backward, obstructionist without foundation of content, and without any effort to establish the content. Very little discussion was conducted around the general and historical content of these conceptions or specifically why certain questions were examples of these errors. For example, at one meeting a position was called racist. When asked to explain why, the comrade replied that it was a general principle and to have to give examples would be empiricist. Needless to say, the comrades from the minority left the meeting with no understanding of why or how they were being racist. We are not arguing that ideas should not be identified if they are incorrect (especially if they are racist, sexist, or anti-working class). However, they must be clearly shown to be incorrect.

3) In the method of "building a straw man in order to knock it down" positions held by comrades in the minority were distorted to such an extent that they were unrecognizable. IM's presentation at the national conference is an example. The presentation began with cheap shots against an opponant who was not present ("He attended meetings inconsistently, came poorly prepared, and didn't make fundamental differences clear.") This was intended to prejudice those attending the conference against any views the minority might put forward. IM then proceeded to put the minority position forward in the form of a distorted straw man. For example, one of our positions is supposed to be the universal primacy of practice. No one in the minority put this forward; why would we join an IC if we held this position? We said that practice must play an important role in developing the IC.

All the other positions put forward as the minority position were examples of

taking statements out of context and trying to make them principled differences. The result of this form of struggle is that the minority will always be on the defensive in answering questions and accusations, instead of putting forward clearly their positions in a positive way. Another result is that it inhibits free discussion. It creates an atmosphere of fear to put forward ideas lest one be labelled. This is the opposite of open ideological struggle.

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

In addition the closure of the steering committee to all but its loyal supporters has created a circle-warfare situation in Southern California. The steering committee denied the development of principled ideological struggle within the local center in the interest of promoting its own small circle ideas. The result is a split in OCIC forces in the area, a split that we struggled against for a long time.

SUGGESTIONS TO PROMOTE PRINCIPLED STRUGGLE

1) Correct ideas emerge in struggle with incorrect ones. When differences arise in the beginning of a struggle they are usually not full-blown, deeply developed positions. They should be encouraged to develop fully. In the course of struggle, only time and social practice will prove who is right and wrong. Differences, questioning, criticism should be encouraged to grow and should not be suppressed.

2) "Ideological struggle is not like other forms of struggle. The only method to be used in this struggle is that of painstaking reasoning and not crude coercion." [Mao, On the Correct Handling of Contradictions Among the People.] Accusations should be avoided. Words and phrases should be given ideological and educative content. When someone is accused of right opportunism, etc., we must take pains to explain why positions they hold are examples of these errors.

3) In the history of the communist movement, minority views have many times turned out to be correct. Therefore, minority positions inside and outside of organizations must be encouraged. Minority positions can be put forward until these questions are put to a vote at a national conference (The struggle around Point 18 is a good example of this method.) After a vote is taken the minority must be subordinate to the majority in practice. However, they must not be asked to give up their ideas. If there is a change in the objective situation which warrants discussion, or if the majority turns out to be wrong, the opportunity must be given to the minority to raise their views again. In order to ensure that organizational maneuvers are not used against them, those holding minority views must not be removed from responsible positions or political work.

Finally, as much as possible, minority views should be put forward by the minority themselves. They should not be characterized by their opponents.

LOCAL CENTERS AND CADRE ORGANIZATIONS

The process of developing local centers is going to vary in different parts of the country. On a very basic level, the problems faced in a city with a number of OC organizations and OC individuals are quite different from those in an area with several individuals and no organizations. The nature of the individuals and organizations will also affect the process.

At the national conference, Pat Fry used the Detroit experience (involving two cadre organizations and several individuals, including minority individuals) to draw several important lessons. We wish to draw some lessons from a very different situ-

ation.

The experience in LA has shown us that the development of a local center in an area without a cadre organization will produce a distorted formation that cannot fulfill one of the central local center functions--that is, involving all possible members of the broader tendency as participants in the building of the IC.

We believe that the prior existence of a cadre organization in the area (or the rapid creation of one) is necessary for the following reasons:

1) A local center composed of individuals, none of whom belong to an organizational form that guides and summarizes practice, will more than likely transform the local center into a de facto political unit, but one with none of the necessary content to function as a communist unit. It will be neither fish nor fowl, neither an open ideological center nor a functioning communist unit.

2) Theory developed in a local center composed only of individuals (theory on a national level as well) cannot receive even the most rudimentary testing in practice in the local area.

3) Without an OCIC organization in the area that can demonstrate in practice the OCIC's commitment to working class, anti-racist and anti-sexist politics, many advanced workers and minority comrades will remain outside of our movement.

The LA experience is a prime example of the first problem. The local center did take on the characteristics of a separate unit with its own internal dynamic, and this will remain the case here until a cadre organization is established in LA and proper elections to the center steering committee, by OCIC members as a whole, take place.

It isn't surprising that the steering committee turned inward. Under the objective conditions it would have been surprising if this hadn't occurred. To believe that it is possible for individuals with no other organizational relationship to exist in some independent limbo to each other while at the same time relating as a group to the NSC is not to grasp the real dynamic involved. More and more the steering committee in LA assumed the characteristic of an organization, dropped the unification talks with SOC, and became a separate organism. The result was an organization with no base in the area, suspended by its ties to the national.

There is another danger in this situation. If individuals come to use the local center as half-way stations which afford them the opportunity of being part of the mainstream (and even occupying leading positions) while ignoring practical base building, then the whole plan of the local centers will begin to work against the future of the OCIC. If the centers are allowed to be convenient resting points for individuals (especially white intellectuals with a strong tendency toward academicism) then local centers will come to exist less as a means for overcoming the left's racism, sexism and sectarianism, and will in fact encourage the scholasticism and individualism we have seen so often on the left.

Some form in which theory can be tested must exist in the local area. The communist theory of knowledge holds that the true test of theory lies in practical class struggle. Clearly no single incident or isolated local group can accurately test theory. In fact, short of establishing a well-developed party, the results of our testing theory in practice will most often approach approximations of correctness (or incorrectness) rather than absolute answers. Nonetheless, the testing of our developing theory through our beginning ties with the working class and mass struggles will play a crucial role in our advancement. The formation of a local center in an area without a cadre organization poses the problem of how even the most preliminary testing of theory could take place. We realize that it is not the duty of the IC

to guide practice, but it certainly would be correct for the OCIC to encourage organized practice especially when it is a clear possibility, and none exists in the area.

To allow a local center to form and function unaccompanied by a single organization actively building bases in the working class and ties with the mass movement is to condemn us to our present state of separation from advanced workers and minorities. Many advanced workers, minorities, and independent leftists will judge the OCIC by the ability of its members to lead the class struggle and fight racism and sexism. Because of the history of racism and sexism within the left, and our low level of fusion today, most of these forces will remain isolated from the theoretical discussions in the OCIC unless efforts are made to win them to the OCIC by means of both our theory, and just as importantly at this time, our practice.

In trying to win recruits through practice, a local center without a cadre organization is hamstrung. Such a center would have to rely on the dedicated yet spontaneous, unguided and unorganized efforts of individuals. We want to include advanced workers and minorities not only as participants in our discussions, but in the process of deciding the nature of these discussions. In order to win advanced workers and minorities, amateurism in practice must be avoided as much as possible. The OCIC should encourage the building of the most advanced forms for OCIC practice possible in any area.

In the situation in LA, organizational forms for practice, on the level of a cadre organization, have been and still are possible. Such a development should be encouraged.

LOCAL CENTERS AND BUILDING THE MULTI-NATIONALITY OF THE OCIC

Pat Fry in her speech at the convention stated:

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

As a matter of record the local center here was in direct contact with two multi-national groupings from the beginning, and neither has joined the OCIC nor is likely at the moment to do so. There are no simple solutions to changing the character of the OCIC, and no quick answers, but it does not appear that a local center by itself is going to attract these forces. We again return to our conclusion that a local organization is necessary in LA to conduct a serious and protracted struggle to develop the multi-nationality of the OCIC.

SUMMARY

In developing a local center in LA two serious problems occurred:

- 1) The steering committee became a closed unit with its own internal dynamic separate from the majority of all OC forces in the area. It did not understand the necessity to involve all OC comrades in the process of constructing the center, let alone reaching out to try to include potential forces. The steering committee was

never elected by all OC forces and this circumstance only fueled its inward development and outlook.

2) The steering committee adopted a method of internal struggle which continually pulled differences out of context and forced them into premature battles over line, with much labelling and name-calling. Such methods of internal struggle do not lead to real political understanding, but to unnecessary divisions and splits.

What resulted was a bitter split between the OCIC forces in the area, with a smaller SOC now ever more distant from LA, and a local center in LA with no base, suspended by its ties to the national organization.

We conclude that a key weakness was the absence of a local cadre organization that could serve as a base for the local center, unite theory and practice to some degree for the cadres as well as for all OCIC forces in the area. Until this conception is recognized we do not feel that any real forward motion in the building of a genuine local center will take place. In addition, to win and consolidate workers and oppressed minorities a local organization is essential.

This conclusion does not come out of a fetishism for the cadre organization form, nor organizational hegemonism on the part of SOC. Our conclusions come out of the living experience we had with the local center. We have a strong desire to maintain the proper relation of theory and practice and the belief that drawing workers and minorities into the development of the IC is essential.

This paper was written as a contribution to further clarify the disputed issues concerning the history of the local center here, and to identify problems that all OCIC comrades may well confront as they try to develop local centers in their respective areas.

December 1979

From: Socialist Organizing Committee, Orange County