

January 28, 1980

P. O. Box 26280
Los Angeles, CA 90026

Comrades:

The purpose of this letter is to inform you that the Socialist Organizing Committee of Orange County has split into two groupings. Our grouping, which is comprised of a bare majority of the pre-split SOC, has taken the name Southern California Interim Group.

We are not now in a position to review fully the issues underlying the split in the old SOC, though we are engaged in a process of summing this up and preparing an analysis for the tendency. We feel that the contradictions which led to the split in SOC warrant a careful study and provide useful lessons for the entire anti-revisionist/anti-left opportunist tendency.

A couple of points should be stated now, however. First, the struggle in SOC coincided with and was amplified by the broader struggle among all OC forces in Southern California over the conception of local centers in general, and the Southern California Local Center (SCALC) in particular. Since local centers are the arm of the OC in a given locale, the struggle over the conception of local centers and over the SCALC meant that our differences revolved around the developing party-building line of the OCIC. Those of us in the SCIG, along with the majority of OC members in Southern California, agree with the OC National Steering Committee's proposal for the development of local centers. Our analysis of the development of the SCALC and critique of the minority position here was best described in the presentation by the SCALC chairperson at the OC Labor Day Conference.

Secondly, whereas most of the account of the struggle among the Southern California OC members has focused on the SCALC, an equally important basis for the split was developing within SOC for a longer period than the struggle in the SCALC. In fact, we feel the minority's criticism of the SCALC process stems from a localist and small circle orientation, an error which we see as based on a "narrow fusion line", or economism. This line downplays the primacy of our theoretical tasks in the process of fusing communism with the workers movement and the movements of national minorities; it resists the need for a national perspective in order to develop fusion; and, most importantly, it views "fusion" as a strategy for mass work and not as a party building line. It is in opposition to the fusion party building line as developed by the PWOC, which we in the SCIG see as essentially correct. In addition, it is our current assessment that this form of economism is at its root incompatible with the leading line of the OC and, as a political line at all, it resists the formation of a national ideological center.

In the next period we will be concentrating, as individuals, on moving the SCALC forward and uniting the tendency in the Los Angeles region. We see this as a primary emphasis for the coming period, along with furthering the development of the tendency in the Western Region. Secondly, we are committed to presenting a fuller analysis of the split in the old SOC. We see our contribution in this regard as especially important for the entire tendency, since we have a critique of the federationist line from the standpoint of how federationism and localism based on an economist "narrow fusion line" both holds back the development of an all-sided

cadre organization, as well as resists the process of uniting in open ideological struggle to unite the tendency in a single center. Finally, we will be deepening our own party-building line as a developing organization--fusion. We share the perspective of the PWOC and other groups in holding that fusion is a party-building line containing at least three aspects: the independent elaboration of Marxism-Leninism, developing a communist current in the working class and among the movements of national minorities, and winning the advanced to communism. Of those we see the first aspect as primary. We think that our sum-up of the struggle in the old SOC which will deal with all of these aspects, will be a contribution to our understanding of the errors of federationism.

Our attitude toward the comrades in the current SOC grouping is that we believe that it is now impossible to be in the same cadre organization with these folks. We understand, however, that we share the unity of the anti-left opportunist/anti-revisionist tendency with their grouping. This fundamental unity demands that our grouping and theirs find ways to work together in broader tendency processes both of theoretical/ideological struggle for party program and strategy and of coordination and summation of areas of practical work. The split, of course, is still fresh, and the forms for future common work are unclear. We are determined to avoid the ultra-leftist pattern where a division of a localized cadre organization results in a thoroughgoing circle war between those on the two sides of the divide. Those of us on both sides of the split are taking steps to keep the split political in character.

We are anxious to develop relations with groups and individuals in the tendency, to be informed of and to participate, when possible, in initiatives for coordinating and directing practice, and in exchanging information, corresponding, and contributing to the ideological struggle.

Comradely,

Southern California Interim Group (SCIG)
P. O. Box 26280
Los Angeles, CA 90026

cc: The Anti-Revisionist/Anti-Left Opportunist Tendency