

To the NSC:

As you are aware, we have been engaged for some time in a sharp struggle with a number of minority M-Lers from the Rectification (R/R) circle over the National Minority Conference (NMC). We want to update you on some of the more recent developments in this exchange, and have enclosed copies of a couple letters that we received this fall. We are bringing this up to you, not only to keep you informed, but also to get some guidance on how we should be proceeding, particularly in light of the recent resolution passed by the OCIC at the Labor Day conference. In addition, we want to raise some questions about this struggle, and to state our misgivings about the resolution that was passed.

Whereas we are all unified in our support for the NMC and feel that it was a positive step for the OCIC, both in carrying the party-building movement to minority Marxist-Leninists and in building the multi-nationality of the OCIC, some of us have developed misgivings about the resolution that was passed at the OCIC conference.

In the first place, to restate a previous criticism, we do not feel that the NSC has moved to correct its error of not keeping OCIC members informed about the NMC. The absence of solid preparation for the discussion of the NMC resolution and an overview for OC members who are politically supporting the NMC we feel was an error. We realize that this criticism is joined with a self-criticism from the NSC: ". . .the SC failed both to provide an overview on OC responsibilities around the conference and to follow up on several important criticisms of racist errors in relation to the conference." We would add, however, that the continued absence of an overview and information on the NMC (particularly important in areas like our own where no one attended it) is a deepening of this error. We are hopeful that a fuller perspective will be soon forthcoming.

Secondly, let us state a couple things that we need better explained. (1) In the opening paragraph of the resolution it states that the "planning committee correctly identified the OC's 18 points and commitment to the development of a single center for the anti-left tendency as the proper basis of unity for the conference. . .Finally, we reject the charge that it was sectarian to demand genuine commitment to a single center on the part of all participants." When this resolution was discussed here during our OCIC conference sum-up, some people who had not attended the conference raised an important difference with this wording. It had been our impression that the participants to the NMC had not been required to have "genuine commitment to a single center", rather that they need only not have consolidated opposition to it and to the 18 pts. Thus, those who were undecided, but didn't disagree, could attend. This was an important basis for our argument with the R/R individuals here, as well as what we explained to the non-aligned tendency forces who raised questions about the NMC. We might have been mistaken on this point, but at any rate we need to have it cleared up. We are, as well, self-critical for not having raised this at the OCIC conference--it was an oversight on the part of some of our delegates. However, we feel that the absence of prior preparation on the resolution also contributed to this oversight.

(2) In the second paragraph of the resolution it states four points that were covered on the agenda at the NMC: Does the last sentence of that paragraph mean that the OC supports the political conclusions reached at the NMC, and backs the speeches and presentations that helped the NMC to arrive at those conclusions? If so, what was the preparation and ideological struggle which allowed the OC to reach that agreement? If the final sentence is not to be interpreted as support for these conclusions, why was the resolution worded so that it could be interpreted in that way? The above questions, along with a better explanation of the relationship between the OC party building line and the fusion line (which was discussed at the conference, we understand), might be important for the NSC to address in its overview and perspective on the NMC. It is really that kind of a background that we very much need here, and would presume that others elsewhere would benefit from.

In the third place, we would like to communicate to you the difficulties we have encountered here because of the absence of a sum-up of the NMC. We want to take up a further struggle and explanation around the NMC here. We feel that this is consistent with the final paragraph of the resolution which states: "In order to undermine these present conditions of racism, the OC should utilize the gains of the national minority conference to the fullest degree possible. This means participating in the organization of local and regional forums reporting on the discussions at the conference. It also means circulating, studying and discussing the speeches delivered to the conference, particularly focussing on each presentations's discussion of the role of racism in the communist movement."

We are unclear about how we should be moving to take this up, mostly because we don't have anything to do this from. We have communicated our concerns to the PC of the NMC and requested that the sum-up of the NMC, speeches, etc. be circulated promptly. However, it seems that it is the OC which ultimately has responsibility for insuring that its membership be prepared to carry through on this point, since we passed the resolution. Because we are in an area which is a stronghold of the R/R forces, because we are being pressed with criticisms of the NMC and calls to discuss its outcome, and because these forces are well-aware of what the OC resolution on the NMC states, our reluctance to discuss the NMC because we don't have anything concrete from it is making us look a little silly. (We have been putting them off since June 20th--the date at which we first promised to meet to discuss the NMC once the sum-up arrived.) Some of the delegates from here voted in favor of the resolution on the assumption that this material (speeches, resolutions, materials, etc.) was immediately forthcoming. (Others disagree, hold to their position in favor of the resolution, and have stated that anyone voting in favor of it should have done so with the understanding that something, or nothing, was forthcoming--that the resolution had to be taken as it read.) In sum, the long wait for materials from the NMC, from either the PC or the NSC, has caused some delegates to the Labor Day conference to feel now that they should have moved to table the resolution. Since we assume that the NSC supports the resolution, could you please let us know why that move would have, in your view, been wrong? We also would like to know why, in an overall way, you think the resolution was essential?

Finally, you are all more than aware of the problems that we have faced here. Those of us who are committed to building the SCALC are now in the process of developing a plan to move the OC forward in this area. Utilizing the gains of the NMC and deepening the struggle against racism in the communist movement is a priority in that process, thus we would like some suggestions from the NSC about how to proceed as regards these forums and discussions on the NMC, particularly since no one from this locale attended. Our situation now is one in which the R/R folks definitely have the upper hand, mostly because of the stagnation caused by the long internal struggle in the SCALC. The criticisms of the NMC have not been adequately countered by us, which has meant that the whole process is serving to drive the non-aligned tendency forces further from party-building all together (when they aren't being won closer to the R/R circle!) In order to win them closer to us, as well as to continue the struggle to unite the tendency, we need to have some input from you. (We might add that it is probably inconceivable that we will be able to hold any discussions here around this, or any OCIC position, without entering into an intense struggle with the R/R's. But that's simply the nature of our area.)

We don't want to leave aside the criticisms of the NMC that have been raised here, to do so would be to allow the sectarian methods of the R/R's to go unchecked and would be an objectively racist error on our parts, but we are going to need some guidance from the NSC about the OC's view of the NMC. I should add, however, that we are going to take on a response to some of the points raised in the Open Letter. . . and that we feel a responsibility to carry through with the information that we have now. That is, we can put forth our criticisms of the R/R line, and methods of struggle, as they relate to the NMC and the struggle locally--I talked to DF about this briefly. No more room--and I'm sure you all don't want to read another "magnum opus" from Southern California! Thanks for the guidance on the SCALC. Hope to hear from you soon.

Comradely,

*Tm*

for the SCALC