

Dan —

I spoke with Tom. There are a number of things that are not in line with national practice, and it should not be brought before the district for a vote.

Also, for matters like this, there should be more consultation with the center before moving forward with votes in the DC and the district to change the organizational structure of the district.

You sent me the document a few days ago, I hadn't had a chance to read it because I was preparing for the SC and CC meetings going on all this weekend. We talked about it on the phone later that day, and already it is voted on and scheduled to be brought before the district. Did you relay to them what I said about the resolution from our phone call?

Tom and I agree on the following — halt this process. There needs to be more consultation with the center about it before the district makes major changes to its organizational structure.

What I see as the positive thing about the resolution is that people want effective leadership for the district and are putting thought into how to achieve that.

The negative aspect of the resolution is in proposing burdensome bureaucratic structures which make sense for a larger organization, but not for us as we are now. We want to function effectively with as few extra layers of structure as practicable. We should avoid formalistic emulation of the Peters manual. It was written for a party with tens of thousands of members.

No district has five subcommittees of the district committee to handle various aspects of district functioning. The commissions and fractions referred to in our rules are national structures established by the central committee. It's not an endlessly recursive structure - "commission" is not just a name for any subcommittee of any committee at any level of our organization. FRSO commissions are organs of the Central committee, established to consider questions of line in our different areas of work. We currently have the following commissions: Labor, African American, Chicano Latino Plus, and Student.

We do have division of labor in district work. There are many districts where someone other than the DO is in charge of organizing general members, or being treasurer. That's it — there is a comrade who is responsible for it, and are accountable to the DC. We don't need a district committee subcommittee ("commission") to do that.

The biggest variance with national practice in the resolution would be the unit heads not being on the district committee. The purpose of the DC is outlined in 3.7 of our rules quite well. Summation, analysis, ability to work collectively - all with the aim of providing effective political leadership to the district. In all FRSO districts, the DC is composed of the DO, the unit heads, and whoever they want to coopt onto the body.

The resolution quotes Peters to oppose “representation by unit”, rather that it should be composed of the “best most capable comrades.”

The “best, most capable” comrades in Dallas should be unit heads and serve on the district committee.

The unit heads are in the best position to know the particulars of the political work of their unit.

If a unit head wasn't on the DC, then the person on the DC responsible for overseeing that unit would spend all their time asking the unit head what's going on in the unit.

We aren't big enough to have several layers of leadership at the district level. We don't yet have such a superfluity of capable leading people in each district that we can afford one set of unit leaders and another set of people whose main work is to read and think about the reports that the unit leaders produce.

The CP of the 1930s was large enough that this arrangement could make sense. A section could have so many units that one section committee person for each unit would be impractical.

We are not there yet.

Here is national practice:

- The district organizer is elected by the district membership annually. Election of district organizer can be done at a district meeting, where all members of the district attend. [*The Peters manual refers to "conferences" because it was written for a vastly larger organization. We are not of a size necessary for district (or section) conferences. Conferences existed for these levels of organization in the Peters manual days because the CP was of a size where it was not conceivable for all members of a section or district to congregate. These conferences were delegated.]*
- The DO must be approved by the central committee
- Unit leaders are elected by the members of their unit, subject to the approval of the district committee.
- The district committee is formed of the elected DO and the elected unit leaders. They meet regularly (usually weekly) to lead the work of the district
- If there are things the DC can't keep up with, they bring on responsible comrades to do particular things - treasury, general members, etc.

You should communicate all this to your district committee, and we should discuss it on the phone soon.

— Andy
For the SC