Letters To The Editor ...

Party Building, the Trend, and "Left" Internationalism

Dear PWOC Comrades.

I read Newlin's criticism of the "Draft Resolution for a Leading Ideological Center" (PWOC's "Leftism" - Organizer, March, 1979) with considerable interest. It makes a substantial contribution to the Marxist-Leninist tendency's understanding of its tasks in the pre-party period.

It seems to me, however, that Newlin missed a very important point in explaining why the DR is not a complete break with the ultra-left party-building line. The essence of the error of the DR is a failure to break with the unity line on party-building. That line belittles the role which steps toward fusion of Marxism-Leninism with the actual class struggle have to play in party building, in general, and in uniting Marxist-Leninists, in particular. The DR makes this error. There are two sides to it.

One side is that the DR envisions a stage in party-building after the Marxist-Leninist trend is united in a single organization, but before the party is formed. The purpose of this stage is to allow for the embryonic fusion between the trend and the class struggle to advance and for the line of the trend to mature in this context. Thus, the DR supposes that the Marxist-Leninist trend can unite into a single organization before the trend's line has matured through significant advances in fusion with the class struggle. This is nothing but a new, less blatant, variant of the unity line.

A plan for party-building based on this supposition will lead to sectarian consequences. Before the line of the trend has matured, which can only take place in the context of significant advances in fusion, organizational unity will not be possible. Any supposition to the contrary will inevitably push party builders to conclude that a failure to come to organizational unity is a result of a contradiction between Marxism-Leninism and oppor-

tunism rather than an inevitable consequence of the lack of maturation of political line.

The other side is that the DR (implicitly) endorses a localist perspective on how the trend will unite into a single national organization. But since local fusion is only fusion of the most primitive kind, the DR therefore effectively denies the vital role which a more advanced development of fusion must play in advancing the trend to the point where organizational unity is possible. But only significant advances in fusion, advances impossible to achieve on the local level, can provide the context for the maturation of line which will make possible the organizational unity of the Marxist-Leninist trend.

There is an additional aspect of the article which deserves special mention. The PWOC has been the target of a barrage of criticism for its steadfast advocacy of the central importance of the demarcation of the Marxist-Leninist tendency with "left" internationalism. The criticizers base much of their opposition on the need to make the struggle against sectarianism in party-building line our prime concern. Many of us have thought that their supposed concern for sectarianism in party-building line was primarily a smokescreen to smuggle "left" internationalism into the tendency.

Their silence on the errors of the DR provides new evidence for this. The fact is that it was the PWOC which uncovered the sectarianism of the DR. The "left" internationalists who hang on the fringes of the tendency, for all their supposed concern about sectarianism in partybuilding line, did not point out the sectarian error of the DR. This certainly lends credence to the idea that their concern for "sectarianism" has been concentrated on a concern that the tendency would demarcate itself from "left" internationalism.

Comradely, JF Boston, MA



SEE ARTICLES ON MAY DAY, PAGES 8 & 9.

