
Correspondence

Dear Comrades:

The article "Points of Unity" announcing the formation of the Boston Political Collective (M-L), which appeared in *TR* No. 16, helped to crystallize my developing belief in the correctness of the "primacy of theory" party building line. I have been in direct contact with two of the major tendencies of the anti-revisionist, anti-dogmatist trend: NNMLC and OCIC. At the risk of oversimplifying the issues involved, I will state that I believe neither of these organizations places proper emphasis on the development of Marxist-Leninist theory; nor are they sufficiently critical of the pre-1956 errors made by the CPSU and the CPUSA.

I would like to enter into serious discussions with the *TR* editorial board, BPC (M-L) and other adherents of the primacy of theory line as soon as possible to test the depth of my unity. Further, I would like to explore the possibility of taking up the task of forming a political unit in my area which will advance the primacy of theory line and engage in advanced theoretical work and cadre training.

S.P.
Washington, D.C.

We urge readers with similar feelings to write to us, either to the Tucson or Boston TR editorial boards. Soon we hope to have a directory of other TR and "primacy of theory" contacts around the country. We will be happy to arrange meetings with you to discuss questions about our line and our perspective on party building. We also have study guides on a number of topics and/or TR articles.—The Editors.

Dear TR:

I thought Harry Eastmarsh's article was polemically excellent within its problematic, but still too much trapped within the "SDS," "new communist movement" outlook, still looking at the world through Chinese lenses. It's interesting that it was Progressive Labor and various "Trots" and quasi-Trots who first were able to perceive the general drift of Chinese and Chinese Communist Party developments and to denounce the China/US alliance (absurd as they are in general). Food for thought.

En Lucha,
D.E.
Sacramento, Ca.



Dear TR:

Please change my subscription to a sustainer status. This issue (July-August 1980) convinced me of the importance of the *TR* to the anti-revisionist, anti-left opportunist movement.

The critique of PWOC's and Silber's lines on Soviet troops in Afghanistan was excellent. Costello (sic) demonstrates a deep and precise understanding of Soviet revisionism. The article points up the shallowness of the "post-1956" views of the origins of revisionism.

Events in Poland confirm once again that socialism must be built by the workingclass. The only legitimate party is one which mobilizes the masses—teaching and learning from them. Silber's pseudo-revolutionary condemnation of questions of morality (especially the morality of those parties holding state power) only serves to reveal him to be at times nothing but a cynical apologist for Stalin's crimes.

In my opinion it is crucial to the struggle against revisionism to begin our study and critique at the place where socialism began to be defined as simple nationalization while the role of the masses was liquidated. It is clear that this happened way before 1956 in the USSR.

P.M.
Boston, Mass.

P.S. Also good to see an article on Althusser's relevance to Peter Rabbit.