

MLEP marxist-leninist education project

PO BOX 27206, OAKLAND, CA 94602

January 15, 1982

Gabriel Castillo
1380 Florida
San Francisco, CA 94110

Mark Davis
1065 Natoma
San Francisco, CA 94103

Marc Norton
562 Guerrero, #6
San Francisco, CA 94110

COPY

Comrades,

The reprinting of your summation of last year's Bay Area MLEP controversy in the most recent issue of Theoretical Review has prompted us to write this letter in order to express our opinion of this development. In our view, the position which we put forth to you comrades in a letter last April has been confirmed. That is, you comrades have won a "sympathetic" audience from the Theoretical Review, but not due to their concern to advance a principled debate over the issues which are at stake but as part of their attempt to challenge the theoretical advances which have been made by Line of March. This challenge does not take the form of rigorous struggle over the political and theoretical differences which exist (e.g., debating the question of Poland or Althusserian Marxism) but comes out in the form of the two articles (your summation of MLEP and Ira Gerstein's defense of the capitalist restoration thesis) which have been linked together by the TR as an opposition statement to LC!

Furthermore our suspicion that the TR has little interest in advancing the theoretical struggle is further confirmed by their refusal to print or even mention the National MLEP's summation of last year's controversy. This was done even though we were careful to make clear to them our views and the opinion of others in the Bay Area MLEP (we sent them the same material which we sent to you comrades), making their motives for printing your piece even more questionable. Such a one-sided presentation of the issue will not push forward the struggle in our trend and only serves to consolidate a sectarian position of oppositionism.

Finally, we want to underscore the impact of TR's publication of your article in such a manner. This article is a critique of MLEP, an institution which we feel has made significant contributions to the theoretical training of Marxist-Leninist cadre in the fundamental principles of scientific socialism. The MLEP curriculum and its rigorous approach to theory represent an important advance not only for our trend but for the communist movement as a whole. The TR, although it has agreed to print a critique of MLEP, has no intention nor the capacity to make the types of gains which MLEP

has made. The MLEP is certainly not above criticism. But a critique which is made merely to further the cause of opposition and does not advance a positive alternative cannot be viewed as a helpful contribution to the work of communists in the US.

In Struggle,

Nina Silber
MLEP National Staff