LM **LINE OF MARCH**
P.O Box 2729, Oakland, California 94602

January 21, 1982

Theoretical Review
P.O. Box 3692
Tucson, Arizona 85722

Dear Theoretical Review:

In its last issue, the Theoretical Review (TR) finally acknowledged what has long been obvious - you are engaged in a self-conscious campaign to discredit the Line of March. Your efforts would have more credibility, however, if you had responded in a serious fashion to the substantive criticisms Line of March has put forward of the TR's theoretical and political framework of Althusserian Marxism instead of resorting to innuendo and obfuscation. For example, Line of March has offered extensive criticism of TR's heralding of Nicos Poulantzas' explicitly Eurocommunist views on the state as the quintessence of anti-revisionism and its promotion of Charles Bettleheim's syndicalist line on socialist construction as a Marxist alternative to so-called economism. As well, we have advanced a comprehensive critique of the overall contours of Althusserian Marxism, and suggested a series of open debates between the TR and Line of March on this topic. TR, however, has seen fit to ignore these serious theoretical and political criticisms. As well, TR has turned down the challenge to open debate, an offer which, we might remind you, still stands. Instead, you have decided to respond with innuendo concerning Line of March's financial base, "exposures" of so-called "Dirty Linen", and labored defenses of the discredited capitalist restoration thesis emanating from forces such as the PUL who are actively collaborating with U.S. imperialism.

That TR should pursue this course of "struggle" does not surprise us. Rather, it serves as one more indication that the TR is self-consciously pursuing a political trajectory designed to take it outside the emerging Marxist-Leninist trend in the U.S. communist movement as rapidly as possible. Clearly, TR's campaign to discredit rather than debate the Line of March is part of its overall policy of abandoning serious line struggle with Marxist-Leninists generally as it seeks a rapprochment with various social-democratic and Trotskyist forces that share TR's idealist approach to Marxism, its anti-Soviet ideological stance, and its non-revolutionary politics. That this policy is both a cause and an effect of TR's growing isolation within the Marxist-Leninist ranks should be obvious.

We have always felt that TR was founded on an unstable ideological base and that its commitment to the developing Marxist-Leninist trend was dubious. Nevertheless, TR and a number of individuals presently associated with it did make some useful contributions to our trend's development in its formative period, especially in relation to the struggle to identify U.S. imperialism as the main enemy of the world's peoples and in underscoring the importance of theoretical work. This

momentary intersection between TR's own development as a U.S. outpost for Althusserian Marxism and the developing Marxist-Leninist trend contains an important lesson. The communist movement is not a static entity, and as it grows and develops, some forces move toward it and others move away. With TR, the latter has clearly been the case for some time, a development which is the inevitable consequence of abandoning historical and dialectical materialism for the bourgeois distraction represented by Althusserian Marxism.

Comradely,
Line of March Editorial Board