

INITIAL SUM-UP OF RESPONSES TO THE ANNOUNCEMENT OF A MULTILATERAL CONFERENCE (MULC) ON PARTY BUILDING WITH WCC'S SUGGESTIONS TO MOVE THE MULC FORWARD -- March 11, 1979

Groups responding as of 3/10: WROC (3/5), KCRWC (3/5), MLC (3/7), Some Comrades (3/7), PC (3/8), RWC (3/8), RWP (3/8). The entire response of WROC, KCRWC, MLC and RWC is attached. Some Comrades, PC, and RWP sent a copy to every group, so we did not reproduce this.

We commend the groups above for timely replies, especially WROC and KCRWC who got them to us by the deadline. We criticize Demarcation for not getting their reply to us by 3/10 since we know they received the Announcement, and they have had views on it for at least two weeks (they talked to us on the phone about it two times and said they would be sending us their views last week). Criticisms may be in order for Red Dawn and CC, but we want to make sure there wasn't some problem with receiving the Announcement first.

All groups responding held that they wanted to attend a MULC: WROC wants to attend and would like changes in the purpose and content, but they did not seem to make this conditional; KCRWC similarly wants to attend and suggested changes in the purpose and content and that this should be struggled over and decided by all groups; MLC gave initial positive indications of attendance but needs to communicate any particular differences yet; Some Comrades want to attend if there are major changes in the purpose and content and their attendance is conditional on the changes, and they suggested changes for the criteria for attendance; PC wants to attend if they meet the criteria for attendance and had mainly additions to the purpose and content; RWC likewise wants to attend if they meet the criteria for attendance and had changes in the content (agenda); RWP wants to attend and suggested changes in the purpose and content.

All the groups had constructive criticisms, much of which we unite with and will speak to later, and groups have positive comments on WCC's initiative. We would like to respond to the criticisms and comments by briefly saying that we were very glad to see groups desire to struggle over party building, the open way lines were put forward and the serious and constructive attitude toward improving and correcting our Announcement. We feel that we are already beginning to know more about groups and that is a positive sign that the MULC will move forward party building if done correctly. By way of exception, we thought that much of Some Comrades criticisms were not constructive in that many facts around the Denver meeting and Announcement are not correct. We feel that part of this reflects not studying the Announcement deeply, and we do not know why the Denver Forum has some misrepresentation. We feel that Some Comrades should study the Announcement more closely and reevaluate their response. As far as the history of the development of the MULC at the Denver Forum, groups are still summing up the Denver Forum and what happened concerning the MULC will be clarified through discussions around the sum-ups.

As groups will see when they study all the responses, there was a wide variety of criticisms and views on the purpose and content of the MULC. There were also similarities in some groups' views. What we have tried to do is find out from these varied views, what preparation before the MULC, and discussions at the MULC will lead to the greatest degree of M-L unity, what will move party building forward to whatever degree possible at this point in time, and therefore what the purpose and content of the MULC should be. We will get into this shortly. In addition to suggestions for changes and criticisms of the purpose and content, PC and RWC questioned the meaning of a POU for attendance, and Some Comrades had additions to the POU's and criteria for attendance. There were other suggestions around location, security, timetable, etc.

The suggestion by KCRWC to have another round of discussions in order to make final decisions is correct. After groups study the responses and our sum-up and suggestion as to how to proceed, they should respond to the changes. Groups should take into consideration that the purpose and content of the Conference may not be what they consider the best way to move things forward, but should evaluate whether it helps to move party building

forward, if even a small step. Therefore, in this second round of discussion, we encourage groups to disunite with the essence of the purpose and content only if they conclude it in no way moves party building forward. Then if enough groups unite with the purpose and content of this second round, we will consider the purpose and content basically agreed upon, will struggle to convince any dissenting groups, and groups will be able to begin preparing for the Conference. This second round of discussion firms up the purpose and content and helps make the MULC more successful. We hope that a third round is not needed because it would set back groups' preparation for the MULC and would make the current meeting date unrealistic, thus setting back the Conference. Given the suggestion by several groups at the Denver Forum that the Conference be held around a 3-day weekend in order for a number of comrades to be able to come, we would then see the Conference set back until September ("Labor Day"). From the responses so far, we feel that most groups will be able to unite with the essence of the second round of the purpose and content, and possibly, and hopefully, all. As far as procedure on this, we suggest that groups respond by stating whether they basically agree with the purpose and content and what things they would still like to see changed, but which are not essential for them coming. These minor things can be struggled around as preparation for the MULC progresses but it would not take another round of discussion around the basic purpose and content.

We will now get into a discussion of the different criticisms and proposed changes and will propose changes to be made in all areas of the MULC. We will go by section, with a discussion first and the proposed change summed up. There are many points in many of the responses we would like to address, but in order to expedite this second round of discussion, we will only bring out points essential to the Conference.

Purpose of Multilateral Conference

There was much disunity (to a greater or lesser degree with each group) with the purpose of the MULC as laid out by WCC. Nearly all the groups seem to feel that we will not (or not likely) be able to develop a plan for party building at the Conference, some groups (such as KCRWC, Some Comrades, RWP) held it wasn't possible, PC held it was unlikely. It was also criticized that we encouraged more than one plan out of the Conference and that by trying to develop a plan out of the Conference we would be drawing lines of demarcation.

These criticisms are valid insofar as we were not clear in what we meant by "party building plan" or "plans," and groups could interpret "party building plan" many ways and could interpret us to be saying there was an equality of plans or that lines of demarcation would be drawn. So, first of all, we criticize ourselves for being vague in the part of the Announcement where we needed to be most precise. We will try to do better this time around. Next, we want to take into consideration the criticisms, what we were trying to say and why (our thinking behind it), what is correct and incorrect about the criticisms and views of other groups on the purpose.

The criticism that it is idealist to think that we can come out of the MULC with a plan for building the party is basically correct if by plan we mean unity on many of the particularities of how to build the party. While we said in the section on the content that a party building plan was unity on "party building as the central task, the tasks that comprise it and their interrelationships, how we should carry them out," we were not thinking that much unity would develop on very specific ways to carry out the tasks of party building. What we are pushing for is unity on general understanding on party building as the central task, the tasks of party building, relationships, general ways to carry out tasks and some concrete steps that can be taken to move this forward. Much of our reasoning on holding a MULC is for groups to come to grips with the disunity on nearly all questions and to want to do something about it and begin to find ways to do something about it. For example, we did not and do not think that we can develop unity on the particular questions of a party building task such as winning advanced workers, as much as we could develop unity on ways in which to bring forward the M-L line on winning advanced workers and win forces to it.

Then there is criticism of having more than one plan come out of the Conference and the question of "how many" need to unite around a "plan," and aren't we drawing lines of demarcation. Our view on more than one plan coming out of the Conference is that, comrades, there already exists more than one plan. All groups operate under a "party building plan" whether it is conscious or not and whether it really builds the party or not. By saying that more than one might come out of the Conference (which was not a good way of putting it), we were saying that, at a minimum, groups would have substantial clarity on the different views on party building (substantial clarity did not exist and comrades are beginning to develop some with the responses) and tendencies begin to be brought out, with an M-L tendency beginning to appear. We do not stand for the equality of plans but for the clarity of differences with hopefully some beginning unity around M-L motion. The number of forces united around the M-L line on how to move forward might be small coming out of the Conference, but through further struggle these forces could win over other groups and individuals (those who hold opposing views coming out of the Conference and others not at the Conference).

Here's where we want to bring out how we don't see that lines of demarcation will be drawn at the Conference, although the Conference pushes forward this process. Lines of demarcation on what? On how to move party building forward? In general? In particular? We don't see that the struggle on party building among the forces invited has developed to where we would demarcate a group at the Conference on the basis of their party building line. On the contrary, we see the Conference as a part of the process of sharpening and deepening the struggle among groups on party building. We want to try to unite as many groups as possible around the advanced M-L line on party building at the Conference and continue to win groups to it after the Conference. Just because sharply opposing views will likely come out of the Conference does not mean that lines of demarcation have been drawn. Nor does the fact that some groups may decline to attend the MULC mean that they are demarcated. on other basis?

It can be seen that we don't see that it is necessary for all the groups at the Conference to unite around one "plan" or that it is necessarily possible to unite all groups around the M-L motion." We view that all the groups attending have certain degrees of M-L tendencies, but that the development is uneven and there are varying degrees of M-L character to groups. All the groups at the Conference will ^{not} necessarily get behind the M-L motion. We have explained that this does not mean that lines of demarcation have been drawn. What it does mean is that the party is built from the top down, with the most advanced elements and groups developing and leading the others. What remains to be seen is who are these advanced groups? Demarcation and Some Comrades feel that the advanced groups will be brought out through struggle over line and drawing lines of demarcation. We believe they will be brought out through those who are, most importantly, able to find ways to build the party (of which drawing lines of demarcation on ideological, political, and organizational questions is part of) and secondarily win the broad masses (also involves drawing lines of demarcation). As V.I. said in the "Preface to the Collection Twelve Years": Now?

"And the circles, i.e. close-knit, exclusive groups uniting a very small number of people and nearly always based on personal friendship, were a necessary stage in the development of socialism and the workers' movement in Russia. As the movement grew, it was confronted with the task of uniting these circles, forming strong links between them, and establishing continuity. This called for a firm base of operations 'beyond the reach' of the autocracy--i.e. abroad. The circles abroad, therefore, came into being through necessity. There was no contact between them; they had no authority over them in the shape of the Party in Russia, and it was inevitable that they should differ in their understanding of the movement's main tasks at the given stage, that is, an understanding of how exactly to set up a base of operations and in what way they could help to build the Party as a whole. A struggle between the circles was, therefore, inevitable. Today, in retrospect, we can clearly see which of the circles was really in a position to act as a base of operations." Lenin Collected Works, Vol. 13, p. 105-106)

Comrades, as far as our idea of the level of unity (of which we were vague but which we felt would mostly be general unity) and degree of unity (possibly uniting a large number) at the Conference, being somewhat idealist, we would agree. Although we didn't think we would have unity on numerous particularities of party building, we did think that we could develop a good deal of general unity with some particularities and that possibly a large number of the forces could be united. This view stemmed from thinking there were more M-L tendencies than really exist. If there were more M-L tendencies then there would be more ability to develop the M-L ^{line} party building and unite a greater number of forces around this line. But now we see that in addition to a lot of right deviations in the movement, there is also developing more ultra-left deviations than existed earlier. We will get into this in our paper for the Conference. Due to a clearer understanding of conditions (groups' recent views, criticisms, and actions helped us develop this clearer understanding) we will elaborate a more realistic purpose for groups to consider.

We think that the Conference should and can be more than just getting to know groups. Although the Conference is going to really move forward getting to know each other, we don't have to get 11 groups (more or less) from across the country together to get to know each other. We feel that groups should come to the Conference in order to get to know each other gain more clarity on party building, and to develop and unite with the M-L line and struggle against non-M-L lines on party building. This is the attitude we feel groups should prepare for and come to the Conference with, but this does not identify what we should strive to accomplish. We will detail that below. We do want to add that we see the Conference as a step forward in party building, and further conferences may be good, as KCRWC suggested. We think that the need for other conferences should be evaluated at the Conference, taking into consideration the positive and negative aspects of this initial attempt.

→ --Purpose of MULC in Light of Criticism and Further Clarity--

The purpose of the MULC is to provide an organized framework so that 1) ideological struggle can take place in a systematic way on how to advance the building of a genuine M-L party; 2) there can be identification and development of the general M-L line on party building; 3) we can begin to unite forces around the general M-L line and struggle against non M-L lines on party building. The general M-L line on party building is taken to mean: 1) the general character of the party we are trying to build; 2) how to build the party-- how to make it the central task, identification of tasks, identification of problems in carrying out tasks, key link in carrying out tasks (key task, main task, main link in party building); 3) some concrete steps to be taken in the near future in order to move forward party building. To deny the possibility for the general M-L line on party building to come forward through the preparation for and struggle at the MULC and the need to struggle to unite groups around this line during the preparation for and at the MULC, is to hold back party building whether from the right or "left." In order to accomplish this purpose, groups must pay much attention to developing and clarifying their views and struggling with other comrades before and at the Conference. This Conference should be viewed as a further step in developing the M-L line and principled unity on party building. We will need to continue that development after the Conference and should find ways to do so at the Conference.

Criteria for Attendance

There was most unity with this section and some questions, and suggested changes. First, the questions. PC and RWC want to make sure that their understanding of viewing the PLA as the leading party is what we mean by it. In order to answer that we must define what is meant by a leading party (RWC asks this question). The leading party is the party in the international communist movement which takes a very important and leading role in the development of the revolutionary proletarian movement. It is the party which other parties look to for guidance. However, it is not a "perfect" party; it can make mistakes and is always undergoing development, positive and negative. Thus another party or group may have a more

correct line on some questions and may not unite with every aspect or even many aspects of the line of the leading party. Also, due to uneven development, parties and groups may not have a correct analysis of something which keeps them from uniting with the correct analysis of the leading party. For this reason, saying a party is the leading one does not mean agreement on all points, but on the guiding principles of that party. Lenin said that recognition of Iskra as the leading organ "...does not at all mean that one necessarily has to agree with it in everything. It merely implies solidarity with the guiding principles of a certain organ." ("Two Letters to I.I. Radchenko," LCW, Vol. 6, p. 176) So saying a party is a leading party does not mean that the party has the degree of leadership and correctness that the Bolshevik Party had. In fact, the German Social-Democratic Party (GS-DP) was considered a leading party for many years. Lenin considered the GS-DP the leading party despite its many deviations, until it completely swung over to opportunism in 1909-10, because it contributed to the development of the proletarian revolutionary movement until then. Lenin's criteria for considering the GS-DP the leading party was that the party contributed to the development of the proletarian revolutionary movement and that it "...came closest to being the party which the revolutionary proletariat required in order to attain victory." ("Left-Wing" Communism,..., Peking ed., p. 19) A Comintern document further explains Lenin's view of the GS-DP:

"Here again Lenin, in speaking of "REVOLUTIONARY German social-democracy" of the pre-war epoch, i.e. about the whole party, excluding the opportunist wing, made two essential reservations: first, that despite the demand of the Bolsheviks, it was unwilling to throw the opportunists out of its ranks, secondly, that it was only 'the nearest' of all others to the sort of party which is necessary to the revolutionary proletariat to enable it to attain victory; that only relatively as compared with other Western European social-democratic parties, did it correspond to the interests of the revolutionary proletariat." ("How Lenin Fought in the Era of the First Revolution for its Growth into the Social Revolution and Against Centrism"--see part II, C.I. Documents, 1932--we are going to reprint this document soon)

We do not compare the PLA to the Bolshevik party, because, as PC says, they have not shown that degree of consistency. We also do not compare the PLA to the GS-DP since we have not examined the PLA to ascertain exactly the cause of the inconsistency, the errors the PLA has made and cause of errors, the motion in the PLA. But what we do look at is despite errors the PLA is making (and probably has made, as we will likely find out with more study), has any other party internationally lately given us as much correct leadership on other questions? What other party at this time is "...'the nearest' of all others to the sort of party which is necessary to the revolutionary proletariat to enable it to attain victory..."? It seems that both PC and RWC look to the leadership of the PLA and consider the PLA the leading party given the M-L view of what a leading party is. In fact, we know that several other groups do not have "substantially higher unity" on the POU regarding the PLA than RWC, although other groups' differences with the PLA may be or are different than RWC's. The whole question of the lines and practice of the PLA are extremely important and we must carry out investigation and struggle over them in the movement. In addition, a few of the questions are part of the focus of the Conference (those concerned with party building), and groups should put down their views on this in their party building paper they submit in preparation for the Conference. Other questions groups wish to address to the movement in the near future could be in the "Documentation of Existing Views" which are not the focus of the Conference. We want to add that PC and RWC's honesty in putting forward their questions on whether they fit the criteria is good.

All the other groups had no additions or changes to the criteria except Some Comrades suggested some.

1. "Eurocommunism should be added to the list of 'main international revisionist trends' since it is as significant as social-democracy or trotskyism, both of which are mentioned." This was a good addition which we don't think anyone would disagree with so we are for adding it to POU #1.

- "X" 2. On dropping the word "simultaneously" for "also" so that the second POU would read "...and practical work must also be carried out": the word "simultaneously" was used to combat the "left" intellectualist deviation of developing theory in isolation from practice, or the "stages theory" of developing all the theory and then engaging in practice. The substitution "also" for "simultaneously" leaves the door open for a separation of theory from practice in that the theoretical work we do would not have to be connected up to our practical work; if practical work is something we do "also" it is something "different" than the theoretical work we would be doing. This type of thinking is brought out more with Some Comrades next statement which holds that it is wrong for "all theoretical work" to be "carried out in close and direct connection with immediate practical work," and that this belittles learning from indirect experience. All theoretical work should serve practice--certain theory is needed to guide certain practice, and all "immediate" practice should be a part of long term practice if it is guided by M-L theory and not spontaneity. (For example, the most important thing to be studying now on the question of the teachings of Mao Tse-tung, is how to build the party and what a vanguard party is. This theory is needed to guide our practice in party building. Other theory, such as questions about New Democracy is not as burning because our practical work does not demand answers to it immediately. On the other hand, examining the PLA's objection to Mao's philosophical work is important because it touches on everything we do.) So we do not agree that "simultaneously" should be changed to "also," but we do think that an addition would clarify this sentence. The sentence would read: Theoretical work is principal in this period where we lack considerable M-L theory to guide practice, and practical work must be carried out simultaneously, in indissoluble connection with theory.
- "X" 3. On the possibility of having comrades come who might want to make a presentation on a few but not all of the subjects for discussion: the suggested content has changed quite a bit as comrades will see shortly. At this point we feel that any one person coming should contribute to all of the content and submit a paper in preparation so that groups know where this comrade is coming from and struggle can take place, unless he is close to another group coming and just wishes to point out his differences with the group where they exist. If the latter is the case, the comrade could briefly send out his unities and disunities with that group prior to the Conference. The point is, the "lone comrades" should be no different than the groups in having a desire to develop party building and not just discuss it.
- "X" 4. All the things brought up on democratic centralism should be discussed at the MULC. Our point was that a communist organizational form was not the criteria for attendance, but that the need or non-need for it should be discussed at the MULC.
5. The suggestion to sharpen up the procedure to invite additional groups is a good one. If there is actually a question as to whether a group fits the POU's, the groups who agree they are coming to the MULC should have a say in whether the new group should come. If there is disunity, the majority of the groups should have the say.

A case is already coming to the fore. Demarcation, in phone conversations with us, has held that they want to invite the U.S. Leninist Core to the Conference and has even held that they would not come if the "Core" can't, since the "Core" allegedly meets the POU's better than most of the circles who received this Announcement. Our view, and that of KCRWC, is that the "Core" has a reputation of foul methods of struggle and agent-provocateur-type activity, which would keep them from meeting POU #3 (during a phone conversation Demarcation put forward that POU #3 be dropped and the part about no genuine M-L center existing the the U.S. communist movement contained in POU #2 also be dropped) and would have to be thoroughly summed up and repudiated before there could be principled struggle with them or before they could come to the Conference. This is the most important thing. Also, their view of themselves as "The U.S. Leninist Core" also keeps them from attending unless there is change here too (Demarcation holds they say they are not the center). If Demarcation insists, we would ask the other groups coming to the Conference to decide, but we do not know of too many groups who would agree that the "Core" meets the POU's. We have attached a letter KCRWC and WCC sent jointly to Demarcation concerning the "Core" which explains our views further.

Content for the Multilateral Conference -- Focus of Struggle

This, corresponding to the purpose, was another area of disunity. KCRWC and RWP thought the Focus of Struggle was too broad and made suggestions to combine areas, eliminate some, and on what to concentrate on. WROC, although not stating as such, must have also felt there was too much for discussion as they suggested the elimination of some and addition of some. PC and RWC had mainly adds, Some Comrades wanted to change the essence of the Focus of Struggle. We have taken into consideration all the groups' views on the content and hope groups can live with what we see will move party building forward.

In reevaluating the purpose ourselves, we also had to reevaluate the content. We agree with KCRWC and RWP that the Focus of Struggle was too broad and we would be unable to adequately prepare and discuss all the subjects listed. We mainly took KCRWC's suggestion to generalize the discussion rather than eliminating various topics. Thus, rather than having specific, set, discussion on each subject listed under the Focus, there would be more general discussion on how to move party building forward. If groups have well developed lines on a "particularity" of party building and this becomes a question during the discussion, the groups would be able to put forward their view on it. [But, in general, we would try to develop the lines and unity around general line.] We also feel that the discussion listed on fusion and winning the broad masses should be limited to where these things are connected up to party building--e.g. what does it mean that party building is the biggest step in fusion, and what is the relationship of winning the broad masses to party building, what does it mean that party building is the central task and winning the broad masses a secondary task. Therefore, these would be a part of the discussion of party building and not separate as originally listed. We emphasize that they are important to discuss and don't advocate eliminating them, but limiting them.

Another reevaluation we made of the original content, was that there was no discussion on the type of party we are trying to build. RWC gave a very correct criticism here, we feel. We feel that developing unity around what is an M-L party is not just something for future reference, but is important to our development now, since whatever degree of non-M-L character of our organizations exists, this holds back our development into the party. This is one of the main changes in the Focus of Struggle which should be something of what Some Comrades want. With this change, the questions of the character of the CPC under Mao and whether it was a Leninist party, any questions of the character of the PLA, would be discussed. But the constructiveness of the discussion will be to apply our understanding of the Leninist party to deviations in the movement and how to go about changing them. We note that PC did not want to discuss this and other comrades such as RWP wanted to omit the section of "other tasks" in which this type of discussion would come up. We hope that they can either see the validity of discussion on this or make a concession on this point.

At this time, we want to speak to Some Comrades' demand that the Focus of Struggle be the miriad of ideological and political (and we would add organizational) questions hardly any of us have M-L answers to or could have M-L answers to. There seems to be general agreement (we hope we are not misstating this!) that nearly all groups feel the Focus of Struggle should be on how to move party building forward, not on the many questions listed in Documentation of Existing Views. Some Comrades will have to decide whether they want to go to a conference on party building or not. Now, there is nothing that prevents Some Comrades from coming to the Conference and putting forward their views on party building--that is, that the way to move party building forward is to draw lines of demarcation on all these questions, and they should struggle to win comrades to their line. However, there will not be actual discussion of these questions unless they directly pertain to party building such as the character of the party.

We agree that we should provide for discussion of some concrete ways to move party building forward in the near future (WROC, RWP, KCRWC) and think that this should be a separate topic for discussion. We included this in the Announcement, but it was somewhat confusing so we will clarify it more here. We would make this subject the last plenum

before the sum up of the Conference and criticisms and self-criticisms. This is a very important area because more groups may unite around something concrete like this than around other aspects of party building.

RWC felt that we needed to deal quite a bit with the basis for views on party building before laying out views on party building. We agree with their concern that the basis for views on party building be laid out and we ask that groups put this forward in a general way in their papers for circulation and include it briefly in their presentation. And we feel it will come up in the struggle over different party building views. However, we don't agree with an entire plenum on the conditions internationally and nationally. This could lead to discussion of a multitude of subjects in themselves (e.g. line on imperialist war, class analysis, split in the working class, nature of U.S. imperialism) in which many groups don't have particular M-L lines on. These two suggested plenums adds too much to the agenda (broadens it again) which several groups criticized. We will reiterate that within the discussion on party building, there should be a discussion of groups' basis for their line on party building, and struggle should go down around this.

Most groups felt the histories of groups were important, KCRWC especially emphasized this (while RWP, Some Comrades deemphasized). We still see this an integral part of the Conference: groups should see this as part of their written preparation, part of their presentation and then part of the struggle around party building. Groups should write and present their histories critically--they should bring up what they think their deviations have been and a discussion of the deviations should be part of the discussion on party building. KCRWC and PC both suggested this and we felt it was a very correct thing to bring out. Also, PC suggested that in the groups' paper and discussion, names of organizations (names of individuals also--WCC), locations, and dates not be brought out. Where this information is not common knowledge (in the movement, to the masses, to the state), there can be good reasons for not revealing it, especially the names of individuals (unless they are agents), details of locations and dates. However, there is also a need to understand the history of the communist movement in terms of ideological, political, and organizational development, and so, wherever possible, groups should give the particularities of their development.

PC suggested deemphasizing the main danger as a separate point and encouraged groups to discuss main and secondary deviations along with the correct line on each point under Focus of Struggle and Documentation of Existing Views, then suggested gathering together these points into a coherent analysis under the main danger topic. We think a lot of what PC says is good. Since we are generalizing the discussions and the particular points under Focus of Struggle are being taken out, we suggest that groups' ideas on the main danger be brought out in their presentations as they discuss their own and other groups' deviations, and that the discussion of the main danger in the plenum would be towards the end of the discussions on the character of the party and how to build the party, and would follow discussions of deviations in the movement on these two questions. There would not be a separate subject on Main Danger in the plenum. On PC's two points to add questions on the main danger--we feel that they should be added to those listed under the main danger in our Announcement for groups to study, but not all groups will necessarily have very developed views on all the questions listed. That's why we are deemphasizing the main danger at this MJLC and emphasizing a discussion of deviations. If we can begin to view deviations in the movement, main and secondary, we will have greater clarity on the main danger, but groups may not have all that clarity at the MJLC.

PC had other points under content of the Conference we think groups should consider addressing and discussing at the Conference, but since they are pretty particular, they would not be emphasized and groups would not have to develop views on these (points 2-4).

We think that we have touched on the major criticisms and changes of the Conference. If we have missed anything important, we should be informed of this. We will sum-up the new content--Focus of Struggle--below and hope groups have general unity with it.

--Content for the MULC--Focus of Struggle--

- I. History of groups--show background, experience, political tendencies and deviations of your group
- II. What type of party do we want to build?--}show the correct line and deviations in the movement ?
- III. How do we build the party?--groups should:
 - A. show the basis of line--general conditions internationally and nationally
 - B. show how to make party building the central task, identify tasks, indentify problems in carrying out tasks, key link in carrying out tasks
 - C. show how your groups' line will move forward party building, how other groups' line doesn't
 - D. show deviations in the movement, if possible discuss view on main danger
- IV. What concrete steps in the near future will move forward party building?

This would be what groups should present and be prepared to discuss, but not necessarily structured as this. Groups can present these views with a different structure as long as this is the basic content. The structure of the conference (agenda) will be a bit different also.

Content--Documentation of Existing Views

There was very little said about this except groups unite it should not be the Focus of Struggle (except Some Comrades who said it should, and that two weeks before the Conference was too late to get it to comrades). We still encourage groups to document their view on these subjects in preparation for the Conference so that we will begin to know more about groups ideological and political line on questions other than on how to build the party, and know where weaknesses and deviations exist. We feel this is a part of moving party building forward. If groups have additions to the questions listed, they should include these in some communication about the Conference.

Preparation for the Multilateral Conference

None of the groups had changes to the preparation for the MULC. We have some however. We think that in light of the time involved in deciding the purpose and content of the MULC, i.e. this second round of discussion, it is unrealistic to think that we could all have our line out to each other, studied the different groups' lines, and then put out criticisms of groups' lines and any changes to ours, before the Conference begins on May 26. Although exchange of views and response would be the best preparation for the Conference, we have to weigh whether it would be better to delay the Conference in order to do this, or to have the Conference with not the best preparation. We think that the Conference should begin on the date as planned and that we accept the less than best preparation. The preparation we feel would be adequate for a good exchange of views, struggle, and development of line and unities at the Conference, is groups sending out their party building line (Focus of Struggle) four weeks prior to the Conference. In this way, groups have time to develop and send out their views, and have a chance to examine the views of other groups before the Conference. As for the Documentation of Existing Views--we think that since this is not the Focus of Struggle, that groups have longer to write this up, and suggest keeping the due date to two weeks prior to the Conference. If groups are able to get their "Documentation..." to others before then, this would be good.

Method of Conference

Much of this remains the same. We will clarify the changes which will occur with the change in the Focus of Struggle.

Since there isn't time for groups to respond to other groups' line before the Conference, groups' presentation may be the same as the paper they send out. If it is not, they should bring any changes with them to distribute (of course, if the changes can be sent out in advance, this should be done). As suggested before, groups will lay out their history, line on the character of the party, how to build the party and concrete steps to be taken in the near future in order to move party building forward. Since groups' line will have been sent out in advance, they may want to use part of their presentation time for clarification of their line or bringing up unities and differences of their line with other groups. We think we should give each group around 45-60 minutes for this and any clarification needed after their presentation.

The struggle will then go down by general subject area--a plenum on the character of the party, how to build the party, and concrete steps to be taken in the near future in order to move party building forward. The history of groups, with deviations, should be within these main subject areas and not a separate subject.

There would be a two hour break between the groups' presentation and the struggle in each subject area for groups to prepare for, and the chair to begin organizing, the struggle. At the beginning of each plenary the chair will sum-up the positions taken by groups, draw out unities and lay out disunities to be struggled over. After changing any incorrect summation by the Chair and there is general agreement on unities and disunities, there would be struggle over those things groups disunite around and discussion of the unities to deepen them. (This procedure will have to be deepened some--groups might send their thoughts on this.) The Chair will sum-up the outcome at the end of the discussion of each subject. Groups would sum-up the overall results of the Conference at the end and carry out criticism and self-criticism.

Tentative Agenda

Saturday May 26

- 7- 4 groups lay out history, positions on all questions in the focus of struggle, with clarification after each presentation. Approximately 45-60 minutes for each group with one hour off for lunch
- 4- 6 supper break with circles caucusing, and Chair organizing next plenum
- 6-10 plenary on character of the party (include history and deviations of groups)

Sunday May 27

- 8-12 plenary on how to build the party (include history of groups, etc.)
- 1- 5 plenary on how to build the party
- 6-10 plenary on concrete steps to be taken in near future in order to move party building forward

Monday May 28

- 8-12 groups sum-up conference, criticism and self-criticism
- 12-10 bilateral meetings, discuss Documentation of Existing Views if desired

Security

It was incorrect for us not to have mentioned in the Announcement that we were planning on dealing with security for the Conference in the future. At the time, we had some general and specific ideas, and, in general, mentioned the main thought to KCRWC shortly after the Announcement was mailed.

RWP raised the question of security in connection with it's view that the location of the Conference should be changed. The question of the Conference location is addressed below. RWP states that because of very limited forces, adequate security could not be if the Conference were to be held in Chicago or the KCRWC-WCC area. We do not have a concrete view of the Chicago area, and were not initially thinking of this area. In general, the security question has a qualitative component (ideological and practical) and quantitative aspect (number of forces). While the quantitative aspect is always important, and in some cases might be decisive at certain times, in the particular case in question attitude in practice is the principal aspect. In essence, the security question is a question of outlook and practice toward the dominant class and its state in general, and in the United States, the outlook and practice toward the repressive bourgeois (e.g. in the factories) and police apparatus in particular. Although we do need to complete a planned study that was put off, WCC thinks the forces in our area (KCRWC and WCC) can adequately coordinate the security component for the Conference (with the suggestions, criticisms, and cooperation of the comrades attending), and we do not see the quantity of our forces as a factor which would prevent us from carrying this through.

The main thrust of our idea of security for the Conference, and some specific implementation measures will not be discussed at this time through this communication because: it is uncertain precisely which circles will be attending, and only the attending circles should be involved in security for the Conference; and the U.S. Postal Service is not the proper vehicle to transmit this information. In the event that the Conference is not held in the KCRWC-WCC area, we request the opportunity to communicate with the hosting comrades (who we think should coordinate security) initially about our ideas.

PC addressed the security question and correctly stated that security ground rules should be known in advance, and advocated using code names, which in general, we unite with. We think some additional measures are necessary to frustrate police intelligence objectives, but as we said earlier, this is not the time and place for that discussion.

One last point: within the next four weeks we will be producing a pamphlet: "On the Struggle Against Agent-Provocateurs" which will contain two reprinted articles, and study questions for one of the articles that we developed last summer. We are producing this pamphlet at this time because of the general security question around the Conference, the developing struggle around Demarcation's demand that the "Core" attend the Conference, the general ideological and tactical problems within the movement on this subject, and other reasons as well. Comrades should advise how many copies they would like, otherwise we will send one copy. Cost will be minimal.

Logistics

--Conference location--

RWP suggested that the location of the Conference be changed to the West Coast for various reasons. If a circle or circles on the West Coast are able to accept the responsibility for hosting the Conference, we think it would be a good idea, mainly because it would facilitate more comrades being able to attend; and there are more forces to carry out the hosting tasks, thus relieving our relatively smaller forces from these tasks. It would also be less expensive, particularly since it seems at this time, that some of the circles in the Chicago and New York City area will not attend. But we firmly disagree with RWP, as explained above, that the KCRWC-WCC area forces could not provide adequate security, and we don't necessarily agree that far better resources, e.g. printing, could be provided by a change in the Conference location--we could easily acquire the necessary equipment. To sum-up: if comrades on the West Coast are able to host the Conference, we encourage them to do so, but if they can't, the forces in the KCRWC-WCC area will be able to adequately host the Conference.

Timetable

1. Monday, March 12: Initial Sum-Up of Responses mailed out to all the invited circles by WCC
2. By Saturday, March 24: Invited circles should mail response to this Initial Sum-Up (see the top of page 2 for details) to all other invited circles

NOTE: If the MULC is essentially go as is, circles can begin actual preparations.

3. By Saturday, March 31: WCC will send out further recommendations after receiving and summing up the above responses
4. By April 27: Mail party building document on Focus of Struggle to attending circles
5. By May 11: Circulate views (where applicable) on Documentation of Existing Views to attending circles
6. Saturday, May 26 through Monday May 28 (Memorial Day)
MULTILATERAL CONFERENCE ON PARTY BUILDING

* * * *

P.S. On 3/11, after we had completed most of this sum-up, we received a special delivery note from Demarcation stating that due to "various problems" they were unable to meet the deadline, and that we would be receiving "in the next several days a counter-proposal for the conference on party building written jointly by Demarcation and The U.S. Leninist Core. Demarcation asked that we take this (their counter-proposal) into account. We can not see holding up this initial sum-up for it, as that might mean a delay of up to a week or longer. In terms of the "Core," we have already taken this into account as seen in this Initial Sum-up and in the attached letter that was sent to Demarcation by KCRWC and WCC. As to the other aspects of their "counter-proposal" we will have to wait and see, but the first question to be struggled out is the "Core" and their past unprincipled methods of struggle and objective agent-provocateur activity which has never been summed up by this "Core" in a Marxist-Leninist manner, let alone repudiated.

* * * *

With Communist Greetings,

Wichita Communist Cell