

one of the candidates. The Mexican comrades were all firmly set on the decision that they should come out and endorse C. while the endorsing was good, basing their position on the argument that it was necessary in order to avoid the danger of the division in the PMR, that all forces shall be concentrated immediately on one candidate and the other fellow shall learn that his case is hopeless and, therefore, give up the fight and make peace and come to terms. And the further argument that we will be in a more advantageous position, that we are committed to a man who is certainly going to be the successful one anyway. But the significant thing about this agreement among the Mexican comrades was that among six comrades there were six explanations for this view, some of them in the sharpest conflict.

For example, one comrade argued against the proposal that I made and which, by the way, was endorsed by everybody else but the Mexicans, that they continue the position of the Party Convention up until the Convention of the PMR in November. He argued against that – that this is impossible because it would mean a reversal of our present line which has been in practice, endorsing C anyway, and that there has been too many corrections of the Mexican Party line, it was beginning to be known as Party of corrections, faced with an accomplished fact, therefore, had to go through with it whether it is right or wrong. Another comrade took a position sort of half endorsing that explanation with certain reservations. Other comrades in the Mexican delegation emphatically denied that, they said it was nothing of the sort, they fully and completely carried through the decision of the Convention not to endorse the candidate but that now the time has come, as they said, when we must take another step forward.

The most disturbing thing about the whole discussion on Mexico was the lack of any homogeneity in the discussion of the six leading comrades from Mexico. So that their agreement is only on the surface, a more or less accidental agreement, more or less arbitrary agreement on the practical steps to be taken, which agreement is then rationalized by each one quite entirely without even a recognition of the fact that their conflicting expressions, for that very reason, completely destroys the political foundation for it.

This question was pressed home very sharply in the discussion, particularly in this last aspect and at the last meeting of our conference, the last day just as we had decided that – well, the discussions were over, that it was not possible to come together on the question, that we are not making any political decisions for any Party, that the conference was merely an exchange of opinion and information, at this last minute HL proposed a certain compromise formulation which abandoned the proposal that they had come very