

August 10.....1931.

46 43  
31.AUG.1931\* 5133

Dear Comrades:

4616 - 5 SEP. 1931

804 41  
EINGEGANGEN  
24.AUG.1931

The Buro has discussed your letter of June 17th and decided to answer as follows:

1. The Buro takes note of the fact that you recognize as "correct" the line of the paper (El Comunista) which was indicated in the article "The Role and tasks of the official Organ of the Buro" and also recognizing the political line to be correct on the whole in the other articles." Your recognition of the correctness of our line will serve as guidance as well as encouragement for our future work.
2. Regarding the article on Cuba, you make the following observations:
  - a) It should not have been prefaced with the note that it was a commentary to the instructions of the Buro. With this we can easily agree but we find it difficult to understand your argument for this observation. You say; "It is not necessary for anyone except the CP to know the contents of the instructions which it receives." Our opinion is that that depends upon the character of instructions. Those that are of a confidential nature should be kept within the confines of the party or even the CC alone. But such instructions as are dealing with the OPEN MASS WORK OF THE PARTY should be made known and explained not only to the CC and to the party membership but also to the workers that are following our leadership. This is especially important in Cuba, and in most of the Caribbean countries, because the parties and groups there have no press of their own in which to discuss and explain such policies. In the particular case of the Cuban article, the Buro found it necessary to bring the essence of its instructions to the CC to the attention of the rank and file in order to arouse its selfactivity and consciousness thus assisting the CC in the mobilization of the workers for their immediate tasks. And for this purpose it was essential that the article should carry the authority of the Buro's instructions.
  - b) The article does not "distinguish between the nationalist party on the one hand and the nationalist movement which is really revolutionary, on the other hand, and also between the leaders of the Nationalist Party (Menocal, etc.) and the rank and file members". If that were correct, the article would have contained a serious error. But, fortunately, the article does make such a distinction. In fact, the whole policy outlined in the article is based upon the vital necessity of winning over the nationalist MASSES for the revolutionary anti-imperialist struggle under the leadership of the workingclass, exposing and combatting the treacherous nationalist LEADERS. This can be seen even from a few quotations.

"The LEADERS of the nationalists, Mendieta and others, are participating in the negotiations for this bourgeois-imperialist peace... The nationalist LEADERS stand ready.... further to surrender Cuba..."

On the other hand, the article shows the need and possibility of winning over the nationalist rank and file. It says:

"In developing the campaign around such a Program of Action, the party will also be able to make a successful appeal to the REVOLUTIONARY NATIONALISTS to join the common struggle which is to be headed by the workingclass."