

47 44
40

And again:

"In the struggle for this program the working class will demonstrate to the REVOLUTIONARY NATIONALISTS that it- the workingclass--is destined to head the anti-imperialist and agrarian revolution, and that the Communist Party will prove that it alone -- as the party of the working class -- is able to lead it".

And again:

"The Party must strive to mobilize the masses of workers and peasants for everyday struggle AIMING TO WIN FOR THIS STRUGGLE FOR REVOLUTIONARY NATIONALIST YOUTH AND THE POOR POPULATION OF THE CITIES."

A careful rereading of the article shows that it is not open to the criticism of having failed to distinguish between the nationalist leaders and the nationalist rank and file. On the contrary, such a distinction is the very basis of the analysis and policy given in the article.

In connection with this, we find it necessary to request you to give us some further elaboration on your statement that some of the Provincial ~~slavery~~ leaders of the Nationalist Party have led a revolt against Machado in the Eastern Province of Cuba. We refer to your statement that "some of the provincial leaders and rank and file members of the party who are dissatisfied with the policy of the Menocal and the other leaders (and) are fighting against Machado (revolt in the Eastern Province of Cuba)". This statement we cannot understand. First, because we have no knowledge of any recent mass movements against Machado that were led by the "provincial LEADERS" of the Nationalist Party except rumours in the bourgeois press which were never confirmed. The recent (May) mass struggles in Eastern Cuba were movements ~~against Machado that were led by the unions~~ of unemployed workers led by the unions and by the communists. Second, the whole tactic of the nationalist leaders, big and small, is NOT TO AROUSE THE MASSES, with the addition that the big leaders are practically supporting Machado's terror against the masses.

c) You say that the article is calling all students the revolutionary nationalist youth and that it makes no distinction between the students that are really fighting Machado (the left Wing) and those that are supporting the Nationalist Leaders. We find that this criticism is essentially not justified. First, because the article does not designate ALL students as the revolutionary nationalist youth. It speaks of the revolutionary youth meaning all those sections of the petty-bourgeois youth of the cities which is either potentially or actually revolutionary. This includes not only the revolutionary students but also the petty-bourgeois revolutionary youth that are not students. The "Left Wing" represents this youth but has not yet become their mass leader. Second, wherever the article speaks of the "revolutionary STUDENT youth" it refers exactly to that section of the students that is carrying on a fight against Machado. It is of this section and not of the bourgeois students, that the article says that because they are "engaged in sporadic acts of individual terror, isolated from the mass movement of the workers and peasants, without a consistent revolutionary program and aims", "the revolutionary student youth is merely becoming a plaything in the hands of the bourgeois opposition." We recognize, however, that this point would have been made much clearer had the article given an analysis also of the student youth.

bourgeois and landlord section of the