

might be improperly interpreted by them in the sense that the revolutionary upsurge in Mexico has ALREADY led to the maturing of the elements of a revolutionary crisis (which you yourselves evidently do not state).

2. In connection with your letter to Honduras, we wish to make the following observations:

a) You do not speak sufficiently clearly, and most of all without the necessary emphasis, on the necessity of strengthening the direct work of the CP in the factories and its struggle for the concrete partial demands of the masses, as the necessary condition for consolidating the Party itself. The references to your previous letter which raised these tasks with sufficient clearness, are correct but tactically insufficient. It was very important to speak of the importance of the mass work of the Party in connection with the task of its consolidation.

b) A defect in the letter was also the fact that while criticising mistakes, the result of which was the betrayal of the Party and a political desertion to the camp of Ferrero, you do not give sufficient indications of how the Party ought to react to rebellions of such a type as that of May last year. Moreover, you were given instructions on this after your first letter to Honduras had been received, after the revolt.

c) Please send us the material you have on the social-revolutionary party of Honduras.

3. In your well drawn up circular on unemployment day, there is one place which is not clear. In part 2, paragraph b, section 1, it speaks of the necessity of the unemployed committees assuring mass propaganda "at mass meetings called for this special purpose by the local trade unions (not only revolutionary but chiefly reformist)". The emphasis on the necessity of speeches at meetings called by the reformists is, of course, correct. However, at the same time this may be understood in a wrong way, as if the letter assumes that the reformists will take an active part in the campaign of struggle against unemployment, which is more than doubtful. This part ought to have been more carefully edited and should now be sent as an editorial correction.

4. Both in the aforementioned circular and in other documents issued by you (e.g. the letter to Cuba on August 3rd), you speak of the "formation of peasant committees and peasant leagues". The organisational connection with them is not clear to us, and also the size of these leagues is not clear. On this question we must have a more detailed explanation of your point of view.

In your further documents for the Party, it would be very advisable to stress the necessity of DECENTRALISING the peasant organisation (otherwise there is the danger of forming a peasants' party).

5. In the same way we expect from you more detailed information on the question of the "single organisation of agricultural workers and semi-proletarians" of which several of your documents speak (e.g. the letters to Panama and Cuba). Concretely, which