

for a general strike when it comes from below. We were in danger that someone would come demanding a general strike. What could our attitude be in such a situation?

In this situation it was the healthiest and correct tactic to change the work in the direction of the daily struggles for daily demands.

I do not want to compete with Comrade Vivo, on the question of Red Aid, so I won't relate all the acts of terror, persecution, etc., which we had and the whole series of work which we undertook to do, but could not carry through because of this terror.

I believe that at that moment, with a constant danger that someone would provoke us into a general strike, that we correctly applied the partial demands and the partial slogans. As a basis we utilized a series of small strikes. These strikes widened out and in this way we ~~have~~ fixed the attention of the workers to this concrete movement. Therefore I believe that the criticism made in this article that the Party underestimated the need of action for the partial demands, that this criticism is not deserved. I also want to say that this article does not reflect that difficult position of the Party which had to make this turn. I also believe that there is a weakness in the article in that it does not condemn those people who wanted to surrender the Party into the hands of the Nationalists. In addition it does not emphasize the positive achievements of the Party, which succeeded in getting itself out of this situation.

One cannot speak of the Cuban Party as we speak of the Polish or the American Party. It is a Party that rests upon the shoulders of a few comrades, ~~in~~ in the most difficult time, when one cannot tell from which side the danger would come, - from Machado terror or from Nationalist demagoguery, or the betrayal of Contona and Herrera. Then you must say to the comrades concretely what they have and what they have not done correctly. For instance, ~~the article says that~~ Machado in his manifesto on the extension of ~~martial~~ martial law said, "we are prolonging the state of martial law only to fight against the activities of the Communists", that it is not a question of finding a solution of Cuban difficulties, but the question of private property which is at stake. One of the very popular professors who supported the student organizations said that he is not worried by the fact that students come on the streets, but there is a danger because he heard that there is a red flag on the streets. Machado said we are witnessing the application of new methods never applied before, of small strikes and street demonstrations, and that this is the danger., and not the nationalists. Also Machado in his interview with the United Press in his argument for the prolongation of the state of martial law made the same statements. Why did he say all these things? This was because the Party had fixed the attention of the workers on the daily struggles and daily demands.

I believe that if we investigate the revolutionary value of a general strike in March, 1930, or a whole series of general strikes that came as a result of combinations with the railroad brotherhood, in comparison with a movement of 300 workers which we brought on the street on the 25th of February and the ~~17~~ 17 meetings which we had in the Harbor, I do not know which of the two movements has the greater revolutionary value. Therefore, the Cuban workers have not deserved, even though we decide to criticize them severely, the statement that they have left the struggle to the Nationalists.

I am not appearing here as a defendant of the Cuban Party, nor do I want to emphasize my special activity in Cuba, but ~~it~~ for the development of the work it is necessary to help the Party against the Cotonas, against the various hidden tendencies that are still in the Party, and to give them credit for the work that they have accomplished, in order to show them what the correct line of activity is.