

January 28, 1972

Political Committee
Partido Revolucionario de los Trabajadores
Montevideo, Uruguay

Dear Comrades,

In the December 13, 1971, issue of Intercontinental Press I offered some comments on your election campaign, praising it as a whole but criticizing what appeared to me to be some negative aspects. These comments, of course, reflected the views of the Political Committee of the Socialist Workers Party. I have been asked to further explain the reasons for these views in hope of removing any possible misunderstandings and of facilitating a fruitful exchange of opinion.

From the discussions that various members of the SWP have held with members of the PRT, it appears to us that the key difference lies in our judgments as to the nature of the Broad Front. You saw it as an anti-imperialist movement in the main, whereas to us it appeared to be a popular front.

Before considering the question in detail I should like to reiterate that on all fundamental questions we consider your approach to have been correct. You rejected the illusion that there can be a peaceful electoral road to socialism. You rejected supporting bourgeois governments, including varieties like those headed by Allende in Chile and Torres in Bolivia. You recognized the need for independence from all bourgeois and petty-bourgeois currents. You stressed the imperative necessity of building a Leninist-type party rooted in the mass movement.

The PRT deserves special recognition for its clear rejection of the ultraleftism that has plagued the new generation of revolutionists in Latin America. This firm stand has enabled you to withstand the pressure from such formations as the Tupamaros. Your rejection of ultraleftism also enabled you to avoid the error to be seen on all sides in Latin America in which former ultralefts capitulated overnight, shifting from guerrilla war to support of the bourgeois government of General Velasco Alvarado in Peru and of the current leading advocate of a peaceful road to socialism, Salvador Allende.

Our common struggle against ultraleftism, which has been the predominant problem faced by the Latin American vanguard for the past decade, must now include its opposite, class collaborationism. This political and ideological struggle requires the clearest possible analysis of such formations as the Broad Front.

Let me take up first the nature of the struggle against imperialism in the colonial and semicolonial countries.

In that area today, the national bourgeoisies will not conduct a consistent struggle against imperialism. Trotsky long ago explained the reasons. First of all, if the working class and peasantry are mobilized, they tend, in following their own class interests, to break through the framework of capitalism. This tendency has become an increasingly paramount feature of the political scene. Secondly, the main class interests of the national bourgeoisie are the same as those of the imperialists, and they serve as their agents.

Leadership in this struggle thus passes to the working class. In any vigorous and massive struggle it can win the majority of the peasantry and either bring in the lower middle classes or neutralize them. In such a combat, the national bourgeoisie will inevitably side with imperialism.

Trotsky taught us nonetheless that the national bourgeoisie is capable of taking actions that are objectively anti-imperialist. A recent example was the nationalization of the International Petroleum Company by the Peruvian government in 1969. While such actions must be supported by the working class, they do not change the fundamental nature of the regimes that undertake them. The working class must not grant them an iota of political confidence. The anti-imperialist actions, whatever their progressiveness in and of themselves, remain within the orbit of continued imperialist relations in which the national bourgeoisie seeks only a more substantial position. This was proved to the hilt in the case of the Mexican bourgeoisie, which undertook some rather spectacular anti-imperialist actions in 1938.

At present, in bending to the pressures of the general upsurge that has marked the colonial world since the end of World War II, the national bourgeoisie has generally felt compelled to give itself an anti-imperialist and even "socialist" coloration that is particularly evident in its propaganda. The objective, of course, is to confuse the masses and to contain the struggle they seek to develop independently against imperialism.

This is often seen to a high degree during electoral campaigns. However, when a national bourgeois party includes democratic and anti-imperialist planks in its platform, this does not change the fact that such a party remains an agency of imperialism. Of course, it is possible that the need to appear anti-imperialist in face of a mass upsurge can bring a national bourgeois formation to endorse, or seem to endorse, mass actions against imperialism. This has occurred in the past but has become rare in recent times in correspondence with the bourgeoisie's increasing fear of the masses. In these cases, actions must carefully be distinguished from electoral promises.

It is perfectly permissible -- in fact, necessary -- for a Leninist-type party to endorse, participate in, or initiate an action front against imperialism that includes petty-bourgeois or national bourgeois formations so long as it does not give up its political and organizational independence, including the right to offer criticisms and to warn the workers on the basically proimperialist nature of the national bourgeoisie and the need for a socialist revolution to win the struggle against imperialism.

Thus the existence of an "anti-imperialist front" hinges on actions that are undertaken and not on mere declarations, that is, propagandistic assertions. Both the July 26 Movement in Cuba and the National Liberation Front in Vietnam projected programs that were confused and even dead wrong on many fundamental issues, including the role of the national bourgeoisie, but they constituted fronts that engaged in actions in the struggle against imperialism.

A popular front is different. This involves an effort by the bourgeoisie, or part of it, to establish a coalition government committed to maintaining capitalism with the support of the workers and plebeian masses. In the colonial world this necessarily includes continuation of imperialist domination. The essence of such a

coalition is class collaborationism.

The problem of such class-collaborationist coalitions has faced the socialist movement since the time of Eduard Bernstein and before. Its practitioners have always sought to give it attractive guises. In the thirties, the Stalinists and Social Democrats presented it as an "antifascist front." In China in 1936 it was offered as an "anti-Japanese national united front." In Ceylon in 1964 it was ballyhooed as a "socialist front," as it is today in Chile.

In China in 1936 both a class-collaborationist front and a real anti-imperialist front existed at the same time. Insofar as a concrete struggle was being conducted against Japanese imperialism, it was perfectly correct and necessary -- as the Trotskyists insisted -- for the Communist party to reach understandings with the regime of Chiang Kai-shek concerning actions against the imperialist invader on the battlefield and elsewhere. However, the Stalinists engaged in something else that hampered the struggle against imperialism. They pressed for a "new democratic republic," a "joint dictatorship of several anti-imperialist classes," that is, a coalition government in which the workers and peasants would be tied to the national bourgeoisie.

The name "popular front" or "people's front" can be a source of confusion. It was the "high-flown name," as Trotsky called it, used by Thorez in 1934 when the French Stalinists set out to form a bloc that would include the Radical party. They succeeded in doing this in May 1935. Several months later at the Seventh World Congress of the Comintern, the Stalinists pointed to this class-collaborationist formation as a model. Trotsky said of the congress:

"It is important if only for the fact that by legalizing the opportunistic turn in France, it immediately transplants it to the rest of the world. We have a curious specimen of bureaucratic thinking in that while granting, on paper at any rate, a liberal autonomy to all sections, and while even issuing instructions to them to do independent thinking and adapt themselves to their own national conditions, the Congress, immediately thereupon, proclaimed that all countries in the world, Fascist Germany as well as democratic Norway, Great Britain as well as India, Greece as well as China, are equally in need of the 'people's front,' and, wherever possible, of a government of the people's front." ("The Stalinist Turn" in Writings of Leon Trotsky (1935-36), p. 13.)

When Trotsky was still alive, our entire movement used the term "popular front" or "people's front" in referring to the class-collaborationist blocs between workers' parties and bourgeois parties seeking governmental power at the time, such as those in Chile, Brazil, China, India, etc. Actually there was little choice in the matter. The term selected by Moscow was universally used in the world press in those years. Trotsky himself, accordingly, used the term in a sweeping way that included the popular front formations in the colonial world.

In arguing on this question, some of the comrades have contended that at least one quotation shows Trotsky to have been of the opinion that a popular front signifies solely a coalition between the imperialist bourgeoisie and the workers of an advanced country. From this, the argument goes that Trotsky did not believe a popular front could exist in the colonial world. As a consequence, it was deduced by these comrades that the Broad Front in Uruguay could

not be properly classified as a popular front and to call it that only confused matters.

Whatever the exact interpretation may be of the quotation found in Trotsky's writings (it is in "For Committees of Action, Not the People's Front" in Writings of Leon Trotsky (1935-36), page 56), the truth is that he would not want us to place so much weight on the interpretation of a single sentence in an article dealing with the popular front in France. He would have asked us why we did not take other things he wrote into consideration, why we did not proceed to a concrete analysis of the Broad Front in Uruguay, and why we did not seek to compare the Broad Front with previous formations of a similar nature.

As an example of Trotsky's way of thinking on such questions, his answer to a request to distinguish between the united front and the popular front is of interest:

"Yes, we make concrete the difference between the two notions. During 1917, all the politics of the Bolsheviki consisted in fighting against the popular front -- not so called -- in favor of the united front. The Russian bourgeois party, the Kadets -- it is from the words Constitutional Democrats which became abbreviated to Kadets -- remained as the only bourgeois party. All the bourgeois parties merged with the Kadets in 1917. The Kadets were in an alliance with the Social Revolutionaries and the Mensheviks. It was named at that time the coalition, not popular front as now, but coalition. We addressed the workers, and said to them: 'You must ask of your leaders, the Mensheviks and Social Revolutionaries, that they abandon their alliance with the bourgeoisie and that they enter into an alliance with us, and the Bolshevik workers are ready to fight with them together in a united front.' It was our policy. Every worker by and by understood our policy. They abandoned the Mensheviks and the Social Revolutionaries, and we became a genuine party of the masses at the turning point." (The Case of Leon Trotsky, p. 386.)

From this it is clear that Trotsky drew a straight line from the class-collaborationist bloc called "the coalition" that sought to derail the revolution in backward Russia and the "people's fronts" initiated by Moscow throughout the world in the mid-thirties.

It is true that Trotsky did not write a great deal about the specific problems of Latin America or about the differences that might be found between popular front formations in the imperialist countries and popular front formations in the colonial countries. What mainly concerned him was their similarities because it is precisely in these that the essence of the matter lies.

A few examples can be cited. In speaking of the decline of popular front governments in the imperialist countries just before the outbreak of World War II, Trotsky wrote:

"But in the colonial and semicolonial countries -- not only in China and India, but in Latin America -- the fraud of the 'people's fronts' still continues to paralyze the working masses, converting them into cannon-fodder for the 'progressive' bourgeoisie and in this way creating an indigenous political basis for imperialism." ("Manifesto of the Fourth International on the Imperialist War and the Proletarian World Revolution" in Writings of Leon Trotsky 1939-40, p. 39.)

It should be carefully noted that Trotsky viewed the popular front in the colonial and semicolonial countries as a vehicle for creating a political basis for imperialism. This is a specific aspect that ought to be explored. An illuminating paper might be written on it based on the experience in various countries in Latin America. Trotsky made his comment following the election of a popular front government in Chile in December 1938 in which Allende served as a minister. Some instructive lessons could be drawn from a comparison of the program, composition, and course of the popular front that was formed in Chile in 1936 and the program, composition, and course of the Broad Front formed in Uruguay in 1971.

Again in the alleged "special national situation" in Spain which the POUM used to justify entering the people's front there, Trotsky wrote:

"The Spanish bloc of the tops of the working class with the left bourgeoisie does not include anything 'national' for it does not differ in the least from the 'People's Front' in France, Czechoslovakia, Brazil or China." (New Militant, February 15, 1936, p. 3.)

Trotsky's concept is quite clear. He speaks rather sharply, saying that "it does not differ in the least." He was pointing to what was similar in the blocs -- their class-collaborationist essence and their aim of duping the workers and diverting them from independent struggle.

Trotsky's inclusion of the popular front in Brazil is of particular relevance from the viewpoint of our own discussion. The "National Liberation Alliance," formed in 1935, was proclaimed by the Stalinists to be an anti-imperialist front. Their claims sounded plausible since the front was organized under illegal conditions. Yet Trotsky disregarded even that in light of the concealed purpose of the bloc -- to create an indigenous political base for imperialism.

I hope that this is sufficient to show that Trotsky made no fundamental distinction between popular fronts in the imperialist countries and in the colonial world. To him, as to all of us at the time, they were class-collaborationist blocs, the essence of which was far from new.

Now what about the Broad Front in Uruguay? To analyze its nature, we must consider its program, its actions, its composition, and its leadership.

The program of the Broad Front was adopted at a meeting held February 5, 1971. The Broad Front took as its goal the formation of a multiclass coalition, including the "progressive sectors" of the bourgeoisie, on a common program. The objective of the coalition was stated to be the establishment of a new government via the electoral road. The projected government, according to the authors of the program, would carry out a series of reforms of a democratic and anti-imperialist nature. Later the Broad Front adopted an electoral platform promising a long list of reforms. The essence of the program and electoral platform was pure class collaborationism.

As to class composition, the Broad Front brought together "workers; students; professors; priests; Protestant ministers; small and middle producers; industrialists and businessmen; civilians and members of the armed forces; intellectuals and

artists...."

In political composition, the Broad Front included Stalinists, Social Democrats, various bourgeois and petty-bourgeois formations, including the Christian Democratic party, and split-offs from the Colorado and Blanco parties.

The leadership was placed in the hands of bourgeois elements, loyally and energetically supported by the Stalinists, trained since 1935 in the school of popular frontism.

As for its actions, the Broad Front was designed as an electoral bloc. Although its program talked about "permanent political activity" going beyond the 1971 election, the nature of this "activity" was not specified. A primary objective of the Broad Front was to instill or reinforce electoral illusions among the masses. This required painting the participation of the Broad Front in the bourgeois electoral process as an action of great moment, the manifestation of a movement of the people against "the imperialist power" and against the domination "of the oligarchy of middle men, bankers, and big landowners."

The campaign unquestionably aroused considerable enthusiasm. Unfortunately a good part of this was based on illusions, on confidence that something might be accomplished at the ballot box, on false hopes of winning the election. The truth is that the Broad Front was set up by a collection of petty-bourgeois leftists, trade-union bureaucrats, Stalinist and Social Democratic reformists, and bourgeois politicians on the make, who were dazzled by Allende's success in Chile and thought it might be repeated in Uruguay.

They played for the stake of emerging as saviours of Uruguayan capitalism in its hour of need. They deliberately established the Broad Front not to struggle but to contain the struggle of the masses by diverting them into the electoral arena. They did not form an action front projecting specific actions requiring specific agreements on the part of the participating organizations.

Of course it can be argued that the Broad Front was formed in response to an upsurge, in response to the fact that the workers, students, slum dwellers, and plebeian masses generally were intensifying their struggles. Precisely. This has always been the basis for popular fronts of any scope. They are formed to co-opt the mobilization of the masses, to advance the careers of reformists and bureaucrats, and to maintain the status quo.

In Uruguay the break with the two-party system is an indicator of the deep economic and social crisis racking the country and of the growing radicalization of the masses. The rejection of the two old parties is a sign of rising political consciousness among the masses. These are welcome developments. But it was the tendency to break from the two-party system that provided an opening for deployment of the Broad Front as an instrument of the national bourgeoisie and of imperialism. Real progress will begin when the masses break from the capitalist two-party system. That would mean rejection of a capitalist three-party or multiple-party system. This is what will give reality to the slogan of the revolutionary socialists calling for independent political action.

This brings me to the inconsistencies or ambiguities in the position taken by the PRT toward the Broad Front. You called on the Broad Front to undertake actions going beyond the electoral arena. This was correct from several points of view. Here I will

note only that it followed logically from your judgment that it was an anti-imperialist front. The urgings of the PRT met with no response, since the leaders of the Broad Front held a quite different view of its nature and its purpose.

The PRT at the same time proceeded as if the Broad Front were not an anti-imperialist front but could possibly be converted into one -- moreover one that would follow a line of independent political action. To achieve this would require wresting the leadership of the Broad Front from the hands of its bourgeois backers and their agents and placing it in the hands of leaders of the workers committed to independent political action. An appropriate slogan for this would have been "Throw out the bourgeois elements!"

The feasibility of such an attempt can be questioned, inasmuch as the founders of the Broad Front made sure -- as is always the case in such formations -- to keep a tight grip on the organizational machinery, and they were acutely alert to possible challenges from the left. To advance the slogan of throwing out the bourgeois elements would, however, have proved advantageous as part of the propagandistic efforts to expose the real nature of the Broad Front.

Nevertheless the PRT did not raise a slogan of this nature. No doubt that was because of the assumption that the Broad Front was an anti-imperialist front.

A further inconsistency was that in a certain way the PRT acted as if the Broad Front were a popular front. We noted with satisfaction that you leveled sharp attacks against the bourgeois leadership. You exposed the diversionary aims that motivated the formation of the Broad Front. In opposition to the program of the Broad Front calling for a coalition government, you called for a government of the workers and plebeian masses, that is, a government of the working class, the slum dwellers, and poor sectors of the petty bourgeoisie.

Yet, in contradiction to this, the PRT held that the national bourgeois candidates of the popular front were anti-imperialist and that "the electoral victory of the Broad Front would unquestionably create a more favorable situation in the interest of the working class."

The truth is that such a situation would prove highly ephemeral without the development of the working class's own independent mass struggle. And if the electoral victory were gained at the cost of that independent struggle, this would signify a disaster! Against any and all electoral blocs with the national bourgeoisie, the workers must develop their own independent struggle. This brings democratic gains for the masses and setbacks for imperialism as by-products.

The fact is that the anti-imperialist propaganda of the bourgeois candidates of the Broad Front amounted to a cruel hoax. Had these candidates won the election and been permitted to take office they would have conceded reforms only under heavy mass pressure, while they carried out their real task of derailing the mass movement.

Although the quotation is rather long, Trotsky's projection of what could happen in the case of India is worth considering in connection with this.

"The Stalinists cover up their policy of servitude to British, French and U.S.A. imperialism with the formula of 'People's Front'. What a mockery of the people! 'People's Front' is only a new name for that old policy, the gist of which lies in class collaboration, in a coalition between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie. In every such coalition, the leadership invariably turns out to be in the hands of the right-wing, that is, in the hands of the propertied class. The Indian bourgeoisie, as has already been stated, wants a peaceful horse trade and not a struggle. Coalition with the bourgeoisie leads to the proletariat's abrogating the revolutionary struggle against imperialism. The policy of coalition implies marking time on one spot, temporizing, cherishing false hopes, engaging in hollow maneuvers and intrigues. As a result of this policy disillusionment inevitably sets in among the working masses, while the peasants turn their backs on the proletariat, and fall into apathy. The German revolution, the Austrian revolution, the Chinese revolution and the Spanish revolution have all perished as a result of the policy of coalition.... The self-same danger also menaces the Indian revolution where the Stalinists, under the guise of 'People's Front', are putting across a policy of subordinating the proletariat to the bourgeoisie. This signifies, in action, a rejection of the revolutionary agrarian program, a rejection of arming the workers, a rejection of the struggle for power, a rejection of revolution.

"In the event that the Indian bourgeoisie finds itself compelled to take even the tiniest step on the road of struggle against the arbitrary rule of Great Britain, the proletariat will naturally support such a step. But they will support it with their own methods: mass meetings, bold slogans, strikes, demonstrations and more decisive combat actions, depending on the relationship of forces and the circumstances. Precisely to do this must the proletariat have its hands free. Complete independence from the bourgeoisie is indispensable to the proletariat, above all in order to exert influence on the peasantry, the predominant mass of India's population. Only the proletariat is capable of advancing a bold, revolutionary agrarian program, of rousing and rallying tens of millions of peasants and leading them in struggle against the native oppressors and British imperialism. The alliance of workers and poor peasants is the only honest, reliable alliance that can assure the final victory of the Indian revolution." ("An Open Letter to the Workers of India" in Writings of Leon Trotsky (1938-39), p. 38.)

In still another way, the PRT proceeded as if the Broad Front were a popular front. Against the slate of Broad Front candidates committed to class collaborationism and the objective of putting a coalition government in office, the PRT proposed a slate of worker candidates under the control of workers' organizations. The logic of this, naturally, was to run an alternative slate in opposition to the slate nominated by the class-collaborationist leaders of the Broad Front.

The PRT did considerable along this course, actually putting up a slate of worker candidates. Precisely here, however, the ambiguities of the PRT's electoral campaign became most clearly expressed. The slate of worker candidates for which the PRT campaigned was headed by the three top bourgeois candidates of the Broad Front.

I appreciate that the comrades of the PRT found it very distasteful to include these bourgeois candidates on their slate

and that they did so only because it was the price demanded of them by the organizers of the Broad Front if they wanted their permission to continue to work within the front. In short, the PRT considered it to be a tactical matter and felt that the price was not too high.

The determination of the PRT to take advantage of every possible opening and to avoid a sectarian or dogmatic attitude that could result in isolation from the masses is completely within the spirit of Trotskyism. However, on the particular decision to accept the terms laid down by the organizers of the Broad Front, I would like to advance three considerations:

1. It has been argued by way of analogy that Trotsky favored the tactic of the Chinese Communists entering the Kuomintang and that in the first stage of this experience he was opposed to them leaving. If the tactic was proper in relation to the Kuomintang why not in relation to the Broad Front?

Trotsky's real views on this question are, unfortunately, not well known. The following quotation from a letter that Trotsky wrote to Max Shachtman on December 10, 1930, makes clear what his stand was:

"You are quite right when you point out that the Russian Opposition, as late as the first half of 1927, did not demand openly the withdrawal from the Kuo Min Tang. I believe, however, that I have already commented on this fact publicly somewhere. I personally was from the very beginning, that is, from 1923, resolutely opposed to the Communist party joining the Kuo Min Tang, as well as against the acceptance of the Kuo Min Tang into the 'Kuomintern'. Radek was always with Zinoviev against me. The younger members of the Opposition of 1923 were with me almost to a man. Rakovsky was in Paris and not sufficiently informed. Up to 1926, I always voted independently in the Political Bureau on this question, against all the others. In 1925, simultaneously with the theses on the Eastern Chinese Railway which I have quoted in the Opposition press, I once more presented the formal proposal that the Communist party leave the Kuo Min Tang instantly. This was unanimously rejected and contributed a great deal to the baiting later on. In 1925 and 1927, I had uninterrupted conflicts with the Zinovievists on this question. Two or three times, the matter stood at the breaking point. Our center consisted of approximately equal numbers from both of the allied tendencies, for it was after all only a bloc. At the voting, the position of the 1923 Opposition was betrayed by Radek, out of principle, and by Piatakov, out of unprincipledness. Our faction (1923) [the faction formed in 1923 that made a bloc with the Zinovievists in 1926 -- JH] was furious about it, demanded that Radek and Piatakov be recalled from the center. But since it was a question of splitting with the Zinovievists, it was the general decision that I must submit publicly in this question and acquaint the Opposition in writing with my standpoint. And that is how it happened that the demand was put up by us so late, in spite of the fact that the Political Bureau and the Plenum of the Central Committee always contrasted my view with the official view of the Opposition. Now I can say with certainty that I made a mistake by submitting formally in this question. In any case, this mistake became quite clear only by the further evolution of the Zinovievists. At that time, the split with them appeared to the overwhelming majority of our faction as absolutely fatal. Thus, the manifesto [of the International Left Opposition on the Chinese question, issued late in 1930] in no way contradicts the facts when it contends that the

Russian Opposition, the real one, was against the Communist party joining the Kuo Min Tang. Out of the thousands of imprisoned, exiled, etc., hardly a single one was with Radek in this question. This fact too I have referred to in many letters, namely, that the great majority of the capitulators were not sure and firm in the Chinese and the Anglo-Russian questions. That is very characteristic!..." (Problems of the Chinese Revolution, 1932 edition, p. 19.)

2. When the organizers of the Broad Front laid down their anti-democratic proscription against any of the participants in the formation running an independent slate offering workers' candidates as an alternative to the top three bourgeois candidates, I anticipated that the PRT would surely denounce this stricture -- which was intended to muzzle and block any independent currents in the Broad Front -- and find a way to challenge the decree in a dramatic way, publicly refusing to obey it. Naturally, I could not visualize from a distance what tactical steps might be required to dramatize rejection of the decree. It was a considerable disappointment to learn that the PRT took the opposite course of merely protesting it and then abiding by it.

Was this a case of tactical considerations determining politics and even theoretical appreciation of the true nature of the Broad Front? In any case I think an error was committed that can prove costly, particularly if it goes unrecognized. Placing the names of Seregni, Crottogni, and Villar on the ballot of the PRT outweighed the verbal criticisms leveled against the three, for including them on the ballot was a way of telling the workers that it was correct to vote for these bourgeois candidates. In short, it was an action that signified political confidence in them and their campaign propaganda.

3. Rejection of a class-collaborationist electoral bloc with the bourgeoisie does not necessarily mean isolation from the masses. So long as the cadres of the PRT participate in the unions and other organizations of the working class, remain with the workers in the plants, and participate in their day-to-day struggles, they cannot be isolated.

If the cadres of the PRT gain a solid reputation as militants, their political opinions will be listened to with respect, even if what they say clashes with enthusiasms of the moment that are based on illusions fostered by the betrayers of the working class.

The main current task facing the PRT is to recruit potential cadres. In this the utmost clarity is required on all programmatic questions, above all on the class collaborationism that served as cement for the Broad Front.

To summarize: When the Broad Front was formed, it was completely correct for Trotskyists to say, "Yes, we will participate in all actions of a democratic or anti-imperialist nature." In saying this, however, it was just as imperative to say, "No, we will not participate in any electoral bloc designed to advance the interests of bourgeois candidates."

Our criticism is based on the failure to make this differentiation clear.

Let me repeat that we are fully in agreement with your determination to explore and take advantage of all possible openings. This includes your persistence in seeking discussions before the ranks of the Broad Front and in making specific proposals to the

Broad Front.

We also consider the intensity of your effort during the campaign to be a model. Particularly notable was the way you got out literature and improved your newspaper both in frequency, size, and appearance.

Comradely yours,

s/Joseph Hansen