

065105

JPRS-LAM-84-136

13 December 1984

Latin America Report

MEXICO: PSUM CC PLENUM DEBATE

DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT A
Approved for Public Release
Distribution Unlimited

DTIC QUALITY INSPECTED 2

Reproduced From
Best Available Copy

19991115 159

FBIS

FOREIGN BROADCAST INFORMATION SERVICE

REPRODUCED BY
NATIONAL TECHNICAL
INFORMATION SERVICE
U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
SPRINGFIELD, VA. 22161

5
181
A09

NOTE

JPRS publications contain information primarily from foreign newspapers, periodicals and books, but also from news agency transmissions and broadcasts. Materials from foreign-language sources are translated; those from English-language sources are transcribed or reprinted, with the original phrasing and other characteristics retained.

Headlines, editorial reports, and material enclosed in brackets [] are supplied by JPRS. Processing indicators such as [Text] or [Excerpt] in the first line of each item, or following the last line of a brief, indicate how the original information was processed. Where no processing indicator is given, the information was summarized or extracted.

Unfamiliar names rendered phonetically or transliterated are enclosed in parentheses. Words or names preceded by a question mark and enclosed in parentheses were not clear in the original but have been supplied as appropriate in context. Other unattributed parenthetical notes within the body of an item originate with the source. Times within items are as given by source.

The contents of this publication in no way represent the policies, views or attitudes of the U.S. Government.

PROCUREMENT OF PUBLICATIONS

JPRS publications may be ordered from the National Technical Information Service, Springfield, Virginia 22161. In ordering, it is recommended that the JPRS number, title, date and author, if applicable, of publication be cited.

Current JPRS publications are announced in Government Reports Announcements issued semi-monthly by the National Technical Information Service, and are listed in the Monthly Catalog of U.S. Government Publications issued by the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402.

Correspondence pertaining to matters other than procurement may be addressed to Joint Publications Research Service, 1000 North Glebe Road, Arlington, Virginia 22201.

13 December 1984

LATIN AMERICA REPORT

MEXICO: PSUM CC PLENUM DEBATE

CONTENTS

MEXICO

PSUM CC Plenum Debate Reflects Internal Disagreements (ASI ES, Nos 115, 117; 3, 17 Aug 84)	1
Document Read Before Debate	1
Debate Proceedings	5
Concluding Agreement	177

PSUM CC PLENUM DEBATE REFLECTS INTERNAL DISAGREEMENTS

Document Read Before Debate

Mexico City ASI ES in Spanish No 115, 3 Aug 84 p 12

[Text] The Sixth Plenum of the PSUM [Unified Socialist Party of Mexico] Central Committee was held in a downtown location in Mexico City. There were two points on its agenda: the examination of the PSUM's internal situation, and the convocation for the National Trade Union Conference. It was the first one, however, on which the main attention of the members of this leadership organ was concentrated; involving a long-awaited debate, because as the content of the discussion demonstrated, many different approaches and practices have accumulated inside the party which came into existence only 2 and a half years ago.

Pablo Gomez, speaking on behalf of the Political Commission, delivered a speech introducing the discussion. Previously, at the preceding plenum, brief material from this CC organ had been distributed, containing a summarized analysis of the situation and proposing some methods for providing an outlet for the differences and helping to develop unity, which is a constant, everyday task.

Next, the floor was taken by Arnolando Martinez Verdugo and Sergio Almaguer, to report, with opposing views, on the planning and holding of the PSUM's Fourth State Congress in Sonora. Both, along with Alejandro Gascon Mercado and Juan Luis Concheiro, comprise the CC commission to work for the unification of the PSUM in that state, where the unification process has not been achieved completely. During the course of the lengthy debate, several leaders expressed differing opinions on the subject; and, finally, the plenum held the view that, although the congress had been held and a state committee had been elected by it, there were still some elements of division in existence before the congress, and CC must continue to strive to build party unity in this state.

The ideas expressed by the Political Commission as a starting point to open the debate on the party's internal problems are contained in a brief document, which we offer below:

Initial Document of a Debate

"Less than 3 years since its establishment, PSUM has made unquestionable progress, as a result of the daring, ambitious, but completely valid decision

of parties and movements that were united to construct an organization in which the revolutionary Socialists would participate, our party has achieved an already important presence in national political life, receiving the support of nearly a million voters in its first participation in national elections. At the same time, it is a political movement that is being reflected and combated, with different degrees of intensity and effectiveness, virtually all over the country. The PSUM members are making their contribution to the most significant struggles occurring in trade unions and among peasant groups, as well as in educational centers on all levels.

"PSUM, the bases of which now essentially in force are its documents of incorporation (Declaration of Principles, Program and Statutes), is showing a tendency toward advancement. There is a process of political and organic integration; and, among the rank and file, as well as among the leadership there is an increasing awareness of how essential it is to provide for and foster the development of our party. In short, PSUM, rather than being an exhausted project, is an open, viable possibility.

"Nevertheless, there are limitations upsetting the development of our organization. One of them is the fact that there is not present the political unity and unity of action in the degree that is necessary now to respond to the serious responsibilities of the party in the increasingly severe political confrontation that is taking place in the country.

"At its Second Congress and at subsequent plenums of the Central Committee, PSUM has passed major resolutions on tactics, which are condensed in the goals to defeat the government's economic and social policy, to progress with the country's democratization and to promote solidarity with the Central American peoples struggling against United States imperialism. These lines of action are tied in with that of accumulating forces to displace those now governing the country and to substitute them with forces which represent a national, popular, workers' outlook for Mexico.

"A large portion of the PSUM resolutions designed to implement the policy contained in the major lines that have been cited has been accepted by a wide majority or unanimously. But, in spite of this, one actually observes a different interpretation or lack of application thereof. This weakens the capacity for action and strength of the party.

"A major cause of this problem is insufficient definition, preparation and agreement on extremely important aspects of our policy, such as the nature of PSUM as a revolutionary party of masses; our trade union policy; the party's relationship with the mass movement; our participation in broad organizations; PSUM's work with women and youth; and others. To overcome these discrepancies which are reflected in a lack of participation or unequal action on the part of our members and leadership cadres, PSUM aims to hold, in the near future, conferences and activities at which the issues of organization, trade union and labor among women and youth, as well as other groups, will be discussed. It is very important, from now on, to stress that the success of these activities

depends largely on our managing to ensure the participation of the party as a whole in this task. To achieve this, we must make the rank and file organizations operate and take the debate to them, organize lectures and discussion groups, and make use of the space in ASI ES assigned for analysis, as well as creating others to publish various opinions on the issues at hand. In this way, the preparation and construction of our policy line will not be merely a matter for the leadership echelons, but rather a contribution from the party as a whole, in which every member must also be a leader. This devising of our positions could be a firm foundation for unified political action. Discipline in the PSUM cannot be viewed as an act of obedience; but rather as the result of making conscious, informed, democratic decisions.

"Another major cause of the unequal application of our resolutions is the lack of participation noted on the party's various leadership levels, but especially in the Political Commission. Following the second congress, the fundamental organ of the PSUM, its Central Committee (with all the limitations stemming from a confrontation among slates of candidates) was made up of representatives of the leading political movements. But this composition could not be achieved in the Political Commission, in which outstanding leaders failed to participate because of their disagreement with the results of the congress.

"This is a factor which influenced the lack of a unified response from the Central Committee as a whole, and from certain intermediate leaders; and, hence, express disagreement with the resolutions adopted, which have not been applied by the entire party. Also, at times, majority resolutions are not supported because of clearcut, manifest differences. In both instances, while the differences are surmounted through discussion and practice, the minority should participate in the application of the party resolutions, obviously retaining its right to express its views and to try to convince the majority of members of its correctness.

"The aforementioned signs of lack of unity have put the PSUM in a difficult situation amid the exacerbation of the political confrontation and the increasingly greater tasks incumbent on the left in general and our organization in particular to perform. Externally, the PSUM does not appear to have the necessary unity, and our adversaries are striving (and will do so even more in the future) to depict us as a party trapped in quarrels, lacking in resolve and divided.

"In view of these problems, a fundamental element is the display of correct, timely political initiatives, as well as extensive debate on the issues awaiting resolution. But that is not enough. It is also necessary to seize the initiative, so as to achieve strengthening of the unity that will involve a more complete formation of our leadership organs. This process cannot be subject to a spontaneous course of action, without the top-ranking leadership organ playing the role that befits it."

Proposals

To deploy the necessary effort to restore to the Political Commission outstanding leaders who have decided to cease participating in it.

To promote within the party a search for consensus as a useful unifying method for ensuring greater conviction and backing for the party's action.

To stress that, once the resolutions have been democratically processed, the party's members must contribute to their application in a unified, aggressive manner, without depriving the minorities of their rights.

To call upon the state committees (and other intermediate leadership echelons) to assume a unified conduct in search of greater effectiveness in our political action.

The main goal of the implementation of these criteria is the strengthening of the PSUM's leadership echelons, which must at all times be the real, effective decision-making level for the line and action of our organization.

It is now time for organization and struggle. A combative, organized, democratic PSUM is essential to defeat the government's current policy, as well as to make our country progress toward democracy and socialism.

After Pablo Gomez' opening speech on behalf of the Political Commission, the debate began. There were 49 addresses, which means that nearly all those attending the plenum expressed their views. There was consensus on the need for the party as a whole to participate in the examination of the complicated problems involving the PSUM's internal existence; for which purpose the members of the party as a whole must receive the pertinent information that they will use to formulate their own approaches and, in this way, through the full exercise of party democracy, reach common conclusions. (To this end, ASI ES will report the contents of the important debate held at the CC's Sixth Plenum, in a special supplement.)

At the end of the long list of speeches, the CC's secretary general again, on behalf of the Political Commission, made the conclusions and submitted a motion to establish a CC committee to study ways of forming and running the Political Commission and the CC Secretariat. The text of the pertinent resolution is published herewith.

Hence, the party debate has started on the PSUM's internal situation. Its purpose is to develop the political unity and action of the party which has a major responsibility toward the left and toward the workers.

Debate Proceedings

Mexico City ASI ES in Spanish No 117, 17 Aug 84 pp 2-48

[ASI ES "Special Edition," full transcript of Unified Socialist Party of Mexico Sixth Central Committee Plenum Debate, Mexico, D.F., 22-23 July]

[Text] Pablo Gomez

(Initial address by Pablo Gomez, secretary general of the PSUM Central Committee, on the first point of the agenda of the Central Committee's Sixth Plenum)

We have postponed the discussion of these problems which are so important with regard to the party's internal existence for some time.

During the last couple of years, our party has, in the view of the Political Commission, been confirming the decision for its creation based on a struggle by all of us to attest to and to develop PSUM's initial design.

No one is unaware that the idea of forming a new party which does not assume the nature of one aspiring to represent solely and exclusively socialist revolutionary thinking and which wants to have within it all those movements that the course of the real struggle has caused to arise throughout the history of our country's revolutionary struggles, is no simple mission. It is highly complicated; it is not the tradition. The tradition is monolithism, and ideological and political exclusiveness; and hence the essence of this new party must accredit it, must pave the way for it, and must project it in our country, gaining party members and also gaining thousands upon thousands of workers who are not in the party now and who might see in it a party with new features, one that is not the reincarnation of the old parties of the left (it cannot be such), but that is the critical recovery of a revolutionary tradition, to find a new way of synthesizing our experience and, at the same time, the basis for the formation of a democratic party. And we have problems with this, too. It is not easy to form a democratic party in this country. The emphasis on organizational problems is, to a large extent, a result of the necessity for having a democratic party. There can be no democratic party if it is not organized. In a disorganized group, it would be impossible for the members to voice their rights, to voice their views or to be the ones who decide on the organization's course of action.

During recent years, despite the serious internal problems, we have (in our opinion) progressed in the struggle to give credence to this idea, to lend it prestige, to convince, to make people realize that a steadfast, intense struggle to successfully build something really new and really democratic within the socialist movement in our country is worthwhile.

There has been questioning (and questioning will continue) of this idea of PSUM as a diverse party, as socialism is diverse, as a party wherein there is freedom to criticize and, at the same time, a single direction and unity of action among the party's members; but this is not anything that should surprise us. The questioning of these notions is quite natural, and is part of our own

internal democracy, which is very imperfect, still very elementary and yet to be developed. The Political Commission is firmly decided to meet its obligation as a permanent leadership organ of the Central Committee: not to succumb to a game of factional strife, and to attempt to lead the party in the implementation of the resolutions from the Second Congress, in the implementation of our party's basic documents, in the development of the original idea of the PSUM and in the search for new space for our party's action, for the party's growth and for the party's organization.

This position on the part of the Political Commission is due essentially to the fact that it feels that, with an intense conflict inside our party, reflected in the Central Committee, and with the temptation and the possibility that the party may set itself up in two branches which will become increasingly irreconcilable and increasingly antagonistic, the task of the Political Commission is largely to try to assume a non-factional position of party leadership, a partisan position that strongly upholds the party line, the party's decisions, the party's resolutions and the Central Committee's resolutions. We believe that the way to achieve this is by establishing among ourselves the methods of consensus as a priority method; seeking agreement to reduce the differences and disputes, without giving up voting, of course, as a necessary measure in view of the impossibility of reaching agreement through consensus and in view of the need for the party not to be paralyzed. A unilateral, overly inflexible line in search of consensus could lead us to the party's paralysis. As a priority method, as a first level of agreement among the members of our party on all levels, this is still the most important method, for which we must strive manifestly.

At this Central Committee Plenum, we want a discussion of the political and theoretical bases (if this is possible) that substantiate an obvious confrontation in the party which is causing serious harm not only to PSUM, but also to the Mexican left and the revolutionary, democratic struggle of the workers in Mexico. We are depicting ourselves as a party incapable of being what it has claimed that it wants to be, and as members who, despite the fact that we have a great deal of political experience and many years of activity, are incapable of using good sense to give precedence to that entire vast accumulation of things that unite us.

Without question, no one could claim that there is more disuniting us than there is uniting us; a great many things have made the formation of this party possible, but that is not what is most significant at this time in the party's internal existence. What is most significant (and this was also stated here in the Central Committee) are those issues which, when viewed thoroughly, are minor, which, from one perspective, are irrelevant, but which, in concrete terms, are very major, very burdensome and overly complicated. We believe that there is a possibility of surmounting this. The Political Commission believes (and is firmly convinced) that all the incidents which have occurred in the party since the second congress, at the second congress itself and at some state congresses before the second congress, with the inclusion of about 18 members of the Central Committee in the Red-UGOCM [General Union of Workers and Peasants of Mexico] Political Commission, with

certain other incidents that have occurred in states such as Durango, Puebla, Nayarit, Jalisco and Sonora, could become an experience endured by everyone, sensibly endured by everyone. I think that, in this respect, we have made a number of mistakes, associated essentially with the notion that the concrete area of the dispute is the predominance of some or others, as a majority of the leadership. I think that this (and I said so at the congress in Sonora) has been a mistake from beginning to end. It was not the predominance of some and others, or others, that had to govern the process of forming PSUM; rather, it had to be the process of including cadres coming from different parties, not as representatives of parties no longer in existence, but as cadres of a new party, who could become completely integrated with a single leadership. I believe that this race (the race for representation, the race in search of a majority) is not illegitimate in itself; there is a right to strive to be a majority, no one could question that. But, from another standpoint, from the standpoint of the development of our party, the formation of PSUM and its consolidation, and the intensification of the PSUM design, it has been completely unsuitable. In this process, there has been no suspension of the exercise of the party members' rights. In the context of this struggle, the party members' rights have been used to pave the way for the proposals that each one upholds; and hence we have not succumbed to persecution or expulsions. That environment does not exist in the party at present, and we should congratulate ourselves on this. This is an accomplishment of the entire party and, except for some very isolated cases, there have been no penalties; and we can still discuss those isolated cases, and they are also being discussed in their locations. I think that this proves that there is maturity in the party, that there is a basis for being able to apply all the energy used in the conversion or maintenance of a majority on behalf of the integration of cadres into a single flow of political participation, political leadership and party militancy as well.

Despite these internal problems, I think (and the Political Commission agrees) that this party is a totally viable party; and that we should not feel (at the first change) that our effort, which was very great, to construct PSUM has been eliminated or has become futile, just because of the fact that we have had, and do have internal problems and conflicts. We believe that the Political Commission should be comprised of comrades who did not accept at the first plenum, and of other comrades; that there could be an expansion on what the Central Committee thinks; and we do not agree with the use of exclusionary criteria. We must add, not subtract political experience among seasoned cadres. We certainly have flaws, both large and small, we all do; but just because of political problems or ideological problems or personal problems, we cannot scrap that experience and those contributions that could be provided by those cadres. Therefore, we shall continue to fight, and we propose to the Central Committee that it continue to fight against what we have called, to give it some name, a method of exclusion, and use the method of adding. I do not think it is denigrating to belong to a leadership committee when one does not have a preeminent position within it. It is the ability of each individual that can make the thinking and action of revolutionaries the requisite for preeminence in any organization; it must be the method of convincing and the ability to convince that are essential in this method. I think

that, with an idea of integration, the Political Commission could comprise a group of comrades without having this imply penalties for anyone; because we are not in agreement on this issue. We cannot turn a policy of integration into something with two sides which includes some, on the one hand, and excludes others, on the other hand; because then we would not be solving any problem. We would be merely letting ourselves be carried along by a whirlwind and responding incoherently to the most immediate reality that we have. For this reason, we want to share this viewpoint with the Central Committee. We feel that we should defend it, that it should be part of what this party should defend, and be consistent with this same idea when the state committees are formed. We see no reason why a policy of this kind could not be voiced on all levels of the committees in the party.

We are now heading toward a National Conference on Organization; we want to find out the status of this party from an organizational standpoint. We do not think that this conference can be the reflection of an internal competition. It is not a matter of a majority and a minority. It is a problem involving ideas; it is a problem of proposals; it is a problem of ability to convince; it is a problem of theoretical and political grounds. I think that what this party needs badly is to discuss, to discuss on all levels. We have opened a section for this in the newspaper; it is used very little (unfortunately). It is open and it will remain open. This is not a concession to anyone; it is a concession to ourselves; hence it is not a concession. It is a party necessity: of its leadership and its members. We must adopt the method of discussion, as we did at the last plenum of the Central Committee, at which we organized a very important political discussion. Of course, it must be about real events; we shall not discuss suppositions, or matters completely dissociated from reality. We shall discuss those issues with theoretical weapons and with political weapons; those issues which the situation demands of us to resolve, to heed and to act upon; and that method is best. I do not consider discussions in an academic style to be bad, but they are not the ones that we can and should hold. Pursuing that path, doing at this plenum what we did at another plenum and with a different type of problem at the previous plenum, seeking viewpoints, ideas and theoretical grounds: that is what integrates the cadres of a party, provided, of course, that there is an intention of achieving that integration.

Comrades, there is a campaign at present. You may observe the attacks by PMT [Mexican Workers Party] upon the left; you may observe the attacks by a number of writers of articles in the press who claim that the left is the wolf of the left, in connection with the assassination of Fierro Loza in Guerrero, for example; in connection with the disdain that some have for our tradition of struggle among the Mexican revolutionary left, for socialism and for socialist positions. I believe that this will intensify. We must not think that it is something isolated or completely circumstantial. It will develop. Our question, the one that we must answer here with all firmness, is: are we equipped to counter this? At the present time, there are five registered leftist parties. All of them occupy a political space. Comrades, we must not think that these are exclusively artificial issues; we cannot be so superficial as

to think that there is not, behind those political statements (all of them), a certain backing which we may or may not like, and which in fact we do not like, but it exists. We must make a policy with regard to this. I think that the previous plenum laid the groundwork for a rather clearcut policy in connection with this. It is time to apply it; to actually find out whether what was decided in the discussion and the preparation is correct. It is now time for us to apply that line, but it must continue to be stated. We cannot apply a line and keep discussing it, because there are no periods here for discussions to open and close. We can always discuss anything, and that right exists; it is a matter of making use of it. But what cannot be denied is that this policy must be applied; otherwise, the party will end, will simply cease to be a party, and become a medium for a more or less undetermined exchange of views.

We think that we must prepare the party to give a response to that campaign against the left, and particularly against PSUM; because it is a campaign. They do not combine to conspire, but they agree, and therefore many forces are acting in the same direction. In this instance there is a convergence of forces interested in insulting the left, and PSUM especially; they are doing so, and they will do it further. But, comrades, there is an ideological content therein; it is not a merely circumstantial matter. There is an agreement among forces to insult, slander, discredit and detract prestige from the left and from PSUM.

This is actually the situation, but not just this. There is also what we have described as the tendency toward bipolarization of the political forces between PRI [Institutional Revolutionary Party] and PAN [National Action Party]. This is a real fact that can be proven; it is by no means a speculative invention. The party which, within the left and with the left (with all its nuances and movements), does something truly significant to at least counter that damaging tendency that has led many other lefts in South America to exclusion and that could put us here in an excluded situation is precisely this party. And this is a deduction by elimination; it is a deduction asking us the question: who else could it be? That is the question. If we are not the ones, there will be no force to lead the left in countering that damaging phenomenon. If we fail to meet one of our obligations, which is to be the strongest party of the left, not only because it has more votes, but because it has better organization, because it plays a role, because it has a policy of alliances, because it uses those alliances, because it heads the forces of democracy (including those which are beyond the left, the anti-imperialist, democratic forces which can pool joint efforts). That is why our internal situation is not a quarrel among us, at least not that alone. It is a problem of a national nature, a problem that is affecting the political situation as it affects this party which is capable of accomplishing this and more. That is why it is so serious. That is why it has very complicated features; and for that very reason we must undertake solutions that do not entail the exclusion of anyone. Because if the solutions are to exclude, for this or that reason, those who should be excluded because it has already been decided, I don't think that we will go anywhere; it makes no sense. There must be an

opening; that is the proposal of the Political Commission: a process of integrating cadres, a process of eliminating the closed blocs, involving a respectable integration without thereby implying the exclusion of anyone whomsoever. Because, I repeat, on this basis we shall not agree to the exclusion of anyone at the present time; because it would be a penalty, a disguised penalty, but a penalty that we do not want to impose (not even that). We have not imposed penalties for overt violations of the letter of the statutes, not to mention the spirit of the statutes. I think that it would be quite unfeasible to do it for ideological political reasons, in a concealed manner, an oblique manner, as if we did not mean to.

We shall submit a report, completely "without comment," let's say, of the status of our comrade deputies who have not turned over their per diem to the party as the statutes stipulate. I think that this battle has been an important battle (it will continue to be such); it has no reason to assume ridiculous features. I believe that, in the long run, the party has gained as it has become more aware of the necessity for this rule. I think that there has been very great support for the Central Committee in the requirement that this leadership organ comply with that regulation. We on the Political Commission have attempted to force compliance with this regulation in certain states where it has not been upheld. We are continuing this, and we must continue it. I believe that this experience has caused the Central Committee to more clearly define a policy toward the professionals in the party (including the deputies), a policy that is somewhat more geared to the situation that we are experiencing, and a little more developed, but based on a defense of the rule. I think that we shall have to continue defending it and creating an awareness of it. I believe that this experience, from an immediate standpoint, has been very bad; it has projected a poor image of the party. But at the same time we can take advantage of this negative, unfortunate element that has cropped up, because there will be a greater awareness by the party, and greater clarity concerning the importance of this rule, in a country such as this, where the positions of the people's representation have been used for other purposes that have not been exactly those of a collective cause or those of an organization of a political nature.

Comrades, male and female, I believe that PSUM is at a time when it must in some way offer responses for the political situation that it is facing. I do not think that this party can afford to open a void stalemate in order to be able to cope with the country's reality. That does not seem advisable to us. It is capable of taking steps toward its integration. I believe that we must strive for this using all our forces, and continue to do so after this plenum, whatever the results of this discussion.

If our efforts are not great enough and our maturity is inadequate for this, the party must continue with a struggle that will be very unequal; because the deadlines for this PSUM, at present, are very short. We are faced with heavy pressure from the political situation; we are not living in the times of long deadlines wherein everything could be a matter of years. Our affairs at present, the challenges that this party has and the obstacles that it

must surmount are a matter of months. It is not that we have wanted it to be so; the situation has just occurred this way. If we fail to realize this, then we shall lose the prospect of a long-term career. And, of course, other problems will come later, perhaps greater ones; but we must, therefore, solve the minor problems that we have, which are actually major, at present. Perhaps, when in time we look back and in retrospect analyze the rise of our party, they will be minor.

Jorge Alcocer

To date, the situation of the five deputies is as follows: First: Raul Rea Carvajal has returned the power of attorney and we have already collected the July per diem; his debt to PSUM is 698,000 pesos. Second: Edmundo Jardon reported that he has collected all the per diem in advance. He has offered to pay a million pesos at the end of December 1984, and would pay the rest in monthly installments which he would start sending within a period of 2 years. His current debt is 2.38 million pesos which, at the end of his term as deputy, would amount to approximately 5.638 million pesos. Third: Florentino Jaimes submitted the power of attorney, but because the Political Commission did not accept a proposal for aid to three comrades who work with him in Guerrero, he collected the per diem again in July. We have talked with him again, but we have not yet concluded an agreement. To date, his debt to PSUM is 2.287 million pesos. Daniel Angel Sanchez Perez reported that he had sent his power of attorney by mail to the secretary of finance, about 20 days ago; thus far, we have not received it. It did not arrive by mail; therefore we have not been able to collect the per diem. Sanchez Perez' debt to the party is 3.612 million pesos.

We have not received any information from Comrade Pedro Bonilla, but a moment ago I talked with Comrade Salvador Castaneda, the comrade assigned to talk with him, and he informed me that Comrade Bonilla has agreed to withdraw from the Chamber in view of his state of health. He expects Social Security to grant him permanent definitive, that is permanent disability; and when that occurs then we would discuss the action for his retirement and the summons of the alternate with the Parliamentary Group. Comrade Bonilla's debt to the party is 2.287 million pesos.

So, in conclusion, to date we have regularized the situation with only one comrade, namely, Comrade Raul Rea. That is the situation.

Arnoldo Martinez Verdugo

What I shall give is not a report from the commission; the commission has already prepared a report which has been distributed. It was the report of the commission to the Central Committee and the Congress which took place on 7 and 8 August. I shall express my views as a member of the commission. The other comrades on the commission certainly are entitled to speak on this issue. I do not think that the commission which was appointed by the Central Committee's Second Plenum on 6 November 1983 ultimately complied with the orders

which the Central Committee established for this commission and which are clearly stated in the resolution of November, which may be read here if there is time.

It was a resolution which cited quite precisely the content of work that this commission must perform in the state, for the purpose of helping to solve one of the most serious local problems that our party has, and that is, naturally, part of PSUM's overall situation. The idea of the second plenum's resolution consisted of an attempt to help resolve those general problems, in the state of Sonora as well. In brief, the resolution stated that the commission was to try to create a unified atmosphere that would make it possible to undertake an organizational process without exclusions. As the state leadership, this commission will also have to direct the discussion in preparation for the congress, so as to focus on the issues involving the devising of the political line and not primarily the battle for the leadership. The commission (the resolution goes on to say) must always act united with respect to the party and the public in the state.

The commission would have to make a meticulous updating of the membership, so that no one could challenge the legality of any of the delegates to the municipal and state congresses; thereby beginning a new process of party unity based on very clearcut agreements which would allow for the formation of a united leadership group. These were, essentially, the tasks for which the special commission for Sonora was appointed.

As you can see from the written report, at the start of its activity, which began in December, the commission made an effort to create this unified atmosphere, to state those fundamental problems to the party comrades, and to set aside issues of a personal or group type that have greatly burdened the party's organization in this location. We held very important meetings of the aktiv in the state's 12 municipal committees, and I think that this made most of the comrades enthusiastic, giving them a prospect for work. To a certain extent, an impetus was given to the mass and organizational activity. As the same report states, the party took part on May Day, in various locations, with its own rallies, or by backing the unions in their marches. It participated in the two national events sponsored by the National Worker-Peasant and Popular Assembly, although not in all locations. The report cites the locations in which this was done; making it possible to observe where the party was engaged in a constructive public activity, confronting the problems and assuming concrete positions on the various issues of the state and the country.

But another aspect may be found in the commission's work. Unfortunately, this activity did not continue and the report does not blame anyone for this, but rather the blame is assumed by the commission as a whole. We could not keep up this pace, and a great deal of time elapsed, because there were 8 months between the resolution and the congress. In the solutions to the various problems that were posed to us, there were some on which the commission could not maintain unified views. There were essentially two of these: first, the position toward the state deputy who does not turn over the per diems to the party, who has

never turned them over, although we brought up this question from the time that the commission arrived in Sonora; the second was the position on the formation of a unified leadership group, representing the party as a whole.

It was on these two issues that the commission could not find ways to agree, and that led to the state congress, rather than being an occasion for progressing with party unity, representing a setback. This is my opinion. Other comrades probably have a different view, but my view of the congress is that it fostered a larger group; because previously there had not been two large groups. There were two groups and there were other comrades who held different positions. But now it can be claimed that two well defined groups have been established; which will not help the party to develop in the state. The question of the deputy turned into a very serious problem, because it is public knowledge in Sonora. Every time I met with a reporter, he would always ask me about Carrera's behavior and the problem of the per diems. I never answered this question, considering it something that we could resolve internally. In December, the discussions with this comrade started; we talked patiently with him, and he put up no resistance, saying that he would turn over the power of attorney so that the commission could collect the per diems. However, the months elapsed and this comrade did not submit the power of attorney. There was a time when we drafted the power of attorney and gave it to him to sign. Then he said that he would take it to run it through the machine and would return it, but he never returned it. That was how things stood for 8 months. It was obvious that we had no solution for this problem. But it was not only that. Deputy Carrera robbed the commission of 26,000 pesos given to him personally on 8 February for the repair of a pickup truck. He never paid the money to the shop and never returned that money. On the contrary, he removed the tires from that pickup truck and put on some useless ones. All this was done with the knowledge and complacency of the commission, which was unable to arrive at any decision. The time of the congress arrived, and we showed up without having solved this problem which seemed simple but which became an obstacle, because it affected the second major issue, that of forming a unified committee.

When we call it a unified committee, we don't mean that there would not be a majority; obviously, there could be one. But we mean a committee that would be representative, that would be the result of a prior study with the party's different sectors, to submit a proposal to the congress that would have consensus. We had agreed to make a common motion, but we were unable to do so. In the end, we were postponing and postponing merely the question of how we would proceed. Comrade Alejandro resolved it by the Sunday of the congress, by the second day of the congress, on the morning that we had met for the last time to find out whether we would submit a common motion. Of course, he had consulted with his associates and that was legitimate. We left it that way, that we would hold those consultations, but we never managed to formulate a motion. We made lists of comrades who could be proposed. But we could not combine a motion, numbers, amounts and proportions of individuals representing various kinds of work in the party. In the end, Comrade Alejandro submitted to us a list of comrades for a committee of 21, and told us: You name the rest. I could not agree to it. At that meeting, we three were present: Alejandro, Sergio and I. Juan Luis could not attend, and that meant

that we had to invent a mechanical solution; in other words, gather a bloc on the other side and tell it: Let's see, let's quickly form a minority of so many here. But, furthermore, there was included in Alejandro's proposal the comrade who was the cause of the problem, namely, Carrera, and there was evidence that at least some of the party did not approve of his being included. But I didn't either, and I told this directly to Comrade Alejandro, Sergio and Juan Luis, explaining this essentially to Alejandro, with whom I was attempting to make this proposal, to take it to the commission and to the group as a whole: simply that this comrade should not be included in the committee. Not being included on a committee is not a penalty for anyone, but being included is a promotion and, to some extent, a reward.

In the report, if you examine it, there is a criticism and a consideration of this issue; but there is no proposal for a penalty. Furthermore, how are we going to penalize comrades if this issue is not resolved nationally? We have been studying this issue in many areas to find a solution, so that the party may find a channel, with effort, patience, etc. But it must be found, because it is a shameful issue, an issue affecting the party's image, in general, as a PSUM that repeats the same evils of the bourgeois political schemers. So, what we had to do was find a channel. But this was at a time when Comrade Alejandro was determined to have this comrade included, and being included on a committee means the possibility of being secretary general, because the committee decides. It is not the congress that decides on who will be the secretary general. So, this caused a very serious problem, because most of the comrades who did not belong to the movement of the comrades from the Red-UGOCM began refusing, one after the other, to serve as members of that committee. That was one thing that happened. For this reason, there was no agreement. I spoke with the comrades in whom I have a certain amount of confidence, to inform them that there was no agreement, because we had announced to everyone that we would make a motion, that we would hold a collective consultation. I later asked them not to refuse to be candidates, and to participate in the election, even though they would remain an absolute minority. It doesn't matter; one must participate. This is the constructive conduct that must be adopted in this respect, to help the party virtually to acquire a channel in particular. Because there is a lack in this regard, a lack of leadership; however, I could no longer decide on Carrera's presence. That issue ultimately brought about the election of a committee of 21, for which they refused any other type of comrade who did not assume a certain position; and that is how the elected committee stood. It did not occur to any of us to question the legality of that congress, because that was not the issue. It was not a matter of there not being a majority there.

Other comrades assumed an improper position, those from Cananea, for example, comprising a committee among the most important one that the party has in Sonora; a committee which has performed highly significant trade union work, which recently won the elections in an alliance, which works, but which is one of the most controversial that we have, mainly because of this problem of the deputy and the comrade on the local electoral commission who voted to have Sainz' registration taken away when he was a candidate for the municipal presidency. These are matters that have not been resolved, and hence are still present. We could not convince them, and they opted not to attend the congress.

I think that they should have participated, even though they were in the minority, because we are not here, no one is here to always have the majority. There were other difficulties as well: The comrades from San Luis-Rio Colorado arrived with the position of denying the congress a quorum; that was not proper. Realizing that the comrades from Canandea would not come and that for this reason there would be an imbalance in the representation, which was a fact, Comrade Petra, when we were installing the congress, challenged its legality claiming a lack of a quorum. She was not correct and her challenge was rejected. I directed that session.

The congress had legality, from the standpoint of the appointed delegates and the organizations that had gathered, as well as the fact that it was an organized party. More than two thirds of the appointed delegates were present, although the commission had agreed to propose that if half plus one of the delegates were present, the congress should be installed; because we were not in a position to place so many requirements on a party which was still disorganized. And of course this caused a negative effect, and those were improper, negative positions which neutralized some of those delegates for participation in the congress. For example, they did not vote. So, in my opinion, those consequences caused the commission not to assume a simple position on this problem which has been and still is, and will be an obstacle.

Hence, the congress ended under conditions that I would call regrettable. Of course there is a committee, and I think that this committee is the one that the Central Committee should support; because it is by no means fitting to be nullifying congresses. But the problem of the struggle for the party's unity in Sonora is still posed; the problem of the defense of the party's fundamental rules is still posed, particularly with respect to the very special conditions in Sonora, where we have very great possibilities for the party to progress, because there not only has there been a decline in PRI, but also in PAN in the municipalities which it is managing, and the people are waiting for the rise of a force, which could be PSUM, to head the dissatisfied ones. But, under the conditions in which the committee has been left, with the type of cadres comprising it, because comrades who had been upholding the party's struggle and the places where it was evident that there was a party, where it would grow and become organized and where there was mass and political activity have been eliminated, this committee lacks the capacity to lead PSUM in a unified manner. Unfortunately, in many locations there is no organized activity; in most of the municipal committees there is no activity, but rather absolute passiveness, and in fact some do not exist. They meet only to elect delegates and they disappear again. For example, some have not met since the previous congress a year ago. The situation is critical. The commission submitted four documents to provide its material for the congress; material which is the report that we submitted here to the Central Committee in which the commission's observations on these issues are made. There is secondary material called "Basic Criteria and Tasks for the Construction of PSUM in Sonora;" material on policy called "The Situation of Sonora and the Policy of PSUM," the tactics with regard to different sectors and the government, which is a major problem; and other material called a "Draft Platform," for PSUM's electoral battle in Sonora. These materials were prepared with difficulty and partially, because a comrade from the commission (Alejandro) could

not participate in the preparation of those materials. Nevertheless, the commission approved them by a majority, that is, by three of its members; and so they began to be circulated. The congress was divided into three major commissions: there was a commission for the commission's report, and the commission passed a resolution which it submitted to the congress approving the report, making some critical comments about it, but approving it. And what happened at the congress? Without holding a discussion in opposition, because only two comrades expressed an opinion, one saying that the report lacked a position on the resolution from the Central Committee plenum on the alliance with the other leftist organizations, PPS [Popular Socialist Party], PST [Socialist Workers Party], etc, and the other noting that the report was not complete because it did not bring up other positive aspects of the commission's work, there was no argument against the draft report. Nevertheless, it was put to a vote, and then most of the comrades rejected it. It had not been rejected by the commission; there was no argument against it. But there was a watchword that was given, comrades, to have them repudiate it; I don't know why, but I think that it was due to the remark made about the deputy, which was a critical comment by the commission, certainly not a thoughtless one, but rather a criticism that seemed to me to be unified. There is a part of the commission's report in which mention is made of the causes that prompted the division of PSUM in Sonora, which have not been corrected, and in the fourth cause it states: "Among the causes prompting the division there is also the fact that the commission has thus far proven incapable of solving the by now old problem that the PSUM deputy in the local congress repeatedly refuses to give the commission the power of attorney so that the latter can collect his per diem and pay him his salary as a party professional. As everyone knows, this is a statutory obligation, the violation of which relaxes discipline and discredits the party." That is all we said until we had agreed with the comrade deputy on what salary we would pay him; but this report was rejected. I think that, since this report is also a report for the Central Committee plenum, the plenum should make a statement about this report; I propose that it be read. It is a short report. You certainly do not have it with you, because it was submitted at the next to last plenum, although it was also published. It seems to me that it contains points that are current, things that the Central Committee must consider to at least find out whether or not it is in agreement with those conclusions. I propose that it be discussed and voted on, and I propose that this report be approved; because it is a proper document, it is a document resulting from at least 7 months of observation and work with the comrades in Sonora. It contains nothing to cause trouble, as will be noted if it is read. It is a fact that three members of the commission drafted it; we approved it, and took it to the rank and file. In the course of the discussion of this material there were no critical comments or remarks that would discredit it, as an improper document. On the contrary, instructions have been given here which, in my opinion, claim that the Central Committee should continue in Sonora, that is, we need to work on behalf of the party's real unity; we need to work so as to uphold the nature of this party, in other words, the essence of the party that we are building; concerning which there has, unfortunately, been a lack of concern among the Sonora committee, because we have been unable to

focus on the issues of a fundamentally political nature, the questions regarding the nature of the party, and where the party should develop. Sonora is an industrial state in which the workers are predominant now, and some of the most important groups of the working class in the country are there; it is a very important mining center. We must keep watch to make sure that the committee operates effectively there.

The other proposal that I would make is that the Central Committee should order the political commission to strive, really and effectively, first, so that its policy will be implemented in Sonora, and secondly so that its instruction on the party's development will be implemented, because there are some very serious contradictions in this regard in Sonora. And I believe that these are proposals which can be approved.

Unfortunately, we were unable to submit a positive report here; I believe that our assessment of the Sonora congress is, after all, negative. This congress did not perform the tasks that it had proposed; it was held, and there is an elected leadership. But the essence of this is that the party's division continues in Sonora, and now we have more difficulty; but it is not impossible to achieve the comrades' full incorporation into a collective effort, and the party's actual existence on the state level. In other words, there are responses for the major problems that have been posed. Up until now, that response has been lacking; but we are in a very negative predicament. In the foregoing remarks, I have made a statement concerning this first point, attempting to resolve the issues involving PSUM, so that the party which we are building will be strengthened and will progress in that understanding, and so that its unity will become more genuine and more in keeping with the requirements of the political struggle in which we are involved.

Sergio Almaguer

I think that I could state at the outset that the proposal submitted by Comrade Martinez Verdugo is, after all, not viable, for the following reason: I don't believe that it is consistent with the remarks made by Pablo Gomez; because to propose now, as he proposes, that we approve the report that was rejected at the Sonora congress means, in the words of Comrade Pablo Gomez, saying that we shall apply a penalty. And I consider it improper if Comrade Pablo Gomez is expressing an opinion on behalf of the political commission; because in the latter instance a private opinion of Comrade Martinez Verdugo was being voiced. And, in the latter instance, to confront the Central Committee, especially regarding Sonora issues having no relevance to the national effort, would not be viable or fitting. Therefore, I oppose approval or discussion in particular, without omitting legitimate comments by the members of the Central Committee; in other words, as it stands on the agenda: internal problems of PSUM, to be discussed. And we have the ability to resolve and discuss PSUM's internal problems nationally, because if we are going to solve problems state by state, then let's begin in alphabetical order, so as to take up all of them, all right? As you can see, the laughter of some comrades proves that the proposal is not fitting, it is improper as it stands. I am not opposed to the discussion, which is a different matter. I don't think that any of the Central

Committee members could be opposed to a debate and an explanation of the facts; but it is not a personal problem. I say that it is not a personal problem because, in the long run, what counts in politics are the tendencies and movements that are formed; not within the individual parties, but rather the movements and tendencies which operate in social and political life and develop as such. And so, it is within this context that one must interpret the development of the policy of one party or another. And in this instance I think that our party must also be included in this general context; which is also useful as a reference point for organizing our work and our debate. I also think that the commission did operate without exclusions. Why do I say that? Because, as opposed to this position, there were individual positions of exclusion in the state of Sonora. And not only were they excluding against someone or against a policy expressed generally or in the past, as Comrade Arnaldo has noted; but there were also self-exclusions. And so I think that we in this area can only issue appeals that they not leave, and to convince them not to leave is legitimate. And we made genuine efforts to prevent their going, to the extent that, in the case of the comrades in San Luis-Rio Colorado, they formed rank and file organizations in the formation of which I worked conscientiously; and they appointed delegates outside of the time periods agreed upon in the state. Why, why did we do this? Simply because it had not been done. That was the entire argument; it had to be done. If we had done it previously, or if the comrades in San Luis had done it previously, it would not have been necessary to "violate" that agreement; but we did not violate it. I am aware of the fact that from a political standpoint we acted in accordance with an obligation in the case of the Cananea comrades; we also acted legitimately and politically in accordance with our convictions. We did not do so unfairly, and the Cananea comrades also spoke with us frankly. They submitted to us all their arguments against participating in the congress, based on a principle. The commission could never go to Cananea to engage in organizational work because the party's municipal leadership there did not agree to it; in other words, I am referring to the appointment of delegates to the state congress and to the inclusion of its members in rank and file organizations in the work. What the commission would not do was the work of the municipal committee. Then that work appeared only in the form of membership papers which they submitted to the commission. They gave us various arguments on different occasions, along with those cited by Comrade Arnaldo. I would mention others too, for example: the claim that the trade union work had been so hard or so important that they did not have time to finish some of the tasks involved in the party's organization. And I say this frankly: I don't understand what trade union work there was to prevent the organization of the party, because that is the party leaders' notion of political work. I don't consider it a correct or logical judgment for organizational work. In other words, when certain comrades do not show up at the state congress as delegates, with a right to speak, and they are nominated to be members of the party's state leadership, with their legitimate right as party members, with these reservations of our not knowing whether or not they were included in rank and file organizations, in any event, this shows that there was no concrete excluding position. Furthermore, in the matter of the per diems, the commission could never ascertain the handling of any per diem in the state, neither that

of the deputy who has been recalled nor that of three other council members, one of whom is from Etchojoa, Margarito Cruz Ontiveros, another a comrade from Guaymas, Antonio Torreblanca, and a comrade from Hermosillo named Jose Juan Ochoa. In other words, it does seem exclusionary to me that the only thing brought up as a problem is the exclusive problem of the deputy. I say that it is the problem of the deputy and that of the three council members. I am not justifying it, but I consider it part of the confrontation that has occurred there in the state of Sonora, as a way of boycotting, of opposing or of developing a policy, because in the case of Jose Juan Ochoa, no reports have been submitted to the municipal committee on the handling of his per diem. I don't know why Comrade Arnoldo did not mention it. In the case of Antonio Torreblanca, from Guaymas, a council member from Guaymas, there is no information about any report to the municipal committee on the handling of his per diem. I don't know why Comrade Arnoldo did not mention it. The same thing holds true for the case of Margarito Cruz; but before the congress the municipal committee never had any direct, concrete evaluation. We received it verbally there. That is what I am talking about. And what did the congress decide? That the state committee must resolve the issue at the order of the congress in accordance with the statutes on the per diem of the deputy and the council members. That is what the congress decided. I believe this is how matters should be assessed as well; I would call it completing them. And I also think that, in the long run, that this chain reaction of refusals to be members of the state committee was rash, although I felt it, without their having said so directly at the congress itself. In the end, there was an attempt at reconsideration, but at the congress different things had been decided, and there was progress. I believe that what is to be debated is: what are the bases for the party's unity, what should the bases be? And I think that I shall stop here, because I shall keep it for my speech on the list of speakers on the topic being debated now.

Juan L. Concheiro

Comrades, I would like to begin with what is most timely, beginning with the Sonora question. I believe that a decision must be made on the Sonora congress; we must be very clearcut about that. The policy of the second national congress and the Central Committee for Sonora, for the party's situation in that state, failed completely. If the purpose of the second national congress, in disclaiming the third state congress, was to seek party unity, to resume a process of unification, to focus on issues for political discussion and not issues relating to the holding of leadership positions, and to find a way of making room for the different ones entering and the newelement of the party, making the new element influence the party's decisions, this failed completely.

In other words, we did not succeed; our goals set for Sonora failed completely. The only thing that happened in Sonora was an intensification of the differences; and there is a risk. For this reason, I think that we should agree to vote on the report which the commission submitted here, as well as that of the Central Committee; because there is the risk that a sizable portion of the party may leave; it could happen. But, comrades, the other risk is that we

may become caught up in a battle involving splits or factions, if we do not offer a possibility of development, and of a political line for the comrades who were a minority and who are not on the committee. But, as Comrade Arnaldo said, they are comrades from the committees, and perhaps among the most important and most active; if we realize that the ones who did something on May Day, who did something, were the committees in Guatabampo and Navojoa which are, furthermore, committees that do not depend on the majority. The comrades are recent arrivals in political partisan affairs; they do not come from any movement. They are the PSUM comrades most committed to this unifying endeavor, who have no intention of registering any organization, because they did not have one. Those comrades were denied the means for participating, and this must be explained. The comrades explained that they could not serve on a state committee which was overtly covering up for a comrade who was stealing the party's money; but I think that there are also other political issues involving Deputy Carrera.

The last and most recent is that changes were agreed upon in the law on electoral processes and political parties in the state of Sonora, and Comrade Carrera did not show up at the session. The next day, the government stated that there was no opposition to the reforms; these reforms took away from the municipality any chance of involvement in the elections, leaving everything in the hands of Governor Ocana, preparing for electoral fraud. At the time, we said absolutely nothing about that. So, comrades, we could cite examples of how this deputy has not only kept the per diems, but has also engaged in a policy that is not in keeping with what has been adopted by the majority of the party on the national level, that of opposition to the government. He is constantly going along with the government policy. Our deputy from Sonora attempted to ignore the municipal government of San Luis-Rio Colorado, besides the drunkenness and shooting that the press highlighted, taking place in a brothel. This may be secondary, but it was what the press highlighted. But this is just the position, namely, that every time there is a municipality which is not in PRI's hands, the government will try to liquidate it; and we are going along with this. That, too, is politics. There were comrades who were said to have excluded themselves, but because they could not participate in a leadership headed by a comrade, a person who has proven that he has not only kept the per diems, but is stealing money from the commission. I do think that this is quite obvious and that we on the central committee should not exclude anyone. No one was bringing it up, although there were some party comrades were going to repudiate this congress and make it illegal if they did not organize parallel coordinating groups, etc. We have explained that this is impossible, but if we on the central committee do not adopt a very clearcut line which states quite clearly that our policy on unity failed in Sonora, because that is a fact, I think that we are not giving any statutory leeway to the party, to the party members who did not join the committee to participate and to take action, so that they will realize that the central committee backs the idea of having the deputies required to turn over the money to the party; so that they will realize that the central committee cannot agree with policies which exclude major portions of the party. Of 12 of the leading municipal committees, there is not a single comrade in the state leadership of five: San Luis, Cananea, Guatabampo, Navojoa and Guaymas; not a single comrade from those municipal committees is on the state committee.

We in our party must take a position, and I think that this position must be in the direction of criticizing the congress for being a congress that was not unifying; explaining the idea that we had a policy, as a central committee, for Sonora, which we could not carry forward. I believe that this is quite clear; in the case of the central committee's commission, virtually none of the resolutions adopted by the central committee on 6 November was fulfilled, virtually none of the resolutions was carried out. So, I think that this should be brought up.

In connection with the party's more general problem, I agree with the appeal for unity, and I think that we shall have to find ways for developing political discussion. I think that, up until now, there have been no conditions for discussing politics. Paradoxically, at the second national congress PSUM's serious problems of unity began, and at the second national congress we have a report that was approved unanimously; we have a political resolution agreed upon by a wide majority. There was no discussion of the political line then, but there was the problem of the discussion over the leadership, having a majority in the leadership and ways of attempting to have a majority in the leadership and ways of trying to be such. Now, comrades, from what I have observed in the discussion, it seems to me that there are starting to be points of difference. Whereas, at the Sonora congress, there was complete opposition to the policy of unity of the left, well, there are comrades who claim that neither PMT, nor PRT, nor PPS, nor PST can be regarded as being of the left, now there is a political line to be discussed. It seems to me that we must discuss these concrete problems and decide what our orientation on these problems is; in other words, this is where there is a political discussion because the previous one was only a contest over the majority in the leadership.

I also think that we must concern ourselves with making a different policy in the central committee as well. For example, I think that our newspaper has been making a great stir about being a newspaper of a new party; then suddenly we see that old newspaper again, loaded with materials in the old language, speaking in the abstract about socialist democracy, for example; and saying nothing about the problems of devising the policy, and what is new in the party. I believe that our newspaper, ASI ES, must promptly show itself to be a newspaper clearly making progress toward unity and a new type of newspaper; but in my view we still have problems.

We are constructing a party founded upon democracy; that is indeed quite clear. Democracy in the party cannot be the majority's rule over the minority. I think that the comrades who are longing for monolithism as a solution to the party's problems are on the wrong path. I think that there are comrades who claim that the problem over the existence of majorities and minorities in the party is the main problem. I think not: the problem lies in having the maturity to focus the discussion on the political issues involving the political line, and to progress in that direction.

Ivan Garcia

At a meeting before the last plenum, the Political Commission resolved to submit a motion to open up a channel for discussion, so as to unify our action beyond the decisions of the plenums; because we all realized that, although there was this common policy voted on and sometimes accepted by a large majority, almost unanimously, starting at the second congress those resolutions of the plenums did not progress; they were not reflected in unity of action. I think that there are many examples that we could give in detail here, or that the disparity in implementing the decisions has been very great; which actually indicates a real setback for the party, because although the declarations and resolutions were approved, there was no subsequent result. And there are problems which are hampering this process of unification.

Comrade Almager stated this here, when he noted that what happened in Sonora should not be viewed in an isolated fashion, but must be viewed as a whole. Well, if that is so, let's embark on that issue; let's look at it from top to bottom; in other words, at the root of the national leadership itself. This was the purpose of that document which, of course, has had its intention upset, as it was written, and from, let's say, the direction that the Sonora congress took. But, comrades, I think that the plenum must realize that what happened in Sonora, which may not be the only example, is a tendency that can occur and, in fact, is latent in a group of state entities and organizations on a different level. In short, I would describe it thusly: There is an impossibility, we in PSUM have not created the possibility of this diversity which everyone talks about and acknowledges being reflected organically, operating as a majority and a minority, but together; in other words, working in an integrated manner. I believe that this is our problem.

Now, we can arrive at resolutions, but from now on we cannot continue, at least this should be the case if we retrieve the notion that Pablo has affirmed today, that PSUM's contribution as a new organization is not only its establishment per se, but rather the character, let's say, of breaking a trend toward division of the left. If we retrieve that, and assume responsibility for that process, beyond what we are as PSUM, and look at the national area, and our responsibilities at present in opposing PAN and PRI, both on the right, we shall have to find out how to intensify this process and not fall back.

So, comrades, in brief, I think that it would be feasible if we, at the plenum, at this plenum, took up the package as a whole. I agree on that matter of our looking at everything, but let's adopt practical measures and find out what the elements are that can help us now to resume a united progress; not in statements, not on paper, because, comrades, that would not lend us a presence in this political situation. What we must accept is the fact that, at the second congress we were incapable of forming a leadership, a political commission, with all the movements. Well, this is a time when we can reconsider it, and realize that this matter disturbing us is not the only thing; there are many other things. For example, it has been stated here that, behind all this dissent over the composition of committees there are political differences; and we already know that. But how can we create a channel for those political

differences, an opportunity for open discussion? And this, in my view, can only be accomplished by striving intrepidly to have the leaderships, with the political commission setting the example, trying to include all the movements which exist in the party, now. And the next step would be to create an atmosphere that would enable those majorities and minorities to work without any exclusions. Because there is also the opposite failing: that a minority would resign. And in this respect I think that Arnol'do's position was clear, that of not approving the position of a minority which refuses to accept its status as such and which refuses to work under those conditions.

I also think that this is a struggle which must be undertaken: learning to work as a minority but, for this purpose, to create the atmosphere, the space, so as to be able to create and work as both a majority and a minority; not air-tight majorities and minorities, of course, but linked with the process of discussion and assuming a position on issues which will become increasingly varied and urgent.

So, I think that I would agree that whatever we adopt here as a resolution should be done overall; but I would say that this affects the entire party. We might say that the position adopted by the plenum here could strengthen or change the course of this tendency toward deterioration and a real, factual, incipient division in the party, or change that tendency and create conditions for removing that difficulty and putting ourselves on the path to unity again.

I believe that the plenum should now attempt to define the new conditions for unity in the party; in other words, that this unity should not continue to be formal as it is largely, but really put our feet on the ground and learn what conditions we need; and put our cards on the table, not creating agreed values, not merely engaging in confrontations wherein matters are not stated and everything is expressed in code, through voting and formation of leaderships in which the political positions are often not expressed. Because the result of that is surprises the complete meaning of which we shall not know, nor shall we know how to prevent the occurrence of those kinds of polarization. So, the solution in my opinion is that the plenum should, right now, take a part in this issue, from top to bottom, as a whole; but not evade a decision on Sonora, for example. We cannot avoid that, claiming that what happened there will counter the tendency toward unity. We shall have to decide on that. It would be bad if it were decided in an isolated manner, if it were decided without the mutual intention of changing the course of the party's process of unification.

Otherwise, comrades, the trend toward greater polarization or confrontation at a time when we shall be faced with a group of very serious problems, such as the electoral contest, now, well, that would weaken the party. Incidentally, I also want to say this here: The party must, in addition, take a stand now, quickly, as a pivot, as a contribution, as an effort for the unity of the left, comrades. Here, at this point, we cannot move to a position of withdrawal into our shell, or independent participation in the elections, when there is a process for leftist unity which, we might say, is essential to enable us to

reach agreement on the difficulties which we shall not deny. But it is a process which we must begin and foster, declaring that we favor that impetus; because if we put too many "buts" in front of this national requirement, in my opinion that too would weaken our own participation. These are concrete proposals. In short, comrades, I propose that we embark upon the national issue as a whole, and for starters that we consider forming the political commission with all the movements.

Florentino Jaimes Hernandez

Comrades, I am among the first to comment because I am unquestionably involved in one of the problems to be discussed by this Central Committee; and I want you to know my views in connection with the per diems and other issues that I want to bring up to you, precisely. As I stated it at the outset, comrades, I think that this problem has two aspects: the political and the monetary. I have always said that this problem is of a preeminently political nature, and it has been manifested, among other ways, in the improper handling of the party's money, partially and favoring a group of comrades who are in the organization. For example, we have, or see, very expensive air travel by commissions comprised of an unnecessary number, making large financial resources available to those comrades who provide the political control on the organization's behalf, whatever the economic and political cost may be. But I think that the most objective element that has proven this claim in a relevant manner is the rejection by the fourth, I'm not sure whether it was the fourth or the third Central Committee plenum, of the report on income and outlays from the finance area of this Central Committee of the party. But it is also important to stress that, from the beginning, obstacles were compounded to a satisfactory solution of this problem. A public campaign was carried out against us deputies who withdrew the power of attorney; a campaign which at times bordered on rage and succumbed to visceral levels. All the available news media were used with an obvious desire to discredit us, without realizing or deliberately realizing that in the long run they were hurting PSUM. That, too, reflected the struggle of two political movements; furthermore, we have reported that a comrade from the Political Commission, at local meetings, even described us as opportunists, as upstarts, when the discussion of this problem had not been completed.

For my part, I think that my goal has been largely fulfilled, in having withdrawn the power of attorney. It was an attempt to make the Central Committee aware of the biased way in which the party's money is being handled. The discussion was chiefted; I don't know how much awareness was created. They will have the say on the future actions and decisions of this leadership group. I believe that there has been a major positive achievement. The fact that it was not handled properly and PSUM was harmed to some extent was not my desire, much less my decision.

The Central Committee's subsequent decision has been encouraging: appointing a commission of its members to discuss this problem so as to help solve it. We are responding with the same fraternal spirit, and we always reiterate,

verbally and in writing, that despite the slander we have been willing to reconsider our position, and we shall never deny PSUM its right. I would like to let me report to you briefly on how this money has been used. I shall talk to you mainly about Tierra Caliente.

In Coyuca de Catalan, before November and December of last year there was a party only in seven communities; now there is a party in 22 communities of that same municipality. And they are preparing the conditions for creating the party in eight other communities. In the municipality of Pungarabato, as of December 1983 there were 360 members; now there are 760. In Cutzamala, as of November 1983 there was no organized rank and file entity; now there are six rank and file entities, and the members have tripled. Generally speaking, the party has been strengthened in quality and quantity; we have transcended the bounds of the state, and have offered membership in the state of Mexico. For example, in San Antonio de Rosario, in Michoacan, in Santa Cruz de Villagomez, etc., conditions have been created for membership in other municipalities, such as Zirandaro, Tlachapa, San Miguel Totolapan, etc. I have just delivered to the Central Committee over 400 memberships of comrades who have worked with us for over 2 years; in other words, they are memberships of people who are convinced, who really understand and who have confidence, whose confidence in the party's activity we have gained. In Costa Chica, the conditions have been created for growth in the municipalities of San Marcos, Ayutla and Cruz Grande. In the center of the state, in Chilpancingo, as well, there is a possibility of making a considerable increase in the quality and quantity of the party in several municipalities. The conditions have also been created for growth in certain municipalities in the mountainous area. Public demonstrations have been worthily offered and given of the party's strength in Tierra Caliente. Already, as a party of masses, it has helped to procure loans for nearly 100 communal farms in 3 consecutive years, with positive results for our party.

An invasion has just been made, recovering 256 hectares of irrigated land in the municipality of Pungarabato, with the resultant sympathy for PSUM, because behind that action there was obviously the presence of PSUM leaders. Comrades, I believe that it is legitimate to make a demand upon this level of PSUM leadership: first, that it make a public statement concerning the reasons which caused this problem, admitting the partiality in handling the party's money, and that it agree to allow ASI ES to publish our views on this problem if what is published by the Political Commission is not satisfactory to us. On the monetary issue, the Political Commission, through Comrade Jorge Alcocer, notified me that it would propose here the acceptance of my offer of a monthly income of 180,000 pesos; because I can prove it, and I urged Comrade Alcocer to inspect my expense accounts. This request is objective for traveling expenses and maintenance of the vehicle, as well as my support in the state of Guerrero and in the Federal District. I demanded that there be added to this the 55,000 pesos per month that I have provided as financial assistance to three comrades who help me in other parts of the state. Comrades, the party work has exceeded my personal facilities, and hence the need has forced me to bring in suitable comrades to continue doing the political work in Guerrero. Those expenses are not based on my wishes or my desire for expansion; but rather because I have taken the massive development of PSUM

seriously, because I think that if this aid is denied the comrades, the political work will be cut to what I could do personally. This would have a political and economic price for PSUM; the sympathizers and members recruited during these past 7 months of effort would be lost, and the resources already invested would be lost. Hence, I request that this Central Committee give permission to continue giving this economic aid to the three comrades, who are not professionals. I must explain that it is assistance for their most essential expenses, so as to perform their political work. I think that if this is accepted, within a year and a half we shall manage to bring together an organized mass movement in Guerrero.

The debt in the document sent to me by the Political Commission has informed me of that intention of the Central Committee which I actually did not hear accurately. But I have the document here, and it urges me to talk about the debt. We have talked with Comrade Alcocer. I want to tell them, as I want to tell you, comrades, that all the money was spent on the political battle. If the Political Commission objectively proposes an expenditure of 180,000 pesos, including my support, my traveling expenses and the maintenance of the vehicle, let it acknowledge for me that same amount, retroactively, from December to date; because that sum of 180,000 pesos is an average result of expenses that can be proven for these same items from July to November 1983. And I was refused all economic assistance and had to borrow so as not to let the work stop in Guerrero.

Furthermore, comrades, I want to tell you that I have had no personal gain from that money that is ascribed to me as a debt. I have no money in the bank or invested. I live with my father's family, and my wife lives with hers, because we lack a dwelling. I do not intend to obtain a dwelling; that is not in my plans. I have a Wagoneer pickup truck which I use as a work vehicle, and I procured it with funds from my family and the workers' bank. I am still paying for it. I would place it at PSUM's disposal, if it paid me the market price, so that it could collect from it the sum that it cannot prove, which I think does not amount to 400,000 pesos. I think that the party will need vehicles for its forthcoming campaign. This vehicle is in very good working condition. Furthermore, comrades, I have spoken, and there is no reason to laugh, because I am talking about evidence; I am not talking for nothing here about proven expenses. Also, before my time is up, I only want to state that there should be included in the discussions of this plenum the issue of the state of Guerrero. There, we have an extraordinarily inept nominal party leadership, which emerged from the second congress in 1983. This ineptness is reflected in last year's election campaign, which took place in a completely disconnected way. There is no implementation of PSUM's correct political line. Generally speaking, the party has declined in some parts of the state, and has come to a standstill in others. For many months, the state committee was not convoked, and in other similar periods it did not have the necessary quorum, despite the fact that the movement which makes use of that leadership has a majority in that state committee. Without the minority, namely us, it could operate independently, but it fails to make a quorum. The right is progressing and the state and the political

bosses are attacking us systematically. Faced with this situation, on 23 June this State Committee unanimously approved the convocation for a special congress, attempting to hold it on 11 and 12 August, so as to come to the national conference on organization with a legitimate presence; but the Political Commission has in fact prevented us from having this congress. And, in conclusion, I would also like this to be discussed: the policy of alliances which resulted and which was stated a few days after the last plenum with PPS, which is a completely discredited party. And I have my views opposing that alliance. Thank you.

Miguel Angel Velasco

Comrades, I have said that PSUM is undeniably undergoing a troubled situation because of its internal difficulties; these difficulties have proven to be greater than the ones we anticipated when we decided to take the step which resulted in the merger of five organizations into a single party. This effort for unity, which included the leftist coalition and culminated in the National Assembly on Unification, aroused many hopes among our people. As I see it, the million votes received by PSUM in the 1982 elections was a stamp of approval for the unity efforts, which were translated into the formation of PSUM.

It is obvious that the unity of the socialist left in the highest degree possible is an inexhaustible aspiration, not only among those of us who are struggling on behalf of socialism, but also among more extensive strata of workers and peasants in our country. This unity is, moreover, a requirement imposed by the worsening of the country's internal situation and in the relations with the United States, the increasing aggression against the peoples of Central America and the Caribbean, and the threat of a nuclear holocaust, which I think is greater than ever today. The proper response from the left for this situation is only one; therefore, the PSUM plan is still valid, the basic documents supporting it, which are arguable of course, still apply in their essential content. Those documents are not a set of dogmas, but rather the result of the experience of the individuals and organizations that lent it shape; different political and organizational experiences for all levels of the party's structure. They are documents which have broken off from monolithism; that monolithism which, strangely enough, led to the division and splintering of the left. For this reason, we must persevere and intensify, redouble our efforts in this process of reversal begun by the Lefist Coalition and the formation of PSUM.

The campaign against our party is no coincidence at a time when the exhaustion of the system produced in 1917 has been evident; against PSUM, the only plan which, if we succeed in surmounting our internal problems, can stop the two-party system, if we succeed in avoiding being led to that state of exclusion in which many leftist organizations in the central and southern part of our continent exist. Hence, we must surmount PSUM's internal problems through the only sound, correct method: the method of maintaining its unified and authentically democratic nature.

The entire left is not in PSUM, it is not yet; and there are non-socialist democratic forces with which it is also possible and proper to arrange for

unity of action regarding issues which transcend the purposes and objectives pursued by the socialist left.

No one would consider it fitting for the Central Committee members to act in flagrant violation of their most fundamental duties. The case of Comrade Jaramillo, with the refusal to dissolve his PSR [Revolutionary Socialist Party], is extreme; but I have always agreed with the view of not applying penalties in this party. Penalties should not be applied; all the possibilities of convincing the comrades should be exhausted. And if there is anyone who does not want to be in the party any longer, well then the door is open; as occurred precisely in Jaramillo's case. That comrade has, in fact, placed himself outside our organization.

Regarding the case of the per diems, I would like to express my disagreement with what was said by Comrade Florentino. You know that at the party's second congress in the state of Veracruz, at the state congress, there was an irregular situation which was also taken to the Second National Congress. There remained a unilateral leadership, a leadership comprised solely of comrades who, let's say, left other sectors outside of the party leadership. Despite this, when I went to take office in my capacity as deputy, although I had denounced at the second state congress what appeared to me to have been violations of the party's own regulations, I never questioned to whom I should turn over the per diems. I turned the per diems over to the State Committee, and I didn't tell it how it should spend them. I have a right to express my opinion in the State Committee regarding the way in which its budget is spent; but I cannot by any means say, as if it were my own money that was involved, that I would not give it, because they are using it to benefit some movement or another. No, comrades, I had an obligation to give it to the State Committee, and I gave it, and am still giving it to the State Committee. That is why I don't consider it proper for every comrade deputy to say how much he should give, how he should give it, to whom he should give it, and how it should be distributed. The party's organization tasks are party tasks, not those of each comrade. I might say: "Comrades, let me contribute 30,000 pesos here for cadres whom I recognize as very capable and very good, so that I may give it to them to enable them to work on one mission or another." No, comrades, I had to turn over my per diem to the State Committee, and I did so, and this should be the rule, comrades. For this reason, I do not agree with the opinion expressed by Comrade Florentino.

Now, comrades, concerning the Sonora problem; of course I don't want to add any more, because I agree with the proposals contained in Pablo's initial report, and I also agree, as I showed by my vote, that the report of the commission appointed in accordance with decisions originating in the Second National Congress and a plenum of the Central Committee should be published. Therefore, I believe that it is necessary to publicize this report.

Raymundo Cardenas

Comrades, I think that one of the points brought up by Pablo relating to this internal problem of PSUM is of national interest; we should consider it very

carefully. I am convinced that the activity in which PRI is engaged on the national level to hold its national assembly, and that carried out by the PAN members also, in many areas, is an activity that we cannot overlook, neglecting to make many analyses. I think that those of us who are watching the PRI members meeting, electoral section by section, and community by community, although they are manipulated, as they are, we cannot, comrades remain impassive, observing our leading cadres embroiled in an internal problem. I think that it is discouraging, not only to the party's members, but also to the country's entire progressive consciousness, to see some of those who were the main pivotal figures in creating PSUM avoiding efforts now. I think that if this is not resolved, comrades, PSUM will be swept away in 1985; because we are not organizing anything, and because the members and sympathizers are discouraged by this division, by these internal problems.

I consider the creation of PSUM to have been a daring, significant act for the left, which removed an entire tendency toward division; and with that momentum we entered the federal election campaign, and with that we won a few victories, still receiving the impact from the merger. And that presidential campaign is the only thing that I credit for the fact that we, comrades, as the PSUM, participating where we are participating, are fighting. You must have heard that at the state university in Zacatecas we made considerable progress last Tuesday; our ticket won in the Zacatecas communications and transportation workers union. And we owe to all this our presence in the telephone workers union, and our presence in some other unions; and this is due basically to the idea of forming PSUM, giving an impetus to the policy of unity, not to anything else. And it also seems to me that there is evidence to claim that those who have adopted a vacuum policy of creating a vacuum, are being left behind; they are not progressing or organizing anything. For this reason, I think that our party must keep up with the times. I believe that if this party does not generate daring initiatives again to revamp itself, we shall be condemned by our party's members themselves and by the entire national left, by Mexico's history; because it seems to me that we must consider the meaning of a statement that we have been repeating for some time: political bipolarization will exclude us. Some may perhaps be satisfied with their small spaces, their turf that they may have in the trade unions and universities; but the fact is that, with the activity being carried out by the government, PRI and the National Action Party, we shall be left on the sidelines completely if we don't manage to give another loud ring of the bell, so to speak.

I believe that this must happen, on the one hand, with internal unity; I maintain that those who do not do everything that should be done internally to achieve unity will be condemned by history.

That is one element, but the other one is the unity of the left. I think that the democratic rank and file of the left all over the country is demanding this: that the party which avoids unifying action in 1985 must remain on the sidelines of the struggle. In this regard, the alliance struggle devised here must be made more active; we must talk to PPS and PRT, and to all the local groups, regardless of how badly we think of the leaders or if we have very

deteriorated relations. I think that if our party launches the initiative, and is really active, on behalf of our putting into practice on the national and local levels unity of action with national groups and movements, the party will emerge with great prestige, and that group, movement or party which does not agree to this, comrades, will, I insist, be left on the sidelines. I think that we must be willing to concede many things which, in our view, may be excessive, to the small groups on the local level. I believe that, with the fundamental idea of achieving the unity of the left, our party must make efforts in the direction of conceding in certain situations involving superimpositions in councils or lists of deputies. I think that the main thing now is for us to put up a unified leftist force against PRI and PAN. But, comrades, that will be impossible to achieve if PSUM is disunited, with each one acting on his own, or with some creating a vacuum for the initiatives that result from a majority.

Finally, I want to say that we are not going to get anywhere if every local or federal deputy, or council member, gathers his friends to make them party professionals so that they may construct the party where the deputy or council member deems it most feasible. I think that the money which we who are popularly elected officials earn should be used to make the party grow where the committees decide. In principle, I think that the proposal made by Comrade Florentino regarding the payments' being made to three comrades should be discussed by the Guerrero state entity. Comrades, I would flatly oppose the Central Committee's deciding to professionalize certain comrades so that they may work in Zacatecas, dissociated from the State Committee. It is impossible to agree to this type of thing for any reason, because then this Central Committee would decide on everything happening all over the country. If this were the case, why would we want committees in the states and the municipalities? I think that the criteria for the party's construction in states and municipalities must come from each State Committee or each Municipal Committee, not from the personal view of any comrade who, by chance, managed to have access to certain financial resources. I don't think that this is the issue in that respect.

Olac Fuentes

Comrades, I would like to begin in the same direction that Velasco indicated. This situation that the party is undergoing is not anything we should surmount for reasons of commitments or regulations or principles alone; but it is, rather, a matter that we must surmount, and surmount quickly and well, merely for reasons of political effectiveness. I believe that this situation that we are beginning with now, which perhaps we should have taken up directly some time ago, must be treated on the basis of the fact that, either these situations are resolved, or the members of this party will have very little to do in politics, acting in isolation or divided. On these grounds, I would like to point out that it is not just a matter of there being a problem of splits and division in the party now; making note, in many instances of rancor, of the fact that one would at times like the energy and rancor that exist among various members of the party to be directed toward those sectors with which we really have to fight. Not only is it factionalism, but rather another phenomenon that I consider to be eroding the party very heavily.

It is the withdrawal, the immobility of many members who are not involved in that type of confrontation, who have not entered the party. There is a problem of people's subjectivity, of many members expecting to find in this party a means of channeling their political energies and who must necessarily be disappointed and immobilized by this situation, not only of the party's struggle but sometimes the struggle of the left, in more general terms. In this regard, I think that a very serious effort must be made to lend it once more, or try to lend it once more, fluidity in dealing with this situation, realistically and authentically; trying as many means as necessary to restore the party's internal situation to its proper pace. I think that, actually, as Pablo Gomez remarked, the fundamental problem is a problem of consensus; but I think that we shall gain little if we don't decide on means for establishing this party consensus. In the first place, I would like to say that there is a way of interpreting consensus that has at times been used here in the party and that is very clearly evident in many documents of the party leadership, submitted to the Central Committee itself; for which purpose an attempt would be made to achieve a certain consensus based on mutual concessions, avoiding confrontation among political positions, in the strict and serious sense. And the party is not served nor is the leadership served at times by consensus which has been sought avoiding any confrontation; a situation which does not allow anyone to progress. I think that in this area of definition and orientation, there have been too many zero ties in this party, wherein no concept advances, no initiative progresses and matters remain bogged down in a very serious lack of determination. I believe that, paradoxically, a path toward unity in an authentic direction is the opposite: it is to afford an outlet, precisely demanding intensity and seriousness for these differences; seriously attempting to come to agreement regarding them. I think that, when this is impossible, the best thing is to explain it to the party, to bring up the differences that exist here, clearly, with the arguments that accompany them, and to transfer this discussion to the party, removing it from leadership groups wherein these matters tend to enter an environment which encloses them and stifles them. I think that we should not be afraid of such things, that this is a method for education and improvement, in this type of political struggle in this party, which is becoming very seriously impoverished.

With regard to the notion of progressing toward unified action, I think that the starting point is actually recognition of the plurality that exists in the party; which demands of us, faced with the concrete situation that exists, the imagination to propose concrete methods to enable this process of unity of action and political discussion to progress. I think this, although on various occasions certain comrades or groups have satanized, or eliminated the idea of proportionality, even for being anti-party. This is an issue that we should be seriously considering now, as a real solution for real questions. We are not fighting with principles or with abstract models, but rather with real problems, and at present proportionality in representation and integration in leadership could help us with this problem in a practical way. I also think that we must consider the composition of the party's leadership organs, of all the party's organs; and this is not merely an idea that could aid us, if it were implemented, such as in the addition of certain

party leaders to the Political Commission. Let's consider how the leaderships could be recomposed, so that they will represent the party and be an area for unity and not exclusion. Finally, comrades, I actually believe that here in the Central Committee, and particularly among the leaders who have an influence on many sectors of the party, we should make an attempt to establish ground-rules in this situation and, in particular, pledge to uphold certain rules on what cannot be done in this party.

There is, there has been and there will be a tolerance which would, at the most, not have been theoretically conceivable when we considered the establishment of this party; but the issue of tolerance also has limits. It does not solve the problem, nor eliminate the problem of discipline; and in this respect I believe that minimal rules must be established, because otherwise the disintegration of the party's activity, the lack of capacity and the opposition of people to the party will become increasingly serious. There have been concrete instances wherein we have had, not three different opinions, but three or four positions acting differently within a trade union in which PSUM is identified with one. If there are four, opposed to the death, then I think that this minimal agreement, seriously arrived at, is essential to provide a solution. All right, let's accept one or the other in many matters, but let's establish the areas wherein it is not worthwhile acting with procedures, methods and positions which adhere directly to the party.

Tereso Felix Aispuro

If we in this party were always in a position to fulfill all the goals that we have set for ourselves, unquestionably this would be a different party. But we are not in that situation, nor can we retrogress or scrap some of the progress we have made for the simple reason that things have not turned out as expected.

Although it is true that the congress adopted the resolution to appoint the commission to achieve regularization of the party's status in Sonora, it is also true that this commission did not necessarily have to carry out all these orders from the congress or the Central Committee; because something necessarily had to fail, and these are things which are beyond our control. In our view, the commission complied with the objective principles assigned to it by the Central Committee, but no further mention has been made of any.

Several comrades have mentioned some, the negative ones, to be precise, not the positive ones. For example, one of these was that of giving instruction for the preliminary exclusion of the party's political line that would be observed at the congress. This occurred, although in a very incipient manner. There was also, for example, that of meticulously regularizing the party's title; which was achieved entirely, procuring a unified leadership group and discussing some political type issues that the party would have to consider in different situations, for example, in the matter of the party's position regarding participation inside the university. The commission organized several meetings with all the members of the municipal entities and, in particular, with each one of the municipal entities.

For example, in Hermosillo a meeting was held, attended by the commission, at which a discussion on the university issue started. The comrades who head the unions and who are also in the party, serving in the unions' leadership, denied the party's participation in the university, or reject it; because, they claim, that would create serious problems for them. There, automatically, we are creating a barrier that will preclude our own progress. On the other hand, it was impossible to hold a complete discussion, because some comrades would not discuss issues of a political and party nature, but only matters of a personal nature; and instead of opening a political type discussion, they would begin with insults, first of all, and that is not a proper way in which to reach a more unified accord.

As for the report which the commission submitted and which has already been published in the newspaper, it was rejected because some rank and file organization of which I happen to be a member in Hermosillo began rejecting it. In one of them, I think it was Comrades Concheiro, Almaguer and others, as soon as it was evident that those rank and file organizations would be excluded, the first thing they did was reject the report for being negative, contrary to unity and for other reasons. The Congress should assume a position of open discussion of the political issue. An attempt was made to focus on a single person, on the deputy, which we do not consider the most important thing, but rather it would appear to be a means of diverting the discussion toward the party's negative aspects.

Comrade Concheiro claims that the Central Committee would have to create a statutory channel for the party in the state of Sonora; he said this verbatim. I do not consider it fitting for the Central Committee to devise a special statute for the state of Sonora, because we already have one: a statute whereby we were to be governed since the first meeting, made by the commission in Hermosillo, which, based on the agreement of all the party members in the state, we achieved and approved; or rather, we agreed to subject ourselves strictly to what it said, the declaration of principles and program of the party. These are situations which have obviously been distorting matters. On the other hand, they have brought up this issue of San Luis-Rio Colorado. The only comrade who came out in favor of the elimination of powers of attorney in San Luis-Rio Colorado, through a demonstration, backing the position of the CTM, which was the confederation that started this bloc movement manipulated by the government, was Comrade Petra Santos; and, in Hermosillo, other comrades such as Raul Saenz, echoed it. In a statement in the newspapers, in EL IMPARCIAL, INFORMACION and others, they claim that PAN, and specifically, Casimiro Navarro, have the power because they belong to the common people. If that praise were given to PSUM's concrete representative in the municipality's council, then it would be good; but they only think that they have made on the latter is attacks. Naturally, this is not conducive to a proper discussion.

The congress that was held in Hermosillo was not an anti-unification congress; from the outset it was agreed to give a voice to all party members, even if they were not delegates, and even to the guests, so that they would not be left without saying what they felt. And I think that, if many comrades have

now joined, they entered the congress only to threaten to leave before it, making a prior conclusions without knowing what was going to happen; because there are other aspects of an emotional nature about them, such as a situation involving leaving or refusing to participate in a state committee without knowing the final result. The fact that the members of a certain committee are not to our liking is no reason for us not to participate in it. I do not consider those to be constructive types of behavior.

We think that the congress in the state of Sonora explained a situation which was very ambiguous, and that progress was made, because it managed to legalize the party in the state in the eyes of the public, the government and the party's members themselves. It managed to consolidate a leadership in which, although not all the elements that should have participated therein did so, there are elements participating which came from an organization such as the defunct PPM, no less. There are two comrades who came from the former Communist Party, and five more who did not belong to any party. The other matter decided on was that of elimination, but that was due to different reasons. That's all.

The foregoing comrade made mention of J. Luis Concheiro. He was given the floor for 3 minutes.

Juan Luis Concheiro

I only wanted to state that what I mean is to apply the statutes, to create groundwork, but if the Central Committee should issue a political decision regarding the Sonora congress, we would not give the comrades who were left out of the leadership in Sonora any opportunity to undertake an effort within the bounds of the party's statutes, these statutes that we have. There is no need to invent others, but if we do not recognize that the party did not emerge united, there will be no participation by a sizable portion of the party in the affairs of Sonora. We must also admit that what we, as a Central Committee proposed for Sonora failed 100 percent, the main point of which was unity. So that is what must be stated, nothing else.

Eloi Vazquez

Well, comrades, I think that the first thing, when discussing the party's unity, must be to define what type of unity we can talk about. In the first place, I think that the party is a party with unity in the area of theory; but it seems to me that, in that of practice, not only does it have different kinds of practice, but also there exists now a dynamics in the differentiation of the practice, both in the party as a whole and among the party members individually. Although this may appear to have its origin only in the groups which formed PSUM, it appears to me not to have been there alone. There are phenomena, which other comrades have already mentioned, whereby comrades from the same group engage in or carry out different practices, and in a highly polarized process of differentiation.

I think that we have a common program, but it seems to me that we do not really have a common strategy. We have a differentiated strategy from the standpoint,

for example, that when mention is made of a new government, or of changing this government, each one interprets that as something different, and there have been no in depth discussions here on this subject. We are living completely in the past when we talk about democracy, which we need to define. We must give substance to the concept of democracy that each one of us has in mind.

On the other hand, at the second congress we actually agreed on common tactics in the theoretical, fundamental and regulatory areas. But those common tactics, also, because of the great difference that exists in the interpretation of concepts, are often interpreted by each individual as he wishes. This, too, results in a differentiated political practice that is reflected in an entire series of problems that we are observing here. On the other hand, we have common regulations, which are the statutes, but I think that, to a certain extent, they represent a rather inflexible expression of what the party is at present and what it needs. There are many forms of organization which the comrades, and I am speaking mainly about the rural sections of Oaxaca and the teachers in SNTE [National Trade Union of Education Workers] in Oaxaca, are adopting; and it is really quite complicated to include them within the regulations that exist in the party. We have the situation that there is a party practice that is not in keeping, to a large extent in these areas that I have mentioned, with the regulations that we have agreed upon. To that extent, I don't think that there is anything more to be said. All right, let's apply the statutes, or let the second congress' tactics be applied. But, of necessity, the area between that theory and that practice must contain an organic middle ground that will make it possible for this coordination to occur. But, in addition, this coordination must be unified, so as to allow the entire party as a whole to respond in a uniform way to the regulations agreed upon. And in this connection I think that, for example, in the realm of ideology, which is the largest realm of differentiation, we cannot arrive at a single ideology. However, I do think that certain mechanisms could be established covering certain conditions for discussion that will stimulate the ideological differences, not only making ideological differences in statements but also making ideological differences with regard to summarizing a concrete theory for the Mexican socialism of each one of those ideological groups, each of which I think has great resources, and will make a major contribution to the development of socialism in Mexico.

Moreover, I am thinking of the area of strategy. Conferences, although they are actually an important occasion for discussing and preparing the common strategy, are insufficient. There must be another type of mechanism for internal communication. One of them might be the participation of the sections of the Central Committee, but not just the voluntary participation of everyone who wants to contribute and prepare. In this connection, it seems to me that, to meet the needs for preparation in this party, the instrument of the press alone is inadequate. Apart from its effectiveness among the members, I think that it should be a matter that covers far more; in this regard, perhaps the holding of forums or meetings, or the use of radio, in short, some possibility for actively engaging in the preparation of policy, and not just preparation by the group of comrades who are specialists serving in an organ of the party's leadership. And I am not talking merely about the Central

Committee, but also about the state committees themselves, on all levels of the party. For example, it seems to me that the meeting of secretaries general that we will be holding within 3 days could have been better, for the purposes of this meeting; if a previous meeting of the Central Committee's Political Commission had been held with the secretaries general, before devising the document proposal to discuss the issue of party unity. It seems to me that this opportunity would lend more enhancement and more practical substance to the Central Committee's proposals. This type of mechanism is what I propose and, in this type of mechanism, in this structure, there must be the opportunity for all the ideological movements that exist in the party, all the revolutionary-Marxist-Leninist movements, to express themselves. I even propose, comrades, that comrades who voluntarily wish to contribute do so; that they participate in meetings and prepare documents, and that we attempt to create an atmosphere of discussion, a fraternal, democratic atmosphere for preparing policy.

I shall move to the more concrete issue. I think that the most important element of political practice is the matter of power, the matter of the one exercising leadership. And this is precisely the area in which there is some division in this party at present. There is a leadership, but it seems to me that, to a certain extent, it is not performing a coordinating function between the party's theory and practice, because it is decimated. I don't think that any expedient should be spared, and in this respect I am self-critical regarding my own state entity. No expedient should be spared under the current conditions, either by those who do not agree with the composition of the leadership at a given time and by those who are in agreement over part of the composition of the leadership bodies. And, generally speaking there should be an attitude of attempting to make up these leadership elements as key elements that will make the party's political work possible. In this connection, I don't know; I have some suggestions that might perhaps prove useful. In the first place, I think that one of the important groups, which Comrade Olac has already mentioned here, is that of the comrade members who joined the party without coming from any of the movements. On one occasion I came out in favor of massive affiliation, in the sense that the comrades joining the party without having come from any of the movements were trying to retain a PSUM position. And I, personally, harbor great hope that the comrades who have joined under those conditions, provided they are not really involved in the struggle in this way, or aligned in a forced manner, but rather choose voluntarily, each according to his own aspiration, his own experience, his own judgment and his own study, what they may be developing, and the training that they may be engaged in, that each one of them may be among the key elements which could join the leadership and lend the party greater strength.

In conclusion, I would like to propose that, in the concrete area of the party work issue, I think that a central effort is needed that would serve to change the dynamics of political dispersion in practice that exists in the party. We must seek an agglutinating element, perhaps a central objective. I don't know; I have no suggestion right now, but it should be a task for all of us.

Adolfo Salazar

Comrades, discussing the party's internal problems is an easy matter. We have heard the first address of this Central Committee, reflecting a position for dealing with these problems. It is claimed that there are comrades who are not in the party's leadership where they should be. One might think that there are comrades who lead the party and who are not in the leadership; and this also presumes that there are comrades in the leadership who are not leading in the party. So, comrades, I think that we must be clear about the party's situation; acknowledging it fully and then also taking action as a result. I do not agree, if it is said that there are comrades outside who should be in, I don't think that this problem alone should be added or incorporated. Someone here, I think it was Olac, said that it was necessary to seek another mechanism, another format. I actually believe that a party leadership should be formed; not adding comrades who, it is claimed, are not in the leadership.

Now, comrades, does the party's problem really lie in the Central Committee alone? I think not, but it is reflected in the Central Committee, and in the entire party. I do believe that this exists. How does the Central Committee operate? Or how was the Central Committee operating? What is its composition as a higher leadership organ for the tasks of unity of action and political unity that we in the party talk about so much? What is the participation of the Central Committee, and its sections, in the genuine formation of the party, in the genuine construction of the party all over the country? And this, I repeat, is reflected throughout the entire breadth of the party. What is the operation of the state committees like? And I shall make a brief comment here. In other words, it should be understood that I am talking fundamentally about what I know directly, namely, Sinaloa. But I don't think that we in the party are dissociated from the national reality. So, what is the operation of the state committees like? For example, it is claimed in ours, and by chance the secretary general himself and the comrade assigned by the Central Committee to deal with the party in Sinaloa heard this, it is claimed that the party is not operating because there is no political line, because there is no preparation. But we have also said that many of the party comrades are not even familiar with the statutes, the program, the declaration of principles; and, what is even more important, the preparation that exists in the party's operation; admitting that, in some instances, it is true that the party has lagged, and has not even responded in a timely manner. But to claim that the party is not operating because it has nothing to do, that is not so, that is not so.

And how are the municipal committees operating? In our opinion they are the most important intermediate organizations, because whether the party's rank and file, the bulk of the party, works and operates, and whether the party is alive and acting, depends upon them. And, comrades, I believe that these issues alone must be discussed. I remember that at the previous Central Committee meeting, it was claimed: "This Central Committee has made decisions about which not even the rank and file know; much less putting them into practice." And, comrades, that is true; and it was said in the Central

Committee, in the highest leadership organ of this party, and it is true. That situation pains one, comrades, it pains one. But that situation is repeated on the state level and the municipal level; and it does not even exist in many rank and file organizations, because they do not meet and do not make any decisions. Comrades, we have held discussions wherein fundamental questions have arisen again; they are fundamental, and we must give explanations. It is claimed: "The problems of the second congress, the problems of the Central Committee, are affecting the party's entire rank and file." But we do not say which problems. So, comrades, I think that we must state which problems they are. But not among ourselves, who know them; rather it must be told to the state committees; it must be told to the municipal committees; it must be told to the party's rank and file. Let the comrades learn about those problems, so that they can express an opinion and can act as a result, also; because otherwise, comrades, one would sometimes think that the parts of the Central Committee, which is supported by the party's other organizations, are being removed, and it is being left in the air with the problems that it is discussing above. Because many comrades do not understand or know about them, or they are misinformed.

About what party are we speaking? What party do we want? I think that we must state this now, not here; I repeat, we already know, but tell it to the party's rank and file, to the entire party. I mention what party we want because some comrades uphold certain party positions that we want, but there are comrades who are not familiar with them, and do not know. There have been discussions in the states in which they have said: "No, comrades, we are not in the position of 10 years ago; the membership is no longer the sell-out type, going about late, in the early morning hours, with a bucket of paint, looking behind and on the run; no, that is all over now. Now, the members have changed; they have a different mentality and demand their free time; they demand their time to provide for their families or their affairs. That is over now." Comrades, we say that it is not; that we need the inspiration that has been lost in the party; that we need the dedication to the party's tasks, and for construction. And so, when there are these two opinions, we are thinking of a different party. That is what I am talking about; it must be said. And as for those comrades who state it, fine, we already know that this comrade has that opinion, that idea. But there are many comrades who think the same or who actually do the same and do not say so. So, one does not know what kind of comrades he is operating with, or what kind of comrades we have; because they do not say, and they continue to take advantage of internal meetings, congresses and conferences to engage in maneuvers.

For example, we have been surprised by the issue involving Sonora brought up here, in the Central Committee; that the latter should voice a critical opinion, an indication, an assessment. This is how I interpret the Sonora congress: that the commission did not comply, that it was told to formulate a question on unity and, in the end, this was not achieved. But, comrades, I don't think that this depends on an order. It has been reported here that several comrades participated, and that is what we must interpret, not transcending that situation which exists in Sonora, which the comrades at the

Congress monitored. The Central Committee, which lacks the authority for this, made a statement, and we noticed the manner, the importance attached here to the problem of the per diems, as the deputy from Sonora said. I don't think that it should be the only one, and by this I am not trying to overlook the liability; but nothing was said about the other cases, although it is not up to this Central Committee. But we have such cases in Sinaloa too, and we have not made that a problem which would keep us further removed from what we could be. We have not made that a problem which would hurt us there. There have even been express requests to the party leadership to make the case of one of the deputies completely without per diems and completely biased toward the weak side. This is why we have not raised an outcry to the heavens. So, we should examine matters in a general, rational manner also.

Finally, comrades, I am thinking of what, in the case of PPS, might be disturbing many comrades, among whom I include myself, who will oppose participation in an alliance with that organization, and not because minor issues are involved. I believe that the events of PPS's everyday practice are well known, and I don't think that it is a matter of coming out with the idea of a broad front, a broad alliance. I believe that what is at stake here are the principles, and the sound, honest, upright, revolutionary quality of our party's action; and that we must consider carefully with whom we intend to join.

Arnoldo Martinez

I would only ask Adolfo to be more precise about the matter of Sinaloa; because I don't think that they are dedicated to the party....

Adolfo Salazar (Response)

I shall specify. The party in Sinaloa has three deputies, two actually from PSUM and one from the Socialist Movement. The PSUM members are Comrade Patricio Guillen Zavala and Comrade Ruben Rocha Moya. The latter comrade, Ruben Rocha Moya, who is in his sabbatical year, I think they call it, at the university and is being paid his salary at the university, expressed his decision, his consent, to turn over the entire salary from the Chamber to the party. The latter gave the comrade only 15,000 pesos per month for gasoline expenses. Comrade Guillen Zavala was assigned a salary of 45,000 pesos per month. It appears that, when this meeting was held, they were earning 57,000 pesos as deputies; at the time, Comrade Patricio was turning over 12,000 pesos per month from the Chamber; look at the amount. Nevertheless, it has not been turned over; and there was, as I reported, there was a request from Comrade Patricio, even commanding some attention from the secretary general of the program, for a meeting of the executive commission on the subject; because the comrade secretary general had in his possession for several days, I don't know how many, a written request from the CIOAC organization asking that all the per diem earnings of Comrade Patricio as a deputy be turned over to the CIOAC of which he is secretary general. Nothing of the kind was decided by the executive commission at that meeting, but the proposal was made; and there has not been any turnover to date of that small portion; because, as we said there, comrades, it is not

worthwhile fighting, and creating conflicts. Nevertheless, I say, we noticed the manner in which the assertion has been made in some cases, and we have others that we have not put on the level of this discussion.

Rodolfo Echeverria

In my opinion, the document submitted by the political commission does not establish real bases for being able to achieve the party's internal unity. I think that we are all concerned for the party to really be able to progress in a unified manner, carrying ahead the political proposals on which it is agreed. However, I think that up until now no concrete proposals have been made in that direction, so as to be able to find the political mechanisms for real internal unity. It seems to me that only the proposal made by Olac would help to make progress along this path. In my view, Ivan succeeded in outlining some elements; but he made no proposals in this regard.

I want to discuss this later. The document does not propose to us, nor to the party as a whole, nor to the Central Committee, bases for attaining these goals. It gives as an example of the internal division and a state of semi-paralysis in the party the fact that, at the last congress, two lists were used to form the Central Committee. I think that the problem of the lists is one that must be discussed among the members of the party. In my view, the lists in themselves are negative, but more so when there is an attempt to use only one list on the part of the one officiating at or directing the congress. I think that the problem is that the party should have the opportunity to decide by itself, on the basis that only an effort for convincing be made, concerning those who are to be the party's leaders; and on what grounds, for what reason, one is entitled to submit the official list or the single list to a congress. At the second congress, it was not established, nor did they establish, nor was it said, nor has it been said to date, why two lists were submitted, when there was an intention of being able to form one, in a unified way. Moreover, the steps toward achieving unity are not a matter of combining "outstanding leaders" on the political commission. That would mean making the problem of the internal division a mere matter of organizational positions.

The essence of the problem does not lie there. In my opinion, the essence of the party's division contains a group of factors, one of which I stated in a document which I prepared; but on other occasions I have said that the origin itself, the manner in which PSUM came into existence, laid the groundwork for our being in a situation of this kind. But also, there is the very fact that the party began its formation based on a diverse process with different ways of thinking, and different political and ideological positions. It has not continued along that path, respecting the existence of the diversity and plurality that there is in real life. So, it is only the hegemonic sector that has succeeded in imposing itself, or taking, no, not even taking us forward; because it, the party, is semi-paralyzed. No one is being led, at least in my view no one is being led. For this reason, our organization is in the state that it is in now; and an example of this is what is happening in the Federal District. In the DF, the party is virtually broken apart. Olac said rightfully that people are withdrawing in a passive, disillusioned

way. As for the situation that the party is in at present, I am not fully aware of the reasons for it. I attribute it, on the one hand, to the state of the organization at present. And, on the other hand, the current party leadership is divorced from the second congress line. At this congress, a group of political proposals were approved which have not actually been put into practice; hence, there is a tacit divorce in this respect.

In my opinion, if we want to restore internal unity, we must first acknowledge the party's diversity, and the presence of the movements and tendencies. And this should not be done in a declarative manner alone; for these groups should have rights and they should be upheld, because, comrades, the true internal democracy of a revolutionary lies, inseparably, in the presence of the movements and tendencies, the circulation of their ideas, their plans and their alternatives, which should be possible to express horizontally, and not just vertically. They should be able to express their views to the different party committees; the movements should actually be able to express themselves in this way, and have proportional representation. They should not be satanized, as is done surreptitiously in certain areas, particularly here in the DF, in certain delegated committees. They immediately begin satanizing, and pointing the finger; and thus, obviously, the situation tends to become rancorous, instead of their seeking the means of achieving genuine internal unity.

On the other hand, unity would be achieved essentially on political bases; as I said awhile ago, the fact that there is a divorce in the line approved at the second congress has led, conversely, to the establishment, in a partial, unilateral way, of the implementation of political decisions of the Political Commission. And to some extent that has prevented the collective accomplishment of being able to progress in unity. For example, I mean that, at the last plenum, passing mention was made of the issue of the talks with PPS, PST, UIC [Communist Left Unity] and the Socialist Movement. Immediately, 2 days after the plenum ended, a press conference was held; but, in time (it seems only yesterday or recently) agreement was reached with PRT. But there, at the previous plenum, comrades, stress was placed on the need for the policy on alliances not to be concentrated solely on these political organizations which, in my opinion, would be nothing more than a mere "democratic exercise"; because these organizations (particularly the first two, PPS and PST) are closely bound to the state and, obviously, are not involved in the political action of the rest of the leftist organizations, that is, the ones opposed to the policy of the government and the Mexican state. So, in my view, there is no impetus in that direction, of developing dynamics for unity of action with the other leftist organizations, to which I think priority should be given, so as to achieve concrete results.

Now then, the last time I said that we should not attempt to solve the problems of internal unity on the party's top echelon alone. We must go to the rank and file, taking this problem to them, clearly explaining the situation, and organizing the real discussion. Comrades, we are within a few days of the National Conference on Organization, and there is no real discussion organized for these problems. Why? Because there is no interest in this matter. It

has come into existence for concrete, objective reasons. The spirit of the previous political organizations has not died completely. It is still strongly going around. The inertia of the system of the previous organizations has not allowed PSUM to come into complete existence, and that has put us in a crisis situation. I think that there has even been a reproduction of the party model as an "apparat-party," and that a great deal of attention has been paid to this aspect, without affording an opportunity to display another type of organization which would at least do what was initially discerned in 1981. Some of the causes lie in these issues. That is why I think that, probably today, at this plenum, we have taken a few steps toward a process of unity, that will really take seriously the possibility of being able to solve the problems and that will not treat them merely in a declarative, moral way.

Pablo Pascual

Comrades, you must realize that the spirit of the document submitted on the internal problems and on the party's unity, by the Political Commission, obviously has not attempted to take up in such a summarized manner the complex problems that have cropped up in the party, much less to be able to solve them with the stroke of a pen; realizing, beforehand, that there are countless problems. But it is an attempt to start and traverse a path that will actually enable us to compare the different positions that exist in the party, as we know; to compare the political differences that have arisen and to be able to find suitable means for solving those problems and comparing those differences. Because, comrades, what has immobilized the party more than anything is that, realizing that there are problems, it has failed to see that it is not through a cultivation of de facto situations, disinformation, and the distorted, deviated handling of the decisions and the information that they can be solved.

The manner of being able to deal with them is to actually state them directly, and in this way we shall find out whether there are possibilities of hitting upon a suitable method that will enable us to do what we want to do, namely, engage in politics, and also to continue the discussions among ourselves; and not to be in a party merely to hold discussions among ourselves, because, frankly, I don't think that is in anyone's interest.

Comrades, the document which we have submitted accepts a situation that has partially typified the party's existence during the period from the end of the second national congress to date; and it is that a group of comrades disagreeing with the results of the congress, decided, with a political decision and with a political act, and as a political act, not to participate in the party's leadership. And we, perhaps the differences began here, think, and I think, to speak in the singular, that we comprise a party which had its origins in diversity, and they are pursuing what is diverse. But we comprise a party which has diversity as its origin, comrades; and we think that, with that diversity, unity can be achieved, precisely because of its diverse nature. However, there are comrades who believe that unity is uniformity; and I think

they are mistaken; and, all right, there is a view, from the standpoint of what the composition of the party leadership should be, that would make it possible to include the opinions and sectors and personal qualities of the comrades who are most representative of the different views. Why, comrades? Well, because it is actually a party that we consider to relate to a particular time in the country, with its origin and its plan supported in terms of the country's situation, and a party which demands the inclusion of extensive sectors from the country's democratic left; one which wants to transform this country, yes, to transform this country, so that it will be a more just and better country. It is one which has incorporated, from its origin, the diversity not only of what are termed comrades flowing in from the organizations that gave rise to the party, but also of these organizations which had a different profile and political positions, and a different view of the country. But an aspiration united us, comrades, and a need for a political activity that this country demands also united us.

If we agree with this diversity which by no means represents an acceptance of schizophrenia, but merely diversity, if we agree on this, then we are thinking of a type of leadership for the party, and a type of party. There may perhaps be comrades who think that this is not what there should be; but rather that there should be a leadership which is uniform, with the same thinking, the same view of the country and the same behavior. Then they are thinking of a different party; so this must be discussed, comrades. And it must be brought up openly, because it is not really a problem of personalities; it is a problem involving the view of the party which is also associated with another main problem. Because some think that this party is based on the situation that the country is undergoing, and the need for a broad policy, which demands making the left in this country unite the left. And uniting the left does not mean uniting the titles, comrades; uniting the left and uniting the left and the democratic sectors means really combining extensive sectors of this country to cope with the escalation that it is experiencing of a reactionary process that we are undergoing, with the progress of the right, the policy of the United States, etc. It is a crisis situation. But, at best there are comrades who therefore think that a different party is needed, because they think that there is a different situation in the country. Let's discuss it. Because one comrade remarked: We all know the problems. I don't know them all. What I know is what is trivial and the way in which it is translated into concrete policy in different locations: what someone said and what one or another group did. But we have not discussed the political background, if those differences exist. Because, comrades, if those differences do not exist, it is more serious; it is merely a problem of the one who has the apparatus, to the ones who don't like the apparatus; and then, well, let's bring the political problems to light.

I would emphasize: What party were we thinking of when we created PSUM? What party is needed at this time, based on the political situation that is being experienced? Comrades, it also relates to the policy of alliances. Or do we think that we are sufficient to be able to cope with the government and the right? Or is it merely a declarative problem? Or do we actually have to show a broad spectrum of alliances that will in no way make our causes and our

demands decline, or deprive us of any personal quality? Rather, we would merely become a pivot for a broad democratic alliance with which to confront the reactionaries, to confront the right, to propose alternatives, comrades, to bring forward the democratic policy in this country and to win democracy in the country. That is associated with the policy of alliances. And so, at best there may be some party title or other that could make us wince; there are many that make me wince; but, unfortunately, they are there, comrades, and they are not precisely the principal enemy, as the Chinese would say; they are not. The enemy is someone else; the principal enemies are someone else. And also, comrades, on the issue of the policy of alliances, there is a difference which is not merely trivial or related to party titles; it is also related to the view that one has of the country. Let's bring it out.

A certain policy of alliances was approved here, apparently by a wide majority. It is not true that it was done with the stroke of a pen, that it was a brush stroke or that it was done secretly. Comrades, it was stated that a broad policy of alliances was needed, which would be carried out in different ways and in different forms. And there was agreement on the essentials. But it turns out that, in the end, there was no agreement on that; so there is a difference here; so let it come out, so that we can actually compare it, because it is, I insist, due to different views of the party that is required and the current time and situation that the country is experiencing.

When it was stated in the Political Commission's document that comrades who decided not to participate in the leadership must be included, it was because this was necessary, because it was necessary based on the view of a broad party; a party in which there would not actually be one movement, one bloc or a particular hegemonic faction, but rather, we would construct a leadership. So, if what it is intended to propose, or what may be thought or inferred from a statement is that this leadership, the one that is present now, the entire leadership, is not based on the party's requirements, then let it be said, let it be said, and propose a restructuring of the entire leadership, of the Political Commission. And let there be a statement on the profile of the Political Commission that is being proposed as an alternative, so as to embark on an actual discussion as to whether it is what the party needs at present. Because, comrades, if not, this is merely questioning in a vacuum.

Here in this document there is, I insist, a proposal that starts with a basic idea that a broad incorporation and participation is needed in the leadership. If one does not agree with this, let the different option be submitted. There are some comrades for whom political participation is, obviously a personal decision, and if it is a personal decision, comrades, some responsibility or other should be assumed, too. It is a personal decision, and any personal decision is completely respectable in this realm of decisions made in the party; but personal decisions should not become the political characterization of activity. In other words, they must not determine our political discussions, comrades, but rather our discussion. The mechanism for solving

the problem of unity is for us to confront our differences in a unified way; and this is a matter of desire, not one of statutes. It is a matter of desire, of accepting the fact that we are different. In some instances we have different views, but we have a desire for unity; and if we have that perspective, we shall be able to progress. I think that it was in that spirit that the Political Commission's document was submitted; not, I would stress, to solve the problem of differences, of which there are many, with the stroke of a pen, but rather to start upon a course of action that will enable us to solve them.

Francisco Javier Pizarro

Comrades, I think that in dealing with PSUM's internal situation, it is not enough to assume a complaining position and propose a kind of Christian ethic, with good intentions, for solving the problems. I think that a long list could actually be made of the internal problems being experienced by the party, but it seems to me that, more important than that, is to dilucidate very concretely whether we have seriously and responsibly considered the problem of PSUM's tributaries; because this concept, which in a way we have stolen from hydrography, so to speak, expresses concretely that something has to flow out. I would take up again the matter of whether the political pact which gave rise to PSUM is being challenged at present; because, actually, it seems to me that this is the principal problem. And what was the political pact? That for giving rise to a revolutionary, independent, socialist party of masses, which would really have a chance of amalgamating broad sectors of the working population, and of waging a decisive battle for democracy and socialism in this country. And, comrades, it seems to me that the tributaries have become depleted; it seems to me that what these tributaries had to contribute has already been contributed; and if the streams are dry, comrades, we run the risk of the PSUM river's also becoming dry. Because it seems to me that there is no real tributary if it does not contribute something to this endeavor, if it does not make a really substantial contribution to the party's development. And at this point I wonder, and state the problem: What correlation is there between the struggle for internal unity and the struggle to bring forward the PSUM plan? This is a fundamental problem in my view; and it is a fundamental problem because we want unity in order to give an impetus to the PSUM plan. Otherwise, it would not make sense to maintain the pact which gave rise to this party. If we are going to fight for the internal unity of this party in order to destroy PSUM, then, comrades, it seems to me that the unity problem is not being considered properly. I believe that there is something transcending tributaries, namely, the party plan itself, which we have devised. I believe that this transcends the tributaries; and, instead of thinking of how those tributaries are going to be represented, we should be thinking of how we are going to give PSUM an impetus.

Why do I bring up this situation? Because, comrades, it seems to me that we have not broken off, that the party at present has no single, collective experience that would even have produced traditions of its own; and for this

reason, the phenomena that have been cited here, that there is no sacrifice, that there is no dedication, that we are lacking in that revolutionary inspiration; comrades, this is created in the revolutionary struggle and in the political struggle. And if we have not engaged in those political struggles as the PSUM, the past must necessarily carry more weight than the present in our perspectives as a new party. And, comrades, this is why I consider it very important for us to recover that original design. And at this point I shall bring up a matter that I have already mentioned, namely, the problem of diversity. I mean that it was very difficult for me, personally, to understand this idea of a party; it was extremely difficult for me to understand, exactly, that this was something different, something new, in comparison with the previous party groups that were being instigated.

What I don't understand now, comrades (I definitely think that those who have brought it up did not reflect on it sufficiently) is that there cannot be a real differentiation unless there is a real process of integration. I don't understand what difference there can be if it is not united. I don't understand how we are going to give a political and organizational outlet and voice to the different movements that exist in PSUM if they have not become united on the essentials. And it seems to me that this is a constant process. It seems to me that this differentiation process must necessarily entail the issue of organization, comrades. I don't think that democracy really exists in the party if these discussions, these debates and these confrontations are not contributing to the development of unity of action in the party. That could be anything but democracy. It seems to me that that could be anything, because it is not expressing the will of the majority of those of us comprising this party, and the will of the majority of those of us who comprise this party is to lend it life, lend it presence, lend it strength, and clearly define it as a revolutionary political force opposing the system and the government.

Another problem is the problem of tactics. I have the impression that the problems involving tactics, and our political conduct, are discussed, rather than in relation to the classes that we have to confront, rather than in relation to the other parties and rather than in relation to the state, are being discussed more with respect to the internal area. So, comrades, it seems that, in each particular issue on which the party has to establish a position to regulate its conduct, we begin by preparing documents for history, and in a very clear manner, leave certain museum pieces so that, in the future, it will not be said of us that we were not revolutionaries, that we were not consistently socialists. It seems to me that the matter of political preparation has no connection with the matter of ideologizing our differences. It seems to me to be associated with the understanding of the reality, with the debate on the reality that we are seeking to confront; which is precisely the only reference point from which we can stop discussing what forms of organization we are contriving, what principles we are contriving and even what differences we are contriving, so as to be able to lend life to this party.

The only thing that the blocs and factions, or the movements organized in a systematic, permanent manner, do is to refuse the real tributaries, the real

contributions to the party. It seems to me that from the time that it was created, it was based on the idea of giving a voice or an existence to different parties within PSUM itself. This should be stated very seriously if we still share the same plan. It must be stated very seriously if what unites us is a majority regarding the essentials, and what divides us is secondary, or else becomes an essential issue. For example, it has been noted here that we must seek integration rather than the voice of majorities and minorities, that we must seek consensus rather than votes; but I wonder: what consensuses can we discuss? What united position can we discuss with comrades who do not yet have a position of consensus or a position of unity? In other words, we are talking here about democracy; but you must realize, comrades, I feel and we have had this kind of experience, that it is democratic when one is in the minority, and it is extremely anti-democratic when one is in the majority. Then, the problem becomes different; then the problem becomes extensively different. And so it turns out that they come here and tell us for example, in connection with the case of Sonora, that those who left and those who did not stay in the State Committee excluded themselves, and it is a very individual problem for them. But, on the other hand, they tell us that, as a political conduct after the second congress, they refused to belong to the Political Commission, so they were not given proper consideration; they were excluded, they did not exclude themselves. Therein lies a problem of alienation.

I don't understand the handling of these concepts. It seems to me that exclusion and self-exclusion must be expressed with very concrete facts. For example, we must review (I think that Comrade Salazar said this) exactly how the Central Committee was formed; and this is based, rather than on our making a mere summary of the discussions that have been held, on how the different commissions and areas have operated. Because I understand that there are comrades who have done absolutely nothing as heads of their areas and commissions; and this, too, is an anti-democratic situation. The fact that some are constructing the party and others are boycotting it is deeply anti-democratic situation. The differences are no problem for the party's development provided that they do not lead to parallel groups and disciplines. Furthermore, it is right that the different movements in the party should fight to advance, but not on the basis of destroying the party, rather, of constructing it.

Jesus Sosa Castro

Comrades, I share completely the approach that Comrade Francisco Pizarro has taken regarding this principal problem that we are examining now. However, I wish to cite a few other issues that seem to me to be present in this discussion, and that we should try in some way to talk about and discuss among ourselves, for the purpose of progressing with the solution to a problem which, in my view, is the one now facing the party as a whole. I think, and I was even one of those who had this opinion, that at the party's first congress, that is, during the period of the national assembly on unification, only during this period, the first congress received an explanation of the validity of forming the party's leadership organs in a proportional

manner, that is to say, in proportion to the strength and the representative status that had been ascribed to each of the forces that we had brought together in PSUM. I thought that, as early as the first congress, it was possible to apply a different kind of criterion to the formation of the leadership organs; however, that was still moved to the second congress, and at the latter different methods were applied which several comrades have detailed here. But I think that part of these issues that we have discussed more or less in the Central Committee is something not yet known to the party's rank and file; and, to a certain extent, the party's rank and file itself endorses political conduct that occurs among members of the Central Committee, based precisely on ignorance of the origin of the self-exclusion in the leadership organs. I think that this is really so, because there are some statements such as those made here, to the effect that someone who had hegemony at the congress circulated one list and then, following this type of procedure, another list was brought out; and, comrades, it seems to me that this is completely untrue, completely untrue. The position was different; but that has not been said; it has been concealed, hasn't it? These issues which are so important and which are not discussed among the party's rank and file have a major influence on whether the rank and file will continue to back procedures that should have been eliminated a long time ago.

The other problem that, in my opinion, is present now is that the party has not been able to extricate itself from these problems, and much of what we are doing, such as efforts for organization, for discussion, for mass activities, etc., is not in keeping with the practice, so to speak. We have been unable to emerge from the party's internal discussions; we are still greatly concerned about these internal problems. I don't think that any of us Central Committee members want a split to occur among the members of PSUM; no one has even brought it up in his speech. But, comrades, I think that this rather calamitous view that certain comrades have stated, to the effect that if this party were to undergo any attrition that would be the end for PSUM, and we would be swept away in the 1985 election campaign; I think that this remains to be seen, comrades. Because we must also consider that sectors, not only those voting now, but sectors of the public that have a political opinion, which they express overtly, I think that they correctly understand and assess what is a discrepancy and is a problem among the party's members now. I believe that there are distinctions to be made, in this comparison that I shall make: the example of the Spanish Communist Party. This Communist Party is divided; it has suffered a very serious internal problem. Some predicted a total destruction for it, and those of us who have in any way been informed of the recent progress of that party are shocked, for example, at the fact that its recent festival was attended by nearly a million people; that the party is currently not discussing the internal problems, but is rather, fundamentally, placing stress on the mass struggle, and is carrying out mass movements and actions on the streets in a very prominent and very significant manner, precisely, confronting the problems which the party had not confronted previously. Of course, I am not saying that I would want a split to occur in the party; no, by no means. Comrades, I hope that we can surmount this problem as quickly as possible, and become an alternative for

other forces which are alert to what PSUM can do, to what PSUM should do. But, comrades, I don't think that, if it reached that situation, which no one wants, it would mean the end of the party. I think not; we are still equipped to remedy these situations correctly and to come out ahead. I hope that this is among the topics that are to be brought into our discussion.

Moreover, comrades, a problem that we have repeatedly been citing for a rather long time, since February of this year, is the problem of the comrade deputies, the ones who are keeping the per diem; because I think that there are instances wherein it is obvious that they are in a process of rectification. It seems to me that this holds true, I would say it was the only instance, of Comrade Raul Rea Carbajal. But we should ask the others to spare us having to listen to them every time in the plenums arguing about matters that cannot be argued; because this seems to me diversionary, and distracting the attention of the Central Committee, which could be engaged in discussing different kinds of matters.

I am also in agreement, and think that we should start working in that direction, concerning a very interesting question brought up by Comrade Olac; in other words, we are being told about this type of problem involving federal deputies and local deputies; but there are some other problems. There have been repeated violations of the statutory regulations, violations of the Central Committee's proposals and rules; as well as violations of the Parliamentary Group's rules, and certainly of other lesser regulations as well. There has now been proposed something that Olac termed rules of tolerance among us. I don't think it would be asking too much for us to state the extent to which we are capable of withstanding, what things we can withstand and what things it is not fitting for us to tolerate in the party, if this is not to become excessive and turn into a conflict with different dimensions. For example, I don't think that a comparison can be made of the situation of this comrade deputy from Sinaloa who, of course it is not proper that.... I infer that he has not turned over his per diem to the State Committee, but rather is collecting it and keeping the rest, with his respective per diems; of course what this comrade is doing is not proper, and steps must be taken to try to settle it. But it does not seem to me that the case of this comrade is the same as that of the comrade from Sonora wherein, besides keeping the per diems, he is taking money which the party gave for a concrete purpose, undertaking to act in a dishonest way from a political standpoint, neglecting the defense of the party's political line. And, comrades, I think that this is reprehensible and, furthermore, it is not in the same proportion. This is why I think that we must try to resolve situations like this in the best way possible; because it has been stated here to the point of satiety that, at best, it has not been undertaken correctly to apply the statutory regulations to comrades who have been in violation, and that, from a statutory standpoint, clearcut penalties are being imposed in the matter of the per diems. But, comrades, I don't think that we can spend our lives discussing these problems without reaching conclusions, not settling these matters suitably; because then the party's existence would be distorted and, in particular, we would be victims of a situation wherein, after awhile, any popular representative could commit these distortions without anyone's calling his attention to it.

Luis Javier Valero

Comrades, I believe that, at this meeting, this is my view, we should start discussing the real causes that have given rise to the situation that the party is undergoing at present. But one essential requisite for this is that we must act truthfully and honestly, and what we say must be backed by action, because if not, we shall not progress. In the time that we have had, and we have had 3 years of PSUM already, through contact with different comrades all over the country, and the different groups which created the party, today, I think that there is a group of comrades who, owing to their training and their very lives, have come to the conclusion that they are comrades who should lead the party, above all the other party members. Apart from the principles that we have adopted, at the national assembly on unification and at the first congress of the party, we adopted concepts such as the one that a university graduate is more valuable than a real leader of a communal farm or a town. And I think that this is a flaw which the left has been adopting for many years, and that it has caused the class that we want to have in the party, namely, the working class, not to be present. Because the presumptuousness of the petite bourgeoisie which has penetrated the leftist parties has caused the abandonment of that humility and simplicity of those who are truly leaders.

I believe that this group of party comrades, their concept and their training, have caused them to damage the process of merger in the party. And there were even statements at the second national congress, where in my view this concept created a crisis, there were statements to the effect that this minority, this group of comrades, had to save PSUM from falling into the clutches of Alejandro Gascon and the group of comrades who were with him for a long time, and who, for a month and a half or two months before the second national congress, triggered a very deplorable satanizing campaign even among members of the left promoting the socialist revolution.

This prompted a group of de facto maneuvers at the second national congress which I do not wish to describe now; but the bulk of the delegates, in order to ensure a majority in the congress that would enable them, not to have the leadership or not to maintain a political line in accordance with them, but rather to maintain the party leadership, prompted a group of maneuvers to occur at the second national congress which have now been scored by many and which are known to most of the party members. And, Ortega has already done so, we even had to adopt a resolution in this Central Committee making it possible to publish at least that opinion of the actions which occurred at that congress. But the party's rank and file reacted; even those who attended the second national congress, who already had a list and who were already completely instructed to vote in favor of a group or of certain persons, or just one comrade. They also reacted, based on the conditions under which the country is developing and, together with the actual, real delegates to the congress, they adopted and voted for a political line which was a result of an extensive, difficult discussion, at least in the Central Committee, that proved to be a discussion which defeated the convergences, causing us to come out in favor of a democratic, popular government, and to hold a very intensive discussion of the party's trade union policy. And it was this

political concept that won at the second national congress; in contrast to those who now have the majority or who comprise the majority of the Central Committee, whose political concept, in my view, is totally opposed to what was voted on at that congress. And it is here that I think the party's main problem lies now: that there is a party leadership incapable of applying the political line that the second national congress approved and, not only the national congress, but this resulted from the fact that the vast majority of the party was in agreement with this policy which, I believe, from the second national congress to date, has been misinterpreted; and, on some occasions, there has been action countering that political line approved at the second congress. It is not that a vacuum has been made out of the Central Committee's resolutions, comrades, I don't think so; or that this is a systematic way of seeing to it that the Central Committee's resolutions and the guidelines approved at the plenums are not adopted by the majority of the party. It is not due to there being a vacuum; it is simply due to the fact that it is a policy that is not geared to the country's present situation, nor is it geared to what most of the party's members, the rank and file, think of it. And this political line is the one upheld now by the majority of the Central Committee; because it put the final touches on it; although it is true that, at the last plenum, we approved our confrontation of the current situation, of the growth of PAN, of all these things; and our struggle for a broad alliance of leftist forces. So, comrades, no one is opposed to that; and for this reason I was not opposed to it. Ah! but 2 days after that they did it in a very, very, I would say even malicious way, with a photograph which speaks, I don't even want to get to the document, the mere photograph of the five secretaries general signing a pact in which most of the points of the pact, of this appeal, most of them are not based on the political line approved by the party, by the Central Committee, even by this one. In my opinion, and I think we must do this, we should make every effort that is sufficient, or even impossible, to achieve internal unity in PSUM; but, comrades, the Political Commission seems to be more of a champion of unity outside the party and a champion of internal division. One needs a little political sensitivity to understand that a sizable portion of the party cannot make an electoral alliance with PPS. That should be clearly understood. We need to have political sensitivity, comrades.

Since at least October of last year, we have expended efforts to go to the mass organizations, to approach what we in the last plenum called the "radical left." So, we approached PMT and PRT. We must seek an electoral alliance in that direction; because it is impossible for us to become allied with PPS and PST, comrades. I believe that the party's main problem today, and the one we must discuss, is that the leadership has a political line that is not accepted by most of the party. It is there that the party's problem lies.

One essential aspect of the party's internal existence, since the second congress, has been the problem of diversity. I have my views on diversity; however, I accept those of the national assembly on unification. At plenum after plenum there has been talk of diversity, of respect for the different movements of socialist thinking within the party. But the issue not to make statements, but rather to put them into practice; and at least the majority of the Political Commission, if not all of it, has not adhered to

that. And in a surreptitious manner, using all the party's resources, in a troublemaking way, it has engaged in alienating a group of us comrades who uphold a trend of opinion that is not of the present, estranging us from the rank and file, and voicing a series of slanders and claims that I do not consider to befit those who intend to struggle for socialism.

There is a group of examples that I could give you, the the problems being experienced by the party will not be solved because Alejandro Gascon and Salvador Castaneda and three or four other comrades return to the Political Commission. We (as members of PSUM with different approaches to the country's political activity) need to sit down and establish a new rule for political coexistence within the party, so that we may cause this party to progress. So, I consider it necessary to at least resume the adoption of the second congress' political line.

One final comment: I believe that the situation in Sonora has returned to normal. Experience has now proven that last year's attack on the congress and the party in Sonora was an attack. This is why I consider it ridiculous for it to be said here, and for proposals to be made here calling for our approval of the report which the congress of the party in Sonora censured, and calling for our criticism of the Sonora party congress. Comrades, experience has already taught us several lessons during the course of PSUM's existence; let's not act contrary to what the situation really is. Of course, we must make every effort necessary to achieve unity of the party in Sonora, and not just in Sonora, but all over the country; but let's not bite off more than we can chew.

Jose Woldenberg

I think that the discussion which we have held throughout the plenum, at least for me, poses a question that I consider to be the same one with which the discussion began over the issues related to the need for and possibility of unity in this party. These are not simple matters, and after listening to a group of comrades, I don't think it would be an exaggeration to say that the problems of unity have become more severe, that reconciliation is becoming increasingly difficult and that, after a series of accusations made here, we might ask whether all the members of the Central Committee are willing to endorse the unity pact that gave rise to PSUM. I believe that this is the problem: whether this party is viable in terms of unity, on a principle which meant, among other things: plurality, tolerance, a search for leadership formulas, for consensus, etc.

Despite the way in which this discussion and these issues are taking place, I still think that we must continue to stress the issue of unity; we must because I think that if this plan for unity fails, the ones that have been summoned, the parties and factions which gave rise to it, will not remain where they were at the outset; they will be many years ahead. And we shall observe the destruction of the most ambitious plan for unity of the left in many years. Not only is this a necessity for us, for our biographies, for remaining mentally sound and active in politics; but it will be a reflection of what is going on in the country.

It has become increasingly necessary for the Unified Socialist Party of Mexico, faced with the progress of the right, the current government policy, the situation in Central America and the United States' harassment, to respond with unity. We should be discussing, today, what it is, and whereby we can lend a little likelihood to this party's unity, not how we have completed forging unity because that will take a long time, and the process will keep on; but rather how we can help to forge it, or at least aerate the party's atmosphere. Rather than resolutions, rather than documents, what we have to change is something very ethereal but, in my view, the focal point: We must change the atmosphere of the party's relations. And, comrades, the atmosphere is not a word; it is conduct. Those who have been on the Central Committee from the beginning until now can surely notice that this atmosphere has changed. Whereas, previously, there was listening, now there is no longer listening; previously, the blocs or forces were relatively permeable; now they no longer are. Previously, there was respect for the remarks of the speakers, based on the diversity, ; and we could go on listing these things, which are highly volatile, very difficult to settle in a resolution and even very difficult to agree upon; that is the problem.

How shall I embark on this? I don't think that it is only a problem, although it may be involved in one. I don't wish to discredit this proposal, far from it. It may possibly contribute, it may possibly entail expansion of the Political Commission or structuring the Political Commission, and the Secretariat, to return to the discussion of a pact or the viability of a unity pact. But if all this is not backed by the desire for unity, any movement in that direction will be assessed by others as a pure and simple fabrication. So, since the problem is one of unity, in my view the political desire is central: who are those desiring to unite? This is something that we must embark upon, so as to simply and clearly ascertain whether we think that we can continue working in unity or not. And what does working in unity mean? It might even mean concessions; yes, concessions, which is not a bad word.

It could mean that, among the different forces, there often are loyalties more in the direction of a group or a movement comparing the party, still present; for it appears that there is very little loyalty in that direction. If this is so, even though we don't like it, let's open that discussion, let's find out how we can retrieve the party's original atmosphere. Let's learn whether this is possible and also desirable; because a certain type of adjective and analysis being used might lead me to conclude that there is room in this party for some, but not for all.

Let's embark upon this point, and I hope that it can be translated into agreements and into something which, I stress again, cannot be translated into the area of agreements, which is associated with the atmosphere and the climate in the party.

Finally, the Political Commission has submitted a point in which it acknowledges the need to start discussing these matters, and it even proposes in its resolutions making an appeal to those who at a given time considered it wise not to participate in the Political Commission. There is an appeal to

restructure, to change, to modify and to incorporate comrades in the Political Commission. In my opinion, this does not end the problem, but I consider it a step in the direction of holding the discussion of unity again and not taking it for granted that unity exists in this party, or that this is a party that is already consolidated; or whether it is a party in which many things remain to be tied together, a party under construction. If we agree that this is so, it is possible that many of these issues can be monitored better; if we start with the idea that it is already consolidated, and that the problem of unity has been solved, it is possible that, within a few months, if we fail to create a suitable atmosphere, our participation in the coming elections may be a detonator that the party cannot withstand if it continues under the present conditions.

Pablo Sandoval

Comrades, I think that the Central Committee is making a very significant effort to achieve the party's unity. We must avoid what Valero mentioned here, for it could be a policy of outward unity and inward division.

The proposal to add other comrades to the Political Commission, as Valero noted, would not end the problem, but it could help to start a process in that direction. There is, then, an orientation toward unity, taking into account the fact that we are making a major effort for outward unity.

The situation is forcing us to expend a great effort for unity among the democratic forces of the left in the country. An extensive account has been given here of the conditions that have required it of us: the problem of the crisis, the problem of the bipolarization, the problem of the coming elections, and the appearance during this time of crisis of rather reformist movements very closely associated with the state, such as the movements that have appeared in certain university unions and parties such as Democratic Unity, etc. This has forced us to carry out a process of programmed unification of the democratic leftist forces, in a very urgent manner.

Comrades, I believe that, in this respect, there are bases, there is a PSUM program that affords us leeway for a diversity of alliances with many political forces; and that the statement made to the effect that we have reached an agreement with PPS and PST on the basis of a program which is not that of the party is not valid. Comrades, if we review the statement, there are three points: the problem of peace, the struggle against the imperialist war-mongering policy; a second point is that of the financial problem, the financial crisis, the moratorium, etc.; and a third point regarding the demands of the country's workers, an increase in the minimum wage and contractual wages, the VAT problem, the battle against speculation and concealment of goods, price control, tenant legislation and an increase in guarantee prices.

Comrades, why do we fear relations with any political force if it is based on a clearcut program of principles, such as the one we are advocating? I do not consider it at all logical to be suspicious of this type of alliance, backed by a policy of principles. We have a program and a policy, and on that

basis we have established the allies as they relate to this program, and not the opposite. So, I think that, in fact, there is a tendency which we should develop more. We should really go with PMT. Today, some statements have been made about them, to the effect that they were not in this alliance relationship because they were not invited. I think that we should have acted with greater initiative, stating this issue more overtly. There are other forces with which we need relations as well, with the so-called radical left forces, of course. I believe that we should have proposed these relations with the Revolutionary Civic Association, with OIR-Masses Line and with all the radical leftist organizations; and of course with what has been termed the social left on the national level.

I wish that there could have been forces, as was stated at the previous plenum, which, even though originating in the official and PRI sectors, could, on the basis of a program, agree on this new situation that the country is experiencing. I think that we must act with a great deal of initiative to display these alliance relations with the leftist, democratic forces. It seems to me that this is the most urgent requirement; and to do this I think it would be very constructive for us to cite the need for starting an internal process of regrouping forces. It is in that direction, comrades, that we have had convocations. It was proposed that a party congress be convoked in Guerrero; there were comrades who cited the need for a process to reorganize PSUM's internal forces in Guerrero, and on this basis it was suggested that we should convoke the state congress, which could discuss again the problems of the party's unified integration, its policy and its leadership. There was no obstacle to the accomplishment of this, because it is set in this direction, that of seeking the necessary coordination and the unity of PSUM members in this state. Obviously, the congress would have to take place on the basis of guaranteeing its suitable political planning; in other words, discussion materials, and the planning of a very intensive, developed, internal discussion. And just because there are no conditions for this discussion, because materials have not been submitted, it has been proposed to postpone it and to complete, during this period, the fundamental preparations for the national conference on organization, convoking the state conference on organization. But this does not mean precluding the holding of a congress that will make it possible to bolster this reorganization more, and the combining of the PSUM forces in the state of Guerrero. Hence, I would stress, the state conference on organization has now been convoked.

Valentin Campa

There are very serious problems confronting us, which affect the process that we are applying to the simultaneous hastening of greater internal unity and a greater unity of alliances externally. This situation, so well known, has not even been mentioned. One of the most serious processes that we are confronting is an increasingly more reactionary policy of the government, in agreement

with the grande bourgeoisie associated with United States imperialism. In this respect, I consider the matter of the foreign debt very indicative of this process.

Our party has very forcefully cited the need for the moratorium, and in this connection a debate has taken place; and whereas here, the line of the moratorium was given leeway, even among some sectors of the government itself, and PRI, they have had to embark on a violent debate against the moratorium.

In Buenos Aires, confronted with a very strong campaign of the Peronists, which appeared at the same time in Bolivia and Santo Domingo, De la Madrid stated that we who favor the moratorium were very frivolous. This adjective was completely arbitrary; and we could prove that, based on this, Benito Juarez was frivolous, because he applied a moratorium against the pastry factory; and Venustiano Carranza, at the height of the Mexican revolution, approved the moratorium. Now, with great levity, De la Madrid says that those of us who back the moratorium are assuming macho attitudes. He cannot decide whether we are frivolous or macho. The fact is that the government has assumed an attitude of capitulation to Yankee imperialism, and it is doing so like a fireman so that a major movement in favor of the moratorium will not be deployed in Latin America.

But this problem of the debt affects the entire Mexican people. It is associated with the tremendous drain of \$14 billion to be used this year to pay the interest on the debt; it is associated with the rise in prices of tortillas and rolls, and of water in the Federal District, etc. And, in fact, within government circles they are starting to be concerned about this problem, to the point where Cuauhtemoc Cardenas, at the Michoacan peasant congress, demanded that PRI give top priority to the foreign debt problem; and on the very day that De la Madrid was calling us macho, at a Latin American meeting, PRI congressmen cited the need for a new handling of the debt problem by the creditors. At the same time, there has been a heightening of right wing orientation, which is reflected in all areas of political and social life in our country, and widespread suspension of the union rights of the activists in many trade union organizations by the "charros." Specifically, 11 comrades of Local 147 of Monterrey were deprived of their rights by the renewal movement that has appeared there.

I wish to explain that this expedient of suspending 11 comrades, including, among others, Daniel Media (who was one of the outstanding leaders of the 1975 movement against the "charros," which gave rise to a process of democratization by the Masses Line, that ended up deteriorated in 1984), this suspension of rights was also applied to that comrade; because in 147 there had been an attempt by the PRI "charros" to reject the resolution stating that 147 did not belong to PRI. And they succeeded in this using very despicable maneuvers, at a meeting; but at the next one the union members of 147 reacted, and reaffirmed the resolution that Local 147 does not belong to PRI. We must consider the political significance of this: 147 is the largest local in the Mine Workers Union, and we must realize that Blast Furnaces is the largest industrial workers' center in the Mexican Republic. These are matters that are forgotten in

connection with the urgent need for heightening the unity within PSUM and increasing the capacity for acting in alliances against this reactionary policy.

None of us has a right to observe the exacerbation that exists in the country without realizing our obligation to reinforce the democratic, revolutionary forces. There are among us differences of approach toward the internal problems. For example, with regard to Perez Arreola, there were naive comrades at the first PSUM congress who thought that he had not signed his affiliation with the party merely out of neglect. Some of those of us who had been deputies with him and who discussed the problems at first hand realized Perez Arreola's tendency: it was quite clear that he did not sign his membership in PSUM because he had decided to continue with an orientation quite contrary to PSUM's revolutionary socialist line, and his process of bureaucratization and corruption was displayed immediately after Perez Arreola left PSUM, that is, the revolutionary party. It culminated in what we have observed of his betrayal in the case of the University of Guerrero, where Reyes Heróles wants to impose an unfortunate precedent, including the separation of the university's preparatory schools, the abolishment of the Higher Normal School, and cancellation of the radio broadcast programs; which, if successful, would immediately be extended to the Universities of Puebla and Sinaloa, and even UNAM [National Autonomous University of Mexico].

Nevertheless, incidents have occurred which show a great deal of deterioration in the party. At the Central Committee's third or fourth plenum, Comrade Luis Ortega proposed an attempt to examine the problem of the elections in the UNAM union, and that Perez Arreola be invited to the plenum. Comrades, I think we have gone too far; one need not be a lynx to understand the direction in which these processes have been going.

Finally, I would like to stress that the problem of the battle against corruption is not merely a problem of ethics; it is a political problem. That is why it is unfortunate that there should be a case of someone as corrupt as Carrera, which was taken to the leadership of the Sonora State Committee; the reason for the reinforcement of the crisis that we are witnessing now (even though some comrades claim that the situation is very good). Comrades, we have a divided party now; we and the National Trade Union Commission have played a role cooperating with the Cananea trade union comrades; and we are playing a very important role. And we are going to have to continue playing it, because that is the program and rule of the Unified Socialist Party of Mexico; but under very different conditions, in view of positions such as those of Carrera's comrades who remained on the Sonora State Committee. I wish to emphasize that the paragraph causing contradiction in the report of the Sonora State Committee's commission is the following: Also among the present causes for division is the fact that the commission has been incapable, thus far, of solving the by now old problem that the PSUM deputy in the local congress repeatedly refuses to turn the power of attorney over to the commission, so that the latter may be the one to collect his per diems and pay him his salary as a party professional. Under Carrera's influence, the Sonora Congress rejected the report on account of that paragraph. Accepting this

position would be really deplorable. It is being discussed here with sophistry. It is not only Carrera; there are council members too, pure and simple; and we should not conceal cases, because besides the per diems there is the 21,000 pesos which was given to him and which that gentleman stole.

In conclusion, there must be stipulated in the document the solemn commitment of all PSUM members to discuss our differences within PSUM, in accordance with the agencies and regulations that our party has established. And when it is proposed that others, Gascon and Castaneda, join the Political Commission, if necessary, it is not accurate, as has been claimed here that it is for the purpose of giving them a job; they were reelected by a plenum, and they declined. Very well, they have undergone an experience and I think that it is quite obvious that the differences with Gascon's movement could be better surmounted if we held a discussion in the Political Commission, and not only in the Political Commission. And this is what has been proposed.

Ramon Danzos

Comrades, the discussion of this matter of the party's internal existence is a disturbing one. I don't think it is an exaggeration to say that, instead of progressing (as there has been progress in some areas), in others there has been some very serious retrogression in the party's existence. And unity, both inside and outside the party, in an alliance with other forces, has become an essential situation at present, as has already been said here; it is not excessive to repeat it: that the conditions under which the country is living are very serious for the masses, for the people and for the existence of the parties themselves, because of the government's increasingly oppressive, reactionary policy for developing capitalism that is destroying the people, the working class and the peasants to an increasing extent.

We are alarmed that, since Aleman's time, for example, we have not seen the process of leasing communal land as we are observing it now in the Yaqui valley of Sinaloa. Every day, more plots are being leased from the peasants, to the grande bourgeoisie, of course, with the policy; and even Posadas, head of CNC [National Peasant Confederation], has charged that PAN wants to destroy communal farms. That is untrue, because it is the government that has wanted to destroy the communal farms, and it has been backed by CNC, among others, as in 1946. So, comrades, I think that the problems of unity require a study the problem, not taking 10 minutes; in a way, I favored the proposal for free time, but I think that we should take 15 or 20 minutes, possibly a little longer. But, comrades, 10 minutes to discuss the internal existence, voting by a majority of the Central Committee members, means that we have not applied our full concern to the full discussion. And if it is not completed in 2 or 3 days, we should continue for more days, comrades, discussing these problems.

Because it is not just the problem of Sonora, or the problem of Jalisco, or the problem of Durango, or of Veracruz; it involves the entire national existence of our party. And the disturbing thing is when some comrades

claim that we have theoretical unity in this party. I think that Eloi Vazquez said this today; no, comrades, I have stated at other plenums that we should hold a meeting of the CC, expanded if possible, at least including the secretaries general, to discuss matters of an ideological nature; because it seems to me that the real division in the party exists because we have not achieved a genuine merger in this party, in addition to problems of ideological differences.

I believe that a discussion of that matter would help us to create unity, and to put an end to a group of problems which at times result in wretched positions in our party; so as to try to find the concept regarding the party's organization, and to deal with the political problems.

I have said on other occasions that one of the ideological problems that we should solve is that of what kind of party, with what kind of revolutionary political orientation we have established, and made this effort for unity. For example, there are comrades who have the notion that some of them in the party are Marxist-Leninists, and another group in the party is Euro-communist. Comrades, this is a problem of a political and ideological nature which must be discussed in order to be able to unify views regarding international policy which is very closely related to the party's existence.

Other comrades think that the reasons for this division are that we have an inept leadership consisting of university people, and that leaders should have come from the masses. But, comrades, we are saying one thing here, and when we set up other organizations we make a different policy, using, as we should, many capable professionals from the universities, who can make a contribution, instead of mass leaders, labor leaders. We are always complaining that we lack sufficient labor leaders but, comrades, when our party has an influence on many regions, an influence of a labor nature, we have a different policy, so that they may be in and participate in our party's leadership organs.

It has been said here (and misinterpreted) also, with Pablo Gomez claiming that we should not hold a position of isolation or separation from anyone; but this cannot be handled thusly, nor may we not exclude anyone; this, too, has its limits, comrades. Measures must be adopted in a revolutionary party to exclude or not exclude.

We must actually add, as a general line, and not exclude, as a general line; but, comrades, we are applying a different line for exclusion. So, let's try to observe this in order to analyze it; not going about with generalities, but looking at concrete cases. For example, although the problem of the deputies is not an essential element here, we should concentrate on one comrade and discuss the violation of regulations by one deputy. Comrades, the deputy's position is an assignment given to someone, and what is accrued from it in income belongs to the party, and the party establishes regulations, whoever the deputy or council member may be. If there was no discussion here about the Sonora town halls (about the council members in Hermosillo, Guaymas and Hechojoa), comrades, there was also no discussion of many other deputies and council members who are doing whatever they please and pocketing the money

that belongs to the party. I think that this holds true of Michoacan; I don't know whether it was an appointment of the Political Commission, I don't know whether they appointed him, but I found out there that they did not find the deputy to have him turn over the per diems to the party, and he is a comrade who came from PPM or the Communist Party. And if he is not turning over the per diems, measures should be taken against that comrade (and, furthermore, he is a leader of CIOAC). I am the first one not to agree that this comrade should be pocketing the money that belongs to the party; I am referring to the deputy from Michoacan. And there are others in different places who are doing the same thing.

Why shouldn't the fact that the statutory and party regulations for constructing a party are being broken be an essential issue? And we have claimed that such problems are not important.

They certainly are, comrades, and I think that, from now on, anyone who does not turn it over will have to sign an agreement, in the next elections, that whoever arrives, will sign in advance: stating that the money which he earns in a popularly elected position will go to the party, and if the comrade fails to turn it over, he will cease to be a party member. And mention was made here, asking why we should have the expulsion plan and then why we should have the plan for gross tolerance of comrades who have come to view the party as a stepping-stone to personal business. Or let them do as Florentino Jaimes says: I have expenses and I can prove them; well, surely he can prove them, but why should each individual be doing whatever he pleases with the money that belongs to the party?

And if there is poor management in the leadership, well then, let the problems be observed and disclosed here, concretely. Ah! but I earn money; and instead of turning it over, I only turn over notes. And we know how we can make many notes, too, to prove large amounts of money. That is by now an old story, comrades, of how many public officials steal on the basis of notes and certified invoices, and there are some who invent houses, such as Rios Camarena, who invented a business form so that he would be given the invoice. The firm was non-existent, but the invoice existed. We already know how many things are proven.

It has been claimed here that the problem in Sonora has now been solved; I think that they are in the clouds, because the problem in Sonora has not been solved. A division problem persists. On the one hand, there are people who wanted to attain the leadership; and, on the other, there are improper sectarian positions, also because they cannot be viewed only one one side. But, comrades, the problem in Sonora has not been solved. It is our intention to make a genuine, very strong party in Sonora, because it can be made; but not with these solutions telling us that everything is all right. Comrades, I don't think that we should continue discussing this matter because, as I said at the congress, the problem of Sonora is not a current one; it is older than I, comrades. I think that it has been many years, but at least when I began having the use of political reasoning, there was already that problem of struggle, comrades, between two political groups in Sonora. It is very old,

and I am familiar with it. I think that some day I shall write about it and disseminate it among us, describing the background of the problem, so that we may be able to seek a proper solution, such as physicians do, making a careful examination of the situation so as to adopt suitable solutions.

Finally, comrades, I think that we are not going to solve the problem of inward and outward unity with positions such as those assumed today, even describing as malicious a photograph which appeared of five leaders of groups to prepare a document wherein there are some questions, of which it has been claimed here that they are not within the party line. For I think that they should decide which ones are not within the party line, so as to discuss them concretely, comrades. If the regulations and policy of this party are violated, with a united position, I think that we shall have to say so concretely and expose it concretely; because we cannot allow our principles to be violated in a policy of alliances. Our policy of alliances is that of the party, and it seems to me that to describe them as malicious is a poor attitude. Now, if it is said that we don't want any alliances with this comrade, then we alone remain the pure ones; there are no others purer than we, and everyone else is peanuts.

Comrades, I don't think that it is the policy of outward unity that should concern us now, but rather that of inward unity, and grasping the problems; as they say, taking the bull by the horns. Comrades, there are plenums at which the talking is not on generalities, but rather they take up each problem concretely; because there are many problems, comrades. There are problems in Jalisco which we need to examine, so as to achieve the unity and not the exclusion of members in municipal congresses and state activities. We must start working properly, with a quality of unity; because there are many comrades who say: All right, we are not being allowed to participate here; I think that the prospect of PMT is being offered now; we'll have to act with them, because there is no way of being able to discuss it here. And there is a dangerous issue in this regard.

Raul Rea

Comrades, it was said a moment ago that I had made a correction with respect to the problem of the per diems. The fact is that the problem of the per diems is just beginning to be discussed seriously; therefore, I am keeping my personal opinions to myself, for when the problem of the per diems is really discussed. Its discussion has not yet started. We are all concerned over the problem of unity among the members of PSUM; that is true. I think that this depends essentially on the theoretical interpretation that we make of what our party should be, of the current situation that the country is undergoing, and in the context of the world, as well as the participation that our party should have in this situation. Until we embark seriously on that discussion, I think that the other things will continue to occur in one way or another. For example, I sometimes have the impression that it is not Karl Marx who presides over the work here, but Einstein; because there is so much relativity here. There are problems in Nayarit, in Baja California, in Sonora, in Jalisco and

in Veracruz; and because there are no problems in the other states, the problems are one thing in one place and something else in another place; and based on the statements made by the comrades themselves, the approach to a problem has one nuance and one feature, according to some, but a different and even contrary nuance according to others.

I think that we should lend more integrity to our statements, and in particular, offer actual proof of what we say. For example, here in many CC documents, especially in the latest speech by Comrade Pablo Gomez in Sonora, it is claimed that PRI is incapable of stopping the PAN right; that only the left can do this. But then I am amazed at how we go about making alliances with agencies of PRI, such as PST and PPS; because, all of a sudden, we are talking with Lugo Verduzco or with De La Madrid, who are the bosses, and in this way we rid ourselves of problems.

I also heard here that, if some individuals left, they would not be missed, whoever those seeking to leave or those whom it was desired to remove might be. I think that everyone is needed in this struggle. We cannot afford to disdain the effort of anyone who wants to consolidate the struggle on behalf of socialism, regardless of the differences we may have; because, in the case of the problem involving titles, certainly neither PPS nor PST nor PAN has such a problem. Government makes up for them very readily. But for a revolutionary issue, for a revolutionary party such as ours, if it continues to be revolutionary, as it will, then it will have problems, and that is obvious. I don't think that government will solve that for us; and besides, it would be very bad if it did so. On the other hand, I want to save time and not tire you, I shall say that I fully agree with the speech given by Comrade Eloi, from Oaxaca, and that of Comrade Olac.

Luciano Concheiro

I believe that some comrades, unfortunately not all, have begun disclosing here the fact that the main problem for us is that of unity, the party's problem lies in what the PSUM plan is; and what must be recovered for us, in our own discussion, apart from the immediate elements that will enable us to progress is this essential element: What is, and what do we interpret as PSUM, and why did we say that it was a plan radically different from the other parties, the other organizations which prompted us to form this alternative, so to speak? We said, we emphasized, yes, we claimed that it was something different, and everyone led us toward it.

I think that a central parameter on this point is the one that many comrades have already mentioned here; namely, the party's relationship with the country's current situation. In other words, we cannot (I think that this is a basic principle for us) devise the development of this party and discuss unity outside of what the country is experiencing, not only because of irresponsibility or their being bad politicians, but mainly because, at the present time, the situation that Mexico is undergoing is a situation which has put the party (and the left as a whole) out of action; yes, and out of what is happening in the country. I think that any of us with the slightest sensitivity can realize

that we are left out of what has happened: an alternative to the crisis, or out of what would mean constructing something during these times that are so difficult for our people.

So, I think that this has been emphasized. Comrade Campa devoted part, or a large part of his remarks to a discussion of the present situation. But many might say: Well what does that have to do with PSUM? I think that this is the key problem and the central problem. In other words, how is PSUM related to that mass movement, and what are the prospects for that mass movement, and how can unity be achieved on the basis of the discussion of the general situation; but also the concrete situation that we are experiencing at present?

The Political Commission has made a series of proposals; although they take this as a corollary, they are essentially aimed, as a first step, at creating a certain atmosphere. As a first step, they may seem good to me. I think that adds to the Political Commission this entire idea of combining the various concepts, and attempting a settlement. And, on the other hand, the topic that has not been much developed is the matter of "unity in action and in the struggle," cited in the document. From the topic, at least, I understand that emphasis has been placed there on what is fundamental to be discussed in the party.

Mention has been made of departures (or, rather, departures are being used); that is what I would call them, a deal made to settle this problem of the per diems; in other words, an entire position on the part of the comrades on the Political Commission to expand, to seek elements of agreement. It seems to me that this part is all right; it's all right but it doesn't seem to me to be the essential part. I say this sincerely, because it is being demonstrated in the atmosphere, and regarding the offer of an expansion policy, and all that, also. Well, there is something on which there is no agreement; there is no agreement, nor is it mentioned. What must be done has only been criticized here; but no one has said what must be done, or what other courses of action there are. But it seems to me that the offers from the Political Commission, if they are not accompanied by a series of elements mentioned here by the comrades, whereby the Political Commission would cease to be considered the only one making policy in this party; but this is not the fault of the comrades on the Political Commission, for it is also the fault of the CC comrades, and in particular, the critics of the Political Commission, who nevertheless do not make policy, do not develop policy and do not compare their ideas here, comrades; because it is very easy to say that the signing with PPS, PST and the Socialist Movement runs counter to the party line, that it runs counter to the line. In what respect does it run counter to the line, how do we uphold our positions, what notions do we have? Well, they must be brought out, and we must not come here with psychological interpretations, or with interpretations also based on a supposedly class position, with the charge concerning the small bureaucracy, made by a disgraceful petit-bourgeois. So, where are we? I don't think that this is the problem of the interpretations. In my view, comrades, I think that we should abolish other suggestions, about the handling of the money, and charges of various kinds, when we are not militating in the CC or another entity, but only in the catharsis of every plenum,

coming only to give boring speeches. But where are we linked with the party's action; how many are constructing comrades and not their turf, but the party in general? How many are linked with an entire dynamics of construction and development of policy? Or is there abandonment as well, or is each individual going to take refuge and from there establish his little stronghold, so as then to combat and destroy what others have done?

I don't think that this can be blamed on any movement, but rather that there is, in general, an atmosphere of this type. There is no constructive atmosphere; there is no atmosphere of attempting to settle our differences, in our work. I think that this is where we must seek the essence of our divisions; I would stress: I agree that we should begin somewhere, or at the top. But I think that what divides us is what lies behind many of the things not said here. It is our concept of the party; I strongly differ from this concept of the party with a construction based on political bosses, where the matter of the money is involved. I shall comment on this later, all this. But who has said how to construct the party, and on the basis of which elements?

Whether, from a certain position, it is understood that it will be construction of the type for me, as has been done traditionally in this country. That is how the political forces of this country have traditionally been constructed. Whether the forces are to be constructed from the deputies' positions; in other words, we would be imitating the construction of a party such as the government party. It is the party which we oppose, but we are using precisely what we have criticized. We are not constructing a revolutionary, alternative party; rather we are constructing our masses, we are constructing our equipment and our political clientele; and we have aspirations. And, furthermore, on occasion we make mention of history; yes, because I am making effective what is revolutionary from my point of view. So I think comrades, as has been stated here, that we must begin to debate our concepts of the party, debating these concepts of the party requires of us a far greater participation, today, in the conference on organization. Everyone must settle there what this plural party is, because it is an alternative; how it is to be constructed; and what its relations are with the party and movement of the masses, in relation to the masses, a labor union party, a party of peasant organizations, etc.

I believe that all of us here have started to construct a different party; each one has brought his own ideas, and I think that we have brought them clearly; now we can make an assessment, and then we shall see the great differences in them. But first, I would just like to comment briefly on this issue: the matter of the per diems. I would like to explain to the comrade, especially the one who said that we have not solved the problem of the per diems here; I would like to make it clear that I, at least, have not voted. At one plenum after the other, they have been reporting to us on how the arrangements are going, how the deals, as I call them, concerning the arrangements for the per diems, are going.

I would like, and at the next plenum, if you will, I am requesting this expressly; the position of the Political Commission seems very fine to me, but we have every right to say whether we agree that comrades may collect

everything and pay us the money in installments, in small installments; or whether there are comrades here who say that they are going to pay so much, or who have not returned their powers of attorney. I believe that we must follow our party's statutes; and that there are issues that must be settled very well, and they are matters of principle, comrades, the minimal ground-rules, at which we cannot laugh, please, as many comrades do every time mention is made of morality or corruption. This is corruption, this is robbing the party; and you laugh. I don't consider this a joking matter; and, furthermore, it is very negative to attempt to adhere, or to adhere oneself as a movement, to this situation. This seems extremely regrettable to me; because then a movement is identified with this money problem, which is a statutory problem; to me it is a problem of principles which we must solve. So, there is no longer any possibility of discussing these matters. Comrades, I believe that we should be united on it, and seek a solution to it. I would ask that at the next plenum it be decided how we stand. This question about the deputies has not been resolved, and it must be cleared up. Nothing worse is being asked, requesting claims against them, etc. We have not yet resolved it, comrades.

Amalia Garcia

We have for a long time, for about 3 years, talked about the question of unity; nevertheless, it seems to me that this word "unity" loses its meaning when we fail to view it based on what is happening in the country. I don't think that unity is an asset in itself, that can be positive at one particular time and can be of no use to us at another time. There have been experiences in the history of Mexico showing how sometimes unity at any price is something that does not necessarily cause us to progress. However, I am also convinced that, at the present time in Mexico, unity is a necessity, and it is a necessity for those of us who are here, if not a necessity for the mass movement. I think that this, regardless of those differences which have existed and which still exist among all of us, is the reason that PSUM was formed because, otherwise, there would be no other explanation. It was not just because we want to struggle on behalf of socialism, because then we would be thinking of paradise for who knows what year; but rather because it addresses a concrete situation at the present time. And it seems to me that, regardless of whether or not we are aware of this, that unity was only to struggle on behalf of socialism within who knows how many years, in the year 2000 or so. Rather, because it is a requirement now is what has unified us. But it seems to me that, in addition, one of the issues that we must concentrate on now in discussing unity in the party is that this is a need only inwardly; it is not a necessity to enable us to progress in the joint effort. Rather, we are facing a very serious problem, namely, that of the elections; and I think that we must consider it an important issue, because the confrontation will be there. The elections will be the area in which the political confrontation in Mexico will take place most clearly. We have been saying at several Central Committee plenums that there is a growing political confrontation. Nevertheless, I think that the elections are the area in which this will occur most clearly. The political parties, the ones engaged in politics in this country, are preparing for it. They are already involved in it; PRI and PAN are involved in this,

and so are PPS and PST, and all the others. Now, what is the situation in which PSUM will join in these elections, this political confrontation? I don't believe that we can join as we are now, if we are going to be part of this confrontation. How many deputies' positions should we obtain from this? All that is the least. The problem is to ask what influence we shall have to be able to reverse this situation that exists. I am concerned, and I said so in a debate the other day in the newspaper ASI ES concerning the conference on organization, I am concerned about the social situation that exists in Mexico at present. I am convinced, and we had a discussion on this here, and we did not agree, that the mass movement, and we in the social and political organizations of the left in Mexico, are in a defensive situation; we are all on the defensive, not just PSUM, not just the leftist political organizations, but also the social organizations. We have been incapable of reversing this crisis which is striking at the working people. And I think that reversing this situation in next year's elections means that we need a party in combat, a party that has a very clear view of the political situation outside. However, this is not easy, because when we say that this party was established as a political necessity and that this unity occurred in that way, in time we shall realize, concretely, that this is not easy; it is not easy to find out how we are going to develop it concretely. For example, I would like to mention one topic here: Actually, alliances are a matter that was overlooked at the last plenum, and this seems to me to be a very important point which could help us to progress. I am in agreement with this policy; however, although there are some differences here regarding how we can progress with PPS and PST, it seems to me that we should discuss from a profoundly democratic standpoint, because we have been talking here about the construction of a democratic party, how we conceive of this alliance with PPS and PST, and we should not say that this has already been resolved. No, comrades that has not yet been resolved, because we shall have to proceed as a single party next year, and so if we talk about a unified party taking action in a unified manner, and holding democratic discussions, then this is one of the issues that has not been resolved, although this plenum voted for it (and I voted in favor of it). But, why don't we debate it, and open the most extensive debate on this. We want spaces, and I think that, in this way, we shall be constructing this party, a party which discusses, and does not arrive at artificial consensuses, which no one abides by later. Let's discuss, let's debate, let's convince ourselves, and then next year let's join in the elections with the policy of alliances, wherein there has been debate and convincing. I would like to state that I am convinced that we must make a policy of alliances, the broadest one; but I am also convinced that, in order to be able to develop this as a democratic party, we must discuss these issues again. There are some views here concerning PPS and PST that we all share; we know what these parties are. There are other views that apply more to a sector of comrades who formed PSUM, because they had very strong differences, because they cut themselves off from that party. And we must actually be not only sensitive to that, but also act with a profoundly democratic attitude, and discuss it. I believe that this is how we could progress with this type of issue. Now this seems to me to be what could help: if there were not this great discouragement among the members; I am convinced that there is such discouragement. Some comrades claim that we have a

pessimistic attitude; mine, for example, is not a pessimistic attitude. It is a concern about what the state of mind is among the members for joining in the battles. We must make an assessment of what rank and file organization we have operating. We have the conference on organization ahead, and what types of organizations they will be, whether they will be capable of confrontations outside, what condition they will be in. For this reason, it seems to me that we must also discuss the matter of the members, what their status is, and what measures are being adopted, not only by the Political Commission and not only in the Central Committee, but also regarding debate, to include the members in this debate, with a view toward the outside, in the mass struggle. A question that concerns us now is how to progress with unity, admitting the diversity in PSUM. It seems to me that this is something which we have to consider in the leaderships, because the party's leaderships, the leadership of the Central Committee, the Political Commission, the Secretariat and the state and local leaderships, cannot be the representatives of part of the party. And in this connection, I am referring to the Political Commission of the Central Committee, and I am also referring to the case of Sonora. I am convinced that they cannot be leaderships of a part of the party; because then they would not be leaderships of the whole party. They would be leaderships of a part, a majority. And another thing, which is not being discussed about this at present, we need integrated leaderships which will be leaderships of the entire party; and if for this purpose measures have to be taken, let them be taken in the best way, let's take them. And there have been some proposals here: Comrade Pablo proposed, specifically in relation to the Political Commission, that other comrades be included. I think that this would have to be debated. It need not be rejected at the outset. And we would also have to discuss how the Political Commission is operating; at the most, we would need to elect the Political Commission again.

But there was also another proposal from Comrade Olac regarding proportionality. I believe that there are others, which have been discussed previously, and which we should examine, to find out whether they will help us to resolve this situation. And there is the point that we could form a collective leadership in which the members would not be permanent, but could be rotated. I think that we must examine all the possibilities that exist, to enable us to have integrated leaderships wherein the whole of the party represented here would be present, and which could actually progress. At the beginning of PSUM's formation, there was a collective leadership, with the ones who had been the leaders of the original political organizations, as a collective leadership, without a secretary general. Well, this is something that has its negative aspects; but it also has some positive ones, namely, that this would show that PSUM is a party which still has, as Adolfo Sanchez Rebolledo remarked the other day, the surname unified; that it cannot have a different name yet, because it is in the process of unification, because it is a result of this. And then we would have to find out, in every instance, what the mechanisms are that could lead us toward having a leadership. In this connection I am referring to the Political Commission which forms the others, but it would also have to be observed in the state committees. In the case of Sonora, I don't agree here with Comrade Valero; I think that the situation is not all right yet, by no means, because that leadership does not represent

the party as a whole. And so we cannot proceed to do political work there, when that leadership represents only the majority, and would be a leadership of the majority, but not of the entire party. And I think that the same thing could be applied in other areas on different levels; and this does not seem to me to be the solution. It does not satisfy us.

Luis Javier Valero (Explanation)

Comrades, when I talked about the situation in Sonora, I never said that it was all right. I even said that we would have to make every effort to unify, or to achieve as much unity as possible in the party in Sonora. What I did mention, and I thought that it would be implicit, is that there is a leadership there which has the majority of the party, and that fate put this majority group of the party, as befits that leadership, in the party leadership; it merely put it there.

Renato Rosas

Comrades, it seems to me that it would be somewhat of an aberration that this party, because of a certain decision that has been made, has on repeated occasions and various levels demonstrated its desire for unity. It seems to me that the vote resulting from the second national congress proved that this party is not excluding on that level of its representation. It seems to me that the formation of certain state leaderships (I think that the majority also prove by deeds that our party is not excluding); I repeat, I think that the formation and the discussion preceding the formation of the Central Committee's present Political Commission alone showed that, on this level, priority is being given to the factor of unity, and that positions have not been adopted to exclude some of the various opinions that exist and subsist in this party. Also, with regard to the attitude of the Central Committee itself and the rank and file, if we look at those who have come from different organizations, our current type of behavior, and the way in which we engaged in political work before the formation of PSUM, we shall see that we have all sacrificed something, and we have kept as a priority the factor or the goal of the unity and development of the Unified Socialist Party of Mexico. There have been times when perhaps those efforts were not sufficient; I think that some have occurred. But on some occasions those occurrences have been surmounted. So, I think that, throughout this period, the goal of unity has been permanent in the decisions that we have had to make at various times. I don't think that we want this unity to be a unity that is not real, or that is not a result of the unification in practice and the unification in judgment that has given rise to this practice.

I believe that it is there that we should try to find the limits mentioned in his speech by Comrade Olac; but as for me, after Olac's remarks (when he said that there is a limit in the search for unity), I reasoned and thought about what those limits would be, concretely. It seems to me that practice itself is providing them; the limit lies in being consistent with the decisions that have been made in a collective manner, purely and simply. The limit lies in whether we have been capable of having those decisions really made by the

collective body and based on the different positions that we have in the party. At least it seems to me that, in the voting at different plenums, there was a great deal of progress in dissolving certain initial blocs, unfortunately not all. Some still remain and have become reaffirmed in time, but others that were present in the voting have been changed, which means that we have progressed in that dissolution of structured blocs.

The fulfillment of the decisions made collectively is the limit for unity; this does not necessarily mean that, with every decision, we are precluding the possibility of continuing to discuss the topic that is being reviewed on that occasion. I believe that the discussion must be constant, but we must have an opportunity to compare the plans that we make at the plenums, to compare them with the reality, and not presume that those decisions are simply not in keeping with the needs of the party's rank and file at that time. Presuming this would not get us anywhere; we must demonstrate this through concrete implementation, so that the future decisions will be based on the experience from the previous planning.

Otherwise, this party will continue to fall short in the intensification of the planning. Yesterday, Comrade Olac remarked here that it is not through decreeing the state of unity that the problems in this party will disappear, and he cited as a possibility the question of proportionality, as another effort for the party's unity. I agree that there is a need to combine, on behalf of its real existence, all the positions that exist inside the party, and to add them to the different levels of election (to all levels); but, speaking of proportionality, comrades, this is a situation which I do not think would bring progress, and which would be disrespectful and aggressive toward certain sectors of the party's members. I think that, in the outlying areas, there are PSUM members, new members, who are indeed making efforts to construct PSUM, and that, in the last analysis, not only new ones, but also some comrades who have coming from some previous organizations, have succeeded in going beyond certain phases.

To speak of proportionality would in a way mean applying some method of exclusion, a practice which, in the outlying areas, I think is making headway in certain locations.

Not in the entire country, but in some locations; this partial progress that exists should not lead us to think that the problems have been solved, that there are no different opinions. And, on this basis, we have the responsibility for admitting their existence. But I don't think that this would be the best way, through a proportionality that would necessarily have to lead us to a quantification involving "you are entitled to so much in proportion to what you offer." That would mean leading us again to situations which we already realize not to be correct methods; because we have already seen it at the second congress, in interparty relations.

So I think that the existence should be admitted; I think that there should be expansion or change, or by some means, but participation should be given, and we should state to the comrades who did not accept participation in the

original Political Commission, we should state to them the necessity for this leadership to be represented by all the different plans that exist. But this will not solve the entire problem; and it will not solve it because I think that there are situations that are being criticized. Sometimes, it seems to me that the Central Committee engages in tilting at windmills. It is said here that we must "reaffirm," that we are willing to "reaffirm" our commitment to the original unity plan; but I ask: Is there any other plan that has been submitted as an alternative? Has there really been a concrete, specific expression of any structured ideas that would offer a different alternative to the original proposal in this unity plan? In the party's report materials and at the Central Committee plenums, frankly, I have only found some differences in very specific situations, such as the one involving the proposal for unity with PPS and PST. But I have not observed any proposals for an alternative. I would urge those who make this criticism to be consistent enough to state concretely what about the original plan is not satisfactory now (but concretely), so that we can discuss this.

Finally, regarding the case of Sonora, I think that this Central Committee must simply take a stand, because it is a phase in the party's life in Sonora, not because it has been resolved. The situation which we cited and which gave rise to the commission that operated has not been resolved. Since no progress was achieved, the Central Committee must resolve this, and it must set a guideline for beginning a new phase of the effort for unity in the state of Sonora; but it must say that the situation has returned to normal, which was the term applied by a speaker here yesterday. Because this is saying that we shall consider as unity simply the fact that there is a party in a state, as in this case of Sonora. We must take a stand in this regard.

Jose Dolores Lopez

Comrades, I think that we are all concerned, in one way or another, about different assessments of our party's internal situation. I also believe that, at this plenum, it disturbs us to find, as was already noted yesterday, certain bases for unity that will enable this party to progress in the final plan that was established at the beginning of its formation as a party as our alternative plan. And I think that one of the major issues that we should all decide first of all is, frankly, the political desire to establish those grounds for unity. Because, comrades, if we talk for 1,000 hours and do not decide that one of the leading features is a political desire, a real political desire to progress in unity, it seems to me that much of what we are saying will remain in a vacuum. I believe that one of the central features, in my personal opinion, is the open discussion of problems. It seems to me that we have not lost any right to come to the party's central organs, to this Central Committee and on all levels, to hold a frank, overt discussion of each of the problems disturbing us, including every member of this party; because I think that such overt, frank discussion is also one that could make the political commitment materialize. Because if that political commitment is lacking, I don't think that unity would have its full reflection as unity.

For example, comrades, I would say that if, as was commented yesterday, if we really believe that the funds are being spent in a trouble-making way by the

present leadership, or the latter is incapable of leading this party, I would say, all right, let's seriously put it on the agenda for discussion, just as it has been established; and then let's hold a discussion of the subject in every case; and let's have an extensive discussion, so that this situation will be explained to us. And I believe that, with a political desire, it can be clearly ascertained whether this is so; and, if it is not so, then we should go forward together for the good of our party. But, comrades, at the same time, I would say that this unity of our party must also seriously entail a discussion of what type of party we need, what concept of a party, and the extent to which we are going to hold a serious, responsible discussion, wherein we all discuss and then put what has been discussed and approved into practice, in matters of the policy on masses, for example. Because I think that certain concepts of the policy of masses, comrades, are closely associated with both the worker and peasant problem, and that of the people.

And I would also say that there is also an association with the problem of a international policy for this party; and, in my opinion, we cannot arrive at unity in the abstract, without also minimally establishing or confirming, in any event, our party plan in these key areas which, in my view, are associated with our entire concept of what we want as a party. I would say that there is a need in politics to establish groundrules, to establish a certain harmony, a certain atmosphere and flexibility; I consider it politically proper. It is not a sacrilege, by any means, against our principles or the principles that all of us in the party have established in the PSUM plan.

Nevertheless, I also think that, at the same time, we must hold a serious, responsible discussion in these areas which likewise disturb many of us, involving the very development of this unity. And I think, too, as other comrades have stated, that this unity is associated with the country's present situation. We cannot be aloof from the serious situation that the workers are undergoing in our country; we cannot be aloof from the threat of international war; because this is associated with our commitment as revolutionaries to the actual participation of the Mexican working class, the peasants and our people, and to international solidarity.

So, I think that we must consider this aspect, not setting it aside nor evading those elements that will enable us to clearly establish the unity of our party, to raise it and to launch it more actively into the commitments that it has and which the concrete situation at present, and particularly the planning for the 1985 elections, demand of it.

I said at the previous plenum that we must devise a policy jointly, collectively and democratically; and that another aspect is how to put it into practice. And I also said that it had to be put into practice by launching it to the entire party, with the members that we want in the party. But, upon reflecting, comrades, we cannot show an image to the working class and to our people that is sometimes so deteriorated, sometimes even by our own statements regarding what our party is. We need a different party image, comrades, and I consider the proposal made by the Political Commission in this respect to be correct: to progress with the mechanisms for unity and to

progress with the expansion of a leadership from within; and on that basis, also debate each one of the problems which are disturbing our party internally and the people of Mexico as a whole.

For this reason, comrades, I think that if we complete a correct overall policy on the national level, many of the problems of Sonora (and many other states in which they are present), not Sonora alone, can be solved, gradually, in a different atmosphere, in a different state of mind too, in a really fraternal mood among us. And that will curtail and reduce many internal controversies that are still occurring, which we have sometimes even called controversies involving the guts, not the head.

Gerardo Unzueta

Comrades, it seems to me that the recent plenums, particularly the fifth plenum, established an idea that I consider among the most important: seeking the party's national integration, and working for this. And this, comrades, includes all echelons and levels of PSUM. We are certainly talking about a revolutionary workers party of masses, but we are talking about a concrete party: this PSUM; not generally, about a certain type of party, but precisely this PSUM. And in this connection, it seems to me that we have a fundamental starting point with which we must strive to achieve that integration; it seems to me to be the principal starting point.

It is, precisely, the party plan that we have proposed for ourselves, the plan stemming from our fundamental and founding documents, from what we have been devising during this period, wherein I think the main features of that plan were proposed and submitted at a recent meeting of the Political Commission, correctly, by Comrade Martinez Verduzco. I would like to present them here, as an idea of how we can judge and how we can materialize this party plan. What party do we want? In the first place, an independent opposition party as an alternative. Secondly, a party which has a national view and which is striving for hegemony, within political channels.

A democratic party with freedom of opinion, with the possibility of differences and persuasions among its members, which is striving to develop methods for consensus, which is attempting to incorporate into the leadership organs cadres with different views; a party which rejects monolithism in its structure and its operation; a party in a constant struggle for unity of the left; and, yes, an internationalist party, but not aligned with any center; a party that is also interested in reflecting its diversity in the leadership organs. It seems to me that these are the main elements of the party plan that we are bent on gaining, by our own decision, formally established in the actions taken by this party, by those of us who undertook to form PSUM; and the impetus for this plan is the prime responsibility of the Central Committee. I also think that this plan is capable of arousing enthusiasm and giving an impetus to the entire party, to its organizations and to the party's rank and file, even in those locations where there are remarkably consolidated concepts. I have had concrete experience with these matters in three states: Coahuila, Tamaulipas and Veracruz.

It seems to me that this experience contributes, precisely, to this purpose; it is in this way that we are striving to solve the problems of unity without exclusion, without rejection. For example, at the last meeting to bring in comrades who were dissociated from the leadership work, at the decision of the previous congress, the group of comrades who had been elected were kept, although some of them, who were concerned, submitted their resignations. An attempt was made to talk with them and to keep them in the leadership organs; an attempt was also made to encourage the inclusion of other comrades.

In Coahuila, where there had been a division in the party, the main method has been to undertake the incorporation of the party with the inclusion of the comrades who had been split into two groups, combining them in the activity itself and in the struggle on behalf of the goals of the masses' action, the goals of the political struggle that was under way.

And in Tamaulipas, and I consider this an important fact, in Tamaulipas, where the Communist Party formed a bloc with another one entitled PSUM, the very transition to a new situation created difficulties, created differences, and created an internal discussion of how to take that step, how to surmount the former difficulties. And that has been achieved and, at present, the Unified Socialist Party in Tamaulipas is a party which is starting to improve in its development and its political struggle.

Comrades, I think that we on this level must strive, must work, precisely on this level; and we must seek solutions to find a way of succeeding and progressing in this integration, and actually seek possible solutions that will not be on paper, that will not be statements, that will not be salutes to the flag. Integration is possible by way of proportionate representation; I agree with the comment made by Renato Rosas a moment ago: proportion among whom? This was possible at the beginning of PSUM, when it was a matter of forces integrating; but now, comrades, we have in a large number of the country's states a membership that has not come from the previous parties, that is committed to PSUM, that is not committed either to PC, nor PPM, nor MAUS [Socialist Action and Unity Movement] nor MAP [Popular Action Movement]. It does not have that position; it is this mass which now demands respect, and which must be given an impetus in the party's new development. But I think that we must clearly understand the time at which we find ourselves constructing the party. I consider what was approved by the Central Committee in the draft resolution for the conference on organization to be quite proper, defining the period that the party is in; that is, we are in the initial period of the party's construction, but, comrades, this means that, in order to be able to continue, and to be able to finish this initial period of the party's construction; it means that we must be careful in each one of the accomplishments, not scrapping any part of what has been won. We must do away with waste. It seems to me that to consolidate every step of what has been achieved is one of the requirements of this Central Committee. Comrades, I think that we have already attained the existence of a leadership, the Central Committee, in which there is diversity; to consolidate the existence of that leadership means that the Political Commission, a permanent organ of the Central Committee, must reflect its diversity. To make the party's struggle more effective and to fruitfully develop the line of the second congress, it

is just a step, but a step that can pave the way toward all of the ones we shall have to take in the political situation.

Eduardo Montes

Comrades, I think that it is by now trite to say that, on the leadership level, our party is undergoing a complicated, difficult situation. In the future, we shall certainly have many of these periods that turn into dark clouds for the party's development; I think that this is normal. These current difficulties are normal, and actually are associated with this period of the party's construction in which we find ourselves. The major problem for the Central Committee, and hence the great responsibility that it bears, is finding ways of surmounting these difficulties. In the first place, it must reach agreement on what kind of differences these are. Actually, everyone in PSUM could say that they were agreed upon the original plan for which we worked during the months of August-November 1981. It seems to me that we shall have to continue developing the components of that plan of PSUM, of that party which we consider suitable and necessary, and ideal for the political struggle based on revolutionary positions in our country.

We must continue to develop those components; but the first problem that has arisen here is whether all of us, at this stage of PSUM's development, are convinced, and not only convinced, but also, whether we are striving to give an impetus to the party's plan itself; or whether we are outwardly in agreement with the plan, but actually working in different directions with different notions. I would say that there is in this respect a very great inconsistency between the theoretical statement and the practice; because in 1981 we conceived of a party, a united party, with a well determined structure, with democratic methods for solving the internal problems, with a desire to progress in accordance with that document founding PSUM, which was the report submitted on behalf of the organizations at a unification meeting. Nevertheless, I believe that, in practice, we have not done so; there has not been that procedure; the party has not been developed along those paths, along those lines.

There is still a group orientation within PSUM; there are still parallel disciplines to some extent; there are still methods not in keeping with the idea that we have of an organized, democratic, revolutionary party for political action in our country. At some of the first plenums, we claimed that this process was difficult, that it was difficult to eliminate the detrimental legacies of the past and the group spirit, the spirit which tends toward dispersion and toward the creation of unsuitable forms of political relations within the party. It was difficult, but I think that it is becoming far more difficult than we had thought at the beginning; because, rather than eliminating the spirit of those organizations and new concepts, it would appear that we are tending to intensify them. And that, comrades, is what is destroying the unity of action.

On the other hand, there are political differences among us; there are certainly differences of nuance and in depth differences. But the great misfortune

in this direction, and in the party in general, is that we have not held a frank, open debate in defense of the political positions that each one of us may have. There is no political debate; there is no open comparison of positions. Only yesterday, we heard here at the Central Committee plenum, after a year had elapsed since the date of our second congress, something resembling a political difference; because insofar as the results of the congress are concerned, six plenums have already gone by and no one has opened his mouth against anything. Or, I am lying, some comrade or comrades have made some comments in this regard; but, essentially, there has been no open comparison of political ideas. Now a major difference has come up: the difference concerning the policy of alliances. Is that difference insurmountable? I think not. We have as points of reference both the ideas that gave rise to our party, and the resolutions of the second congress, and the first one; which are points of reference for solving these problems. As for the struggle on behalf of the unity of the left, at the last plenum we were all in agreement on the resolution on unity of the left. No one said anything expressly or categorically against that policy; no one mentioned exclusions, except Luis Ortega, who said that it was necessary to seek unity of action with what he termed the radical left; a suggestion that may be correct or incorrect. But, in connection with our policy as a whole, there was no opposing statement.

I believe that we must embark upon this group of problems involving discussion of the policy openly and frankly, and not just here in the Central Committee, but publicly; so that the party as a whole may join in this debate. And on that basis, let's make decisions; but make decisions to act united, because that is another major problem, the one of our making decisions, seeking consensus, progressing, arriving at broad consensus and finally voting. But, once that period has elapsed, the decisions have not been implemented; there have been differences; individual criteria have prevailed; and the movements and groups within the party have prevailed.

Comrades, I would say that this is doing PSUM great harm. We are in favor of the movements, freedom of criticism among the natural movements and trends of opinion within the party; but it is deeply divisive for those movements to become parallel groups within PSUM. Because then, as we already know, the history of the labor movement in Mexico and all countries is filled with examples of those types of relationships inside parties such as ours causing division and dispersion. We must be categorical in that regard.

Claims have been made regarding the conduct of the party leadership which have not been proven. But let's put matters in their proper place: The party leadership, this one, the Central Committee, is the one responsible for leading the party between congresses; but if we want to create an artificial contradiction here between the policy being carried out by the Political Commission and the CC's general decisions, no proof has been given, there has been no argument whatsoever for confirm, to prove that there is actually a contradiction and differences between the political conduct of the Political Commission and the decisions of the congress and those of the plenums. An assertion has been made (I want to conclude with this) that attests to the presence of at least enormous confusion in this respect. It has been claimed that the Political

Commission signed an agreement with PPS, UIC, the Socialist Movement and PST which totally contradicts the policy of PSUM, contrary to the line of PSUM. Let's look; is it contrary to the line of PSUM to agree with certain organizations on the solidary struggle with the peoples of Central America? Is the struggle contrary to the line? Or is it also contrary to the party line to make commitments to promote the struggle for world peace, for disarmament, etc.? I think that those are methods which could be used, if other resources for the argument are lacking; but I don't think that they in any way contribute to an explanation among us of what the real problems that actually exist and are hampering the development of our party are.

Eduardo Gonzalez

Comrades, I think that it could be claimed that the party's relations insofar as its unity is concerned are what is termed a situation of unstable balance. It is a situation that cannot be permanent; it is a situation that either evolves in the direction of the rediscovery of real, authentic unity, or evolves in the direction of a comparison with other forms, other paces and other methods. The party must leave behind the discrepancies, differences and confrontations that exist among its members. That is an enduring trait of this and any other organization, particularly one such as this. But it seems to me that the level at which matters stand is exceptional, and hence not lasting. For this reason I think (repeating very briefly what some of the other comrades have said) we have to ask ourselves fundamental questions here. One of them is whether or not we agree that the original PSUM plan is viable; in other words, whether there is a basic unity in the party regarding the view of the country that we have, regarding the course of action for its political and economic transformation, and regarding the role that a revolutionary socialist party can play in the country and in a situation such as this.

In my view this is still the basic device for our unity and the guarantee that such unity is possible. There may be other arguments for maintaining unity, such as the fact that if each one returned to his origins, everyone would be worse off than they were; and we would have to begin again and find ourselves, at the end of several years, attempting unification again. I consider this a lesser argument. The fundamental argument is that (in my view) there is a common view of the essentials in this party. Now then, faced with this, we cannot dissociate ourselves from what is the practice of forming this new party, what its most recent and most concrete history is. We cannot make a kind of "clean slate"; rather, we must learn from that process, from the mistakes that we have all made in different positions, etc., and find a way forward. But that does not entail making every battle the last one, and almost proposing things such as the claim that what we need is a mutual begging of pardon. This could happen in a school or in a club of friends, but not in a political organizations comprised of people who must be mature enough to devote their lives to a plan of this nature. Therefore, proposals that would mean a total revision of views, positions, acts of contrition and begging pardon are no solution. I think that if they were, they would be the simplest of all, because I think that PSUM's unity is well worth begging pardon, even if some of it were unwarranted. So, it is not that. I say

this because I find alarming signs of inflexibility in the statements of certain comrades; it is almost this statement: that what we must do here is a sort of starting a process of expiation of that kind, and that is impossible and not viable either.

Nor do I think that PSUM's unity (the basic unity on the level necessary for making this an effective party) can be rediscovered with a sudden change in the correlation of forces. If we imagine a future congress at which there would be a confrontation with some winning and others losing, or the reverse, a situation very similar to the one we have would recur: There would be some comrades in the leadership and others would be self-excluded, and a battle would begin on the same bases with changes only in political roles or on paper. In other words, it cannot be a result of a sudden change, either in one leadership or another. Even if it were possible, over the short or medium term, for a change to occur in what we might call the correlation of forces, that would not extricate the party from the situation that it is in. Hence, in my opinion, total confrontation, making every battle (in the state entities, wherever it may be, or in the Central Committee) the final battle is mistaken, and would not get us anywhere. Therefore, I think that the problem of PSUM's unification must be viewed as a complex, uneven process, wherein there is winning and losing, wherein blows are dealt and received, and where it would also be possible to reach the level of intelligent, balanced and constructive concessions.

Hence, I think that if there is not in the party an idea of this as a process, which could keep changing, there will never be a result such as the one we all want. There will be no sudden change here that will change the situation, or ease the situation. There may be a change on paper, but nothing more; and that would not solve anything. I do consider it important to start discussing the policy problems frankly, but governed by an attitude of flexibility. If not, this discussion has no purpose; it would be an exchange of views without any major practical consequences. And I would like to mention a couple of factors which are the subject of the difference based on this premise, that of viewing the unification process as just that, a process, with a pace. To apply a little stress, I certainly think that this pace could be hastened, and be more smooth, as we acquire more confidence; and to achieve that we must begin somewhere. So long as there is not assurance that taking a few steps toward common action is something that can be achieved with confidence, based on the evidence from practice, and that we can work together, major leaps will never be possible. We must prove to ourselves that it is possible to start proceeding little by little, and perhaps latter we may be able to start running and hastening the pace of the rediscovery of real unity in this action.

I said that, in conclusion, I wanted to comment on a couple of points: the major statement made here yesterday about this matter of the alliance with some parties of this perverted socialism, such as PPS and PST. I consider it a mistake to view it as a provocation of the comrades originating from a split in PPS. And I consider it a mistake to view it as such because, with this argument, one could virtually run the whole gamut: It would be a provocation to the comrades coming from PMT to work on some things together with

Heberto. It would also be a provocation to work together with Manuel Terrazas, who has come from a division of PCM. It is true that the level, the features, the almost dramatic quality of the split by the comrades from the former PPM with this PPS leadership have a scope that is not comparable to that of the split involving UIC or Terrazas, for example. It is true, but in essence it is the same thing; with such reasoning we shall never be able to approach a very broad group of movements from which PSUM has increased its numbers. Hence, I would say that what we must discuss is the issue in different terms: What is the concrete significance, from now on, of a common action in certain areas with members of PPS? And on this basis, at least we can reach the conclusion that is is not fitting; but on the basis of that argument, looking ahead and not backward.

I also think that it is no help, and that it is exaggerated, to repeatedly describe the Political Commission as a trouble-making group. In the first place, the Political Commission's heterogeneity is not necessary to prove; it is a fact, a datum, that (in my view) cannot be seriously debated. Secondly, the Political Commission is not a group cornered there, outside the party. It is a leadership group which has backing nationally, in this Central Committee and this party. Consequently, it is a force within this party. It may hold positions and attitudes, or adopt measures which are erroneous; Let's discuss them concretely, but putting adjectives in front of it, thereby attempting to put the party leadership, surrounded, on the defensive, well, it may be achieved, but it will not help. It will not help from the standpoint of forcing changes in a policy that might be erroneous. Therefore, what must be discussed is the policy, and possibly reaching that conclusion. I say all this because the methods count too, and I conclude with this: The methods of discussion count too, and influence the positions of the members and action groups in the party. And to start changing things, let's discuss them seriously. I believe that any leader (not only on the Political Commission but in the party as well) would make a mistake if he thought that the starting point for a discussion is that one is always right; no, absolutely no. But yes, to begin to discuss with a desire to change is correct, arguing along a constructive line; arguing with adjectives and with a harshness that closes doors does not help. And if that is what is proposed, well then, the issue is already on a different level.

Arnoldo Martinez Verdugo

Comrades, the initiative for undertaking a discussion of the problems currently confronting PSUM, particularly since its second congress, was taken by the Political Commission after it had already devoted several months, in a series of meetings, to the concrete study of PSUM's progress. We have always linked that discussion with a fundamental concern: the negative evolution of the country's situation, which some have described as a process of right wing orientation of political activity; a matter that has been debated at nearly all the Central Committee meetings during the year that has elapsed since the second congress. And what has been present is the study of the role that PSUM is forced to play in this complex situation; not only because some

sectors of our people are focusing their attention on the chances of the left's being able to assume a responsible position, a mature and effective position during this period of crisis, but also because we are aware that PSUM could be a factor capable of helping to make the interests of the popular masses and the great area of democracy intervene, with all their weight, in the course of events, have an influence and become involved in the determination of a new economic and political direction for the country.

Because it is not true that the dispute over the immediate future can be settled between a PRI that is rapidly losing an audience and showing lack of initiative and a PAN that is benefiting from PRI's decline but lacking in a real plan, worthy of offering merely minor solutions for the problems that the country must solve at present.

By this I do not wish to underestimate the significance of its being a right wing party with such meager aptitude that is capitalizing on the dissatisfaction of broad sectors of the middle classes and working groups in certain areas; because this is a very serious situation on which we are forced to reflect seriously. What I am trying to do is stress that the left, in its broadest sense, has not been in the center of the confrontation as a force which has its own alternative and long experience, as well as daring in coping with the tasks that are posed. It is not so, at least in the case of large masses, but it must be so, and this is the essential problem. Let's not be confused: PSUM's problem is not an internal problem. If the leadership of this party begins to become lost in thought, if it turns its attention inwardly, it will lose the opportunity that it has at present to serve as one of the main protagonists in the political battle of this period.

I would also like to say something else, although I may not have time to develop it: Comrades, PSUM is not being questioned; all those who have already doomed PSUM to defeat, including some of our comrades, are mistaken. No one is claiming that PSUM is progressing full speed ahead, nor is it our method to conceal the difficulties, keep the differences secret or minimize the obstacles intervening against the consolidation of a party plan that is really new, original in many respects and representative of the creativity of our nation's socialist revolutionaries. PSUM is undergoing the initial period of its construction, as we have stated in the draft resolution for the national conference on organization; and (it states there), to define the essence of the tasks that we have proposed for ourselves, this means: first of all, the formation of PSUM's leadership group; also, the collective devising of the methods for its organization; as well as the issue of ways and means of its link with the masses. I think that these are major problems on which we must work hard; they are very difficult problems, but I think (I am not saying it to please anyone) that they are relative natural difficulties; we must view them this way. We do not have enough time to work on these issues in a new way, as this party requires; but the fact that we have these problems does not negate the propriety or viability of creating PSUM, much less negating the future of this party with the projection with which it was created.

The problem of the leadership (we have been observing some of these aspects here) is a problem that demands our taking it up in all its projection. There

has not emerged what must be the typical leadership, what we might call the natural leadership in this instance, the leadership that is in keeping with the features and nature of this party. And I think that we must consider this a process. To be sure, in that process we must seek the means of eliminating those aspects which have proven negative, and we must continue to progress, step by step. But I believe that we must think of this as a process; we must think of it as something that cannot be accomplished for once and for all, but rather as something on which we are working, on which we are advancing, on which we are eliminating mistakes, obstacles, flaws, whatever they may be. And so it seems to me that if we think of it in this way, we shall be able to hold discussions calmly, hold discussions among comrades, asking which issues have to be resolved today.

I believe that we must, in this regard, we must of course take into account PSUM's tributaries, the cadres with whom each organization participated. But this is not the only thing, comrades, because PSUM's plan attracted many more sectors and groups, the ones that we are always talking about. And there are therein cadres worthy of consideration; there are individuals who are contributing to various aspects of our work. So, we must also consider the capacity of the cadres for performing the tasks, whatever their origin may have been. We must also seek effectiveness, and not just connection with certain origins; although this may have an important bearing (and I claim that it still has, and will continue to have it).

The Political Commission has made a proposal in the draft resolution made for this plenum, and an appeal to the comrades who did not agree to join the Political Commission at the first plenum. Well, we have not held much discussion about this. It seems to me that this proposal has not been considered. Of course, it is not the only one that could be made, there may be other variants; and I think that we should air them here. But we must listen to them, and we must exchange views on the viability of one measure or another. We are not married to any previous resolution, comrades; we can make changes; but they must be reasonably and accurately stated as a proposal for airing. And I think that we would be open to finding solutions. I think that the PSUM leadership should reflect what this party is; in other words, it must be plural and not monolithic; but this plurality must be defined on a political, and not an arithmetical basis. Comrades, the representation of movements does not unite us; it divides us more, because new groups would start to be created in order to have representation, or to aspire to it. We have already experienced this.

It is an experience that we had prior to PSUM; the creation of PSUM means, among other things, the beginning of the elimination of many of the traditional vices of the Mexican left: the division, in other words, the inability to recognize what is common among socialist revolutionaries; political bossism, that is, the tradition that puts loyalty to an individual above everything, not the defense of principles or a policy; and also the inability that the left in general has shown for many years to realize that the left, and more precisely the working class, must have a democratic program and a national program, because they are inherent in it. Leaving this task in the hands of others means losing the

capacity for hegemony, leaving to the bourgeois and petit-bourgeois parties the opportunity to carry along, as they are doing, large strata of the peasantry, the middle classes and even the working class toward positions which are alien to the class, but which are adopted and assumed, taking up causes that the revolutionary parties of the left have abandoned.

I believe that we must devote all our efforts to becoming capable of strengthening our unity but, comrades, this requires that the issues which we discuss here must be stated to the party; we must hold an in-depth discussion of the existing problems and differences. This has already been proposed on other occasions in the Central Committee; even more or less precise measures have been adopted; and the discussion has not taken place. I think that, after this plenum we must hold it; it must be held; we must start debating among ourselves in the most respectful and proper way possible; but we must go in depth, so that the party will become involved in the debating of these issues. And I am referring to the issues of policy and tactics, and theory as well.

Just let me finish one issue very briefly. I think that this discussion could be useful if it does not paralyze us, if it does not turn us toward ourselves; because that is not what PSUM needs for unity; in addition to the fact that the unity of a revolutionary organization has never been achieved in internal debate. So, we must debate in the course of our battle to carry ahead the conclusions of PSUM, the program of PSUM and the resolutions of PSUM's second congress, as well as those of the Central Committee's plenums. At the previous plenum, we took a highly significant political initiative, comrades, a highly significant one; and I left with the impression that in that discussion at the last plenum we had unanimity here; because no one opposed the report (not only did no one vote against it, but no one was opposed in the debate). There were comments, which of course must be considered, different nuances that must be considered; but there was no opposing vote. The appeal was adopted, the appeal to the forces of democracy and the left was adopted by everyone; no one even abstained. So, how is it possible now for it to be stated, here in this plenum (because there is an inconsistency), that we are obliterating, or jumping over, or not taking into account positions of esteemed comrades? No; we have discussed them here, and all these issues were brought up frankly. Of course, I don't think that this means that the comrades who want to do so are not entitled to. I respect that right, and we all respect it, to discuss these issues again. They are of maximum importance, because the issue of unity is not a whim; it is not an initiative that has arisen from us; it is an issue that comes from below. That issue is the one being brought up by the members, by the people, because they realize that a consistent force of the left is not appearing against the two major groups contesting (PRI and PAN), which are equally reactionary..

Roger Aguilar

Even before the merger of the parties, there was already a reflection of the potential difficulties that might crop up, which reality has shown to be a fact.

This is the origin of PSUM. There was an overt, express decision among the leaders of the five organizations to give priority to the conditions for forming PSUM; but from the outset it was noted that this was one thing, and the practice was something else; from the beginning, long before the second congress and the first congress, long before that. It is not true that this was a problem at the second congress; it was a problem from the beginning. We saw it on the occasion of the representation. I was not at the merger meeting, but I learned that a sizable portion of that meeting wasted time discussing what the representative status, etc., would be. Comrades, this is because although the desire for merger existed (and that is not at issue) in any event it is very difficult to give up the views that were devised for many years, or the practices that have been carried out.

But we arrived at this situation well known to everyone; many comrades have already dwelt at length on it, on the dangers that it represents; and so we are faced with the need to resolve it. I share the opinion of the comrades who have insisted on plurality in the leadership of the party in general matters, the need for the differences that exist (not only of a political type but also in many other areas) to be debated, and for channels to be sought; also noting that this debate must have a limit. But, comrades, I think that we need here an expression of the political desire that this be done.

Thus far, there has been a repeated insistence upon this point, but otherwise there has not been any response in this respect. It seems to me that the response yesterday was rather hotheaded, with elements that have not helped the debate. I say this with the most absolute candor of which I am capable. Comrades, I think that the discussion of these issues brought up here, which has not been held effectively, has limits. I share the opinion of Comrade Renato, who claims that one of those limits is precisely the fulfillment of the decisions. It is no use if, in the party, for the sake of maintaining a different opinion, one decides that it suits him to fulfill some and not to fulfill others. That is not worthwhile in a Unified Socialist Party of Mexico. In any event, we would have to change the initials, and call it PSLI: Socialist Party of Internal Struggle; because it would not be anything else. Comrades, I do not agree with the proposals that movements should exist, as stated in the material for the conference on organization, and that the minority should have every right to become a majority. Do we want to turn this party into a party of internal struggle? Well, let's approve things in this way. The trends of opinion are actually formed in the debate; this is inevitable, and we have no reason to place limits on this. But if we uphold as a policy that there should be movements, there should be persuasions and that the movements which are now a minority should become a majority, then what are we here for? We could do this outside as well. Let's fight with PRI; let's fight with the bourgeoisie; let's use a different way of converting the minority into a majority. Why waste time? So, let's revamp the party, which we should be doing outside, not here inside.

I also think that matters should be separated; the political differences must be discussed, but there are issues that cannot be discussed; and they are issues associated with integrity (I do not call them political, because the

problem of political integrity is also rather complicated). Comrades, it so happens that a person could be very honest, but when he has a liking for power, and this must be stated with absolute candor: I have been head of the state committee for approximately 10 years, and why shouldn't I say it, when a congress is approaching, since we are all at odds this way, how are we going to emerge from the congress? It is difficult for us to consider that we might leave the leadership; but it must be admitted. That has not been said; underneath, something different is being done. So, if we are going to discuss the political differences and the issue of integrity here; I say that political integrity is set aside when these problems occur. We are on the eve of a change, and these pure, honest revolutionaries are not ceasing to trip things up. This is set aside; and it seems to me that it is normal, because in my view there is no confidence, or if there was confidence in a principle, this confidence has been lost. And it has been lost precisely because of political differences, because of doubts regarding certain comrades; because we do not have the same notions. And I believe that these issues must be debated; and we must learn, because we have not learned to accept being in a minority.

It seems to me that emphasis must be placed on consensus now. This can by no means be to the detriment of the democratic rights, not of the members of the central leadership nor of the intermediate leaderships, but the democratic rights of all the party's members. This discussion, which we are now insisting be held, but which is not being held, is a discussion in which all the party's members should take part; because much harm was already done during the period between the first and second congresses by the differences never expressed between Comrade Jaramillo and the rest of the leadership. There were only rumors and more rumors. And how can we seek to have this party not scattered when such matters have not been debated as they should have been debated. In this connection, a very great, historic responsibility lies at present with all those of us who are members of the Central Committee, and the different tributaries that have arrived; and I summon them to that historic responsibility.

Elvira Concheiro

At this stage of the discussion, it would be fitting to try to observe what might be the scope of the meeting being held by the Central Committee. Certainly, the document submitted to us by the Political Commission is extremely brief, and concludes with very simple proposals. We all know that the situation being experienced by our party is far more complicated, far more complex than could have been expressed in that document. Nevertheless, I think that we should assess the proposals made by the Political Commission; because, although in the states, in each of the State Committees, there is a group of conflicts, with their own histories, among the movements which joined PSUM, we are not deceived, and we are quite well aware that the possibility of surmounting the situation, or many of the troublesome situations in the state committees, lies there. It lies in the possibility that the national leadership, and the Central Committee may resolve, or progress in the resolving of an internal division, a political atmosphere (as several comrades have indicated) which,

although it has not hampered the political planning, because I think that this is evident, has certainly hampered the chances of this leadership's becoming an effective leadership of this party, mobilizing this party and arousing this party.

Hence the limitation, many of the limitation that we are experiencing. I would also say that if a solution is not found for the problem, it could cause even greater problems in each state committee, or in many of the state committees in which we have conflicts. That is why I think that a meeting such as this is very worthwhile. And what several comrades have attempted is very worthwhile; and I think the majority at this meeting have called for a political desire, the generating or revitalizing of a political desire that will make the unity of this party possible, so that we may progress in the unity of this party, so that we may progress in solving the problems that are dividing us. I think that we have had an experience that is not confined merely to the assessment that we have made just now, of having a new, united, strong, unified socialist party, but we have also had concrete experience with the importance that a political desire might hold. Without doubt, we can claim today that the conditions for forming this party have ripened in many ways in this country; but without a political desire, this could not have been accomplished. Those conditions might have occurred to us, or at least they existed for a long time; and up until a particular time there was the political desire, why not say so? among the main leaders of the different groups that are here or that arrived here, for the creation of PSUM to be made possible. So, I don't think that it is wasting time at all to keep insisting on this, on the generation of this desire. I think that to some extent we have progressed along a good path during these past months; after the difficult situation in which we departed after the second congress. In any event, we have evaded a situation that was very complicated and very tense, from our second congress, and which lay in having focused the discussions of this Central Committee on politics, on the political struggle that we were facing. It was correct, but now, at this point, it appears insufficient to us. In other words, at the same time that (as Verdugo said just now) we do not get lost in thought, and do not lock ourselves into our own problems, but are watchful to take external political action, we must also start solving a series of our problems, and discussing our problems.

Unquestionably underlying this internal struggle is the concept of the party that we have, as several have noted; and in this respect we have been lagging; to a great extent we have kept repeating what was discussed at the time of the merger, at our unification meeting. And I think that, during these past 2 years, we have had an experience that forces us to progress with that concept, that forces us to review many features of that concept that we had at one time for achieving unity and we must progress in other areas. One has not failed to hear notions here which look backward, which desire a return to a past which in my view is no longer possible in this country, and which is not possible not only in this country but in many places. And we in Latin America can observe this very closely, but in many other places by now it is also something irreversible.

Yes, this monolithic party, this party with a single ideological concept, is no longer reversible. And I think that the problem that we have is not the formation of blocs or movements, but rather the inadequacy of their formation; in other words, they are not backed by ideas and political plans, with an open, frank dialog and a genuine circulation of ideas. The formation of these blocs, these movements, is looking backward, insofar as movements and even individuals are concerned, however respectable and acknowledged they may be. That is what this party can no longer withstand. It can no longer put up with that formation of movements based on a few leaders or a few brains.

We must make an effort to focus on ideas; it seems to me to be truly disturbing that at a meeting such as this, differences of a political nature should emerge which we had a complete opportunity to discuss at the previous plenum and at the earlier plenums. It is on this basis, then, that we should now argue a political position or a lack of unified desires, and then call for certain differences of a political type. Comrades, I think that we must take this very seriously; and at such times (which are not few in this party, I would say that it was all the time), take a stand and focus on planning of a political type. That is what will unite us, that is what can lend a quality, not of outward compromise, to the composition of our leadership organs, if those ideas are actually central, if the political ideas are central, but not the individuals, not this or that representative of some tributary or of the ones being formed now; for what they were because, furthermore, they were a great deal, and not for what they are right now, for their influence on this party, and for their striving to make this party progress; not for what they were or what they represented. And, comrades, this is something that I think we must overcome now.

Comrades, I believe that, in this composition of the leadership organs, many of us (or at least I am speaking for myself), actually feel that what we are treating is this idea of a lack of plurality, that we actually have to progress with it; and that at present it could be reflected precisely in that desire to progress with the formation of leadership organs that are actually plural; in other words, reflecting this genuine diversity that exists in our party. Finally, we must make an effort in this Central Committee to progress with the discussion of the concept of our party. This is a discussion that has been left in abeyance; because I also think that we feel that it is unnecessary until it is on the agenda for discussion. And I believe that, well, today, the conference on organization has put on our agenda for discussion the fact that this Central Committee should intend to go to that conference on organization; in addition to the document dealing directly with a group of features involving our party's organizational structure, which is far more equipped with in depth discussions on our concept of this party.

Sergio Almaguer

Comrades, we must look at the party's origin, and just observe the diverse origin. I believe that this was how we achieved this party, but it was not the essence with which we achieved this party. I would say that PSUM emerged

on the basis of ending a tradition of the sectarian, opportunistic left; I would say that PSUM, in that respect, made a break with that policy. But, comrades, we have not yet ended that policy. I think that the conditions for the party's unity, based on its origin, still hold true; that principle still holds true. It is not a matter of repeating the previous parties. But I'm sure that we hear expressions from previous parties, and fortunes are not read among gypsies. This matter of plural origin is not inherent in PSUM per se; I am referring to the development of the general policy as a concept of the inward pluralism of the party as such. I think that it is one of the party's tributaries; that doesn't frighten me. What does disturb me is that there are comrades who think that this should be the permanent quality.

Because, on the one hand, Pablo Gomez says that the diverse origin, as diverse as it is, is socialism; and, on the other hand, he says that we must put an end to the differences and the discrepancies. So, I don't know what will be decided or who will be the one to decide on that: whether to retain the differences and the discrepancies due to the diverse origin, or to put an end to them. The method has not been proposed. When there is talk about democratic centralism, I think of it as a single desire, not uniformity. But when there is talk of a single desire, there is a reaction from those who believe that the desire comes only from above, from the leadership organs, and not from the rank and file. I think that it is also on the agenda here to bring up for discussion acknowledgment that it is the rank and file which always has the right to decide on the leadership of its party. That, obviously, is democratic centralism, with a single desire and a single leadership. But I believe that it is incomplete, not to describe it otherwise, for the Political Commission to state that it will be a permanent organ of the Central Committee. I don't think that this is up for discussion; after all, the Central Committee has appointed it; but that is the relationship.

I believe that if we are attempting to change the atmosphere of the democratic relations in the party, I believe that, at the Central Committee meetings (and this will have to be observed later, because of the decision per se that we have made), the Political Commission has no reason to be in confrontation with the Central Committee here, in fact; because, for example in the case relating to the Central Committee's regulations (and forgive me for delving into this, although it will not be resolved now, but it is part of the discussion), the Central Committee's regulations state that the Political Commission decides on the party's national and international relations and informs the Central Committee. No, comrades, it is the Central Committee which decides and reports to the party; it is not the Political Commission that can decide on that, always. And I am referring to the content of the previous document that the Central Committee approved. There are arguments for everything, but it is not the authority of the Political Commission to make the final, definitive decision on the policy and course of action being carried out; it is the Central Committee which must decide and support this.

Therefore, comrades, the conditions for unity are very clearcut: precisely, not to ignore our origin, and to realize that, at present, alliances in the abstract

are not on the agenda as a leading topic for discussion, but rather alliances concretely, but with the left; and we are not going to become allied just because they are there. I think that there is a large mass of Mexicans missing, whom we have not reached yet and which should be included in the struggle facing the party, the real struggle for socialism. Why? Because the history of the labor movement (and I don't consider myself a historian, but it is what is most fundamental) to date has proven that the central feature has been that opportunism has struck the leadership of the labor movement, with a few exceptions of an independent or revolutionary nature, of opposition to the government or on behalf of trade union democracy, which have occurred in an isolated manner and have been persecuted by the government. But, comrades, the fundamental trait of the labor movement is that opportunism is what has struck the leadership of the labor movement; and there are parties which have been going along with the government itself in this respect. This holds true of PPS and PST. The break with opportunism is not a phrase, nor an imposition from some previous group. It is not an imposition involving a break or a previous system of those of us who were in PPS or PPM; it is a consistent position, which I am not asking us to interpret on the basis of previous groups, but rather on the basis of PSUM's origin in that area and that environment.

This is why I think that the alliance of the labor movement, of the Fidel Velazquez, with the government, like the alliance of those from PPS and PST with the government, is what must be fought; and it cannot be fought by allying ourselves with them. That is not how it can be fought. It can be fought by explaining to the people that the solution does not lie in an alliance with the government; that is obvious. Is that something new, comrades? That is not something new. That is the struggle of many revolutionaries who have arrived in the party, and that is the experience that is not being taken into account. And so why is the Political Commission frightened that this should be brought up? There should be no problems. If the Central Committee decides, why should the Political Commission be frightened that the Central Committee might appoint a different Political Commission? I think that the issue should be stated thusly. without fear. We should say: The Central Committee decides, and who will be frightened that we might change the leadership? Because it is sometimes claimed: No, there is no need to struggle; we must engage in politics and not struggle for the leadership. But sometimes we hear from comments that this is coming; it is reflected in just one area: We should prevent leadership from being given to the party. And it turns out that those who say that sometimes reserve the right to give it leadership and to keep the leadership. Comrades, that is not the democratic game; that is not PSUM's origin. Therefore, I believe that this should be interpreted in that way, and so I don't consider it a matter of persons, I don't consider it a matter of personalities; but they should not fail to count and to contribute to our party's struggle. That's all, comrades.

Reynaldo Rosas

PSUM's situation has had one fundamental quality since the second congress. This quality consists of the fact that there has been an internal struggle.

An internal struggle may be very annoying, but I think that it is a fact. And we should, therefore, try to put that internal struggle in the best terms for the development of the party itself. I think that the comrades who think, who consider the change of leadership to be the main problem have a legitimate right to think that this may be the way to settle the situation. I don't believe that anyone is afraid of such proposals. But the important thing in this regard is to view a change of leadership from the standpoint of which policy is to be applied, and which party is to be promoted; because that is not present, that is not explicit.

I deem it feasible for those proposals to be developed and explained completely, developed, so that the party will be apprised of them. It seems to me that this would be most feasible. In other words, we should actually engage in a struggle involving proposals and plans, and not be using expedients that in my view, will not extricate us from the problems in which we are involved at present. For example, the expedient of saying things that have not been proven. I think that the charge of trouble-making management of funds is something that has been said without even putting forth a serious argument, without citing concrete instances or facts. And this seems to me to be something extremely serious. There has also been talk of violation of the second congress resolutions by some of the leadership; well, that must be looked at, comrades. It is very serious if that leadership is not following the second congress line; at least a change is warranted.

There has been talk of satanizing campaigns, which may actually have turned certain comrades into villains. And all these things are mentioned, but without any argument; and I think that we are in an organ with maximum responsibility. What we say here must have many grounds; we must not merely state things, I think, in a certain direction, and then not even bother to prove them. I would urge the comrades who have put forth these accusations to try to document them, and submit them seriously. Because, if not, then we shall be heading toward a campaign of squabbles; and it appears to us that this would not help us to find solutions for the problems that we have. The proposal made yesterday by Pablo Pascal seems very proper to me: namely, that we should ask which party plan, which leadership plan, in which direction, which plan of this type is being proposed for us to progress? That is what we would like to know quite clearly, because it is not proper either for this to involve merely a change of leadership, not knowing in what direction.

I think that the leadership has acted properly in the matter of the alliances; and on the basis of the discussion and the resolutions that we adopt here, which were not opposed, we are working in the state of Mexico to make the broadest possible electoral alliance, an alliance which in our view should include PRT (PMT has not wished to participate with us, for the present). There is the Socialist Movement, there is MRP; ACNR is interested; we have been talking with the PPS leadership in Toluca. We have agreed that it would be very important for both forces in the state of Mexico if we were to go together to certain town halls. The party's rank and file, which we have informed, is greatly interested in this; because, actually, if we go together and agree on

a platform, we have a chance of winning some town halls (small ones, but there is this chance); and we don't think that we would be violating anything, comrades. If there is agreement, if we need to observe how this policy on alliances was devised, if this helps the left and the democratic forces to have a presence there, then let's do it; let's try to seek the broadest alliance. And, of course, may the comrades offended by this forgive us; but we are here making, trying to make a policy, a policy that will aid in the expansion and development of our own struggle, the workers' struggle.

And we shall not sign anything with PPS that is not the party's policy. We are attempting to seek agreement. I don't think it can be claimed that PSUM cannot make alliances in general with PPS. I have not seen any resolution in that direction. And so whoever makes that claim is not basing it on the decisions of our second congress nor on the decisions of our plenums.

It would be a mistake if we were to think now of a certain type of solution, such as the one involving representation of movements, etc. I believe that the movements have complete freedom in this party; there is the UGOCM movement (I consider it a movement). Some comrades claim that it is a mass organization; It seems to me to be a movement organized to work within PSUM, and I don't know whether this is correct; simply this, the organization of that movement to work within PSUM (because it seems to me that UGOCM is not working so much outside, but rather is working inside PSUM). I can probably be refuted, but it is a movement that has caused considerable problems. It is starting to cause them for us in the state of Mexico.

We must form social organizations, mustn't we? We must not form movements to make policy within a party. That is my view, comrades; we have committees for that. I would not be willing to affiliate myself with any movement; I am not meeting with anyone; I meet in the organs. Well, I would not be willing to affiliate myself with any political boss, or to follow any political boss.

I don't consider that proper; that is, prompting people to ask: Whose side are you on? At least I am on the side of PSUM, and there are many who are on the side of PSUM, and who don't do that type of thing. We have resolved to organize in a different way, and I consider it retrogressive to organize in that way; and the contrary cannot be proven. Or else, if there is no other remedy, then let's embark on it, but let's embark on it seriously. Let each one have his movement well organized, so that it will not be advantageous for some and disadvantageous for others. Yes, comrades, let's have a place in which to hold discussions, so as to bring settled, processed resolutions here; because I consider it disadvantageous for those not affiliated with them. That's all.

Jose Luis Alonso

Setting aside all the problems that occur when one tries to attack, denounce or oppose one of the movements which really exist in this party, I shall try to submit a concrete proposal, without discrediting and without forgetting that there is an entire conflict here, which I shall not repeat, since 30 speakers

have already mentioned it. It seems to me that we are united to construct a revolutionary party of masses. We have all said this, we all know it, we all want it, at least in terms of a moral statement. Then we are seeking that revolutionary party of masses today more willingly, because we have a major political confrontation in the 1985 elections. That, too, is a common site, but those of us who are directly involved in the mass action, although it is sometimes minimal, those of us who feel close to the persecution from the government and the right wing reactionary forces which are trying to prevent our advancement, need to make this party a party which will truly lead, in an operative, daring and aggressive manner, and with the least possible number of internal personal problems.

Because the personal problems will never end; our very formation in this capitalist society and that of the new cadres that are arriving in the party and the revolutionary labor movement bring all of them, that legacy. And here, in the struggle, in political education, we shall be coping with those flaws, defects and mistakes, without putting an end to them completely. But, attempting to minimize this, I think that we must seriously consider how we are going to transform this party, to make it more capable, operative, daring and aggressive.

Concretely, we should say that PSUM is in its first period of construction, that it has not been consolidated, that the merger has not been achieved; and that we must probe deeply, as stringently as possible, into what this principle is. It appears to me that we all agree on the basic documents: the declaration of principles, the program and the statutes. We are more or less agreed on that, more or less; although there is lacking some discussion which, moreover, no one is preventing, but few are holding. In other words, we are lacking a desire to sit down and work on this; because theoretical preparation is not a simple task; it requires training and serious approaches for such preparation. It doesn't simply mean saying: we want to discuss, now; no, there must be work, without anyone claiming that it is being prevented or that it can be started by decree. Discussion will always occur, on one level or another, on one platform or another; but I think that we must return to the origins of PSUM. If we agree on the theory, on the fundamental part of the theory, on the basic elements, we can find out where the party is failing. And I think that it is failing in its organizations.

In other words, this party operated well when it was set up at the national unification meeting. It operated well because there was an operative, collective leadership. We saw Comrade Arnoldo and Comrade Gascon all over the country. They attended state meetings, just as other comrades, such as Rolando, Miguel Angel and Jaramillo, did; of course some more than others. We saw more of Comrade Gascon and Comrade Arnoldo, leading state meetings and municipal conferences at which the need for the merger, its chances and the needs of the immediate struggle were debated. There was also a discussion of the construction of socialism, although each explained it in his own way. But there was more or less of an idea that we were struggling on behalf of socialism. After the first congress, the organizational problems started, involving leadership,

not only on the central level, but also on the state, local and municipal levels. After the second congress, this became more obvious; because there were two lists opened up, two blocs in direct conflict; and what resulted from that was not the most constructive thing, not the most proper thing, or the thing most suited to the party's real circumstances, that is, for the initial growth period.

I believe that the end of that associative leadership was hastened; it was set ahead of time, artificially. Because what we are observing is that the associative leadership is continuing but not in a united manner, with a desire for unity; rather, on the contrary, each one is leading a sector and there are many sectors not being led by anyone, because we have neither political bosses nor movements. In this sense, we should consider that situation and look back again at the origins, when this party operated well, and try to resolve this situation in the best possible way. It seems to me that we talk a great deal about collective, unified leaderships, in which the majorities do not crush the minorities, and we repeat it at one plenum after another, in the congresses and resolutions, but the reality is otherwise: There are still majorities crushing minorities. There are still organized sectors of the party, organized movements and unlegalized factions, which nevertheless exist. And this has to be accepted and given a positive solution, not one of retrogression, but rather going forward. If we want to put an end to this, let's not try to end it tomorrow or within a year; perhaps it will have to be acknowledged.

Concretely, I propose one measure; there must necessarily be many. To begin with: realizing the fact that the Central Committee does not operate as a leadership organ, as an operative organ, particularly in the execution of its decisions. In other words, the Central Committee is not operating as such. We know very little about the Secretariat; we know a little more about the Political Commission, through its statements, from what we read in the newspapers and what comes out in manifestations; but we know nothing much about the Secretariat, and far less about the work of the national commissions. We know now about a convocation for the national trade union conference, but what is going on among the youth? They claim that there was a meeting in Sinaloa; it doesn't seem to me to have been properly called. I don't know; someone may report on the work with women and the work in agriculture. They claim that there was a national agrarian meeting, and that only five state entities were represented, and that some documents were prepared, very badly, so it is said. So the commissions are not operating; the Secretariat is not operating; all of them are operating poorly; and the one most observed to be operating, based on its statements, is the Political Commission, owing to its national and international relations. So I think that all this will have to start operating, but well.

The point that I propose is this: that this plenum resolve to restructure the Secretariat General, from the standpoint of appointing three secretaries general: one to deal with the Political Commission, presiding over the Political Commission and acting as the public representative of the Central Committee, in addition to chairing the Political Commission's meetings; another secretary

general to officiate at the Secretariat's meetings, and to oversee, steer and coordinate the secretaries' work; and another secretary general to oversee, coordinate and steer the commissions' work.

These secretaries general should be full-time professionals; they must be located essentially in the Central Committee building; departing and leaving their jobs covered; in other words, not leaving and finding out what is happening the next week. No, they should keep in constant communication with the center, but also go out to various parts of the country, if necessary. In addition, the three secretaries general must have permanent, constant, daily, everyday, systematic, planned agreements. If this is transferred to the state and municipal levels, perhaps there would be an improved operation by the state leaderships wherein the majorities are also preventing the minorities from being represented.

The concrete proposal is: "For an associative leadership. The Central Committee's sixth plenum, heeding the demands of large sectors of the rank and file, the intermediate leaderships and the Central Committee itself, calling for an improvement and for lending greater operativeness and efficacy to the leadership organs, resolves: a. to form the Secretariat General of the Central Committee with three comrades from the Political Commission; b. one secretary general will perform the function of representing the Central Committee and will chair the Political Commission's meetings; c. another secretary general will preside over the Secretariat, will call and direct its meetings, and will oversee and coordinate its work, according to the internal regulations; and, d. a third secretary general will oversee and direct the work of the national commissions and will discuss the party's work problems with the secretaries general of the state and regional committees."

This is the concrete proposal that I shall submit to the board. Comrades, in view of the situation that the party has experienced and the need for unifying it, strengthening it and consolidating it, lending continuity to those real, genuine, principles of unity that we saw when we toured the entire country, when all of us were excited by the unity and merger, I think that one of those secretaries general should be Comrade Gascon, and another Comrade Rolando. And so, comrades, at least for awhile, we can establish a truce and devote ourselves to the work with masses, giving priority to the work with masses. There have even been considerable complaints here, or some, perhaps only one, giving priority to having the Central Committee's spending relate to the work with masses, applying it to the work with masses, and not having a series of almost luxurious expenses. I don't know, it even seems to me that we spend too much on these meetings themselves. We should devise a different kind of operative mechanism to prevent the meetings from proving so expensive. Comrades, this is the concrete proposal. I hope that I have made a contribution.

Jorge Alcocer

Comrades, it is clear to everyone that the basic principle which has given life to our party and allowed it to develop is unity. The brief experience has shown

us that, when the unity is strong, the party progresses, grows and displays its capacity and influence. In my opinion, that was the experience during the months just before the merger, and to some extent the opposite has occurred during the months that have elapsed since the second national congress. But unity implies diversity; uniting is possible only when it is first acknowledged that there are differences and there is a desire to surmount them. Monolithism and intolerance do not require a unifying spirit, because by definition they exclude diversity and plurality of approaches. Unity is precisely one of PSUM's essential contributions within the left.

We have started to discuss our differences, not to make an endless account of the supposed or real abuses that have marked our relations during recent months, but rather to seek the areas that will enable us to rediscover unity. In my view, there is one encouraging fact, namely, that, despite everything, all those of us who sincerely believe in this PSUM are here; those of us who believe that this party could be the alternative to which we aspire and to which the people are entitled and, I believe are demanding, as some comrades have said.

The few who have left were never really on our side; it was unnecessary to exclude them, and in this respect the Central Committee's conduct was proper. They excluded themselves at the outset. But one thing that we cannot overlook, that we cannot close our eyes to, is the fact that PSUM is, day by day, losing its attraction for broad sectors which, when we created this party, we called upon to join it. And it is losing its attraction for reasons known to everyone; because what is said about us in the press will actually continue to be said, but it will have a far greater impact when the real situation that we have here is present. And that is what we must try to resolve, and what we must try to progress with, if we want this party to rediscover its path and become attractive again to that large number of Mexicans who viewed it, in my opinion many of them still view it as a hope and as a viable, effective alternative that will make it possible to defeat the tendencies that are present in this country today.

Comrade Adolfo Salazar remarked here that not all the members of the Political Commission are there, they are not all present, to put it briefly. He may be right, but those who are members and are not present have done this of their own will. And what we want to discuss and explain here is what the conditions for their being present are. Let's speak frankly. The Political Commission has made a proposal seeking to provide an outlet for the solution to our differences, but to achieve this dialog must be reestablished; dialog must not be reestablished as an exercise in catharsis, but rather as a democratic method for solving the problems. We believe that it is possible and an urgent need to reestablish in PSUM that atmosphere mentioned by Pepe Woldenberg; from the standpoint that rumors and lies cannot continue to be almost the only "method of communication" among us. I claim that it is necessary for the comrades who have decided to exclude themselves from the leadership tasks to state their reasons and their differences; but what is of no use among us is inventing specters, such as the one claiming that the Political Commission consists of us comrades who are opposed to the political line approved by the congress.

or that we do not have the backing of the majority of the party. Let's not invent differences nor cloud the atmosphere any further; and if, perchance, the only real difference was that of the leadership posts, we could still resolve that, not as a hidden settlement, but as an open, frank commitment to work together for the party's development.

We have proposed that the comrades who refused to participate, and other comrades here who consider themselves necessary, join the Political Commission. This could take place by way of expansion, or through the election of a new Political Commission. Our proposal does not exhaust the problem; we are aware of that. It merely opens a channel for overt discussion of, among other things, the formation of all the leadership and permanent working organs of the Central Committee, such as the Secretariat, the sections and commissions. That is the course of action which we propose: that the comrades involved state whether this proposal is acceptable, or make others. It seems to me that there is here a spirit for discussing any proposal. Let's be flexible, and remember, I wish to recall here, to back the necessity for unity, what Fidel Castro said a few weeks before the founding of PSUM, commenting on our unity process.

Fidel said: "I am opposed to cliques and enemies of sectarianism. There are organizations and there will always be more. They grow like grass, and their leaders are reproduced like rabbits; there are more than enough enlightened ones interpreting the only truth." Fidel said: "I have seen groups that have proclaimed the uprightness of their principles and fought to the death with cadres that were upholding their exact same theories. For a long time, the leftist forces have looked at each other like a dog and cat. This neurosis is gradually disappearing, and the mutual feeling is progressing. When planned in a corner, the isolated struggle is poisonous." And Fidel concluded by saying: "For all these reasons, I am inclined to eliminate details. I would not give my life for nuances, and I don't think that it is humiliating for anyone to make honorable concessions in good faith."

Let's accept these comments with all the constructive quality that they hold for PSUM's unity. Let's not make nuances an obstacle, nor lend details a value that they do not have. Let's not poison the struggle. This exemplary unity, as Fidel Castro described it, lies above our differences.

Comrades, in conclusion, there is a matter that I don't want to fail to mention, because I don't want it said that anyone who is silent gives consent. It has been claimed here that there is a trouble-making handling of funds; it has been hinted that there is squandering and it has been said that there are luxurious expenses. Something has also been claimed which is absolutely incorrect and which we must explain. The Central Committee has never rejected any report from the finance section; on the contrary, it approved it, and it approved the budget. I invite the comrades who claim that there is a trouble-making handling of funds to review each and every one of the documents showing what this party's funds are spent on. I am sure that they will not find a single proof; but, if they should find it, then that would make it possible

to debate with evidence. I am certain that, if they review that, if they take the trouble, they will come here and amend their remarks.

Antonio Becerra

Some time ago, I bought a ticket for life with Comrade Heberto Castillo, because at a meeting I made the rebuff of calling him a "political rogue." And it turns out that the story is more or less this: When a commission appeared before Heberto Castillo to propose an electoral alliance to him, Comrade Heberto said: "Why an alliance and no merger?" Ah! we said, that is not our problem. If they want merger, let's have a merger. We are no problem. We have proposed the alliance because we thought that this was the level of possible relations at present; he said "merger," and that seemed to us to be an inspired idea, and we enthusiastically engaged in working, no longer for the electoral alliance, but rather for the merger. But, we had just begun, when Comrade Heberto, in a manner which...we certainly have granted him a great deal, not continuing to explain publicly the reasons for his abandonment of unity and allowing the story that he gave to be the official version. Now, in some places the question is being asked: "Why didn't PMT become allied with PSUM? And we are told: because Heberto wanted a different symbol to be used, not the hammer and sickle, because he didn't want a language with foreign orientation, because he didn't want "The Internationale" as an anthem, because, etc., etc. And all of us present here know that this is an erroneous story, that it is not true, that the reasons for which we didn't accept Heberto, the proposals for solving problems such as those of the leadership, which at that time I considered a flaw, I now think was a virtue in Heberto. What a good thing that there was no merger! It was sensible, because I can imagine now, if we were right now as we are, with Heberto and Roberto (and what a good thing that he left too), this mess would be unbearable, truly unbearable. I believe that this party, PSUM, is the most united party; united at the top, because thus far I have not found anyone here telling me that it is now obsolete, or that it is in opposition to this document.

We are all agreed on the major, fine, noble, lofty issues. Moving briefly to an account of what has disunited us, what has divided us, I shall not give a complete account, and you must not demand that I cite case by case, because I have neither the knowledge nor the time to do so. But I shall give sufficient examples to prove the problem that has disunited us. Comrades, it is the petty things, the foolish things. What has disunited us is the ambitions; what has disunited us is those elements in our personality which have cropped out and are obstacles to the establishment of a revolutionary party, as persons. Like everyone, I would like to devote myself now to an examination of major, lofty issues; but it is impossible. We progressed very well, very well, when all the concepts had consensus; our problems started when the simple things, the trifles were stressed. They began saying that there were differences, and I would say, yes, in fact there are differences; but now it is time, although we may be discussing on the ground level, although we may be discussing on that level, without any loftiness, we must attach the child to George, the child to George, not George to the child, mustn't we? We must, in fact, state what our differences are, and what plurality is, lending it an essence, and

filling that hollow of concepts. Because we are agreed on qualities, we are agreed on concepts, but when we attach an essence to it, therein will lie our differences.

For example, I find a very specific difference. Here in this party there are some who accompany Carrera, the deputy from Sonora, and even communism with him. I do not; I am not going to the market because the stalks are being stolen from the onions, either. That is a difference, comrades; all right, comrades. That divided us, and there are some who would give their lives for Carrera; I wouldn't give a cent for that man. I cannot call him a comrade nor can I call him a revolutionary, nor can I even call him a man. How is that? I am opposed, and I stated, I lent essence to the very specific difference. Where did our problems begin? Because the deputies stole a little money and there was a risk of our expelling them. And then it was said that, if we expelled them there would be division. Love for our unity has become cowardice over division. And so as not to become divided, we have to put up with rogues here. We are at that level.

Well, I am only continuing the level that Valero applied, the ground level: he has mentioned attackers.

Valero

And I support it. Another interruption from Raul Rea.

Becerra

Outside, and here, and wherever you want, man!

Unzueta

Comrades, be calm. That is not the meaning of this....

Becerra

Valero mentioned attackers. There it is. So what is the level that we are attaching to the discussion? This is the level that we have, comrades; this is the level. So, where is there fear? Why those rude remarks from the comrade? If they proposed the terms of the discussion in this way, then we are conducting it. There is no room for anything else. What good is it to talk here about communism and socialism, and lofty things? No, gentlemen, we are not here for that. We are here to settle matters in this area and of this type. So, let's embark upon it. We began to divide when the discussion began about who would be the secretary general of the Municipal Committee, the State Committee and the Central Committee; that is where our differences started, over issues of power, comrades. because we are unwilling to allow others to be the leaders, or someone else to be a leader; we want to be the leaders. And so there is division over that. I do not agree that there should be a proposal here, the one of the comrade from Baja California, Chelis. Why? Well, because the leadership that would result from that would do the same thing; it is a concession to pettiness. Because he is dissatisfied because he is not the leader, then let's make him leader so that he will be satisfied; let's unite on that,

let's share the pie, let's see how many slices we can make, and of what size, so that each one will receive a share that satisfies him, and then in this way we can be united. We are united at the top and on the ground level too, on major matters and on minor matters. Comrades, this is impossible. Or, if it is possible, if we are going to proceed in that way, we must put matters that way, matters of that size, on that level. And let's proceed on that level. Because it now so happens that the main problem is that we are too petty to aspire to something as noble and as grand as that plan which we all forged together in our imagination. We are throwing stones and putting up obstacles to that party, not because of what unites us, but because of these petty things. And so, if we are going to continue in this way, we must put matters in those terms, and resolve the issues of this type which divide us.

Gerardo Unzueta
(debate chairman)

Comrade Rolando Cordera and, later, Comrade Alejandro Gascon, I would like to make an appeal.... Yes, yes, we want to ask the Central Committee plenum that we do whatever possible to remain on the highest level of discussion at this meeting; that we avoid violent confrontations, and that we avoid all issues which could divert the discussion from the course that it had assumed.

Castaneda
(explanation)

The issue is that neither I nor other comrades have ever made our membership in PSUM contingent on the resolutions adopted by the party at the time regarding Carrera or the deputies; and I think we should start from there. Second, it seems to me that, not on account of the reports from a comrade whom we greatly respect, and who gave a report on Carrera, should we now make official here the charge that Carrera is a bandit, because he has not been judged either by the party nor by the authorities, nor has he been listened to. So, we are making the mistake that the newspaper EXCELSIOR made in the past, telling a lie and later editorializing on the lie.

Unzueta

Comrade, that is a characterization, an intervention....

Castaneda

.....about whether Comrade Carrera has not been, or may not have been penalized; he has his rights, and one cannot talk about a person who has not yet been judged on the basis of reflections. That seems fundamental to me, and in keeping not only with the party's principles, but also the principles of all mankind. The other point that I wanted to explain, because it refers to me, is that I was in San Luis-Rio Colorado in January, at the time of the problem of PAN's town hall. It was Comrade Petra Santos who signed a document requesting the dismissal of the PAN town hall. Carrera arrived in San Luis-Rio Colorado,

requesting to talk with me, to ask my opinion; he was traveling with a commission of deputies; and the congress had the entire procedure for declaring the abolishment of authorities in the municipality. I told Carrera that we could not assume that position; what had occurred in Juchitan was a precedent. And Carrera acted accordingly, influencing the congress not to make a statement regarding the abolishment or dismissal of authorities in the town hall. That's all.

Rolando Cordera

In some notes made awhile ago by Alejandro Gascon, Arnolito Martinez Verdugo and I, as somewhat of a reminder of a series of talks that we had held on some of these problems that we are airing now, we had agreed, agreed that the purpose of writing them was not to make a political document or anything for history or anything but merely for our own purposes. It was worthwhile trying to determine the situation that we were undergoing, if we wanted to reach useful conclusions regarding the internal problems confronting us. And we said that there were two problems, that we could, in brief, talk about two basic questions: First we had to admit that the party was still in a construction phase, certainly not put in an abstract or pretentious sense; because now everyone is saying that everything in life is a life under construction; agreeing that this is so, we are talking here in simpler terms, and in these terms, I would say now, and assume responsibility for the remark: namely, that we have not finished the initial phase of PSUM's construction.

What we meant was what I propose now; nevertheless, nearly all of us said it, before the second congress, during the second congress and immediately after it ended. I believe that we have all shown that we were mistaken. And, secondly, we said that we had embarked (and this is perhaps most important) on a phase of acute problems and political confrontations of a national type which would find a point of definition, probably a preliminary one, but of important definition, next year in the elections. Well, I think that this diagnosis is general, but it is very useful; and it seems to me to be still essentially valid for guiding our thinking. Now I would like to make a few general proposals, not as precise as those made by Comrade Alonso, but indeed with the idea of our reaching some conclusions on which we could assume positions. I believe that the construction phase that I have mentioned necessarily forces us to revise the original pact in the good sense of the word; and that we must make an effort to overcome the fetichism of the statutes, in order to gear PSUM's real structure, that is, the one we want to use to organize our action, to the requirements that result from this revision.

Obviously, we need to revise, and to revise the texts we must assume responsibility. And we must deal with the issues, attempting to be commensurate with this requirement. In other words, we cannot engage here in an exchange of, I was almost going to say of nonsense; because what is involved here is that if we are on a low level, then raise it, isn't that so? Let's not revolve about in the depths. I would agree, if I understood him correctly, with what Sergio Almaguer said to the effect that PSUM's unity must be pursued taking

its origins into consideration. I think that, whether it bothers us or not, and it doesn't bother me, it seems to me that this is necessary if we want to bring the party ahead as a political organization worthy of consideration, not from us, nor from the national or international left, but from the people and the voters. Now this requires a great deal of work and time, and we must devote it. But I think that we must begin in one area. And at this point I would adopt a proposal, or a thought from Olac Fuentes, to the effect that from what we have seen, not from what each individual brought here, but from what we have seen during the past 2 days, it is not sufficient for us to propose the expansion of the Political Commission as a starting point. I think, definitely, that we must say that we must restructure it, and that the party must undertake to examine this proposal and the next Central Committee plenum should decide on it. First, the press must be used; in other words, we must evoke opinions, evoke them seriously, and for this purpose a minimal method must be contrived to ensure that everyone will be satisfied with the direction of the opinions that are evoked. For example, we must discuss, and find out what they are saying in our organizations; we must speak and embark on this debate. What restructuring, in which direction, and even with which titles, why not?

Later, it seems to me from now until the conference on organization, and at it, we must define (I would say redefine) forms and methods for leadership and representative status. Comrades, I greatly respect the experience of those who have been in parties, and it is a very good thing for us to try to have a delegate for x over n , but, comrades, that has not worked; that has given rise to a heap of situations which then, immediately have their interpreter on every side. And when the devil are we going to come to agreement on the interpretations, what each one did with x number of votes, for this or that congress? I don't think that having a delegate for every 10 or for every 20 is the only way of holding representative national events; we could have that and along with that have federal ceilings for each state. We had also arrived at that, Gascon, Arnolde and I, not as a conviction, because it is an arbitrary matter on which some reach agreement, but as a suggestion. I would suggest it here, too.

But in more general terms we must engage in a study of this issue. And then, in fact, we must talk in a very practical way, not being told by I don't know who what type of Political Commission this party should and wants to have. This Secretariat which is so unknown and so active should be that way. Or shouldn't it be that way? I frankly don't know; I don't like how the Secretariat is acting, but if you were to ask me now for evidence, I would have none. It is simply my impression that it is an organ which is not doing us any good in our political relations, as it is operating. Is a group of dedicated people needed to do what the comrades are doing? I don't have the slightest doubt, and I think that each one of them is handling his affairs well. But there is a problem there with that organ, which in my view has become an organ of political leadership, and it should not be, in my opinion.. And of course this also applies to the sections and commissions of the Central Committee, which have not been sections and commissions of the Central Committee thus

far, unfortunately. I don't know whether someone will later use this to say: There was someone from the Political Commission who said that there are no sections of the Central Committee. I am saying this from the standpoint of a candid diagnosis; I don't think that they are from any trouble-making group, certainly; at least that would be a little less bad, but they are not even that. There are spaces there to which everyone refers, according to his liking.

Comrades, we must also talk, because we are talking about a concrete party with flesh and bone men and women, about what type of system and professionals we want to have, who they are, what they do, what they should do, and how those professionals should be organized; and, of course, something that is no minor matter, what rights those professionals have. Because at times we receive the unfortunate impression, comrades, that we have turned our party's professionals into a kind of "punching bag," depending on our state of mind; and that seems very unfair to me, comrades. Because they are people devoted to it, for better or worse; that is a different problem, and they have virtually no job security, nor rights of any kind, and very poor pay. So, let's talk about the system for the professionals; I think that it would have as many complaints, or more than most. Let's discuss this as something which is ours, deserving a fundamental respect. Let's not continue there a harmful tradition, which to a large extent comes from PC, at least the one I know about, that in the final reckoning everything is the fault of those involved somewhere, engaged in a heap of maneuvers, whom we call professionals. That seems to me terribly unfair and disrespectful. And if we are going to construct something together, let's agree that respect be included, particularly, as a fundamental starting point among adults.

I would say, and clearly reaffirm, what several comrades have said; but, unfortunately, it must be said again, in view of what has preceded: If we do not make an effort to create a different atmosphere, and to behave differently here, as politicians, we shall not get anywhere. I have to do it, Alcocer had to do it, and I am doing it too, because it involves me: I reject the charge that the Political Commission has made trouble-making use of funds. I would tell Comrade Valero here that, in these matters, I defer to the evidence. And in my view, making trouble-making use of funds which are not mine is called fraud, inside and outside the party. I personally reject that charge, and I would say that I have not noted the Political Commission making any decision that could substantiate a charge of that type. I definitely cannot accept that. It may be said here that we should have respect, because, in fact, in such matters, as Rea has said, both inside and outside, this has to do with the integrity of each individual, and in such matters that is what little one has.

Finally, and I shall spend half a minute, I would like to mention a point that is not directly related to the issue, but has prompted many speeches, and it must be discussed. I don't think that we can resolve it as the comrades wish. What I do agree with in what they say is that it must be reviewed and it is the problem of the alliances. Comrades, I don't have the slightest doubt that the phase that Mexico is experiencing, the phase that the left is experiencing, forces us to seek the greatest possible broadness in alliances, relations and convergences. Comrades, a long time has elapsed; I hope that the word will

not irritate you; it is a very fundamental word. We should become allied with whomever we can, comrades, because the circumstances so indicate. In addition to which, I believe that these people require supports, great organizations, not small ones; and, comrades, in the matter of great ones, it takes all kinds, it takes all kinds. Alvaro Ramirez told me between board meetings: "I wouldn't ally myself with traitors." Well, I wouldn't either. I don't think that anyone here is willing to become allied with traitors; but, comrades, let's not take ourselves to the extremes of turning it into a methodological principle. This statement that someone made about no fortune-telling being done among gypsies sometimes has to be made; because I shall tell you, I can tell you my very small experience in the Chamber with PPS and PST, and it is not at all encouraging.

Even today, now that we have said that we are in contact, they have left us hanging, because the gentlemen don't go, they go elsewhere; and we are left doing things, and they are not done. All right, but they may tell me: "You allied yourself with a traitor." Who told me that he was a traitor? I don't consider the PPS members to be traitors. I beg your pardon. I do not have that information. That they are not in the party that I would be in, no; they are not. That I doubt we shall progress much beyond the statement of this alliance based on fraternal relations, and now I have very serious doubts; I don't think that this is an alliance which would really suit us, either. Certainly, we should not go to the other side. If that one does not suit us, the one of the genuine left suits us; Let's discuss that, comrades, too; let's discuss that. Because, as I have said on many occasions, I do not agree with praising that alliance with the genuine left, when I don't know who I am, or who anyone here is who could tell me which ones.

Shall we discuss the problem? Then let's discuss it seriously. And I would only stress here, to leave it on the table of this discussion, that I am not gratified that Heberto Castillo left the PSUM plan; it seems to me that it is still regrettable. And if it is to be remedied, we should expend the greatest effort that we can.

L. Javier Valero

In connection with the matter in which I was mentioned, I shall cite only one thing, comrades: the use and the amount of electoral propaganda in Nayarit. It is a clear example of how propaganda was reversed in favor of a political movement inside the state of Nayarit, and of how all that was used as a tool in favor of dividing the party there, even undermining the election work. I could not tell you how much, but this was obvious to most of the party members there, where a large amount of propaganda, signs and funds were allocated, I would not say as a priority, but massively, in favor of the municipal campaign in Tepic, and where the rest of the state was neglected, I would not say totally, but to a large extent.

I am pleased to learn that there are comrades here who are beginning to discern what was very obvious to some: That was a homogeneous position of the party leadership, the party's top-ranking leadership. That is good. In a different

connection, those of us who were in the Popular Socialist Party know that the political decisions are not made by the Central Committee nor the national leadership of that party; they are made by the Government Secretariat.

Jose Woldenberg

Well, since I am responsible for the propaganda section, I would only like to make an explanation of how the election propaganda was carried out for the state of Nayarit. A list reached us later, with the photographs of the different candidates; and, on the basis of that list, we started putting the propaganda together in the exact order as the photos, names and candidacies reached us, in that exact order. It was done in that order, and it was sent in that order. And, insofar as I know, except for one candidate, all the propaganda was sent directly to the State Committee. The direct contact was with Comrade Gonzalez Gallo, and the propaganda was sent directly to him. I shall repeat again, the order in which it was done was exactly that of the propaganda.

Gonzalez Gallo

Comrades, how good it is that we are beginning to explain many things which have caused upsets among those of us who have in any way been involved in a party such as the one of which we are dreaming and which we continue to think of as our own, PSUM. But we have flaws; in the case of Nayarit, there was actually a real discrimination regarding the propaganda. Whereas, in the case of the candidates for municipal president, and not all of them, because there were seven candidates for deputy lacking, there was propaganda for seven candidates for deputy and municipal president, Comrade Eduardo Saucedo Fuentes was given too much propaganda, too much; whereas in the case of the small signs for the candidates for municipal president and deputy, they sent 3,000 or 4,000 small ones, for Comrade Saucedo Fuentes they sent no fewer than 8,000 signs, and quantities of 10,000 and 15,000 in each mailing; but the worst party was that this occurred beyond the control of the State Committee, and I say this with my own sole responsibility, because I was the general coordinator of the campaign in Nayarit.

We did not know the amount or the occasion wherein Comrade Saucedo Fuentes was receiving the propaganda; we only saw it arriving in packages, but too much for the town of Tepic alone, neglecting the rest, the entire remainder of the state. The comrade, who was our particular liaison, owing to our close association, owing to whatever you like, was Comrade Manuel Stephens. And he, luckily, can attest that, for the candidates in the rest of the state there were the so-called electoral commitments, there was the electoral platform, the sign with their photograph and, later a small flyer with the candidate's name. But they were lacking to us for seven more, whereas Comrade Eduardo Saucedo Fuentes had, and may still possibly have, enormous amounts of propaganda which he didn't even use, because he had too much. Yes, that is waste. And if that is not waste, it is a matter of each individual's reaching his individual conclusion. What is not acceptable, nor valid, is that there should be discrimination in this respect. Now, I would like to add, speaking for myself, that, in addition, he received a large amount of money. I don't wish to investigate, nor do I

wish to know the origin, or why he was receiving enormous amounts of money. I could reckon that he received about 1.5 million pesos in cash. That's all.

Jose Woldenberg

Look, I want to make this as clearly explained as possible. And I would ask Comrade Gonzalez Gallo first, concerning the list that they sent us, and the photographs, if any of the candidates didn't receive his propaganda. And, second, whether the propaganda for each and every one of them didn't fluctuate between 3,000 and 4,000 signs. Third, whether the electoral commitments were printed; I think that there were about 100,000 of them, and sent to them on time. The only thing that Comrade Saucedo ordered was a single sign, at least according to the order from the information and propaganda section. If there were seven more, as you claim, we would have to find out whether there were seven. And in that respect, about there being seven, that too was concurrent with the information and propaganda section. I would like to state emphatically, so that there will be no doubt, that we sent all the electoral propaganda that we prepared directly to the State Committee. Secondly, it was in almost identical amounts. Thirdly, the electoral commitments were also sent through the State Committee; and, in that connection, there was a large sign for Comrade Eduardo Saucedo, which was also ordered, because he was the candidate for municipal president in Nayarit, pardon me, in Tepic. The responsibility, or my responsibility, was to that extent.

Gerardo Unzueta

Listen, comrades, please. He was asked several questions, he will answer, and we shall finish this discussion. The matter of the propaganda section was obvious, comrades; because Comrade Gonzalez Gallo is responsible for the section, it was sent directly to him.

Gonzalez Gallo

...His answer was not understood, because he didn't take the floor in front of the microphone...

Pablo Sandoval

...In his capacity as university union leader, Comrade Eduardo Saucedo received solidarity from certain university union groups in the country, in connection with this propaganda issue. And I have observed it concretely. But that was outside the party's financial channels.

Alejandro Gascon Mercado

Comrades, I would like to request of the Central Committee a few minutes to express some views on the situation in Sonora, because I was a member of the commission which convoked, and tried to organize the congress and also, at the same time, discuss the general issues cited here. Therefore, I request

the chair to ask the Central Committee whether it is possible to combine this information and my opinions regarding the matters being debated.

Gerardo Unzueta

Comrade Gascon Mercado's request will be submitted to the Central Committee plenum.

Alejandro Gascon Mercado

Comrades, I think that in this issue involving Sonora there have been different accounts here; and we must also interpret things differently based on the credit that is given to the informants. We have been virtually stating matters in this way. We set up a commission which expended serious efforts, and I don't think that the comrades will refute me, to perform a unified job. We operated on an irregular basis, for 6 months. Some comrades spent months in the state of Sonora; and it was not easy for some members of the commission to have traveled so often to that state. And on one of those occasions we spent 20 days in Sonora. This means that, if we view matters from a positive standpoint, then we members of the commission made very great efforts to be in the state of Sonora, despite the large expenses that we had to make, not always giving the party this responsibility.

On the other hand, we were in almost all the locations in which we have an organization several times. We talked with the municipal committees that had been set up; those municipal committees met on several occasions; guidance was given for the work; and in a completely troubled party they even worked jointly on several occasions as well. I don't think that the party's situation in Sonora is worse than before, I don't believe it. Why? Because we have called for the comrades to rejoin, and at least 2,600 comrades have rejoined. This is not the case in other states of the country. Then at least 2,200 comrades became members of the rank and file organizations. Later, they elected 159 delegates to the congress (one for every 10), without considering the fact that some rank and file organizations had more than 10, with three or four extra comrades who were not taken into account. In other words, nearly 2,000 members had representation.

Were there any incidents? Yes, but none which questioned the authenticity of the congress. The leaders were there, installing the congress, and they started debating all the issues that we had pending. There were four documents to discuss: the one from the commission, the commission's report. I believe that this document obviously didn't reflect the reality of our effort. Rather, it reflected the state of mind left from our first public differences on the occasion of the Hermosillo municipal congress. There, a document was prepared reflecting this, but not the commission's 4 previous months of work. And, moreover, this document did not discuss all the earlier work that was done, not only by the members of the commission, but also by the municipal committees and the party members themselves, who had to check the designation of the delegates, from one organization to another. And they went from Guaymas to Hermosillo, and from Hermosillo to Guaymas, to make the checks. Scores of comrades participated in this check; it was an effort, and this report did not reflect it.

I think that this was the main reason that the report was rejected at the congress; because it was partial, it had a partial view of the events that had taken place in connection with the preparations for the Sonora congress.

Comrades, I think that the idea of having a leadership in which all the comrades would be represented was not given up by us over the months; it was given up at the final moments of the congress. Because in this respect as well, we must view matters as they are here. Comrades, the representation in the congress was more or less 35 or 40 delegates on the one hand, and over 100 on the other. That is a fact. And of those, 133 attended; and there were about 23 on the one hand, and 105 or 106 on the other. There may be talk here about blocs, if you wish, or movements or persuasions, or whatever it might be. And were those movements homogeneous? No, because the majority of the members were not really in any of the parties which created PSUM. That was a fact. There were 30 delegates from Echojoa who had not belonged to any party.

What happened was that a new regrouping took place, that is also a fact, of all these members around the leaders of the parties which made the merger. And we experienced a very special congress. The congress adopted the resolution that all the party members who arrived there were entitled to speak. So, many members spoke there at this congress. And those who participated most were the visitors, because there were prominent comrades from the party who did not have the time nor the desire, or who made the decision not to affiliate 10 comrades to be delegates. Those are also realities which cannot be changed by decree; and we on the commission made the decision to find the ones in whom we had the most confidence, so that they could discuss this process of unified integration.

And comrades, we surmounted many obstacles and, in the end, we were left making a joint proposal, and making an effort to formulate this joint proposal. As has been reiterated here, there was an objection to the presence of Comrade Carrera on the state committee. It seems to me that we should not go about replacing the authority of the party's regular organizations; therefore, we said: what we can do is merely not propose Carrera in the proposal that the commission makes. And we did not propose other comrades who might have caused conflict. We were agreed on that. But the fundamental decisions concerning the election were made by the delegates to a congress; this commission could not replace a state congress either.

But, at the end, I explained to Arnolando that the leaders whom I had asked were agreed that there should be two thirds of the majority and a third of the minority. Arnolando later made a proposal to me, so that I could pass it on: about 10 and 10, and a third position with six; of that third position, five were associated with those who were members of the Communist Party, and one with those who were members of PPM. This means that there were 15 against 11. With that number of delegates in one group and the other, it was, therefore, impossible to accept that proposal, regardless of how brilliant and intellectual some of those who would be participating in the new state leadership might be. I believe that this has to be objective.

And, ultimately, what did we undergo? A series of incidents for which we were not responsible. The comrades from that group of visitors, in which there

were almost no delegates, engaged in repeated speeches to fill the majority with abuse. The majority never responded to them, never. There was a former member of the Communist Party, Ortiz, who said: "There is a new option, PMT; let's take it into consideration, and let's all take a beating." And he left. That was the treatment that we were given; and it was all of them, shouting against bandits, in language that is really only customary in certain university circles. It was slander, diatribe, threats, that sort of thing. That is how we ended the congress.

There were incidents such as this. I made a proposal regarding the deputies' per diems. Juan Luis was chairing the meeting. So I proposed to them, concretely: in the matter of the per diems of the PSUM deputy in Sonora and the council members, this congress should resolve to have the party's statutes on this topic be upheld and the elected state committee should have them upheld. That was my proposal. And Juan Luis asked the congress, told the congress that there were two proposals: one, that the statutes should always be upheld; and another, which I had proposed, that the statutes should be upheld at the congress. I requested the floor to repeat my proposal again; but that didn't happen. Then he said: all right, then, there are two proposals, one from Alejandro saying that the statutes should be upheld here and now, and another that the statutes should always be upheld. Well, since that was very repetitive, I said: All right, then, let's discuss Juan Luis' proposal and the other proposal. And Juan Luis' proposal won at the congress; to the effect that the statutes should be upheld starting at that time.

Comrades, in such an atmosphere I don't think we act with the amount of calmness that is demanded here. During the last 10 minutes of the congress, Arnoldo himself left the congress, and I didn't have a chance to say goodbye to him. This is not a matter of a state of mind, no. It is a matter that we should resolve collectively; at least I am here because I think that this PSUM has the opportunity to become developed and organized. If not, then I wouldn't have come. I don't believe that this plan, as some have called it, has failed. I don't believe it. I would say that it has problems. Yesterday, they were telling me that Chucho Sosa was already saying that nothing would happen if some of us left PSUM here. All right, that might also be an idea, that we should leave PSUM. But I want to tell you that some of us have no desire to leave here. Let's see whether we can succeed in making this political endeavor that we are carrying out jointly have a positive result. I still believe in it.

Because, of course, this does not apply to Jaramillo. Jaramillo arrived here with a small bag; and he grabbed his bag and left. But there may be some here who need a moving van in one direction or another; and I am not referring to anyone. Why destroy, when we have made so many efforts to arrive here together? Nor do I think that we should remain orphans, one group or the other, in the event that this broke up, no. In any event, we would each return to the usual position of engaging in political activity with the limitations that we have had doing so all our lives; because I don't think that anyone here could presume to have had success constantly. Therefore, comrades, my version of the Sonora situation is that one. Some comrades may not believe me; others probably think that I am not right. But I don't think that the Central Committee has a chance of entering into such individual affairs of a party which were

ultimately resolved by its leadership after 2 years of failing to do so. And if certain comrades did not participate, it was because they, as is usual in this PSUM, declined to join the state committee.

Some called it a spurious committee before it was elected. And some claimed that they would withdraw from the congress as soon as it was installed. Of course, they left and came in through the other door and sat down. And what was expected, more appeals for unity? I think that this dramatic feature that we attach to the issues must be eliminated. It makes no sense, because, actually, we are expending many efforts, many efforts, on internal matters. And so we are not applying that concern that we have to solve the external problems.

Comrades, it has been stated here that we must make policy. I think that this is what we must do, make policy and policy is made among us. Only sometimes that policy is made well, at other times, fairly, and at still others, poorly. For example, as secretary general of the state committee I was surprised to receive a visit, on the very day of the state electoral assembly, from the secretary general of the Political Commission, from Campa, Stephens, Sabino Hernandez and Eduardo Gonzalez, from half the Political Commission, visiting us on the occasion of this assembly. Do they have a right to do that? Of course they do. In this country there is freedom of movement, and the party's leaders can attend any event, on any level. But there are methods, there are methods, methods that are not being kept; that is making policy. And also, all of a sudden, a group shows up putting a banner over the electoral assembly, saying: "Welcome, Pablo Gomez and Valentin Campa!"; making that our main slogan for the electoral assembly. I acknowledged the right of Valentin's and Pablo's close friends to receive them with all the pleasure they wanted; but to turn that into the main slogan for our electoral assembly seemed excessive to me. To be sure, we left the banner there; we didn't remove it.

There are ways of making policy, there are ways of making policy in the party which lead to division and not to unity. I think that we have to give rank to matters, and that the candidate for municipal president of Tepic was very important. Because they dealt with that matter; incidentally, we should consider it in this way. But to make a sign measuring a square meter for some, and another one measuring 20 square centimeters for others, seems to me also to be excessive. There are methods for making policy. And how good it was that the university unions helped us with so much propaganda, because in any event it was general propaganda and very useful to us. I mean that the Central Committee's propaganda was plentiful, good, very well done; and the electoral commitments were distributed in at least 100,000 homes. And I believe that this was at least a real, genuine contribution to the electoral battle.

Unfortunately, we did not receive the response from the voters in Nayarit that we might have expected; we lack the capacity to receive over 25,000 votes. That is the concrete fact; and that was enough for 31 council members and three deputies. But I think that we must banish those methods of making policy. Could this be in the interest of one group; it could be. We only have to come to an agreement on whether this is going to be the procedure; because the

resources of this party belong to all of us; they don't belong to a leadership organ, regardless of how important it may be. It seems to me that the resources cannot be used in this way either. And we could adopt some measures to give them a different orientation.

Comrades, I would like to discuss now some of the issues that have been raised here. It has been noted that there are conflicts in Nayarit, Sonora, Jalisco and Durango; in short, certain states where there is a leadership which, on general matters, does not agree with the methods of those (I am not talking about everyone), those on the Political Commission who determine the policy that the party is making. I have the impression that those who do not belong to particular groups are not entitled to be state leaders, and they are being constantly subjected to conditions; because there is not that kind of oppression in other places.

And, on the other hand, there has been an intense campaign against the Red-UGOCM, which I head; and here it has been called the Red-UGOCM faction, the movement that has been formed in the Red-UGOCM; in short, comrades, I really don't think that the issue is being raised properly. I would say that we are promoting the rebirth of this organization, because many of us think that we are not participating actively in mass organizations. We consider it necessary to contribute to the organization of Mexican workers.

Some are concerned about the Red-UGOCM's individual affiliation. I think that, in view of the closing and the control that the government exercises over the labor movement, we must seek cadres who do not agree with this position, individually; and, in particular, become affiliated and organized. This is why we have been organizing the workers' clubs, because we realize that we cannot make up groups of unions for the organization. We are forming workers' clubs to hold the political, trade union, ideological debate within the labor movement. This is a decision from the Red-UGOCM's fifth congress.

Now, there are many comrades who are Central Committee members in the Red-UGOCM's leadership. Yes, all those who were concerned. We have called upon everyone that we could. And we are not all agreed on how to assess PSUM's issues, despite the fact that we are all PSUM members. And for a long time, comrades, not everyone in the General Union of Workers and Peasants of Mexico has belonged to any one political party. For example, now half of the leaders of the credit associations in Hermosillo, Sonora, are from PRI. And they have not yet left the Red-UGOCM. I don't think that we can really claim that this is an organization that we formed and structured to wage the internal battle inside PSUM. I don't believe that any of us leaders of this organization would agree with that.

I, in particular, have been a member of the Red-UGOCM, the now Red-UGOCM, for dozens of years. I have often participated in activities of this type. Castaneda O'Connors was a member of the UGO national committee; and other comrades who have just joined this organization at our invitation know very well that we have said that this organization is not headed by any political

party; this has been said by those of us who lead it, and those of us who belong to it. And it is not so as to participate in the activity of any political party.

We believe that we must attempt to group many Mexicans who could hardly join the revolutionary parties; because for the struggle involving concrete things, comrades, it is very easy to group people: for things involving the rural areas, for issues of a trade union type, for the popular movements, it is very easy to group people. But, for a struggle for a new society, there must be certain political and ideological agreements; that is a different matter, totally different. And experience has shown that we have progressed rapidly in the organization of the Red- UGOCM's aktiv in various parts of the country. There is already an organization in over 20 states, and we intend to create a very large, very broad organization, in which the ideological differences are not upsetting, nor are the political positions upsetting, much less issues of a religious nature. This is strictly an organization of masses.

And that could not help us to struggle within PSUM, nor do I consider it necessary. Here, there are very concrete ways and means for putting forth our views; and also, there is a number of us comrades who think the same way, and who will continue to demand a certain respect for our opinions within our party's organizations. For example, comrades, there is a general resolution that I read at the previous Central Committee meeting, to strive for the unity of the left. So, in abstract terms, I think that we are all agreed. Who would object to that? Let's strive for the unity of the democratic forces in this country. We have all been agreed for over 30 years. There is no problem.

But one way of making policy is that, within 2 days of that resolution, the alliance is made with the Popular Socialist Party and the Socialist Workers Party, and the documents are started and the liaison commissions are formed, in short, with great speed. This reminds me a great deal of that congress at which PPS proposed Lopez Portillo. We were going to discuss whether we had our own candidate for the presidency of the republic or not, and whether we backed other candidates; and when we on the Nayarit delegation arrived at the PPS national assembly, the presidential staff had taken it, and Lopez Portillo was already waiting, in a house, to come in and be sworn in as the PPS candidate, as the candidate for the presidency of the republic.

It is true, comrades, those who are stating abstractly that we cannot look at the individual conflicts of each organization to make our present policy, well, from a general standpoint, are correct. We could not look at the abuse in each case. But this case, associated with the Popular Socialist Party, is not an isolated case. A large percentage of us PSUM members decided on our participation precisely on the basis of the government's dependent position with respect to those who constitute the Popular Socialist Party's leadership organs.

One method of making policy is by taking that into consideration, or not taking it into consideration. Why? Because, obviously, not everyone reacts, in that study of nuances sometimes made by certain cadres of the left. At least among the people of Nayarit there are no objective nor subjective conditions

for that type of alliance. Why? Because we are familiar with some of these parties, at least we are very familiar with PPS. We know that many of their decisions, including that of greatly favoring affiliation with PSUM, have been made by the Government Secretariat, not the PPS organizations. Those of PARM [Authentic Party of the Mexican Revolution] are made in that way.

And I also suspect, those of PST; I'm not sure of those, but I suspect it, so as not to appear later here as someone who has committed an abuse. But I suspect that certain decisions in PST are made by the Government Secretariat and not by the regular organizations. And at least I am convinced, no one could convince me otherwise, that this friendly, fraternal, outward position of allying with PSUM is an instruction from the Government Secretariat. And this is a political action. I could not say at what time, when and where, but I am basing it on 20 occasions when I saw them dealing with those affairs on the highest level in the Government Secretariat, after Lombardo Toledano's death.

And everything indicates that; and, of course, comrades, becoming allied with someone who has a few flaws, well, that means running risks; but becoming allied with someone who is prostituted might be a romantic act, but not an act that would benefit us. Because there are some comrades who want to save the prostitutes, but that has never been a way of liberating the society. Comrades, I think that linking our electoral existence in 1985, linking our electoral existence to PPS, because each individual could change, to PST, that would mean putting ourselves in the budget-eating left that is so discredited in this country. Because by now everyone knows that there are some elements of the left, 50 or 100, whose whole desire is to live on the budget; and that is why it is so hard to take the leadership away from them. We have already seen it. Why? Because they depend on the government.

It is the government that they are serving. And we have become allied with government organizations to talk about the left. That manifesto signed by the secretaries general of the five parties, that manifesto contains all the language of the Popular Socialist Party. That is not a document inspired by PSUM's basic documents. The government has said this in its international forums; and this, it is all very well for the government to do this, and for the government to do something else, as it says in that document. Is that our opinion of what the government is doing? It probably is our opinion?

But we have never had the tendency to put the government's view ahead of our own opinions in the international area. That document is new from a tactical standpoint. And in my opinion the distortions begin there. It seems to me that this should not be done, making policy in that way. When we formed this party, it was so that it would be a clearcut party in the eyes of the people, from the revolutionary standpoint. And I agree with Rolando Cordera, that this doesn't mean that we are moving to the other extreme. Ah, but of course! There is no point of comparison with seeking an alliance with PMT, which is also a registered party, seeking an alliance with these parties, with all the background that they have; because we cannot make a Christian policy. I don't believe that that would be our suitable tactic. Let them all come, without

our looking at their flaws; let's forgive everything that has happened in life and state here, like everyone, that we are curing the lepers, forgiving the Magdalenes; there is no problem here, and let's be filled with love. I don't believe that.

The national electoral assembly should reject that alliance, because it is an alliance that would harm the Unified Socialist Party of Mexico, purely and simply. It is nothing else. And I don't think that these are the commitments that we upheld; they were commitments precisely the opposite of this. And I don't think that enough time has elapsed to enable us to say: Other forces have already corrected themselves, now they are behaving differently, now, indeed, we can take action. I believe that we should seek an alliance with independent forces, from an electoral standpoint, as we have said, and not in that way.

Comrades, it has been said here that the problem is that some of us have refused to be members of the Political Commission and that we should join the Political Commission, so that everything would be resolved. I don't think that that is the fact, nor, as some comrades have claimed, it is not a matter of wanting to be a member of the leadership either. No, because if our ambition were to take part in the leadership, we would have accepted the generous proposals from some comrades on the Central Committee to join the Political Commission. Some think, and they have told me so, that there is the question of how the deputies' positions are going to be distributed, and whether they will go only to one group. At least I have no desire to be a deputy, because I have already suffered enough from that. I don't think that this is a problem; it is not a problem of power, no. It is a problem of the type of party we want. That's it.

There are some of us who want a party that is opposed to the system, the state and the government, and clearly and openly opposed, not in an adventurous manner, but opposed; a party that will be of the real opposition, not the formal opposition. Well, all right, that is the type of party that we want. Some others must want to rest on all the suffering in scores of years. Well, that is not our problem. This is why I think, comrades that we must discuss that and not be inventing things, comrades.

Why do we invent things? A series of subtleties and subjective things. In short, if the level is very low, if it is very high or if it is moderate. No, because we are what we are. Everything that has been said here, there have been respectful speeches from very special positions, such as that of Arnoldo, that of Roland and that of Alcocer. This is how we are. But there have been others, not on the ground level, but on the underground level. That is also how we are. And I don't think that this is the issue, but rather how we are going to settle our affairs if we are all still interested in continuing with this party, in being a member of the party itself. But let's not go about with maneuvers or tricks, but rather openly.

Are we interested in continuing with this party? Well, let's settle it. Are there sufficient facts, as the majority says, to prove that this commission does not answer to the party, to this Political Commission? Well, if it does

not answer to it, comrades, let's appoint another one, whatever it may be; not saying: let's keep the same movements so that Rolando or Gascon will be secretary general. I suppose that the other movement would have to decide, then, who the other candidate would be.

I don't think that this makes sense, no. Let's observe from a practical standpoint how a leadership interprets this party's general direction. And I would make a single proposal: Let's appoint a commission here to study the matter and make a proposal to the Central Committee, for a new Political Commission, a new Secretariat. Very well. Let that commission be appointed, let it meet, study and examine the matters from a political standpoint, and make a proposal to the Central Committee if we want to be in the same party. Because we cannot be champions of unity in this country's literary and political circles, and champions of division inside PSUM.

I think that we should act realistically, and by appointing that commission we would embark on an open discussion. Of course, the concrete experience counts. I have not had any difficulty in exchanging views with Rolando or Arnoldo for many hours, none; nor with other comrades either, even though they may not agree with me. But it is also a matter of confidence, a minimum of confidence. Experience counts: the one who is burned by milk can stand yogurt. And there are also things that count in the political struggle, and we cannot ignore that.

Let's look at matters quite realistically, but without repeating the systems of the past. It makes no sense. Let's think of our party, this party (as Rolando said), those of us who comprise it, what we are like, without inventing things, what we are like, and without making pathetic appeals for political morality. Because I don't think that they count, for purposes of our solutions here. Let's look, from a practical standpoint, at where we want to go. Now, if we cannot be together, well, comrades, then there is no way; nor shall we be bound here to how we fit. If we cannot be together, each one will leave for his position and, in any case, some day we shall meet again. I think that this is a "sine qua non" condition: unity of the left to take over the power in this country. I believe that.

If we lack the capacity today, for one reason or another, to continue with the construction of this party, then we should not waste time either. Let's openly consider how far we can go. And, as Chucho Sosa says, nothing will happen to anyone and no one has lost anything, either for you, for us or for anyone. At least it is a liberation; it could also be that. But let's make the attempt. I propose: let's make the attempt to continue constructing this party, if we can. And we shall try, if possible, to find a suitable language for continuing to work together. Because this way, head to head, about who is more of a man, since pistols were invented there has been no more superiority of anyone. What is the purpose of making threats here? Saying that I support them here, that I do too, and that I give in to you. That is the conduct of Mexican drunkards, Mexican, Latin American or African drunkards; I suppose all of them react alike. As politicians, making policy, where do we want to go, openly? So, I leave my proposal there.

Arnoldo Martinez

Concerning only the matter of Sonora, I ask that everyone realize that I don't want to make the matter of Sonora either a "casus belli" or the fundamental problem that we must solve. No, it is merely that the plenum should clearly understand what the situation was and judge. I repeat, since the commission's report is a report for the plenum, for the Central Committee, in the end, when we embark on resolutions, the text of the report should be read. I only want to explain. First, there were not two blocs at the congress, comrades, nor were there two blocs before the congress; that is not so. We have that difference. That was the view of Comrade Alejandro Gascon, but I think that others on the commission can understand that there was a difference in positions, but there was one bloc, that of the General Union comrades.

They did not have any argument against the resolution, but merely applied a line of rejection, because, I repeat, there was no argument against the resolution in the discussion. I said that two comrades participated, to say what? One, that the report did not contain the point on the alliances with PPS (they were already calling it an alliance), and the other to say that it had no constructive features. That was all. The vote at the congress, the highest (I have just reviewed the notes), was 39 on one side and 81 on the other, 120 delegates. I already explained before, in my report, that there were comrades at the congress who were neutralized; some of the comrades from San Luis did not assume any type of position after they threatened to leave, at least one did, comrades. That had an effect.

If we look at the accounts, this congress, if it had been normal, would have been balanced (from the standpoint of movements), because the comrades from Canandea were missing, because they had rejected the congress, telling us something that we totally opposed, particularly Juan Luis and I, who were the ones that attended the last meeting with those comrades, who said that they would not go because it was going to be the same thing: a mistake, an imposition, and that they were not willing to have that again, and preferred not to go.

It was their decision, but we opposed it and fought against those comrades, trying to convince them that they should not adopt that behavior. Carrera's problem became a central problem, comrades. It was an element for division; the commission had to consider this in order to settle something that was not critical for anyone. But this was to be a cause of conflict and it was, comrades, it was. So, since the position of taking it to the state committee was maintained until the end, naturally, this created a problem which is already known to us. That would be a cause of conflict, in other words, if we tried to avoid them because we were supposed to have contributed to this, and there was no contribution in this regard.

Concerning the leadership issue, I want to say something that I have not said here, because Comrade Alejandro was not present yesterday, and that is why I didn't say it. But now that he is here, I want to say it. For over 3 months, I was insisting, with Alejandro personally, that we should make a common proposal, that the two of us should make it to the commission, and then the commission should discuss it, and all that, if it agreed. And the response:

from Comrade Alejandro, he gave the response to me by Sunday, the second day of the congress. That was the last time that we talked. Naturally, I cannot approve of this conduct; I cannot approve; because I submitted lists, actually, initial proposals; but the idea was that we would sit down and discuss them: why is this approved, and that not approved? What kind of balance are we going to form? And it was not because I was making a particular request, no; because that is in the plenum's resolution which we all had to comply with.

Finally, on Sunday, the comrade told me and Comrade Sergio, because the three of us were present: "Here is the list of a committee of 21; you appoint 10." As if we were a group, and it was easy for me to make up a list, and then everyone would be agreed. But no, comrades, no; in that second proposal, I tried, comrades, to submit one from the standpoint of his position; that is, I made proposals. It was the secretary general of the Administrative Workers Union, the main PSUM leader in the Administrative Workers Union, because they are people who have an influence from the masses standpoint; the comrade leader in Cananea; and other comrades who head committees and who are secretaries general of municipal committees and others which are active in PSUM.

From a different position, of course; but this was so that we could discuss it, comrades, and we did not do so; we did not do so. So that was a fault of the commission. But I think that in this regard, Comrade Alejandro kept me for over 3 months without giving me a response in the matter, regarding the proposal about Carrera. The number one board, the board for deciding on the report, submitted this proposal. It is point four in the resolution which was rejected. Listen to it; its says: "In the case of the PSUM deputy to the Sonora state congress, and those council members who have violated the statutory regulations, by appropriating the per diems that belong to the party, this board proposes that the provisions contained in the penalties part of the PSUM Statutes be applied." The board proposed that.

Then Comrade Alejandro proposed another resolution, the one that he read here. Juan Luis was the chairman at that time, but he didn't turn Alejandro's proposal over to the board; he read it. Then Juan Luis said: "Those who are present, on the one hand, there is the board's proposal, to the effect that penalties should be applied, and the other, to the effect that the matter should not be brought up until after the congress." That is how he interpreted Alejandro's proposal. So I said to Alejandro: "Give me your proposal." We were seated together. And this is what Comrade Alejandro did: he folded it, threw it into his pocket and would not show me the proposal. I don't understand that.

Alejandro Gaston

I shall be very brief in my explanation. First, 2 months earlier, we on the commission on precandidates for the state committee prepared a list, and that list was distributed all over the state, 2 months previous. We prepared it, and someone publicized it; but we on the commission prepared it. And we reached agreement on that list, and it was discussed all over the state. So there was no position of being locked in a collective proposal, no, as Arnoldo has claimed now.

I have to give a public explanation, because I have not had an opportunity to make them privately; he went away. Now, the second question is this: I didn't make a proposal, comrades, because there was division in that famous closed bloc. I cannot make any proposal; that is the fact. And it wasn't until the last day that we agreed to make a proposal, and agreed to form a state committee representing the two opinions, or whatever they may call it here. Well, it was not until that time. Only when we submitted the slates, I told Arnolando: "This is not the proper proposal. We are proposing a third; we reached that agreement early that morning." Then Arnolando said: "No, because it is impossible." All right, then it is impossible, and I turned Arnolando's proposal over to the board, hoping that the congress would vote for the third of those present. I submitted it personally, but then they all declined to participate in the state committee. Now that is very difficult.

As for the other proposal, after I read the proposal twice, and Juan Luis interpreted me otherwise, it no longer made sense. I told Arnolando: "Vote for Juan Luis' proposal." I told Arnolando that, and I kept my proposal; it no longer made sense. That was what happened. There was no idea of concealing things in a machiavellian way, no, no. What for? If I read it twice and I am told: "What Alejandro proposes is that the statutes be upheld in the congress," I never proposed that. Well, here is my proposal. It is, it was, I am bringing it here because it was the same one; and I think that everyone will remember that those were the terms of the proposal. Therefore, comrades, I believe that this explanation will suffice. Now, let the Central Committee approve the commission's report to the congress. That seems useless to me; I don't understand why. Does the Sonora congress have to be punished again because it didn't elect those liked by certain members of the commission? This is the infinite path to destruction. I see no sense in it.

Cuauhtemoc Sandoval

Comrades, in this very hall, on 15 August 1981, the formation of PSUM was announced. A highly favorable reaction was immediately evoked among broad democratic sectors of our country. Even the subsequent departure of PMT from the merger process, although it spread doubt among some sectors and individuals, kept up the suspense, in the sense of creating a great revolutionary workers' party of masses that would overcome the traditional scattering of the Mexican left. PSUM's first national congress approved the basic documents; which are, basically, the foundations of a political pact on which this party has been structured on the national level and which enabled it to carry on the federal electoral campaign and progress in the merger process.

The second national congress, which discussed the main features of the party's tactics and devised the main political lines, on which unanimity was obtained, nevertheless did not progress with the formation of the party's leadership. For this reason, I think that PSUM's Central Committee must now undertake a redefinition of the political pact which gave rise to this party, or rather a re-updating of this political pact which gave rise to our party. In the course of the discussion, I received the impression that we are reiterating,

especially those of us who have come from the Communist Party, some of the discussions that we held at the 19th National Congress. For example, the issue of whether a party, or that party, should have movements or not; and whether it was valid to form movements or not. PSUM resolved that problem in practice, and this is a diverse party, this is a party of movements, but at the same time with unified political action, at the same time with a political leadership representing the members as a whole.

In that respect, so as not to repeat, I agree basically with the statements made here by Rolando Cordera, to the effect that now, at this time, the movements must be taken very much into consideration. He said: "We must take the origins into account." I think that the movements comprising this party at present have not necessarily been demarcated on the basis of the groups that gave this party its origin. He cited the need to restructure the Political Commission and seek new types of representation; this seems to me to be actually fitting: the need to discuss what type of Political Commission and Secretariat this party should have, under the present conditions, and what type of system.

In other words, it seems to me that these are matters which we need to start discussing now, that we need to start defining. And I said that at times I have the impression that we are reiterating old discussion because, comrades, it has been stated here (Comrade Martinez Verdugo said it), that the representation of movements divides and does not unite. And he claims that, historically, it has been proven that parties with movements become divided and end up being divided. I think that there are also examples of monolithic parties which have also been divided, and parties with movements which have survived, which have forged ahead; parties which are, to give an example in Latin America, MDB (Brazilian Democratic Movement); because that is an example of a non-Social Democratic party, a party acting with movements, acting structured as almost a front, almost a front-party, and yet it is progressing.

Let's not talk about Social Democratic parties. It doesn't seem to me to be the issue here that we should describe ourselves as a Social Democratic party; rather, we need to position ourselves in our reality. I think that if we look for examples outside, we shall find examples (of one kind or another) that we could gear to our reality. But it seems to me that the experience that we are having is an unprecedented experience. It is an experience that we can hardly get elsewhere, to propose some type of experience that would enable us to advance.

In this respect, I think that we must realize that this is a diverse party, a party in a process of integration. This is a party that has movements in it, and for this party to advance, we need to have unified political action and a political leadership that will represent the party as a whole.

It seems to me that this is the fundamental issue that we must discuss, and on which we need approval. There have been proposals to expand the Political Commission or to restructure it. I don't think that the effect of an expansion would resolve matters. In his initial remarks, Pablo Gomez said that if we

restructured the Political Commission, we would stop one problem, but extend another one. That is, we receive the impression that the positions, the membership on the Political Commission is a position that cannot be neglected without the result of this being something harmful, something unnatural in a party such as ours. Comrades, this party, in which no one is married to his position, no one is stuck with his position, rather this party must be sufficiently flexible to be able to be restructured, changed and renewed in a natural way, without this necessarily causing conspiracies or splits.

I believe that, in our case, it is very sound, for example, for the Secretary General's office to have to be renewed at particular intervals, based on the statutes. I think that there are instances, in the international communist movement, of secretaries general being perpetuated in the party leaderships, leaving only when they die or as a result of a split.

Finally, I would like to express an opinion on the Sonora problem. Comrades, I was active in Sonora before the second national congress. I went there several times. The first occasion I had to go was at the time that Raul Saenz' registration as a candidate for the municipal presidency of Canandea was taken away from him; and I found that, actually, our appointee on the State Electoral Commission had voted in favor of taking Raul Saenz' registration away from him; which was really stupid. The state committee met immediately and removed this appointee; and we named Comrade Raymundo So, who works in Raul Saenz' law office. We appointed him to the State Electoral Commission. Comrades, I proposed that we eliminate the atmosphere that had been created, suggesting that Raul Saenz' registration had been taken away from him because our appointee to the state commission had been bought, had betrayed.

Comrades, I said that the one responsible for having taken away Raul Saenz' registration was not our appointee, but rather, essentially, the state government and PST, which had made a maneuver into which our appointee eventually entered; but our appointee was not the one responsible. So, at that time we passed a resolution that was published the next day, basically blaming the state government for the maneuver of removing our candidate's registration.

Now I give this example so that we may see how, at certain times, the situation there has become a very damaging situation. Our comrades said that our appointee was the one to blame, and I told them (and the state committee finally settled it this way) that he was not, that the one responsible was the government and the parties which had made the maneuvers in the State Electoral Commission; that our appointee was also responsible, but it was a different situation, in my view.

Comrades, I think that there is in Sonora a majority that has not known how to be a majority, and a minority that has not known how to be a minority, either. I was at the second state congress, before the second national congress, comrades, and we reached agreement (I don't know whether it was good or bad, it will be judged later by the Sonora comrades) we reached agreement on a state committee formed with, I think, nine from the majority and six from the minority.

If, as Comrade Martinez Verdugo claims, there was a proposal for 11 from the majority and 10 from the minority, it seems to me, comrades, that such an opportunity should not have been missed. It seems to me that, under the circumstances of this party in Sonora, that was something which could have been accepted. Finally, comrades, I believe that in the issue of the unity of the left, in this issue, it seems to me that we have almost embarked on a discussion that could enable us in our party to have a correct policy of alliances.

Luis Ortega

Comrades, a few days before the holding of the Second National Congress, a race started, not to win the majority, but to show who in this party has the capacity to decide on this party's policy and action. On some occasions, it was actually a legitimate race; but on others it was not. All this led us to a major confrontation at the Second National Congress. After this congress, as some comrades interpreted it, it was shown who in PSUM had the majority and the strength; and with this view, after the Second National Congress there was developed an entire policy inside the party to prove who had the decision-making and who had the strength. And this was an entire race, an activity that took place from this central organ to the State Committees and the Municipal Committees, and in the implementation of policy. Because it was necessary to destroy the enemy and defeat it, and defeat it totally, so as to stabilize a policy, to show not only who had the historic right to lead this country toward socialism, but also who had the capacity to lead this party today. I think that this is a mentality that has to some extent developed, grown and been given an impetus. Obviously, based on the search to prove who has the majority in the leadership, there is no other way than satanization; rather than a search for conviction, ways of working and using the official leadership organs to give a very clear, very accurate interpretation of the agreements, obviously, based on continuing to prove who has the power, who has the majority and who has the combined potential for advancing.

It is no coincidence, and it does not surprise us, then, that this should also develop in the direction of the mass organizations, in which the PSUM members have influence, and the same in connection with UNAM; because in UNAM the same policy was developed to prove the same thing; this struggle of majorities and minorities in the Central Committee and the Municipal Committees. This has led us to a group of proposals and policies for being able to advance or not.

Comrades, I think that, on the basis of all these relations, we must form a Central Committee, as we did at the first plenum, with the opportunity to develop the policy of this Central Committee taking into account the level, and not the proportion, but rather the importance of the forces that have been taken there; involving the possibility of directing the party as a whole from the Central Committee, but not exactly directing the party as a whole from a majority of the Central Committee; because that would mean using the majority of the Central Committee so as to have a confrontation again, with the combination, so to speak, of other positions expressed at the congress as well.

Comrades, all this policy, all this proposal, all this political necessity, has, I think led the party into a very difficult situation; there is an entire concept of the control of the party, of the power of the party, of the very straightforward manner, factions, or the use of factions. I don't consider that to be the problem either. Here the problem is the need, or one's concept of the need to develop an entire bureaucratic apparatus, an entire proposal to control the statistics, the cadres, the lists of members of the rank and file organs, in the municipalities, etc.; aimed at knowing how to develop and promote a particular policy. The matter of the decisions being made by the Political Commission strongly reminds one of how some renewal comrades, at the PC's Second Congress, said that the only legitimate faction in the PC was the executive commission at that time; and there was an entire proposal against the control of the party as a whole by the party leadership.

Comrades, I think that this situation, this scheme involving the party leadership, the bureaucracy, the apparatus, the secretariat, and the Political Commission, tended to develop around specific, very concrete conclusions that emerged from the Second National Congress. And this development had and has had its effects on the party, on the party's rank and file; because it reached a major confrontation, a serious confrontation, and the results are evident there. Comrades, who didn't bet, in the case of Sonora, that the majority would win? Both sides strove for that, to win the majority, and it was an entire confrontation. That is how things stand in the party. What do we want now, comrades? There is a majority of the Central Committee and there is a certain majority of the Sonora congress. It would be good to confront this majority in the Central Committee with a resolution based on the report on Sonora, if there is a reproduction of this confrontation that could lead to the disqualification of the Central Committee itself, and so on forever. Comrades, I think that if we continue in this way it will lead us to an eternal path of confrontation; it could lead us to the effects already shown to some extent, with the departure of party members, disenchantment, distrust, seeing in the party only the strife among factions, movements and confrontations, for what is termed the search for power within the party.

All this development of the party's political existence has already had its culmination, and this use of the party to reaffirm the majority has arrived at failure, has embarked upon a crisis and has put the party into a crisis. In that respect, comrades, the failure of this policy has been proven. We all agree now on the need for making a very sizable change. We want this to be changed, because if we continue in this way, not only will we ourselves head for failure, but PSUM as a whole will head for failure, in another general political confrontation at UNAM or SUNTU or, let's say, the elections.

This entire proposal, this consciousness of saving the PSUM plan and of committing ourselves to the PSUM plan, forces us to change this position and progress in a different direction; there is a series of proposals aimed at this.

I hope that these proposals regarding the elimination of all this will actually lead us to progress, to save the PSUM plan, and make it befit the country's political needs. But this demands a change in this struggle and this race:

in the first place, realizing that we are a party in which different movements, which will prevail, coexist. We must learn to have a party in which these movements will express themselves; we must develop the mechanisms, the political regulations or agreements that will actually aid us in allowing these different expressions to be maintained, so as to make it possible to voice, both in the realm of its organizational existence and that of providing for the party's organs, the concept of how the party's affairs should be carried out. Because there are several aspects. I am not in agreement with the composition, or the method of consulting the party nationally, or with how, for example, the conference on organization and the trade union conference have been set up. I don't know what will happen in the case of the national electoral conference; whether it will be a composition, as I called it at one time, wherein the party's national apparatus will be put into operation. So, there is a need not to use the majority of the Central Committee, to consider the political proposal on alliances, on electoral policy, on convocations and on national events. We must consider the concrete situation of this party, and not just the use of the Central Committee majority.

I deem it necessary to bring up for discussion the policy of alliances; I propose that we discuss it. Comrades, it must obviously be discussed, but on the basis of this ruling that we must have, admitting that the policy of winning the race, not the majority, has led us to failure. We need to make a total change in the system in order to be able to progress.

Alvaro Ramirez

Comrades, when I registered, I considered making some statements that have already been made, and hence I don't want to repeat them; but I do want to mention others, so that you will know my position regarding cases and, in some ways, details. First, I would like to say that all of us here are seeking and want unity. I do, too, but sometimes our procedure is not in keeping with what we want. I do think that suitable decisions can be made in this Central Committee. In the previous Central Committee, we observed a vote that was won, differing from members of the Political Commission regarding the position on the federal electoral issue. I think that if we carefully reconsider what we have to do, we could do it, assuming this responsibility that we have, each one of us, as representatives of comrades who had enough confidence in us to allow us to be here.

I shall repeat what I feel personally. When I come to these plenums, among comrades, I get along very well with the vast majority of those present; not with all, but with the vast majority. It was not like that when I started; for this reason, I have confidence that we shall succeed.

I say that we want unity among us, but I shall cite details that are not aiding this unity. Carrera was described here as a rogue, a someone corrupt, without any commission having previously issued a judgment on the subject. We must be very careful; this does not help unity. I shall give an opinion

on Carrera; I think that Carrera acted badly. I told him that personally when I saw him, and in front of other comrades. I think that he is paying the price for that behavior. From the time when he was the former secretary general, and now, he hasn't remain as secretary general. He knew beforehand that he was not going to be, because he realized that it was impossible, beforehand, and so he left. I was present at that vote during that congress; I am not a member of the Sonora State Committee; I am a member of the State Committee and the Executive Commission in Jalisco, which is where I participate politically; but just now I am in Sonora, because I have work there. I was present then at the congress; I didn't take part in anything, but I was waiting, because Carrera was already starting to pay for those mistakes, even with the members of his own movement.

Now, I don't think it is unifying for Arnolando to propose here that the Central Committee censure what the Sonora congress decided, because there was not much discussion there. That affects me somewhat, because often I do not speak, but I do think carefully when I am going to vote; and I think that this was the position of the comrades in Sonora, the majority. I remember that they were even provoked, asking how it was possible for some peasants to let themselves be swayed by a few people; something of the sort; but, when it was time to vote, they voted, and they took their judgment into account. It is not in keeping with unity if we come out against what the Sonora congress decided. Arnolando also says that the commission which went there did not discharge its mission. I don't agree with that. I noticed the efforts that were being made by the four commission members, all their work for the congress. It has been stated that they were represented in the congress, because they were very scrupulous about having the delegates identified in the rank and file organizations, the real delegates of the comrades who had rejoined the party.

I received the impression that there was a slogan for them to refuse to belong to the committee, but Arnolando says that he recommended that they not refuse. I do think that Arnolando acted properly in telling them not to refuse; but now, if they have refused, it is their problem. It is no longer the commission's problem. I think that the comrades acted properly. But now, I do believe that there should be a recommendation among each one of us, personally, as members of the Central Committee and the Executive Commission, to seek the incorporation of these three comrades into some commission, so that they may reconsider. They can no longer be members of the State Committee, but they could be considered for commissions; in short, there must be some way.

I also think that we are doing well, generally speaking, in the party; I am satisfied. I shall comment on the situation in Jalisco, on my leaders. As for Pablo, for example, I have great respect for Pablo; I have always considered him secretary general; I have always given him that position. He has been very respectful toward me; we have a good relationship. I have felt that, since the Jalisco congress and the national congress, Pablo has had more confidence in other Jalisco comrades who are not Central Committee members; he believes more in them, and he has a legitimate right to believe in them; but that has not prevented Pablo from being respectful toward me, nor I

toward him. It is merely that the treatment is a little cooler, in my opinion. On one occasion, he went to Jalisco; I was not there, and some agreements were made. Later a committee from the Political Commission went to find out what was going on there. Everything was explained; all the members of the Executive Commission were present.

I think that progress is being made, and so I think that progress can be made in the other locations. We are doing well, but there are critical matters cropping up. It is precisely that alliance with these parties. I was at the previous plenum; I wasn't there every day, but I was on the last day. I trust that the Executive Commission will settle all the general matters concerning what we think and want. If it is decided to have unity with the left, I think that all of us are agreed on having unity of the left; this party was even created for that purpose, nevertheless I would be very troubled to be on the side of a traitor; and in my view being called a traitor is the worst description that could be given to anyone. That is why I am very careful about saying it. And here we are on the side of Cruickshank, who is a traitor. In case some of you don't know, I was not a member of PPS, but I know what he did in Nayarit: he betrayed the comrades in Nayarit, leaving them in the lurch in the confrontation with the Army. He later accepted defeat and accepted the alliance so that he could be senator. I call that treachery; that is why I say that I would not become allied with traitors. That is detrimental to unity among us. Wanting to become allied with those people means becoming disunited ourselves; so, let's be cautious, comrades.

Salvador Castaneda

Comrades, I wish to state that I am totally opposed to this letter of intent, this document agreeing with proposals signed by the Political Commission with PPS and PST. I believe that those who met there, those who were united on that occasion, are parties which have deputies. That explains the presence of UIC and the Socialist Movement.

At the congress, if we don't want to become bogged down, making it an immobile apparatus, because there is a parliamentary game, and sometimes, in a fleeting way, certain positions are accepted and rejected there, some commitments; sometimes many of us are in favor of a comma or at other times opposed to a phrase. For example, this has caused even the dramatic incident that, one day, we reached agreement, without much discussion, with all the independent parties, so to speak, excluding PRI, and left the meeting hall when it was attempted to impose on us a forced discussion of the reform to the Penal Code; all this occurred in the parliament. So I don't consider it necessary for this type of parliamentary work to have to be backed by the parties' leadership. I don't think that this helps, rather, on the contrary, it withers and hampers the smooth work involving the agreements and disagreements that occur in the congress. But I am opposed because I think, not to mention principles in general, that this agreement runs counter to the spirit and the letter, the political resolution adopted by the party's Second National Congress.

It was stated there, in other words, that the materialization of the alternative for which PSUM is struggling entails the ouster of the present government bloc from power; it entails a struggle right now for a new democratic, popular government. I don't think that this statement is a mere repetition of the goals which all the parties propose for themselves upon their creation, that of seizing power. A party which does not propose that for itself is not entitled to call itself a party; it is a matter that explains its very existence. This is not a repetition of that general position; it is something more concrete: that conviction that we must radicalize our position toward the government, which is a government that no longer allows pressure either in the opposition or with backing; which no longer allows pressure, which can no longer be corrected and which we must oust. Our being able to do so immediately is another matter; but if we are on the path of struggle against this government, if we confront the government, radicalizing our position, we cannot make alliances with the government. And this letter of intent, this document, is an alliance with a part of the government; because when we separated from PPS, there was an entire national controversy in which it was fully demonstrated that PPS had lost all independence from the public authorities. At that time, the Communist Party itself admitted that we were right, and offered us solidarity with that position. I don't think that we can evade here this principle imposed on us by the document of the political resolution: saying "no" to making alliances with PRI, but "yes" to those with people who respond to the general policy of PRI and the government. In a different section, this political resolution says that PSUM is struggling for the unity of the independent popular organizations; this means that the entire group of alliances that we make with the socialist or merely democratic forces has one condition: that they be independent from the public authorities.

This pact with these parties is not an exaggeration; it does not lend prestige to PSUM; and it bars the possibility of genuine alliances with forces independent of the public authorities. If this pact is successful, and everyone who participates in a pact, at the outset, with unity of action in minor matters, later wants unity of action in more extensive matters, ending up with unity; which would not help the Unified Socialist Party of Mexico, especially if it is an element at present, for temperamental reasons in the case of some, but at present, a large portion of PSUM would be and is opposed to that supposed alliance with these gentlemen from PPS and PST. This contradicts the spirit of the document which Pablo Gomez read, seeking unity. This is totally opposed to the party's unity at present; and if that were not enough, this alliance, this act of the Political Commission seems to me to be contrary to the statutes, and the statutes are an integral part of the principles. It is all one thing: statutes, principles and programs.

It is all a single document which, for different reasons, is separated into different documents; but it is just one issue, and Article 21 of the statutes stipulates, as an express power of the Central Committee, that of deciding on the party's relations with other political forces in the country and abroad. And this relationship established here with these parties, including the

formation of liaison commissions and others, is a relationship that was not concretely agreed upon by the Central Committee. The Central Committee agreed on a general appeal, but not this relationship, which is a concrete, specific power of the Central Committee. Furthermore, when the appeal relates to the registered leftist parties, it makes only one proposal: that of seeking the opportunity of having common candidates in the electoral districts; something that this Central Committee cannot decide upon either. In the end, it would have to be settled by the Electoral Assembly. For these reasons, I am opposed to this document. I thought that the haste with which we were summoned was for the purpose of considering this matter, and that at least the Political Commission had decided to submit it for the Central Committee's approval. I request that this alliance be voted on today by the Central Committee, to reject it.

Comrades, we are all concerned about these matters of unity; I am primarily concerned that we remove all the obstacles which, since the second congress, under different circumstances and for different reasons, have prevented the merger process. The dialog among us has ended; the fraternal, unified spirit and the atmosphere have changed, as someone remarked here. Returning to the spirit of unity in the discussion, I agree that we should lay the groundwork to come to agreement and construct unity, that the merger process should continue. I maintain that the aspiration of a party is that of being a single, merged party from an organizational standpoint, from a political standpoint and from an ideological standpoint; when that does not preclude differences and discussion. Hence, I have ended up not understanding this matter of diversity very clearly. I do understand the unified spirit of those who say, regarding the present situation, let's apply a remedy, let's establish a proportional leadership on all levels, in the Central Committee, in the Political Commission and in the State Committees. This would have to be discussed very carefully, because this business of proportionality, which could be accepted as a solution to the crisis, should be a temporary thing. Proportionality implies the recognition of movements, so it would not make sense. These movements, this diversity and this proportionality must be something temporary, because at some particular time they clash with the rights of the majority and with the secret vote. But adjustments would have to be made so that, without giving up the secret vote and the rights of the majority, there could be some devices that would enable us to progress with unity; and these adjustments, whether we like it or not, must occur in the statutes; not merely saying that the statutes are something over there, like the Laws of the Indies which are not obeyed.

Let's treat matters here as they are; there is no problem of our being able to restructure the Political Commission. The Central Committee could do it without reforming the statutes. But a problem does arise when we attempt to restructure the Central Committee and other things. So, we must look carefully at this matter and the possible reform of the statutes. Another congress would be required for that. I agree with Alejandro's proposal and, originally, that of others, for seeking the means for a restructuring of the Political Commission; but to restructure the Central Committee we need another congress, and I believe when there are great evils there should be great remedies. Let's

hold the Electoral Assembly, which entails the same work that a congress does. Why not hold that congress on the date planned for the Electoral Assembly, with the same delegates comprising the Electoral Assembly? That is my proposal.

Cesar Navarro

Comrades, I think that the discussion which we have held concerning the party's internal existence and its unity is, after all, to a certain extent, a recognition of the difficulties that the party is undergoing. Since PSUM is the result of a unified action, I would say the most important action taken by the independent left, from the outset, its establishment, owing to the different propositions of the segments which gave rise to this party, was diverse; because it was a unification of a left with different parties, which had diverse ideological propositions, different political traditions, problematical political proposals and, sometimes, different strategies and tactics for action, also with different origins. But we agreed that the unity of the independent left was a political necessity, in a new, great party that would be capable of more decisively influencing the transformation of the Mexican society, based essentially on the goal of socialism. Nevertheless, comrades, even though, at the beginnings of the Unified Socialist Party of Mexico, we had to take that diversity into account to guarantee unity of action and to consolidate the party's unity, it is also true that the fundamental decisions of this party were made by a majority. This was reflected in the decisions of the unification assemblies; it was reflected in the First Congress; it was reflected in the Second National Congress of PSUM; it was also reflected in the unification assembly leading to the campaign that we have started. It was also reflected, at the First Congress, in connection with the option for the party's basic documents. This means that some of us, during the course of the party, have demanded concessions or proportionality; but I don't think that this is right. We have acted in accordance with decisions of the majority; but we did think, at that time, and we still think today, for the sake of guaranteeing unity of action and guaranteeing the party's formation, a group of individual features and conditions inherent in a party under construction had to be taken into account. Because, as some comrades have stated, it would appear that a group of comrades, or a particular movement of opinion now, at this Central Committee meeting, has come demanding proportionality, has come demanding a series of negotiations or a series of concessions.

Those of us who are members of this party, even when we are opposed to one another and continue to maintain the same ideological positions regarding what this party should be like, accept the decisions of the majority. It was not because of a pact that this party adopted scientific socialism; it was by a majority decision. It was not because of a pact that this party adopted democratic workers' power; it was by a majority decision. Just as some day, also, as the correlation of forces changes, if it should occur in this way on the party level, this party's ideological situation might change. This has been fully accepted by those of us who have differences on fundamental features of the party's existence; but we do think, and we have thought

for a long time that the individual features of a party of integration should be taken into account. I think that this occurred, to some extent, when there was a ruling on the Unification Assembly, at the first congress, until shortly before the second congress.

These types of work among us started to change and to change the party's internal situation in areas which some comrades have already mentioned. It was only natural that, at a congress with those features, at which we were going to discuss matters involving the country's concrete existence, at which we were going to discuss issues of tactics and proposals of a trade union nature involving the popular-urban struggle, and the construction of the party and democracy in Mexico, we should have differences which we knew beforehand that we had; We were aware that there were differing assessments; and, naturally, I think, at the Second National Congress, there were two major political concepts that were grouped together naturally. I would reject the claim, that has been made here, one which makes it seem that, when we say there is a need to revamp the situations in PSUM, it should be done on the basis of the old groups which gave this party its existence.

I think that it was obvious at the Second National Congress that at least some of us who shared certain political concepts, not based on our political origin, nor on the alliance with former comrades from the party of which we had been members, I think that several comrades from the party of which we had been members, and several comrades from other political organizations as well, now hold political positions which we have submitted jointly at the Second National Congress. Therefore, it is only natural that those of us who held a certain position should group together with those who agreed. One hoped that, once the national congress had ended, and based on the resolutions adopted by it in connection with what Salvador mentioned, the policy and the determination of PSUM to strive for a new government, the rejection of the policy of convergences, and that of continuing to discuss much of this, one thought that the Central Committee should implement it, based on the development, materialization and discussion that we had begun at the Second National Congress.

At the second plenum, after the Second National Congress, several of us said that we felt that this draft resolution did not concretely grasp, or at least did not give priority to the fundamental decisions that were reached at the Second National Congress; and, minimizing fundamental aspects somewhat, included another concept which the second congress virtually rejected. Therefore, we considered this type of discussion and the implementation of the resolutions of the Second National Congress to be incorrect; because this occurred, comrades, this was reflected when it would have been natural to continue these discussions in the party and the Central Committee. It didn't happen this way, simply because there were problems involving the method of a certain sector of the party. The majority concluded, it put together the congress, it put together the Central Committee, and hence it put together the Political Commission in such a way that, at the Second National Congress, there were problems not only involving political differences but also involving the method for implementing PSUM's democratic existence. In my view, there resulted from this a Central Committee elected by a large number of

delegates who were not really delegates. Everything subsequent resulted from this. Therefore, I don't believe that it was a temperamental attitude that prompted certain prominent comrades, as the document notes, not to join this Political Commission or engage in other Central Committee activities; because at least what some of us are stating now about the party's present situation is not blackmail to force the adoption of our political positions. What we propose, in the first place, is restoring this party's democratic existence; and when I say democratic existence, I mean that it be really the majority that decides in this party, and not based on invented majorities as was the case at the Second National Congress. I mean that it be based on the majority decision of those who, through their participation in the rank and file organizations, comprise the higher organ, namely, the national congress; that it really be they. I consider this very fundamental, for what many of us are striving now: the return to the party's democratic existence, which was ended at the Second National Congress by this Political Commission or by the top-ranking heads of this Political Commission. Therefore, I think that, since that Second National Congress, this Political Commission has become a majority, a majority group, which, as some comrades have mentioned, has attempted to impose a policy to impede not only the process of this party's formation and construction, by non-democratic methods, but also PSUM's political decisions. Hence, what we are demanding now is the opportunity of continuing this debate which we began at the Second National Congress.

Some comrades claim that documents and resolutions have been approved in the Central Committee by a majority or unanimously. In fact, this has been so, but, at times, the non-participation of many comrades in the Central Committee debates has been noticeable; because we know that, after the Second National Congress, it seemed useless to bring up certain issues in the Central Committee. What we propose now is respect for a free discussion and, based on this broad discussion, political conclusions may be reached that will determine the party's opinion. But, one after another, the Central Committee's plenums have clearly shown that there is a policy of not considering the opinions of those who held a position different from that of the majority. Comrades, we showed this when the convocation for the National Conference on Organization was discussed, or approved. It requires debate, it requires participation by the rank and file, it requires the statement of political positions.

I wish to give a reminder that certain comrades challenged that method of holding the debate among us, because that would virtually mean discussing only the affairs of the party's organizational existence in an extensive manner, and reproducing them in this Central Committee; and that would not be translated into anything, not even a positive decision. If they really wanted the party's rank and file to participate in this major discussion of the party's organization, and this appears to be the intention of the conferences as a whole, then some of the virtually most important debates had no participants from the majority of the Central Committee, spreading this problem that has been cropping up within the Central Committee. So, we have practiced, somewhat, the policy of Snow White's stepmother, and it seems that the conference on organization will be like Snow White's stepmother, who looked in the mirror,

and the mirror told her that she was the fairest. It would appear that we intend to settle the debates on the party's internal situation based on the presence of a Central Committee with the combination of apparats.

Graciela Romo

What a good thing it is that we have finally decided to analyze the party's internal situation. It would appear that there was a failing here; we should have started to analyze the party's internal situation after a preliminary meeting of the secretaries general; here, matters are reversed, that is, first we hold a meeting of the Central Committee and later there will be a meeting of the secretaries general. Why? I note this because at least the secretaries general have more knowledge of how the party is progressing in each of the states and, based on that, we could have made a more concrete analysis of the party's work and the party's organization. I think that we should have information on what the party is doing in all the states, so as to implement, by actions, what was agreed upon in the resolutions of the party's second congress, in the sense of making this party a party of masses. Then we should observe whether we are really engaged in work with the masses, on what front of masses we are participating, what our failures have been in this work, what our successes have been in this work; because we have done it in many locations. There may possibly be little work, or a lot; but it has been done; and we should find out whether this work that we have performed on the different fronts of masses has contributed to the fundamental goal, which is to make the party grow and strengthen it. Because I think that if we are working on the fronts of masses, it should be for this purpose, to make the party grow and strengthen it. But we have said here that the party must be a party of the masses; and if we are creating a party of masses, it is only logical for the party to be expanded with comrades who, at some particular time, have voluntarily joined the party, becoming affiliated with it and constituting rank and file organizations. The fact that the party's policy should be developed within these groups of masses is a relationship.

And I bring this up because of the problems that have been occurring in the congress, for example, or the party's development in Sonora. It is possible that, as we fulfill the decision of the congress to make this party a party of masses, it is possible that problems may arise in other states; because there are comrades who are working for this purpose, and there are comrades who are not doing so, who refuse to take this step. So what is going to happen when it is time to establish the delegations, so that there will be a congress? Those who will go as delegates are precisely the comrades who are in the rank and file organizations, who are in those groups. And, of course, whom will they elect? Well, it will be the comrades with whom they work every day, and so there arises this problem that has occurred involving the minorities and the majorities; and, of course, the lists will be essential. Why? Not to have the leadership comprised of the comrades who do constant work, but rather of comrades who do a different type of work, which is at least important in the party: the intellectual work. And so lists are needed sometimes so that those comrades may also be put in the leadership.

I think that we must make it quite clear what type of party we want: either we shall create a party of intellectual cadres or we shall actually create a party of masses. In this case, the comrades who are intellectual cadres must put the theory into practice, if those cadres are not to disappear from the leadership.

I shall express my opinion on the alliances. We should look at this very carefully, this matter of the alliance with PPS and PST in particular. Some of us have had concrete experience; what I shall bring up is not a gut issue but a political one. There are two deputies in the state of Baja California, one from PPS and the other from PST, and those two deputies are precisely the most raging enemies in the party. They have opposed the proposals that we have made concerning the government's wage policy, which relates to the president's economic policy for economic reorganization; and they have not had any qualms about backing the proposals made by the PRI deputies, blindly backing the government's policy, instead of backing us in our positions. And, of course, in this connection, they have called us destabilizers and alphabet soup, saying that this party is not a working class party, but rather we are petit-bourgeois and a series of adjectives.

The comrades in the party's leadership very seldom attend the debate, but the comrades in the party's rank and file, those participating in some fronts of masses, they do attend; and of course they leave very displeased by the position of those two. They realize that they are traitors to the causes of the people.

I would be ashamed to go and tell the comrades now: We're going to make an alliance with those two. It is a fact that they have always been attacking us and have also shown their treachery at times. So, I want to tell you that, if we are going to make an alliance with these two parties which are traitors to the working class, the government party's puppets, then we would do better to make the alliance with the government party. We have a political responsibility toward the working class, and as a party of opposition to the government's policy; and we cannot say now that we are really going to become allied with these two opportunistic parties. In particular, I wish to tell you that I shall never sit down with the PPS secretary general to hold a discussion; no, I shall not do it, and not for other reasons, but rather because of a political position. We have already been in that party, and we know them from their actions; you are familiar with their political positions. And it is not true that such alliances would bring us more votes; they would take them away from us, because they would have government funds for conducting their campaign, and they have prestige. If we have prestige as a revolutionary party, with our prestige and with our work, saying that we are the same, going about working together, we would receive votes too, and that is the government's intention.

This must be analyzed, and it is not a matter of our having differences here with the leaders and members of PPS, but rather of political positions.

Sabino Hernandez
(debate chairman)

...Then I call for a vote, please. Those who agree that we should continue the discussion, please say so. Comrade Horacio Garcia.

Horacio Garcia

Comrades, I think there has been an extremely abundant contribution from several comrades whose speeches I have observed. I have appreciated the attempt to arrive as fully as possible, at ways to solve the problems that we have in this party during its formation phase, but that are particularly concentrated now on the most important feature of our plan: unity. And at least five aspects which seem to me to focus directly on this issue have been brought up here. When we were a little into the discussion, this plenum elaborated on its remarks. And I think that the entry into a more open discussion occurred when Comrade Rolando Cordera brought up a question that is very important: the fact that a certain consensus was reported, at least in the opinion of three comrades; with Alejandro and Arnoldo adding that when talks were held regarding the party's situation, there was agreement on stating that the process of constructing PSUM has not ended and, secondly, that the country was entering a phase extremely dangerous to its future.

Comrades, I think that this consensus is quite valid, and hence we may now be facing one of the party's most difficult situations. It could even be, as was noted once in a talk with Pablo Gomez (he said it), the first crisis of PSUM. I hope that we can say one day that it was merely the first crisis of PSUM. Which five central aspects did I observe, or have I observed in this discussion? First, concerning two central aspects: the question as to whether we should uphold the unity pact, the political principle that gave rise to this party, at this plenum or regularly, in the party's existence; and, second, that relating to the policy of alliances, which has also been debated very much. However, there are other elements such as that relating to the restructuring of the Political Commission and the operation of the Secretariat, also adding that associated with internal discussion, which relates to these as well; and I shall explain later how I interpret it as a fundamental feature among us, namely, unity.

As for the first point, comrades, I think that we must state quite clearly what we think. I personally believe that this party must view the diversity in it as something effective. Comrade Castaneda has clearly stated what some of us think about this party plan, whereby we aspire not only to having an independent opposition, alternative, internationalist, nonaligned party, but also a plural party, which accepts the diversity within it and which rejects monolithism. Secondly, comrades, it seems to me that it is also important to state that, with regard to the policy of alliances, there is a feature that we here have attempted to disregard: In this unity pact, it was also made implicit that those features relating to the policy in general and, in this case, the policy of alliances which run counter to PSUM's unity should be surmounted with a political and unifying view. And in this instance, it is important for us to

look at the issue brought up by this policy of alliances, at the start of an electoral alliance with PPS from this standpoint. And I say this because it does not relate only to something running counter to the party's unity, although this would suffice to start the discussion and develop it extensively, but also because it has assumed signs of being an effective tactic in the political area. For example, comrades, in Jalisco the Popular Socialist Party was represented by a 70-year-old man named Pablo, who was aided in his work by his family or friends, who do not represent any alternative, not to mention an electoral one, not even an everyday position in the state of Jalisco. It is with this person whom, in addition to considering that we have made alliances, we have invited to functions and, on some occasions, the pact for broadness in PSUM's open policy in Jalisco has worked, but with the intention of creating conditions for struggle only in very concrete, temporary areas, based on the struggle that we are waging. But, comrades, in Jalisco I think that making an electoral-type alliance with PPS would detract votes from PSUM, in Jalisco. That is very definite, comrades, because we all know that, in the main confrontations that we had with the last governor, Romero de Velasco, the PPS leader agreed precisely with that governor on the rules that were to be adopted in dealing with the leading phenomena of the social struggle in Jalisco. And I also think, comrades, that it is important to cite here the matter relating to the operation and leadership of the Political Commission and the Secretariat, which have also acquired a major connotation in terms of unity, in my view. Why do I put it this way? Because, on some occasions, issues that have been debated in this Central Committee have had as a flaw the meager opinion, or rather the lacking opinion, in the Political Commission, of one of the parties involved. I have talked with some comrades, as I have stated here, that I find it somewhat disturbing that, sometimes upon arriving in Mexico City, I come upon an opinion developed concerning some political situation, whether it involves Sonora, Jalisco or Nayarit, expressed even with alarm. And I try to become informed later of the channels whereby one could have access to obtain the other opinion. And it turns out that it is only when the discussion is held in the Central Committee that a more extensive knowledge about the problem begins to appear, more or less. And the concrete example is that of Jalisco, when in a previous Central Committee discussion, it appeared in a Political Commission document that the issue of Jalisco was to be considered a serious issue. Having given that information, the Central Committee didn't hesitate to correct its position and rejected the aforementioned term. Now we are faced with different information regarding the problem of Sonora, and this problem had already actually been put in these terms, it had already been analyzed in this way. And so now, we have different information that will at least enable us to have greater breadth for deciding on a concrete issue. And, comrades, that has the flaw of the fact that, in the membership of the Political Commission, there is no representation that would make it possible there to remove the party's problems, and this has a direct effect on unity; that is why I mention it. There is another point that is also important to note as evidence that this operates in that way: During the morning mention was made here of the issue relating to Jalisco. The comrade remarked that we in Jalisco are banning the participation of the municipal entities. Comrades, a few days ago in Jalisco we had a meeting of a committee from the Political Commission from which I emerged extremely

gratified, because we had managed to progress, concretely, in unity in Jalisco. And the terms were expressed as follows: that we would form a regulatory commission that would be responsible for visiting all the party's rank and file organizations so that, when the conference on organization arrives, we would know exactly what situation we had, in terms of organizational policy and also in terms of the internal issue, to progress with the political agreements and the operation of the party itself. After that, we held several plenums at which this proposal advanced. A commission of 35 comrades has been formed, a format has been established for all the rank and file organizations, and we have even upheld a convocation which, abiding by the terms in general, adds only one clause that will enable us to help solve the problem of the inclusion of comrades and the organizational operation of the party in Jalisco, which is as follows: Unfortunately, in Jalisco the process of unity caused only those who belonged to a merging party to be the main leaders; and the party grew, it developed with the last elections, and now the leaders do not reflect the essence of their own organizations, from the standpoint of representation and that of daily activity as well. And we don't think that it is any crime to propose here an addendum to the national convocation that simply states that in rank and file organizations with more than 19 or 20 members, or from 10 upward, another comrade should be added to be the political head of the rank and file organization itself. And, in this way, we have served our purpose of having proportional representation and participation by the movements. Nevertheless, the committee from the Political Commission started discussing this convocation and, Pablo said (he told me yesterday) they decided to send a proposal to Jalisco to the following effect: That in rank and file organizations with over 20, in addition to the political head, the person for organization (of 19) would participate; in other words, a rank and file organization which had 100 or 150 (there are that many in Jalisco) would have to submit to that. And, you must see, comrades, that we don't think that....we could discuss it, but we are convinced now, after this plenum, that it will be necessary to talk with the comrades in Jalisco and convince them that these conferences are to discuss the problem of the party's organization, its organizational development, etc. We shall go with that spirit; we are not convinced that we shall succeed in the proposal, but we shall achieve acceptance for what has been stated here; because it is not a matter of holding a congress or a conference; it is that we must, comrades, become geared to the reality that we have in the party at present, here and now. That is why it seems important to me to say this; and, at those meetings, when there has been a discussion of the terms of the convocation, we have upheld all the municipal leaderships that have been identified by the comrades as coming from the former PC, and who work in CIOAC, who have done that work, indicating that they should participate as such in all those locations where they consider municipal leaderships as existing. And you may ask: why that problem? Because in the party in Jalisco there are only two registered municipal committees, and so we have to start in good faith, comrades. If we were merely statutory, if we were merely dogmatic, then no more than those of us registered here would participate. The comrades in the previous leadership have told us that they lack that data, and so where do we start there? With good faith, with a zeal for unity and with a desire to progress in this plan which all of us are constructing. So

it seems very important to me, from the standpoint of what we are discussing now, for us to understand that the desire for a revamping of the Political Commission and, why not? a restructuring of the Secretariat could contribute to the unity inside the party. It doesn't represent the trouble-making attitude of wanting to call for proportionality for a distribution of something, as if profits were being distributed, as has been stated here. No, comrades, it is the desire to construct a passable road for this party, as has been noted here; and that is why I think that the proposal now submitted by the Political Commission in this document is very good. They held a discussion which could no longer be put off; it relates to the party's unity, no more nor less. I believe that this document has that virtue; I don't think that, in general, it expresses the opinion of all those here present, in a unified manner, in a homogeneous manner. But I am convinced, comrades, that this document has been corrected now, expanded upon and enhanced in its essence. And it should not be just the document, it should be the attitude that we take to daily political activity that will enable us to progress and to traverse this road properly.

Finally, comrades, regarding the discussion, I have heard here too that there are comrades who have been surprised at how this Central Committee has worked, discussed and dealt with matters, in comparison with the previous one. So it seems to me that if, in the previous Central Committee, there was open discussion, respect and proposals that enhanced the party line in general, those ideas could not be exhausted, for some comrades, nor could the understanding be standardized. What exists is a problem (cited here by several comrades), namely, that the atmosphere in the party has become rarified for these essential reasons; and that atmosphere must be resolved in the political realm, comrades. It is not a desire, it is not a state of mind, it is a political reality that prevails here and that must be changed, and, if it is integral, then integrally, comrades. In the end, what is at stake is political efficacy, adherence to groundrules and the viability of a political plan on which many of Mexico's people depend.

Sabino Hernandez

Comrades, there is no act, no alliance, no unifying attitude, or nothing resembling it, with PPS, PST, UIC and the Socialist Movement. There is a document, which cites agreement on the opinion concerning three problems, and one other which emerged regarding the Simpson-Mazzoli law in the United States; which are issues of essential concern to Mexicans. For this reason, and in this respect, I don't believe that the Political Commission has gone too far in its activity, nor in its work either; because that is something inferred from the normal activity of a political organization which always tries to offer opinions that are correct, with the greatest backing, in the best sense, and with the greatest chance of having an effect. Comrades, I think that in this regard, establishing this precisely could help greatly in understanding what that document represents. In the case of Sonora, comrades, I at least do not think nor believe that the Central Committee should intervene to change anything there. If anyone has proposed this, it seems improper to me. In this connection, the view expressed by Comrade

Arnoldo, that the Central Committee should not intervene, is correct, it is proper. But comrades, that is one thing, and the Central Committee's not having an opinion concerning the commission that it appointed, the work that the latter did and the manner in which it has acted, is something else. I think that they are two different things. The least that could be done is, when it receives the report, the Central Committee could give an opinion on that work. In this respect, everyone who had an opinion and views would have to submit them at the proper time; but from a clear, objective standpoint, the fact that the Central Committee has received the report and submitted its opinion and its views does not run counter to unity in any way, nor violate congress resolutions; nor could any question even arise over the fact that a problem was solved there, under the conditions that were present, an attitude was developed, a situation was developed, and the party, from one standpoint or another, dealt with the situation from that standpoint. It is important for us to have it because of the fact that we members of the Central Committee have the chance of being called upon, in every instance, to account for our work and our activity. It is something related to discipline; it is something related to democracy; and it is something related to unity.

Comrades, it is far more important that measures and solutions be proposed to make progress in this party's unity process; that is something urgently needed in all respects. I think that this will lead us to understand what this party is. When it is said that this is a new party, that is always annoying. New for what reason, new on what basis, and new for what purpose? I think that this is pertinent if we essentially devote ourselves to a review of what has been stated here: our documents, in which we have agreed with the 1981 merger and on the first congress in 1982, and also, comrades, what is closely linked with the problems of our political origins. And in this respect we must necessarily realize that PSUM is something different, and that this PSUM requires certain circumstances, and forms of existence, work and relationships that are the same that might occur in any other political group, so that it may survive. I talked a great deal, particularly, about the diverse party; I talked a great deal about the problem of the majority and the minorities. I have some opinions regarding the issues of democracy; but, comrades, I think that at this time, under these conditions, and in this party, this is what we must maintain, what we must accept as a reality, and what we must accept as rules for dealing in all areas and from all standpoints. This is why I think that it would be far more difficult now to become involved in a discussion, trying to decide on this situation and trying to resolve something that the left in Mexico and the left in other countries as well have been bringing up for discussion. When are we going to discuss it? I don't know. Tomorrow, in 10 years? I don't know. We'll have to discuss it some day, probably very soon, or at a very far-off time; I don't know. What I think is that what this party needs today, at this time, to fulfill its tasks now, is this: what has been discussed, what has been rejected in one direction or another, and what has been proposed as something that should be changed too. And I believe that we should be far more attentive to these matters.

Comrades, thus far this year, from last year to this, our party has been engaged in many struggles, actions, mobilizations, strikes, land invasions and settlers' movements, which the newspaper ASI ES has also been publicizing since the very time that they occurred. I think that if we peruse the pages of the newspaper, we would find scores and hundreds of these activities wherein the party led, participated and expressed views. The party has voiced many opinions on the crisis situation that our country is undergoing, on the need for implementing measures and methods that will remove the workers from the antidemocratic situation in which the labor union organizations exist, and enable them to be put on a different level. Our party has had many views and has made many plans in this connection; and, comrades, it is also far more important to point out that these views have been accepted by the party's leadership organs, and applied, and the party has mobilized around them. In many parts of the country, the party's struggle have been precisely in this direction and from this leadership. This political leadership has faults, this political leadership has many situations to overcome and to resolve; but, comrades, this political leadership is a leadership accepted by the party. Some aspects of it could be criticized, but it is a leadership that also has consensus in the party, in all areas of its political activity. And I say this, comrades, because we cannot start from a different situation in order to successfully propose measures that will enable us to progress in the search for solutions to the internal problems of the party, of PSUM. We scheduled a meeting of secretaries general 3 or 4 months ago; 27 secretaries general came. We have been receiving the documents and the information on the state organizational conferences that have taken place to date, with the exception of those in five states. The rest, comrades, have ordered that the dates, on each occasion, stipulate the time when their conferences on organization would be held. We have been receiving demands that the Political Commission members and the Central Committee members go to attend state plenums and conferences of all kinds, and participate in solving state-related problems throughout the length and breadth of our country. And, comrades, this can only indicate that, in our party, the leadership has consensus, and that the Political Commission has acceptance. It has had criticism, that is quite a normal and logical occurrence; and the important thing is that this criticism can really help to better and improve their work in all respects. I believe that there are many issues which we have to resolve.

The matter of the Central Committee's work has been brought up here; it must be settled from every standpoint. The Central Committee cannot continue to operate in this way; and, comrades, this is a major issue for the goals that the party is pursuing with regard to its internal integration and the adoption of all types of measures that will enable it to continue progressing, not as a plan but as a reality. Because the Unified Socialist Party of Mexico is a reality. As a plan, it has many problems, but the party exists; it is active, and as such its opinion, its viewpoint, have been well received, either criticized or accepted, depending on the situation. But, comrades, there is a need for the Central Committee to refine its forms and methods of work, understanding what one has to do as a Central Committee member, as well as this organ's function as the most important leadership instrument that we could have at any particular time.

There is a problem, yes, comrades; I say this in all frankness, and we must discuss and delve deeply into it: that of our internal democracy, which is associated with the way in which we are going to assume the behavior that the party must use in actual life as part of its task and with its respective responsibility. How can it assume it? If we consider what our party is today, I don't think that citing and proposing a solution merely through the expedient of majorities and minorities, comrades, is the way to find a solution in this situation, by no means. There is an issue that we have been discussing in great depth: consensus. But so that consensus may occur, there must be an atmosphere that will make it possible for attempts in this direction to be carried out; and that atmosphere is intervention in the Central Committee, presence with opinions, and the performance and completion of the tasks and different work that the Central Committee itself imposes as part of the responsibility on its members. If that does not occur, comrades, it will be impossible for us to delve into this issue. But thinking only on the basis of majorities, well, what is there that is new in this party with regard to its democratic existence? And this is something that should concern us all very much. I do think comrades, that our party has not failed (I doubt very much that it could fail); but it has problems now; maybe those of the future or the past may be greater, but, comrades, there is no doubt that we too are obliged to seek the means of solving them. Comrades, let's review the experience of certain South American countries, the concrete example of Chile. Last night I read something in this connection: how the Chileans are discussing again the questions that they asked and those which were not asked, the discussion among the different leftist organizations over issues that might have been important, but, in comparison with the matter of reinforcing the power situation that was present, were minimal matters. Comrades, let's not make the same mistake.

Paquita Calvo

Comrades, from my standpoint, any analytical conclusion that we reach on our party's present internal situation must take one fundamental matter into account, and that fundamental matter, apart from the documents, based only on facts and the reality, is the existence, the coexistence within our party of two substantially different concepts, resulting also in two essentially distinct, strategic and tactical views, and even different styles, I would say. One is that of those who, giving a priority, think of this party mainly, not exclusively but mainly, as a party which has an influence on the civil society in the struggle for economic, political and social reforms, for the purpose of achieving the expansion and widening of the democratic spaces. The means that they deem necessary (this concept) for attaining their goals are, fundamentally, the electoral battle, the policy of alliances, the growth of PSUM's presence in the state organs and denunciation through the mass media. The others are those of us who also give a priority, and think of this party not exclusively, but fundamentally, as an instrument for accumulating the organized strength, that is so necessary, that will enable us, at a particular time, to seize power or afford us the opportunity of seizing power, not as a short-term goal, but as a very clearcut and very precise goal, from now on. The means for attaining this end, based on this concept, is only one: the work with masses, the direct struggle among the struggles of the masses which,

although it may assume different forms, is a single one basically, although it may even take on the struggle for reforms, but interpreted as a means for achieving change in the correlation of forces in favor of the revolutionary goal, which is to seize power. Socialism and the seizure of power are the fundamental cores of this concept. Reforms and democracy are the fundamental cores of the other concept.

Now then, where could we think these different strategic concepts originate? In a particular theoretical notion of our reality, achieved from a particular ideological position also. With the concept that gives priority to reforms, this country could still be developed gradually and extensively through, or based on a dependent, underdeveloped capitalist system which is the one in which we are living. (Comdr Fidel Castro said in his report to the Sixth Summit Conference of Nonaligned Nations that 400 years would have to elapse before the underdeveloped countries would be able to attain the level of the developed capitalist countries based on the logic of capitalism.) With the other concept, dependent, underdeveloped capitalism has reached its limit; it has nothing more to offer. United States imperialism is unloading its crisis, which at this point is structural.

It is zealously, hastily and with interest obeying the dictates of the International Monetary Fund. So, developing bourgeois democracy in all areas is seen as a fundamental issue by this concept. With the other concept, the fundamental issue is to establish among the working masses a revolutionary political center with decidedly classist features; in opposition to a real, concrete, fundamental situation, which is the existence of a clearcut, obvious tendency toward the strengthening of the state apparatus to centralize all of the bourgeoisie's power. And this, in my opinion, comrades, is the fundamental political situation in the current historical era of our country. As is evident, they are two very different theoretical and ideological views. But, what is the specific thing in this instance? That we coexist inside the same party; that is the originality of PSUM, that is the specific thing about PSUM. And what can be done about this? It seems to me that the first thing is to be clearly aware of that coexistence; the second is to carry it out with mutual respect, to have mutual respect present inside the party.

Now then, how can we coexist with mutual respect? In just one way, comrades, through discussion and unity of action, thereby reaffirming our originality. But discussion and political debate are precisely what have been impossible to have in this party, because we have been concerned with a million foolish things; that is sincerely how I feel. We have neglected the political debate which is fundamental and which typifies this party; and it is that internal debate, that unity of action together with adherence to the decision of the majority, that comprise, that would comprise, if they were achieved, internal democracy within this party: internal democracy in PSUM's party existence, in all respects. And I think that this is the only way we have of confronting and taking on the problem politically. This is all that I would say about the fundamental debate on our party's internal situation, but I would like to discuss other matters.

It is very painful for me to discuss the first one; frankly, I would not want to discuss it, but I think it is important. I had to travel to Cuba; I would explain that this trip to Cuba did not cost the party a single centavo. When I returned from Cuba and showed up to collect, as the part-time professional that I am, 9,000 pesos before, 12,000 now, I went to collect them from Comrade Abel Mercado, and he told me that I was no longer on the payroll. It was that simple; he even showed me a receipt of the kind that they give every time they pay, on which it read: appropriation 0000. He showed it to me and told me: "You are no longer on the payroll." I brought this up with Comrade Stephens, and he expressed surprise, telling me that he would speak with Comrade Alcocer. Comrade Abel came up to see me, telling me that Alcocer wanted to talk to me. I went to talk with Alcocer, and he told me that I actually was no longer on the payroll because he understood that I was leaving the country, and so I was no longer on the payroll, that he had to prepare an IOU to pay me for the first 2 weeks of July. I explained to him that I had not been paid for the second 2 weeks of June, because it was the receipt for the second 2 weeks of July on which the 0000 was recorded. Then he told me that, regarding that, he would have to consult with the Secretariat, and that he would inform me about it later. A couple of days later, I went to talk with Comrade Abel Mercado, who told me that he had no instructions to pay me that money. Comrades, I think that there is no unifying policy even present here; there is no political level here; this is a situation in which there is no political level. It also seems to me to be a rather crude, discourteous attitude, telling someone that she is no longer on the payroll, ousting her as a professional cadre, showing her a receipt reading 0000, without any clarification, any explanation or anything. I want to explain, this pains me too, that I think that even as a matter of basic courtesy, he could have called and said to me: "Listen, you intend to leave the country, so how can we solve this problem? Are you going to stay, how long are you going to stay? Are you going to go?" Nothing of the sort was said; he simply erased me from the payroll. And what I wanted to tell you is that 9,000 pesos or 12,000 pesos, comrades, is no use for anything; I am obviously not a professional cadre of the party for that amount.

Now then, regarding the situation in Sonora, I would also like to express my opinion. I think, and I agree with what some comrades have said, have stated: that we must make a non majority unifying policy, a political policy not an arithmetical policy. I agree with that; we are making policy provided we don't make a political decision that would affect a decision of this party's majorities, on any level.

Finally, concerning the alliance with the Popular Socialist Party. Comrades, I don't think that it is an issue of titles here, as has been claimed, but of the real, authentic, discreditation of that party among the people of Mexico; and the people have a historical memory, something that is sometimes lacking in us, the left. But they do remember many things. Comrades, I sincerely believe that the discreditation of our party would be dreadful if there were an alliance with PPS and PST, also, but particularly with PPS. It was also claimed that signing a program with PPS would not be very important. Well, comrades, I would not sign even an agreement for taking power with PPS. That's all.

Jorge Alcocer

Briefly, comrades. I actually discussed this matter brought up by Paquita with her. There was unquestionably misinformation in the Secretariat, because we in the Secretariat were informed that Paquita was in Cuba. We were told that there; no word arrived at the Secretariat that Comrade Paquita was leaving, that she was going to be absent, etc. We received the report that it was quite likely that she would no longer be coming there for awhile. What was done? Awaiting this, and since the payroll comes out every 2 weeks, and we are not used to having the cashier keep envelopes that are not paid, zeros were entered. I explained this to Comrade Paquita, and this amount was paid to her immediately. Now there was also confusion between her and me; at least let's agree on it; it was that when the payment was made, she was being paid for the first, or second 2 weeks of June. She later told me that she was also demanding payment for the first 2 weeks of June. I told her that I would ask about that, not the Secretariat but rather Manuel Stephens; and I asked Manuel. Comrade, forgive us, we could not pay this because we have a rather large overdraft; and as all the comrades who are currently requesting funds could attest, we have had to tell them to wait. That is the entire situation.

Marcos Leonel Posadas

Comrades, it seems to me that our meeting may perhaps have good results and great usefulness for solving the problems that have been brought up, with proposals in the convocation for this plenum on this point, and proposals in the initial document submitted by the Political Commission. I think that certain vantage points could already be directly noted in the results of this Central Committee meeting, which may perhaps make it possible for us to resume a course of integration. For this purpose, I think that a fundamental basis, the key issue, a matter without which no step can be taken, is the issue of discussing the problems, and including them directly in all our debates. I think that the issue and the direction that the discussion should take must result in finding collective solutions. And the advantage that we have is that we now have the attendance of comrades who, at a series of consecutive plenums, did not show up for the Central Committee's discussions; and that there has also been participation in the debate from that attendance. I consider this an important element which we should use, taking from it every advantage that such a procedure could bring us. I believe, comrades, that one of the features of antidemocracy is not to participate, refusing to bring up one's own views with the other comrades and, together with them, attempt to reach common conclusions, useful for everyone, resulting from the effort of everyone. Comrades, this seems to me no minor issue, and a lesson from our own experience in this period.

I think that participating and expressing opinions is the first major duty of the members of this party's leadership gathered here to try to offer a solution for the problems that have arisen. It has been said, and I think that this is another very important, fundamental, starting point in the political decision to approve any worthy effort for integration; comrades, I think that another problem immediately crops up here: the attitude for

taking up this discussion, the question of whether, through discussion, we shall polarize the positions and prepare other scenarios for confrontation and prepare a battle of exclusions, or whether we shall undertake a discussion in search of integrating solutions. I consider this matter of the discussion procedure to be also another major element for our undertaking and resuming a path of integration, which has deteriorated and which has already brought us negative consequences (which we have mentioned in various ways); but which has been a very great concern voiced by comrades from various positions and with different interpretations of the problems. The deterioration stemming from this failure to continue along the path of integration is a concern shared by everyone. Comrades, I think that here, too, an attempt has been made, with complete responsibility, to assume positions of not cultivating nor fostering confrontation. Comrades, I believe that a series of judgments and proposals offered here are leading directly to that. For example, some very untimely interpretations of the Second National Congress. This would not have a solution unless it were an integrating solution; we would have a solution of a different kind, of exclusion, of splitting, of a break, of disregard for legitimacy, of disregard for legality, etc. However, that type of conclusion, comrades, that way of dealing with the issue, would not help us at all to resume the path of integration, and I use this phrase.

I also think, comrades, that we should reflect far more, for example, on the proposal to convoke a Third National Congress soon. If we fail to lend this integration process another different basis, comrades, it would be another congress that, sooner or later, would prove to be a probably aggrandized, aggravated repetition for the final confrontation. I think that if we want that integration, then we cannot have a new congress deciding on the difficult, critical process of integration.

Comrades, I think that one infers from this discussion, owing to a group of proposals that we should immediately consider, one undeferable necessity: that we convey the topics of this discussion and the arguments supporting positions to the entire party, and then arrange an immediate, and not very long period, organized by the Central Committee, for conveying reliable information to the entire party which is, essentially, the one concerned with resuming this integration process. And, comrades, as a Central Committee, I think that we must make way for this discussion, which will have to dynamize the party's activity and reinvigorate the Central Committee's leading role in this party.

Along with this, we must take charge and assume, without hedging, a series of responsibilities from which we cannot exclude anyone regardless of the presence of different views. I am referring to matters of this kind: the obligation to defend and strive for the implementation of the second congress' line (and this does not involve incidental, temporary interpretations based on expediency or frame of mind); this has been written and shaped in documents, and the principal elements do not allow that type of interpretation. Secondly, I think that another unavoidable commitment with which we must confront the entire party is that of upholding the founding plan, which also cannot lend

itself to temporary interpretations, interpretations for a specific discussion; but rather is based on decisions which gave rise to this party, that we have a fundamental role of loyalty and struggle to carry forward. Along with that, comrades, and as part of the defense of this founding plan, I think we must state political commitments here to be carried out, in an attempt to root that founding plan in the consciousness of all the organizations and members of this party, and the tasks that will enable us to give it an impetus. And, comrades, something on the agenda is the defense of the concept of the points for the party's construction that we have in a Central Committee resolution, defending or debating it openly and directly. Therein lies our opportunity to hold an organized discussion on all the levels that operate in an organized manner in this party, from the rank and file; so as to be able to establish the real views of this party's members and to clearly define which view has the backing and esteem of most of the members of this party. Identifying and indicating, comrades, is also another element that we cannot evade; and in this respect, I simply think that I would adhere to what I said a moment ago about the method; but we cannot evade these more difficult problems. What are the types of conduct that upset our unity and our founding plan? Which types of conduct do we mean? And there is surely a group of incidents in the political action of the Central Committee members, because I am referring to the responsibility that all of us here must fulfill; they must be considered or brought up in this discussion, and they must be put forth in this way: the consideration of these problems and the individual views of all the comrades.

Pablo Gomez

Comrades, male and female; I think that we must realize that this discussion has assumed major importance in the context of the internal situation being experienced by our party. This discussion has been very broad, very significant and replete with concepts and proposals, which we must consider and which we must develop so that they may serve the purpose of achieving a leap, a new step, in the struggle for our party's unity. One element that has been present in this discussion and very clearly expressed in the document which this Central Committee prepared in planning the National Conference on Organization, and which is under discussion in the party now, is that we are still engaged in the merger process. This party is becoming formed; it is undergoing a very irregular process of formation, to be sure, with conflicts and problems, some of them major. This idea has been present, in one way or another, implicitly or explicitly, in all the speeches. Hence, no one in this party thinks that we are now a completed organization, or that the process which led to our unification has been finished. We still have many problems yet to be solved.

In the first speech that I gave, I mentioned the party's nature as a diverse party. The sources of PSUM's diversity are not just the old parties; they are the socialist movements that really exist, the socialist diversity that is an historical matter. We have not discovered it; the party does not have that merit; its merit is different. Its merit has been to attempt to unite them

in a single party. Socialist diversity is certainly not the system that exists in Western Europe; the also historical division between two parts of the labor movement, the Social Democrats and the Communists, has never been reflected in the same way in this country. We in Mexico have experienced a different process, a different phenomenon; and for that very reason PSUM relates to its own country. It has arisen as a reflection of that socialist diversity shown in our country which, naturally, has had an influence outside, an influence in other countries, in other parties and in other international movements; but it is only an influence, not a determination. We have taken an experience from the Mexican left, or isn't this an incidental experience? This nature of the party is a condition for the development of socialism in our country; it is an expression of the historical experience of our country's socialist parties and movements; therefore, PSUM's origin certainly does not place conditions on its plan. But the diversity, which is an integral part of the original pact, a central part, a fundamental part, of the original pact, does impose conditions on the future of this party. At least an organization came here which did not bring up the issue of the socialist revolution; and it accepted that. And it has not come now to say that the party should change that position; it has assumed that position, which in no way commits all the members to maintain that principle personally, internally, in their own ideological concept, but it does commit the party to uphold that position. We could say the same of the party's theoretical basis; this party's theoretical basis must relate to a theory which has diverse movements, which is diverse.

For many years, many Mexican Marxists thought that this was not so, that it was not diverse. But therein lies the reality, and herein lies the reality: it exists. Our daily lives as members of this party only reiterate over and over again that diverse nature of socialism, and the refusal, particularly by the party's rank and file, not only the leadership, to return to the system of ideological exclusion of one or another of the many movements existing in socialism, which are reflected in our country, as a result of our national historical experience. I think that this party's rank and file has responded to that proposal made by the leaders, the founding leaders of this party, when they set forth on this adventure to form a party which recognizes and fully accepts the diversity of socialism. And we are greatly pleased that similar attempts arising from individual national experience are starting to occur in other Latin American countries as well; not because of our party's influence, there has been none of that, but rather based on realities and experience that the socialist revolutionaries in other countries have had throughout their service as revolutionary militants.

Comrades, I also believe that our party is not caught up in the discussion between the reformist socialist position (I think that this should be in quotes), as it is called, and the revolutionary socialist position. I don't think that our main problem is the discussion of the party's revolutionary goal; and I don't think that many other comrades on the Central Committee, and this party, the rank and file of this party, could take a position based on either of the two. This party does not have an instrumentalist concept of reforms and the

struggle for reforms; it does not think that this association can be achieved through a merely idealistic concept of linking the reforms with the revolution, because the revolutionaries claim that they are linking it; no. It is the process of the struggle to form a new hegemony that governs the course of the revolutionary struggle; and one of the qualities of this party (which has many) is that it realizes that the course of the revolution does not lie in the issue of the implementation of some reforms or others of an economic and social type which could be very constructive and very advanced; but rather, in the process of forming a new hegemony. And this is a politico-ideological process; and the workers' economic struggle takes place there, the struggles over the dispute concerning the surplus, the distribution of the surplus, take place there; and the disputes over the fundamental rights and demands of the working class and the workers as a whole takes place there.

But the key problem, as we know, is not the alleged consequences of one reform or another of an economic and social type: whether they head toward the revolution or head toward another slightly improved capitalism. This is an old controversy which had no solution in Latin America and which was abolished when faced with the void of events, in the reality itself. Many of those of us who are here participated in those controversies, and we also accused many others, calling them reformists, etc. We didn't achieve anything from this standpoint. The struggle against political opportunism is something else; there, we achieved a great deal, very much; but in this connection, no. So, our revolutionary viewpoint is not framed in that alleged division among the socialists or the advocates of socialism. Our problem is one of attempting to convert PSUM into an instrument, I emphasize, an instrument for the struggle on behalf of this new hegemony.

Therefore, we must be an alternative party; therefore, we must be a program party; and therefore, we must also be a political party; therefore, we must have a policy of alliances; therefore, we must have alliances with others who do not share our positions; and therefore we must develop our theoretical concept (or our theoretical concepts), accepting the fact that our theoretical basis has diversity, has different movements. I think that ideological differences have arisen here which are related to what I am indicating or, to what Comrade Castaneda has said; because I have not yet completely understood it.

I don't think that anyone of us has completely understood, comrades, completely; let's realize that. Our own action, but in particular our association with reality and with the political struggle is what is giving us the answers, and giving us the capacity to understand this completely; we still understand it halfway. And we are not always consistent with that. Naturally, it is difficult; but, comrades, we in the party leadership (I am referring to the Central Committee when I say the party leadership) have not demanded of sectors of the party, members of the party, a very firm, highly developed, consistency in these matters. But, comrades, this was not based on a majority. This question of the party's theoretical basis and goals was not just a matter of a majority. Yes, of course, the first congress voted on it, but it voted at the proposal of the founding leaders. All of them submitted the plan for the consideration of the party and the first congress; so, everyone there is responsible.

A sizable number of those founding leaders are on this Central Committee. Let's accept it. Is a process of unification from the top improper, as has been said, etc.? I don't consider that criticism to be fitting, no. If the founding leaders had not reached agreement, had not arrived at agreement and had not fostered unity, comrades, PSUM would not exist. That means having a rather out-of synch idea of the reality, of the role of the leaders and the role of the rank and file in parties.

No one has claimed that these founding leaders have supplanted the rank and file, because they couldn't prove it; no, they gave an outlet for an unrest that already existed among the rank and file, and that is to their credit: having managed to interpret within their parties, regarding others parties and in other leftist organizations, the unified state of mind that was present, and is still present, and translating that into political agreements; because that's what a leader must do, that is his role, one of his roles. And I think that we must analyze the issue from that angle; otherwise, we cannot do anything. We would succumb to a completely spontaneous, disjointed and disorganized concept of the processes in the Mexican left, and we are not here to succumb to that kind of demagoguery.

Comrades, this party is viable without any doubt. I don't believe that a calamity will occur here, no. I agree with whoever said, I think it was Alejandro, that we must remove some of that dramatic tone; and I think that we could all agree on that. The success, the progress, the fact that this party exists, that it is recognized for what it is and what it wants to be to a large extent, the fact that we are overcoming the exclusiveness and monolithism, the fact that we are proceeding toward a more united concept of what our country is and of the workers' struggle in our country, constitute an entire process, comrades; but we are heading there, in that direction. It is highly significant that the party of the Communist Internationale did not exist in the Communist Party formed in 1919. I consider that an achievement for all of us, and it was also greatly to that party's credit. But this doesn't mean that, because of the merits it had, it should now turn over the bill to PSUM. No one here has a right to send the bill to PSUM, no one. Hence, those are events, perhaps of history, but they are; and that was achieved by all of us, all who came from the five organizations, and those who came from PMT, the 23 September League, and others, many, from the Guerrero Vanguard Party, etc.

Now, comrades, we can continue to develop this party. I consider it difficult to return. I say it is impossible; we cannot reconstruct again, or remain with our family; it is impossible. We are involved in something different; and we are already engaged in this. But we cannot, because it would mean the destruction of this plan, turning it into something that it never wanted to be, to attempt again to reiterate in PSUM the monolithic concept, the ideological exclusiveness, the vanguardism and the messianism that are in a state of crisis in this country and in Latin America. And we shall observe the elections, we shall draw many good conclusions from the 1985 elections concerning these matters, regarding the situation of the Mexican left.

Comrades, I think that we could reach agreement here on these issues involving differences that have been expressed, not just ideological ones but of a political type; the others, well, they must be debated, if they haven't been debated sufficiently. I have seen little written to warrant discussing a debate. And sometimes people write and give the impression that no one is concerned about this. Of course, there are many people who read the documents, but there is no exchange of proposals and ideas, except incidentally. This doesn't allow for the development of positions. So that is a first topic that we must finish: we should establish everything that we are, but not in a bloc, not in a bloc; this has nothing to do with real or alleged blocs within the party.

Now, we must work on the ideological concepts, the party, the left, the courses of action, etc.; and after that let's ask: where are the blocs? Well, basically, they are political ones; the blocs are political. So, to solve the problem of blocs we go to the internal political question, as has been noted by several comrades here who have taken the floor. On the basis (I want to stress this strongly here), on the basis (as has been stated here) that there must be a restoration of the internal existence broken off at the second congress; because there were delegates who were not real, because there were many irregularities, etc.; it seems to me that there was no settlement of any kind. That is my conviction and, I think, that of the Political Commission. Why? Because, comrades, this is, as has been remarked here, a way of never reaching agreement on anything, and heading for destruction. If we want to raise the cause of this leadership's illegitimacy so as to continue a hollow, direct struggle for the predominance of political sectors, I think that this would worsen the internal problems and, eventually, it would be resolved in some way, but I don't think that there is any unifying solution. On the other hand, based on holding the discussion, dealing with the political problems, etc., apart from small, large or insignificant petty campaigns for personal discreditation and all those things that we often have to put up with, and that are irrelevant, then I think that it would be possible to take a step toward unification, paving the way for the ideological, theoretical discussion that must flourish without limits in the party.

I would also say this in connection with that alleged divorce between the Political Commission and the Central Committee, the alleged divorce between the Political Commission and the party, and the alleged divorce between the Political Commission and the line of the Central Committee and the congress. This must be documented, because it cannot be merely stated thusly. I think that the report which I submitted to the congress on behalf of the Central Committee was approved unanimously; something which was very surprising to everyone; except for one sentence which had to be voted on individually, and on which there was certainly a very close vote. It seems to me that the resolution had an overwhelming majority; I think that those documents are effective. I think that we are leading the party in the struggle against the government's economic policy through an alternative position, from an opposing standpoint. Comrades, we have not made any commitment either to the government's offers in the area of economic and social policy, nor to the government itself. No one could make such claims, because this has not occurred.

In connection with our platform of struggle for a new political reform, and for a process of democratization in the country, I think that these two issues are the essence of our everyday policy. Now then, how are we doing this? How are we carrying this process out? Obviously, there is no possibility that this PSUM, alone, could attain those goals or could make a major contribution, alone, to those goals. Therefore, we are participating in the National Worker, Peasant and Popular Assembly; therefore we have relations with other forces; therefore we are making an appeal, which was published today, the appeal from the Central Committee that I mentioned today, rather briefly, on a television broadcast.

I think that we are on the right path; the only party on the left that could do this is this party; there is no other. Because PST excludes PMT, because PPS excludes PRT; we can sit down to talk with any party in that area, and not only with parties, we can also sit down to talk with the many clubs, without names and without statutes, that exist in this country, among individuals who are involved in trade unions, in housing developments, in public administration, everywhere; in the press, journalists' clubs and those of intellectuals. Doesn't a revolutionary party have to do this? Could it be claimed that this need not be done? Why isolate the PPS issue from a policy that was the one approved by the Central Committee? That is not proper as a method of discussion, because then it looks as if the Political Commission wanted to take PPS' chestnuts out of the fire, or condemn it. Nor is it proper, I am talking about the method, to say (I shall read it here, to make it as literal as possible), to claim that there is a desire to rest from so much suffering for so many years, from the opposition struggle and persecution; because that, comrades, is frankly annoying. Comrades, in this party, all those who have been in jail never came here to boast about their experiences. That is one good thing about this party. That is one thing, and claiming that we are resting now, that we want to rest now, is something else. I consider it annoying and not the proper method for discussion among comrades.

Among the left in Mexico a struggle took place for over 20 years against opportunism, and no one is willing to scrap that, no one; it would be irresponsible. PSUM had some at the time of its creation, in its creation, in the reasons for its creation, associated, I don't know how much, with that long struggle of decades, the struggle against political opportunism among the left and, of course, with mistakes and deviations; because I was among those who headed toward sectarianism, and that was a very serious mistake and deviation.

I don't consider this matter of the alliances to be a moral issue. There is some morality in it, yes, certainly; but, essentially, taking that partial moral aspect in the issue of the alliances into account, it is not essentially a moral issue. And we must analyze this very dispassionately.

First, this party has not made an alliance with PPS, comrades; that is what one reads there in a declaration: it is not an alliance. What concept do we have of the alliances? It is a joint declaration, like others we have made, which Comrade Castaneda mentioned in his speech. And there are others, because

we have always been in the Mexican Peace Movement, and so has PPS, and we have done things together. Why have we done this? To counteract the campaign against the left, because of the fact that the left has been fragmented; an element that is causing us much harm. Why did we do this at that time: why then and not at another time? Because it was at its height, on the eve of the Federal Electoral Commission's decision to allow its registration; the campaign in the press regarding the fragmentation of the left was at its height. Ah, well, some may think that press campaigns are not important, but I don't think that one can accept that; because why wouldn't they be important? Because they have done much harm to this party and to this left, mainly because we lack the capacity to respond, because we have virtually no press, comrades, nor news media. So, they do us a great deal of harm. What must we do? We must hasten what was called in a joint declaration, and lend it a certain importance that the content of the document lacked, but that the presence there of the five leaders of these parties did lend it. This is with respect to the occasion. Isn't it proper for a Political Commission to make policy? So, what sense is there in all this, comrades, that it should assume its responsibility, that it should know what the right time is and that it should have wisdom, if the main criticism made of the Political Commission, the proper criticism, is that of lack of wisdom, of timeliness, of decision and of daring? And, comrades, many of us share that criticism. That was not an alliance but, let's discuss the matter of the electoral alliance with PPS, why not? In order to be able to discuss it, there must be material for discussion; because, frankly, comrades, that business of saying that PPS is directed from the government does not seem to me to be a topic for discussion; because any comrade could come here and say that this is a very old issue. Where would we arrive with that discussion? How much further? I would like you to tell me: where would we arrive? Nowhere, comrades, please. It is very irresponsible to state matters in such a way that they would lead us to other discussions which are not the ones that have been brought up here. Let's not discuss the history of this party. There are wounds, too; why open them? They have already been closed, in 1968. Why return to that? There is no need to discuss that again, please, comrades; we are not mature enough to discuss that now. Who knows whether, in the future, within 10 or 20 years, we might hold some very interesting discussions here in our country, and some of the present comrades may then be able to be essayists on historical issues, analysts or theoreticians in this field, but not now, please. So, what I think is this: If this party, PSUM, has at present the opportunity for a common platform of struggle against the president's policy and line, against the economic line, against the line in the area of democratic rights, in connection with the debt, in connection with all these fundamental problems wherein the concrete political positions are decided and defined, I think it would have to examine very seriously the possibility of alliances; because that would change their line. It would not change ours, because it is not going to change. It would change their line, if we reached a level of confrontation to which they are not accustomed, which they have not held. That is not their experience. So we must analyze this matter here with a different methodology, I believe. There is no revolutionary political party without alliances. This has been lost, because sectarianism has developed greatly among the international left; but, many years ago, at the turn of the century, this was something completely clear, which no one

would question in the least. And from this there emerged the masters of these alliances, who are precisely those who headed the first socialist revolution. So I don't think that we should have any fears, unless we fear ourselves. The moral aspect, which is also present here, must be analyzed by us as well. But we must analyze it as such, not amid an upheaval wherein everything is confused and there is no way of discerning the scope of one thing or another. There was, previously, it is not present any longer, but previously (remember, comrades, when we were going to form PSUM and at the time of the leftist coalition, also), the perpetual problem of PRT, the idea that we had: "'no' to PRT," etc. It was a completely undesirable party. We have overcome that. Now, if we are going to exclude the opportunists and their alliances, it will be very difficult to do anything, comrades; because there is also a great deal of opportunism in the left which has a radical language; and, although this will be published, I want to say the following here (at least we would remove it so that it would not interfere with our relations with PRT); but at the time of the pressure from the Secretariat of Government, comrades, in connection with the PARM affair, PRT...and let the suspension points be retained. So, in these matters, comrades, we must clearly understand the ground that we are treading on. PST, on the other hand, must certainly be given credit; it confronted the secretary of government for the first time.

Comrades, we must stipulate the time for discussing this matter of the electoral pacts; we cannot discuss it here, in advance, without bases. What do they offer, what do they propose, what might it be, so that this party may give a response? I would ask: Do you think that an alliance with PMT, for example, would be easy? Comrades, that would be very difficult; we would have to attempt it and strive for it manifestly. Why would we do this, comrades? We do realize that PMT is starting to engage in a rather hostile discourse, and that it must correct that rather hostile position toward us and toward the rest of the left. It will be difficult for us to wage the battle, but we must wage it, and we must find out how we are going to wage it. But we should not isolate ourselves, comrades, PSUM should not become isolated, it should assume its role of being the most important party in the left, not only because of the number of votes, but also because of the steadfastness of its positions, the consistency of its statements, its unifying nature, all those things that we talk about so much and that we must carry out much in practice, in actions; because it is there that one sees the correctness or incorrectness of a political line and a political discourse.

Comrades, there is another issue: we are struggling for a new government, another government different from this one; but not only that. If our position was confined only to that, then we would be proceeding very badly. This party is struggling for a revolution; that is a central element and a fundamental decision of the party, far more than any other matter of a different sort; because this entails far more.

There is another question; and, in this connection, too, it must be said that when PSUM, its Central Committee, makes an appeal, comrades, we are not making abstract appeals; we are making very concrete appeals, comrades. Now, the other matters, quickly.

In connection with the question of the trouble-making management, I interpret it as a cover (I may be mistaken, but I shall run the risk of interpreting), as a cover for the violation of not turning over the per diems; for it might be proven that there has been bad management, fraudulent, trouble-making management on the part of the leadership, I mean the Secretariat and the Political Commission, of the party's funds. There is very little involved in this, comrades, but there has not been that trouble-making management. I want to ask the comrades on the committee, and I shall personally request that the comrades on the Committee on Guarantees and Monitoring, that they make a decision on what Comrade Gonzalez Gallo has stated here; that is, not in connection with him, in connection with what he has stated. I would like to explain, in the Nayarit electoral matter, that I don't know how many millions have flowed to "El Morro" * (all this has been taped there); and on that basis I shall have them make a decision on whether funds (monetary ones) have been channeled to Comrade Saucedo's campaign, over and above a determination by the Central Committee organs and the State Committee itself; so that there will be no doubt about this. And I also request Comrade Woldenberg to report to the Nayarit State Committee, in writing, the amounts of propaganda published by the Central Committee for the campaign in the state of Nayarit; and, to complete this, I would also have to urge the comrades on the Nayarit State Committee to generate a capacity of their own in the propaganda field.

In connection with the Nayarit Electoral Assembly, an explanation can be given here; this is a detail, but Gaston attached importance to it in the discussion. Maybe Gonzalez Gallo and Stephens could explain this matter clearly to us; but, insofar as I know, the State Committee was notified that I would attend the Electoral Assembly. I talked to Comrade Gascon's household, but he was not in the town of Tepic; then there was nothing else to be done, but I also left a message for him. There was nothing else to be done except discuss this entire matter with Comrade Stephens and Comrade Gonzalez Gallo; and I don't want to get into whether I could go or not, or the freedom to travel, here; because, comrades, that is frankly something else. But the State Committee knew it; it knew about this. In connection with the banner that was present at the assembly, we have no responsibility, I say it sincerely; I greatly regret that there was not any banner there reading: Party Electoral Assembly in Nayarit, with the party logo. But we bear no responsibility. Our performance at the assembly, some of you were there, was united; that is what we in the leadership think. Comrades, we didn't go there to entrench ourselves or to promote bloc formation; it was united, defending the party, expressing its line, its opposition bases, its alternative, and its position of independent struggle.

And as a final topic, the last one, I shall make a written proposal here. We, I mean the Political Commission, I am speaking for it in this regard, we deem it of the greatest importance that this discussion regarding the internal problem that we have been analyzing, continue a little further, both inside and outside the Central Committee; of course, not so much that it would preclude

* Eduardo Saucedo, former PSUM candidate in Tepic.

the party's action; we must settle this matter within a short time. We cannot allow this to spread and continue, and arrive the following year and the next; that is impossible. Our deadlines are short now, comrades; this is in the interest not only of some comrades or others, but rather of the entire party. To discuss this matter carefully, there are many detailed points to be analyzed, for the purpose of forming a more united and more suitable leadership; which does not imply that the present Political Commission is not a united leadership, because we cannot start there. That it could be much better, yes, of course, of course it could; but that is something else. So now we are proposing that a Central Committee commission be formed, which would have very specific functions. I shall read a draft from the Political Commission. It states: Point of Agreement. The Sixth Plenum of the PSUM Central Committee resolves to continue the discussion on the matters relating to the formation and operation of the Central Committee organs. Therefore, the Central Committee is forming a specific commission, for the sole purpose of submitting a proposal to the Central Committee itself, at its next plenum, on the formation and operation of the Political Commission and the Secretariat. Said specific commission will be chaired by the secretary general of the Central Committee. The specific commission is comprised as follows: (and this is our proposal) Pablo Gomez, Alejandro Gascon Mercado; Arnoldo Martinez Verdugo; Rolando Cordera; Pablo Pascual; Manuel Stephens; Sabino Hernandez; Salvador Castaneda; Sergio Almaguer; Cesar Navarro; and Horacio Garcia Perez. There are 11 comrades. This is what I mean: Comrades, I don't think that we should allow, in this process of internal discussion, it to be presumed in the party that there is a schism and that we know in advance the conclusions that this commission might reach, because of the method of its formation or its functions.

We have a National Conference on Organization that is imminent; it will not appoint leaders; it will discuss realities and problems. Of course, it will not resolve everything, but it could be a wonderful form for discussion and agreement, and for consensus that must be dealt with in this national conference. So, comrades, we must not start a parallel process to that of the conference here, because most of the party is involved in this process leading to the National Conference on Organization. We shall be specific on this point but, of course, the topics that might be discussed by this commission are not exhausted there. Proposals could emerge from there which would go beyond the commission or go beyond the Central Committee; but it must be given a specific mandate. Otherwise, it might be viewed as a parallel apparatus or a parallel instrument. As for its formation, look, comrades, I don't think that it is a matter of haggling. I think that it is more or less obvious, because there is this formation here, and I think that it is quite natural for a commission of this type to be able to operate with highly specific perspectives and with good chances of arriving at proposals by consensus there.

Another minor question regarding the Sonora issue. Comrades, how can we be satisfied with the results of the congress in Sonora? Are you satisfied with the results of the Central Committee's first plenum? You are really not? Then you must not be with the Sonora congress either, comrades; for the same reasons, among others, perhaps, but at least that. Because if this Central Committee gives the Sonora commission the assignment of uniting the apparatus,

saying that all this must be directed by a single leadership organ, and this turns out not to be the case, then it might be said here that some were to blame, that others were to blame, that it was a natural disaster, or whatever you want. But the fact is that this was not the case, comrades; that this, which was the fundamental goal of all this work, of the commission and everything that it was doing, and of the Central Committee, in forming the commission and lending it all its support, etc., was not carried out, comrades. Other goals were fulfilled, but the main one was not. No one has proposed that this means that that Sonora State Committee must resign; I wish the comrade members of the State Committee would understand this and apply a policy to change that situation. That would be the best thing, and I think that they could do it; what is preventing them? I can't see anything to prevent them, if they have the political desire. It shouldn't be said that one cannot when one will not. I think that we must pave the way for this here. We appointed a commission for Sonora here, and that commission submitted a report to the Central Committee; they provided their report, because, comrades, that commission came under the Central Committee here. These were not ex officio positions or positions resulting from campaign merits; no, it was named here. All right, they have a report; at least let it be received. If the Central Committee is unwilling to approve it, or doesn't want to disapprove it so that this will not be interpreted as an aggressive act (I don't see what kind, but anyway), then it will be understood. In any event, comrades, we must decide, as members of this Central Committee, whether we are satisfied with what happened in Sonora, whether that is the path to the party's unity and its development; because it is very difficult to claim here that Gascon was to blame, or Verdugo was to blame, or others were to blame. Besides, that is not the issue, comrades. It is that the party's political situation in the state of Sonora created a situation, comrades, created conditions that made a settlement, an agreement, etc., impossible to make there. But it should not be claimed that the Political Commission is responsible, comrades, because I would cite the example of Oaxaca, Jalisco, Veracruz and Coahuila, and others I don't care to mention; but right now I can't recall others, wherein the Political Commission has intervened, comrades, with a policy that is the one being applied: a unifying one; that we have solved many internal problems, that we have left some half-solved; but, comrades, the important thing is that we are persisting. And if there are some other problems involving per diems there, then let's deal with them; and I at least dealt with one, in Jalisco: Garcia Perez. And I can almost say that I had to fight the majority of the Executive Commission of the State Committee, which wanted to apply a different, unsuitable solution to the problem, without bad intent, but in my view unsuitable. If there is a dispute in a Jalisco municipality, comrades, regarding the council member's per diem, if there is a political problem there, and the council members refuse to turn it over to the municipal committee, but turn it over to another committee which also calls itself municipal, then let it be turned over to the State Committee, comrades, and let that dispute be settled quickly there, in a unified manner. That is proper, comrades. And it cannot be claimed that we concealed a single instance of failure to turn over per diems to the pertinent party echelons. It is not just a statutory regulation. It is the conviction that this must be done, and hence the battle must be waged. Therefore, we must assume a position

regarding this issue in Sonora, and, comrades, we must not do anything that would at all entail (I wish to correct), that would hint or give the interpretation, even if it were misinterpreted, that we are pretending not to notice a problem involving a deputy who refuses to turn over his per diems. Now, the other matter of our having been flexible and cautious, and too respectful, and all that, comrades that, too, is all well and good, very good. It lends prestige to this Central Committee, because people will end up understanding. At first, there was a great deal of exacerbation; many among the rank and file were saying that this was improper, that forceful measures had to be taken, and so forth. Now, many are also considering that it is better to win the political battle before any other issue or measure of an administrative type. That doesn't work, least of all in PSUM, which has surmounted this type of question among the Mexican left. So, comrades, we must continue, we must continue with that battle. I don't want to fail to comment here on the issue of the per diems. I would simply say that the comrades who are not turning over their per diem, and who say that they are spending that money at their own decision, well, with that attitude, they are not adhering to a party; they are adhering to themselves, to their own personal endeavor. We greatly regret their not liking the leadership, but that isn't the way to express displeasure. Comrades, it is impossible for us to leave here now without saying anything, without expressing an opinion on a deputy, two, three or however many it may be, it doesn't matter who they are, either, using his per diems to form his own leadership team. Someone here said: "So that they will help me." Yes, comrades, but there is a party here, and we want to form and develop it; and I don't think that this excuse works; it cannot be a justified cause of anything, nor can serious situations of a personal nature, either, comrades; because we are not a group of philanthropists. And, of course, we could try to help a comrade who had serious personal problems, as friends, and the party too; but it is impossible to solve very serious problems involving millions of pesos; it is impossible, it cannot be. With what right? At whose expense? It is unacceptable. All those arguments are unacceptable, comrades, and regardless of how many turns we make of the issue, we end up with one issue: "The Secretariat is trouble-making, and is handling the money in a trouble-making way." How can it be claimed that the Secretariat is trouble-making; for we would be even more trouble-making? How can a policy be demanded of the Secretariat, when one's own activity is far worse than that being ascribed to the Secretariat? Furthermore, it has to be proven. This must be done before anything else; and in this respect I agree, as Salvador Castaneda said, that we must not take things for granted before there is judgment. Very well. Then those charges against the Political Commission, the Secretariat, the National Congress and the Central Committee have to be proven; the situation must be judged. But I don't think that anyone has been able, and Carrera * has not been able, to prove that he has turned over his per diems; because Carrera has admitted that he has not turned over his per diems. Carrera says that he has spent the money, and he said so at the congress in Sonora, comrades, and that he had some notes. So, as Alvaro himself has commented here, that is an improper attitude, because there is a problem in this report of the Sonora commission, a serious problem, namely, that of Carrera's per diem. Thank you.

* Enrique Carrera, PSUM deputy in Sonora.

Sabino Hernandez

Comrades, before moving on to vote on the draft Point of Agreement which was announced a moment ago by Comrade Pablo Gomez, we shall ask whether it is in order to have explanations; if it should be in order, I ask you to state who wishes to register for an explanation. I asked whether a period for explanations should be opened, and, if so, that you express it.... (Comrades Rodolfo Echeverria and Cuauhtemoc Sandoval make a series of explanations, but, since they did not go to the microphone to make them, it was impossible to record their comments.) Is there anyone else, comrades? Then we can proceed to vote on the Point of Agreement that has been proposed by Comrade Pablo Gomez, if there are no explanations, comrades.

Alejandro Gascon

I think that Comrade Pablo Gomez speech really has very little to do with this party's unity process. It seems to me to be an irresponsible speech, and of course I would not join a commission chaired by him. So I ask you to vote on those terms.

Pablo Gomez

On what terms?

Alejandro Gascon

Dissociated from this commission.

Sabino Hernandez
(debate chairman)

Anyone else, comrades? Efrain

Efrain Bermudez

I understood that this commission would not have any executive authority. (Cannot be understood because he did not go to the microphone). So, I didn't have the same interpretation that Comrade Gascon has, that it was a commission chaired by someone, but rather a commission that would organize the discussion on unity. So I would request that it be specified.

Sabino Hernandez

Anyone else, comrades? We shall reread the proposed Point of Agreement, comrades. "The Sixth Plenum of the PSUM Central Committee resolves to continue the discussion on the matters relating to the formation and operation of the Central Committee organs. Therefore, the Central Committee is forming a specific commission, for the sole purpose of submitting a proposal to the Central Committee itself, at its next plenum, on the formation and operation of the

Political Commission and the Secretariat. Said specific commission will be chaired by the secretary general of the Central Committee. The specific commission is comprised as follows: Pablo Gomez; Alejandro Gascon Mercado; Arnolfo Martinez Verdugo; Rolando Cordera; Pablo Pascual; Manuel Stephens; Sabino Hernandez; Salvador Castaneda; Sergio Almaguer; Cesar Navarro."

Francisco Javier Pizarro

I think that (as someone commented here, I think the last one who spoke) one of the major advances made by this plenum (and I believe that this is everyone's opinion) was that it brought up for the first time the possibility of initiating a process of discussion on the party's internal situation. And it was also claimed that it was precisely a democratic act to hold a discussion of the opinions and debate them. Comrade Gascon noted that the conclusions that Pablo Gomez has just stated are irresponsible.

And at least I noted 10 concrete points which he mentioned and which it seems to me that we should touch upon (with an actual desire to discuss these matters). Hence I would request that the plenum not conclude today, and that tomorrow the discussion would be opened again, so as to have evidence as to whether the conclusions stated by Pablo Gomez on behalf of the Political Commission, which end with a proposal, actually have merit, or whether they are of that nature, preventing the participation of a comrade who proposed the formation of a commission to discuss these issues.

So, comrades, I think that, if it is irresponsible to propose that we not conclude, that we consider a process of discussion, it must be discussed; if it is irresponsible to propose that this is a party which must accept its diversity, it must be discussed; if this is a party which proposes...I beg your pardon, if it is irresponsible to propose that the charges of trouble-making management of the party's finances be proven, it must be discussed. In other words, as I see it, the proposals of the Political Commission were very precise; and so I would not like us to depart with a vote now, with a commission that would exclude comrades who are really a fundamental part, for providing a solution to the problem that the party is experiencing. So, I make a motion that we not vote, and that the discussion of these points be opened tomorrow, so that we may have actual evidence of whether or not the naming of that commission is in order.

Jose Luis Alonso

Comrades, I would like you to allow me to read the following: "Article 27 of the Statutes: When it is a matter of examining political or organizational problems that demand the urgent mobilization of the entire party (and we are on the threshold of a National Conference on Organization), the Central Committee may hold plenary meetings expanded with the participation of the secretaries general of the State Committees." I think that this type of meeting is in order here. It seems to me that the situation is serious; this doesn't seem to have been sufficiently discussed; and although this is not going to

be discussed forever, a second phase must be given to this discussion, and it should be enhanced by the participation of the secretaries general of the State Committees; because they have a great deal to contribute, far more than some comrades here have contributed in their capacity as members of the apparatus, often without any bond with the masses or with the party's direct work on its organizational construction in the state entities.

And so, I think that it would enhance the discussion and enable us to find other solutions. The Political Commission has proposed one, and I think that it is somewhat related to Comrade Gascon's proposal. But, if not, then we shall seek others, expanding them, diversifying them, and making them a little more concrete. This may be too simple and may be disliked; I believe that we must seek others then; but not close, not recreate the bloc which refuses every proposal emerging from the Political Commission, and with the Political Commission clinging to its position. I would not be in a position now to vote either in favor or against; but rather I call for this plenum to be continued, but expanded by the secretaries general of the State Committees; because what we have discussed to date is insufficient, nor would we obtain any constructive resolution from this plenum.

Miguel Angel Velasco

Comrades, we must put an end to that insistence upon depicting the members of the Central Committee, as well as the members of the Political Commission, as individuals living in the stratosphere. I am a member of the Political Commission and the Central Committee, and I am no fool, I am not dissociated from the masses' struggle; and I invite any comrade to go to Veracruz and see whether I am participating in the masses' struggle, in the seizure of the municipal presidencies and in the street marches. Why is there a desire to discredit the Central Committee members here? Who considers himself the great champion of the masses' struggles? I don't approve of our continuing to act in this way.

Sergio Almaguer

I think that we can resolve the matter of forming the commission that the Central Committee has approved without necessarily embracing the proposition that what is up for debate first is Pablo Gomez personally, the secretary general as such. Therefore I do think that if the Central Committee appoints a commission without including Comrade Pablo Gomez, it will not....it is not an excluding position, because we are not deciding to eliminate him from the party leadership in the Political Commission. We are not establishing a criterion of this type, in my opinion. Hence, I do consider it viable for us to accept the possibility of forming a commission...well, in this instance it might be put up for the consideration of the Central Committee, in a plenum, considering the Political Commission's proposal per se.

But I would come out in favor of the position that, for the next Central Committee plenum to operate, being informed of its report and, obviously subject to it, it should be a commission obviously comprised of members of

the Central Committee, without necessarily including Comrade Pablo Gomez. That is what I think. I uphold the view that, if Comrade Pablo Gomez were not included, I am therefore embracing or backing the proposal of Comrade Alejandro, in a different direction, in what I would call the more direct direction. Comrade Alejandro says: "I would not serve on a commission chaired by Pablo Gomez. That is how I interpret it; I think so, Comrade Alejandro. It's so! Well, to clarify matters. If it's so, I think that the commission could be formed in this way, because....

(Please, comrades, don't interrupt the speaker. Don't hold dialogs.)

...It would be a...-I think that a point for discussion comes in right here, which could ultimately be resolved by the Central Committee, and discussed as such. For this purpose, a list of speakers could be made, and a discussion could be held on the formation of the Political Commission, the commission. But, in this instance, I am saying that if the proposal that Pablo Gomez not be included is submitted (which I back as a proposal), there is a possibility of forming the commission as such; and I might add, perhaps interpreting the feelings of some of our comrades, that it would not be to the discredit of the personal status of the secretary general's position which Pablo Gomez holds now. Because the proposal revolves around the stipulation that it is the secretary general of the Central Committee who would chair the commission. And, in the latter instance, I am challenging or stating that this should not be the nature of the commission, chaired by the secretary general of the Central Committee. Concretely, if what must be formed is a commission of the Central Committee, as such, wherein it would be obviously....the Political Commission continues its duties which it has had up until now, and they are being carried out; and the commission, in conjunction with the debate held by the Central Committee, would take up all the issues cited concerning the problems of unity. I don't know if, in this way....

Pablo Gomez

All right, I would like to go a little further (if you will allow me), because I don't think that, in my capacity as secretary general, I should be subjected to a judgment in advance regarding the fact that Comrade Alejandro Gascon would not agree to my being a member of that commission. I am the secretary general of the Central Committee; I represent the Central Committee; not because I want to, but for reasons of a political statutory and other nature; hence, it is not a personal matter. I think (and we discussed this in the Political Commission) that we should not agree here that a commission that is going to deal with such a critical matter, that will have to reach conclusions, that will have to arrive at consensus, should make resolutions in advance. Almaguer claims that this would not affect the, let's say, the secretary general's office; but, comrades, of course it would. And Comrade Gascon's intention is obviously that.

I don't think that it has anything of a personal nature involved, at least I don't see it, I haven't considered it. But, even if we did have such a thing, we are here in a political party, fortunately. I can hold a discussion with

him, and with anyone. In other words, I don't think that we should back it, because we would begin very badly. What kind of oath are we going to take here with the Central Committee if we start with this insistence on excluding a comrade. I think that this would do a great deal of harm to the party and to the Central Committee, not only in his instance, but there might be another, and the same position would have to be assumed. We cannot start there. It would affect, not me personally, but the political situation. I don't know what channels have been used to arrive at that position, that nothing could be done with Pablo Gomez. We have held a great deal of dialog since the congress, going to Pepic often; I spoke with Gascon for about 6 hours. Later, it was more difficult, and other comrades took up the dialog, mainly Verdugo and Rolando Cordera. I think that this was good, because an informal matter was involved, or it was to pave the way for the search for solutions. Thus far, this has failed.

So, we have held a plenum, because that informal dialog failed; we have held a plenum, and then here at the plenum we have been stating an idea which Gascon himself has proposed here, it is his proposal: for a formal commission of the Central Committee to submit a draft to the Central Committee. I take all these proposals that have been made here into account, and perhaps others that others have made; and then the secretary general cannot participate; he is banned. I don't consider this a party method, frankly, comrades, I tell you; I don't think that there are grounds from the standpoint of a socialist political party.

If the Central Committee wants to replace me, remove me from my position, it has every right to do so. Then they would have to listen to the arguments pro and con, but I don't think that this should be done because one comrade has so decided: How are we going to construct a party in that way, comrades?

Pablo Sandoval

I would say, comrades, regardless of whether or not we can agree with Comrade Gascon's opinion, this is an opinion that can be heeded; let's put it that way. In other words, he has an opinion: Pablo Gomez' conclusions are irresponsible, he claims. Hence, they are a topic for discussion. That is, a commission has been proposed to discuss these conclusions too, and the proposals that may be made to the Central Committee and to the party for paving the way toward a new situation wherein irresponsible positions will be left behind.

But to do this, there must be a discussion, and obviously, the discussion must be with the one who was the cause of that opinion. It would be improper to discuss these "irresponsible conclusions" without the one who stated them present, if he could not have a chance to defend a viewpoint. I also think that the proposal made here by Comrade Gascon, for the formation of this commission and a discussion there, should be accepted by everyone in a unified manner; I don't know whether an appeal that Comrade Gascon reconsider his position sounds overly Christian, but it seems to me feasible to make it.

I think that, in this commission, the Central Committee obviously requires that the commission be made up (I would say) of comrades such as Gascon and Pablo. I think that we expect, as a result of the debate and the exchange of opinions, that it will actually be possible to formulate a proposal for the Central Committee and for the party that will lead to unity in our organization. This is why it seems to me that we should make a very fraternal suggestion to Comrade Gascon to reconsider this opinion and join this commission in which it has been proposed (I think that this proposal should be voted on) that the comrades included on that list mentioned here are to be members. That is my proposal.

Salvador Castaneda

Comrades, with the desire to remove this issue and so as to make way for this idea of there being a commission to prepare the reports that we have seen assigned here, on a restructuring of the Political Commission (a possible restructuring of the Political Commission) and other topics regarding unity, I would like, based on the experience that we have had on the parallel commissions, which some claim to have been successful and others claim to have failed, and so as not to become involved in matters excluding anyone, nor any member of the Political Commission, in this regard, to propose that it be the Political Commission itself that submits that draft to us. That's all.

Eduardo Montes

I am going to stress the proposal of the Political Commission; it may be otherwise, but that is how we devised it. Comrades, I consider it very important for us to take a step of this kind, forming this kind of commission, for the following reasons: For 2 days, nearly 50 speeches have been delivered, and except for some instances of rancor, I think that everyone (with but few exceptions) has stressed the idea that we must avoid the logic of confrontation inside PSUM, now, so as to seek ways of solving the problems.

We have sought consensus but, comrades, I don't think that the consensus should have another side, that would be that of the veto; in other words, that if there is no consensus, then there is a veto. I think not, comrades. It seems to me that what is involved is a political, not a moral effort, as Pablo Sandoval put it; rather, a political effort by those who, as members of the Central Committee, must fully assume the political responsibility for discussing, and for seeking suggestions that will channel this process of internal struggle. And that is why I think that this is a political matter, and we must avoid any attempt at vetoing, for reasons of political differences; because then we would begin badly, or for personal reasons even worse, and attempt to actually form a commission which, being representative, could submit proposals that would win the consensus of the Central Committee and enable us to progress with the solution to this problem.

Arnoldo Martinez Verdugo

Comrades, I don't think that we can allow, without a debate on this issue intervening, a consideration which at least recently has determined the position of Comrade Gascon, namely, that of eliminating Comrade Pablo Gomez, to be imposed on us here. It cannot be done, at least in that indirect way. In any event, this issue must be debated in the plenum, but if it involves appointing a commission for matters as important as that of making proposals for the restructuring of the Central Committee's organs, as has been done in the proposal and which was the proposal made by Comrade Gascon himself, I deem it essential that Comrade Pablo participate in that commission, just as it is essential (in my view) that Comrade Gascon participate.

Since what we have been discussing for some time, between Alejandro Gascon and some of us, is precisely the topic of finding a way for an in-depth discussion of the matters of concern to him, which none of us have failed to consider, matters which deserve to be discussed and debated by this Central Committee and by the party as a whole.

So I don't think that this proposal is viable; in any event, I would adhere to the proposal of Comrade Castaneda; because I do think that this issue that has been brought up here by several comrades should have a response; the discussion of this matter should be made possible.

If the formation of the organs and their operation is an issue which concerns many comrades, then let's embark on it and we must make a proposal. The proposal is simply to have a basis for debating this issue. Finally, I would also like to say that the final speech delivered by Pablo Gomez was not at all irresponsible. One may be opposed to the views which Pablo submitted, but, comrades, this is a responsible speech which paves the way, and offers opportunities for the development of this party.

Valentin Campa

The Central Committee is our party's leadership organ; it could not accept the method of vetoes. This would be intolerable, because if we accepted the veto against Comrade Pablo, we would have to agree to let any other comrade on the commission veto Gascon, and that is simply unacceptable as a method for us.

Just as Comrade Gascon's position of claiming (he has the right to claim, but there is a little presumptuousness) that the opinions and conclusions submitted by Comrade Pablo Gomez are irresponsible is not a suitable position. I would explain to him that the majority, if not all, were examined (very briefly, it's true) by the Political Commission, and they were collective, not personal opinions. I think the problem is of understanding that this is a serious objection (I would not call it one involving dignity) of the Central Committee.

I hope that Comrade Gascon will consider and rectify his position. Moreover, the proposal that it be the Political Commission which would be responsible

for making a very serious and very critical study agreed upon by the plenum is obviously a very feeble proposal, because some comrades, assuming even a bombastic attitude, have attacked the Political Commission; and certainly several comrades would put forth the inviability of the conclusions reached by the Political Commission. It would be best if it were a commission of the Central Committee, and I propose that there be a vote on the proposals made for forming it; and I hope that Comrade Gascon will rectify his position.

Alejandro Gascon

Comrades, I think that there have been several misunderstandings in this matter. In the first place, I do not have the ability to veto anyone; I am not doing so, I am not involved in that area, because it is the Central Committee which adopts resolutions. These are precisely statements which disorient our party's internal existence. Some time ago (not now, but months ago) this was being rumored, that I was vetoing Pablo Gomez.

No, I simply don't think that Comrade Pablo Gomez is equipped to contribute, either with his methods or with the essence of his work, to this party's unity. I have nothing against Pablo Gomez; I have no personal problems with anyone. Merely, it is quite obvious (if we review the speech with those conclusions); because there are no problems in this party, everything is fine, the Central Committee has had many successes...the tape must be reviewed.

There is no self-critical intention and, frankly, after having heard many speeches from the comrades, I don't think it is worthwhile continuing this discussion under the chairmanship of Pablo Gomez; it would not make sense.

I am not rejecting his being a member of the commission; which seems to me to be a decision, indeed, a presumptuous one, of the Political Commission with respect to the Central Committee, to say: This commission which is going to examine the work done in the Central Committee should be chaired by the secretary general, because that would be of no help. This is why I don't think it makes sense to repeat those arguments on these matters which have been stated here, to conclude that there is no problem. Let's restore one or two comrades, or three or four, to the Political Commission, and we shall continue very well.

No, I think that we must embark in depth on this issue, and the fact that I refused to participate in this commission doesn't mean that we should not appoint a commission; I'm not proposing that. Let proposals be made; let the commission be appointed. I am not withdrawing the idea that a commission should discuss the possibilities of improving our work, and I think that all of us are interested in that. I, personally, do not believe (and you should review the speech) that, with this attitude and this language, it will be possible to lay the groundwork for a unifying process.

If we want to unite, it will be on the basis of mutual respect; that is a basis, first; and we should not be saying that these comrades are dissociated from reality; let's heal wounds. In other words, we are being treated,

at least Comrade Gomez Alvarez is; we are being treated like people who have no experience, dealing only with matters relating to disposition, attaching no importance to political issues; in brief, I think that this arrogant, self-sufficient treatment that has been used here is one of the things that we must start eliminating.

For this reason I say (I am not saying that Comrade Pablo Gomez should not be on the commission); what I am saying is that proposing that the Political Commission, this commission be chaired by the secretary general is like saying: fine, let's appoint a subcommission of the Political Commission here to oversee the work of the commission itself, that's all. This is not the proposal that I made. I say that a commission of the Central Committee, elected here, apart from the present Political Commission, although some members may belong to it, should examine the party's internal existence.

That is something else; but it is not governed by this attitude of: let it be chaired by the secretary general, because if the secretary general doesn't chair it then it is subject to prior judgment. These are maneuvers, aren't they? Frankly, this is so. No, I think that what should be done is to name a commission and let it organize its work; that's all. In any event, if the secretary general is going to chair the commission, all right; then let it be the commission itself which undertakes an examination of the situation, and makes new proposals to the Central Committee, as Salvador Castaneda said; because this is, in fact, tantamount to the same thing.

Rolando Cordera

Well, Comrade Gascon, they are not maneuvers, by no means. The fact is that each individual has to interpret the reality as best he can. And it seems fundamental to me that Pablo Gomez should be on a commission that is going to examine the problems that we want him to examine; just as it seems to me fundamental that Comrade Gascon and the others serve on it.

In my view, no further discussion should be allowed; this is the best arithmetic that we could find. Furthermore, if we refer to arithmetic (I don't think that we should), you would realize that, if we had thought more carefully, at least it would not have been made; because it is a proposal which considers almost too strictly some of the statements made here, to the effect that if we have to discuss unity, we must continue to uphold the effectiveness of PSUM's origins.

I don't think that it could be claimed that this commission is prepared to be viewed, ultimately, as a subcommission of the Political Commission. Arithmetically, what Gascon says is unsupportable; and I think that all of us here have said freely what each one of us thinks; and it cannot be claimed, on

the basis of what all of us have said here, that this would be an extension of the Political Commission; much less trying to identify it as a unified organ in confrontation with the rest of the party's organs.. It seems to me that this has no grounds either; and I consider it an obligation of the Central Committee to prevent there ever being grounds for this; because this is the elimination of any minimally sound political relationship.

And I am not very certain of what experience each one of us has, and what meaning each is attaching to the term "chairing." Of course I could claim that, to me, the term "chairing" doesn't mean deciding, not at the outset, nor at the end nor in the middle. I don't think that the fact that the commission is headed by the secretary general means that we would validate what he said, or that we would imitate a decision-making commission. I think that we are taking matters too far; and I would suggest that, if we could understand each other, we would not get into the merry-go-round of epithets which, furthermore, are the same thing. Comrade Campa has already mentioned presumptuousness, and Comrade Gascon also mentioned presumptuousness.

It seems to me that there are three solutions (so as not to resort to the utopia of meeting tomorrow), because the joke about this meeting is that the composition has not been changed nor has anyone given a guarantee, we could all take an oath in blood and I assure you that, tomorrow, we would not have the same composition...all of us here have listened, discussed, thought and rested---we must reach a solution, and not leave this task for those here tomorrow, although there might be many of those here today; because they will not be the same ones, and we won't hear this endless taping that we have allowed.

Now, I see three possibilities. Ah, of course, I agree with Gascon; we must not invent either. At least Gascon thinks so, but that will be his problem if he does not say so. I have not heard Gascon veto anyone, and let's not talk about a veto, because there is no veto. He said that he couldn't work in that commission; so, he has excluded himself. Well, one possibility is that he could exclude himself and we could keep the commission as it was proposed; that is one possibility. In numerical terms, it still includes one of the requirements cited by several.

I think that the one who stated it quite clearly and flatly, in my opinion, convincingly, was Almaguer. It seems to me that if you review that list, you won't find arithmetical problems, current arithmetical ones either; that is, revised origins, so that it will not be thought that I am making inventions with the numbers or individuals (it is not the time to be doing so). That is one solution, comrades: It would mean that the comrades who agree with Alejandro Gascon, some of whom have even said, using the first person plural, like Horacio Garcia Perez: "This is what we think, we agree with Salvador," etc. It appears to me to be quite legitimate for this to be said; it would mean that the other comrades pledge to serve on this commission, and we wouldn't be teasing one another.

The second possibility is, in fact, that we accept Salvador Castaneda's suggestion. This seems to me to entail a twofold responsibility for the comrades who brought here the line of proposing an in-depth revision of the internal existence; twofold, comrades, because they have come here to propose, we have put up with over 12 hours of discussion, we have all (not the Political Commission) tried to accept that in work organs and proposals, and all of a sudden they say no. Comrades, I would say here: if no is being said, then say it, comrades.

Then let's start the crisis in this party, let's declare that it is in a state of crisis. But if you say no, comrades, and we go for the second proposal, I insist, your responsibility is twofold. For example, it would be your responsibility to heed the summonses of the Political Commission to be heard, and you would be responsible for having the next Central Committee here, with a position. Because, if not, we would be lacking in respect for the others; and I don't accept that as a possibility among comrades on this level.

And the third one, obviously the best, is that: one, we stipulate what it means to chair a commission, and, if we come to think that it does not mean what Alejandro Gascon has told us, then let him reconsider. Except that, aside from the chairmanship, he thinks (and it doesn't seem absurd to me either) that he could not work on a task commission with Pablo Gomez; and, if that is so, then, we understand, and it's finished. What I mean by citing these three possibilities, which seem very naive, is the following: Comrades, for various reasons, if we reach the conclusion that it is impossible to seek an understanding in this way, let's say so; let's not hide it, because that could do us a great deal of harm from now on.

I think that we have, on this occasion, with all the unpleasantness that accompanies our conduct, as we sometimes conduct ourselves, I think that we have, despite everything, attained levels of candor which are very encouraging; and if we leave here, we shall wake up to the fact that every one will give a version of the commission that each of us has drawn; and we shall find ourselves again facing a politically manipulated silence involving detraction of legitimacy which is not acceptable in a party; and yes, we shall have destroyed everything.

I think that we are at a time for speaking clearly, comrades. It seems to me that these are the three possibilities. Let's examine them, and I would ask you, I would ask Comrades Castaneda, Garcia Perez and Almaguer to speak clearly, as they know how to do, besides. There must be clear talking now, because if not, if we all equivocate, and if we don't hurt each other, as some have said, what will happen to us? We shall return to where we were. I don't know whether this is even thinkable. We won't hurt ourselves, I'm sure of that; we aren't so important.

Pablo Gomez

I want to make two or three explanations here, because I feel very directly challenged by Alejandro Gascon. I merely stated, and I said it very sincerely,

I think, that we should not, in discussing the policy of alliances, harp on things and bring up discussions which do not befit the party; much less hinting that there is fatigue in the opposing position. That seemed very inconsiderate to me; it still seems very inconsiderate to me. I don't know how you feel about it. But I reaffirm that we need not harp on controversies of the past, and I maintain this. But my saying so doesn't mean that I want to bring them up, but rather that I really don't want them brought up. But some of this has been brought up here, in the discussion on the Popular Socialist Party.

Alejandro later said that he did not veto me, that he merely questioned me; in other words, I cannot chair a Central Committee commission. So, I cannot chair the Political Commission; I cannot represent the Central Committee; in other words, I cannot be secretary general, according to him. Well, I think that this is an issue that has been in the air here since the second congress; this was what was present at the first plenum. We have not discussed it here in the Central Committee; it would be a good thing to discuss it, and in this commission that it is proposed to form. Why couldn't it be discussed there, and later in the Central Committee?

I once brought up this matter in the Political Commission; I said that it seemed to me that if my removal from the position would solve the problems, it was the cheapest way; it wasn't worth anything from the standpoint of a political party, if that's the problem. But, is it? Why not discuss it? Alejandro, why not discuss whether this is the problem? But this problem cannot be discussed if there is an attitude of questioning my being secretary general. At present, right now, that is what it means to say that the party's secretary general could be secretary there; but a commission should not, could not head it, because, as Cordera said (I agree with it), chairing is not deciding, by any means, and there is a great deal of evidence in this party that chairing is not deciding.

But we cannot overlook the fact that there is an objection here to my remaining as secretary general. Why are we going to decide it in advance? Why are we going to solve it in advance now? Why? Is that the solution to the party's internal problem? Shall we create a party such as we thought it could be some time ago? Well, then, that is easy; the issue is simple. But we need to examine this issue carefully, in depth; we cannot take it for granted. I even came to think, I admit it, I even came to think that this might be the path; and many comrades here on the Central Committee have doubts, I too have serious doubts now that this could happen. But perhaps there are no grounds for those doubts; perhaps that is the solution to the problem. Let's discuss it. Why can't we discuss it there, in that commission, and later here in the Central Committee?

We would have to hear what Alejandro says about that, the political bases of this idea. This issue could prove to be interesting to document, because when this seemed to be the problem, my remaining in the secretary general's position, a heap of other issues began cropping up, indicating that the issue must at least be viewed as a whole. At least I insist on that. So, comrades,

I don't think that it would be good if I were not on that commission. I have an opinion about this. But it wouldn't be good either if I were on that commission proposing that...someone would chair it, someone would give the floor, would take down the minutes there, and would call the meetings. That is what chairing is. And another comrade would do this, because I couldn't do it. I can do this, comrades, I can do many other things.

But this is not the only point; the point is that we cannot carry things to the extreme of establishing a criterion ahead of time, previously, as a starting point, which is what Alejandro is asking us to do, or so I interpret it. So, all right, he is not vetoing me but he vetoes me, there is no need to exclude, but there is exclusion; in short, I no longer understand much about this matter because, as it stands, how could we unravel this, all this? If Alejandro doesn't want to serve on the commission, I don't think that it makes much sense to form it, or this, as has been proposed here. I don't know what Castaneda thinks. Well, we have already heard his proposal for having the Political Commission propose a solution; but, comrades, what we need to know is what Alejandro thinks, what Salvador thinks, what Navarro thinks, what Garcia Perez thinks; and the opinions that they could give from other comrades. We need to know that too.

And this is why the commission is necessary, because how is the Political Commission going to find out how these opinions are developing? Only two very concrete opinions have been given here. Finally, Alejandro says: The fact is that if Pablo chairs that commission, a recommendation will emerge that two or three more join the Political Commission; then it would be all over. I won't decide either; and I don't think that the commission should draw a resolution from them, or a proposal from them; it would appear very rash to me.

Efrain Bermudez

Comrades, I think that it is the Central Committee which should solve this problem. It is not two or three persons, or the Political Commission, that will resolve the issue of unity in PSUM. What I consider a concrete proposal is that a commission be formed, appointed by this Central Committee, to prepare the materials, first, for restructuring the party's leadership organs, analyzing the role of the party leadership at present, and making proposals that will lead us to unity.

I consider it a proposal that will enable us, at the next plenum, to hold a more organized discussion; it seems to me that this is what is being proposed, and I don't think that the problem of who is going to chair the commission appointed by this plenum is a problem that we cannot solve. Comrade Sabino Hernandez is currently chairing the Central Committee. Comrades, I think that this is the role of that commission, and that it would end at the next plenum.

Cesar Navarro

Comrades, I think that, on various occasions, this Central Committee, and even other types of party organs or functions, have formed commissions at times

when there has been a need to form commissions for the purpose of discussing or proposing a series of solutions or problems that have come up.

I recall that at the Second National Congress, I was a member of a commission to consider issues relating to the problem in Sonora, Jalisco, Veracruz and the state of Guerro itself; and I also recall that, at the first congress, because of the work that we had been doing in connection with the problem of constructing the party, I was a member of another commission having to do with the problem in Sonora and other problems which had occurred there, or problems involving the formation, unity and construction of the party.

Just as we recently ended up appointing a commission to deal with the problem in Sonora, so that, being a commission decided on by the Central Committee to perform a specific task, it could carry out its activity. I think that, in this connection, Alejandro, in his second speech, proposed that this commission could be formed as it is, but based on our not naming a chairman for this commission in advance. If this Central Committee commission is given a full opportunity to work, then I don't think we should object to a chairman of this commission's being named in advance.

I think that the commission, I think that anyone could coordinate the work at any given time, just as some comrade chairs a Central Committee meeting at any given time. So, I don't see anything against Pablo's thinking that, because a chairman is not proposed for this commission, it would mean harming, disdaining or underestimating him in his capacity as secretary general. It is simply that we would have no reason, in the case of a working commission, necessarily; because there have been other precedents when, even though party leaders have participated, the investiture or assignment to the position was not undertaken. I think that this might be a position...it would make the proposal that comrade Alejandro himself made possible; and, if not, then I would join in the proposal of Comrade Salvador Castaneda, that it should be the Political Commission itself that would in any case, bring up, at the Central Committee's next plenum, a proposal that has come from the Political Commission itself.

It is a fact that the proposal to form a commission came from Comrade Alejandro; but, comrades, the proposal to discuss the internal existence of the party at this plenum was not a proposal from some of us, who cited some possible ways of finding a solution to this problem. It was the Political Commission itself which made a series of statements in a document...well, I think that it would also have the capacity, based on this discussion, to contribute a concrete proposal to the next plenum, based on what we have been discussing.

Sabino Hernandez

(No, no; there is a proposal submitted by the Political Commission, by Comrade Pablo Gomez. That is the one that is going to be submitted. There is another proposal made by Comrade Castaneda O'Connor, to the effect that it should be the Political Commission itself; and there is another proposal, submitted by Comrade Rolando Cordera, that it could be with the exclusion of Comrade Gascon. You offered three options...all right, two...).

Pablo Pascual

Look, comrades, I am going to make a proposal. That the commission be voted on with this composition, and that's all; that it be a commission of the Central Committee with the members that Pablo read, and that the vote be taken, and we leave it there. We are converting (to translate it), we are converting the issue, not into the existence of the commission and the formation of the commission, but into the chairmanship of the commission. The important thing is for the commission to result as the proposal for its formation stands. That is what is important from the standpoint of the proposal made by Pablo himself, representing the Political Commission, and I think that if we vote on it, we can solve the problem in that way.

Pablo Gomez

We are not going to solve any problem here by doing that; we are going to create a problem here; because it is not a matter of...the whim that we must necessarily say that, no. Rather it is the position to the effect that the secretary general cannot chair that commission because that secretary general is Pablo Gomez. That is the issue. No, it's not your proposal, but it is the argument that lies behind the other one....

(I suggest that you respect the arguments of the speakers.), Pablo Pascual.

I am respecting them.

(It is an argument of one speaker, which is not the same argument as that of the other speaker.)

Agreed, I am not referring to Pablo Pascual. No, I am referring to the proposal made by Cesar.

(Don't interpret me, Pablo.), Cesar Navarro.

Yes, because I have to interpret you. I shall explain to you why. I have to interpret you for one reason: because Alejandro objects to my being the one to chair the commission. That is the origin of this problem. The origin of this problem is not the manner of forming the commission and who will call upon it and who will draw up the minutes; that is not the problem. The problem is Alejandro's position. I was not referring, and I tell you this sincerely, to Pablo's position. I feel that what Pablo is doing is trying to untie this knot, but I would caution...all right, let's untie the knot, but wouldn't we be creating other knots? That is my question. Wouldn't we be making way, at the very outset of the formation of this commission, for an entire, very specific, political essence? Why get ahead of ourselves? Why not respect the fact that there are echelons in this party elected by this Central Committee? Why not admit their existence, and why aren't we consistent with that existence? Is the excuse that has been given here, that it is my intervention with conclusions, a matter of principle? Then let's discuss it. If it has been irresponsible, well, I shall change my views which are irresponsible, with great pleasure;

let's see what they are. That is part of the discussion that is in progress. The fact that I chaired this commission or headed it doesn't mean that my proposals would be the ones shared by the Central Committee. In other words, I feel that, in the way in which it has been put, a view is being expressed, an entire statement that we would not want that to be what has already been sanctioned. What would it be that has already been sanctioned in advance? No, it's not...Comrade Alejandro has always said so: wherever the secretary general is, then he chairs. He said this 100 times before the second congress: that it had to be so, that this was proper from the party's standpoint. When this view was changed, it was because there was a political issue. We shall judge on that. It is not enough, comrades, to say here, it is not enough, it is of no use to make that statement about not prejudging anything, and not objecting to Comrade Pablo. But allow me to express an opinion. I think so. I think that it is an objection, a very concrete objection that Alejandro is making. Let's go ahead with that objection; tomorrow there will be another one; in other words, we are full of objections here.

Cesar Navarro

I think, at least it occurs to me, following Pablo, that he is interpreting me and (I shall admit it) I, too, am interpreting him; and it turns out that, often, either we are not agreed or we are; but it turns out that he interprets me, as he is doing now. I came to make a personal proposal, when you were even urging us comrades proposed for the commission to express our views. Certainly, Pablo, on repeated occasions in this Central Committee I have stated that we have an improper method for submitting the documents, and that the way in which we hold the discussion about what has been submitted here is unsuitable. Because, as I have said on other occasions, and I hope that we shall have a chance to discuss this at the next plenum, just as we proposed regarding the discussion of the regulations, it is somewhat repetitious for the one who submits a document, in the end, to make a speech that might be proper and fitting, about the document, an introduction; then comes the document, we all discuss it and, finally, it seems that one always debates with the one who submitted a document, and it seems that the problem is always debating with the comrade who is a proponent; and Pablo is usually a proponent on behalf of the Political Commission. Because of this habit that we in this party have acquired, it turns out that everyone debates with Pablo Gomez; because, at times, perhaps not deliberately, he upholds the Political Commission's document, but with a defense that seems to be the defense of Pablo Gomez' document. And this is a defect that has also contributed to our not having a chance to understand each other better; because it turns out that, without intending to, Pablo engages in challenging each member of the Central Committee regarding what he thinks or doesn't think. Comrades, I think that this is an unsuitable method, and at times it hurts the personal status and political positions of the secretary general, because he is, at a particular time, obliged to defend the document (that is his duty); but I don't think that he is obliged to agree or disagree with the proposals of each of us comrades participating in the Central Committee. And that has been happening, and it is a method that we should change; it is a method that we should avoid, namely, to personalize all

the debates in the person (the redundancy is fitting) of the secretary general. And that has been occurring possibly because of a tradition imposed on our parties, because it is part of the practice, but it sometimes leads to this confrontation and this dialog over the party's secretary general being the one to chair this commission, with the desire that Pablo himself and the rest of us comrades serving on the commission could even work more freely. This doesn't mean that Pablo, just because he is on a commission that he doesn't chair, would cease to be secretary general. I think that this is also something like thinking that at that time he would cease to be the leader of the party. I think that, in the desire that this commission which we can all discuss be freer and more unified, but no less formal, I think that, with Pablo Gomez, there has been no opportunity for us to hold a discussion, in any event, in the terms that he sometimes established, sometimes by his style, or the very individual method that he has. If Pablo becomes strident, one becomes strident; and if Pablo becomes gracious, one becomes gracious; we all hold those positions. I think that we could discuss it; but I don't think that we necessarily have to have imposed on us the figure of the secretary general in order to hold free discussions with the comrades who are proposing the formation of a commission. That is why I suggest that there be this possibility of forming a commission of the Central Committee, but without necessarily having the presence of a secretary general's investiture involved in that commission. In any case, he is secretary general, and he could chair if the commission so decides at any given time, internally, presiding over its work, or rotating with others. That is my proposal, so that we won't be interpreted.

Pablo Pascual

And have already been talking for many hours, and I consider it worthwhile to explain that the proposals have not been made with a naive spirit, or thinking that, based on one's eliminating them from his brain, the problems would be solved. But I think that what is important to settle here is something which is an original initiative of the Political Commission, to try to deal with the internal problem, which is what has kept us debating for 2 days. And if there were a different situation in the context of the Central Committee's discussion, it should be the Political Commission that submits a proposal at the next plenum, and it should be the Political Commission that should have other comrades included in it to specifically analyze this matter. But we know that this proposal is already loaded in advance with a judgment of a group of comrades who have spoken at this plenum; and we cannot make a dissociation, we cannot dissociate ourselves from this reality, and merely make a proposal as if nothing had happened, as if there had been no provision for this discussion. That was a proposal that I even made in the Political Commission, bringing it as a resolution. But, well, it is loaded with all these elements and many more, from which it could be thought, it could be inferred and it could be stated here openly, that this was not the spirit of a commission that could make a proposal wherein a group of matters are not involved. Why? Because some comrades might think that this would endorse a Political Commission which has been systematically challenging, with different positions, attitudes and definitions. And the desire to submit the commission's proposal

was actually in the atmosphere of the results of the discussion, comrades; a discussion that we want (at least I do, and I think a group of comrades do, I hope all of them). Let's hope that the result will not be a divided vote, and that in the end, the commission, however it is left, will not represent the tone, the spirit of the different proposals that have been made, in an attempt to offer a viable alternative for the party in the plan for unity. I think, I said this originally in this speech, that it is not a naive spirit that prompted me to make the proposal; because I don't think that agreeing that we should vote on the formation of a commission with the members submitted by Pablo is in any way backing in advance a questioning of the secretary general, comrades. Because, obviously, as a member of the Political Commission, I agree with a series of determinations, assessments and judgments put forth by a considerable number of comrades. For if we are going to explain all of them every time, and if the Political Commission is acting in a trouble-making way, we shall not be able to continue the discussion; if we were to contest each one of these assertions from whoever was speaking, concerning what was involved, or reach more violent manifestations such as those which took place throughout the discussion. I am not backing anything of the sort with my proposal, nor am I backing the challenging of the secretary general; but I think that the important thing to bear precisely in mind is that the commission result and that there actually be a viable proposal present to resolve a conflict which now, after a very long time, has been possible to express openly on various levels. It is in this spirit that I make the proposal that it be a commission of the Central Committee, with the composition that has been suggested. Because, comrades, we are going to turn the problem of who chairs the commission into the result of the commission beforehand. This seems to me to be a point...there has been a mistaken assessment. It appears to me to be mistaken. I am not, I insist, suffering from naivete; and I know that there is a group of opinions regarding the problem of the secretary general. But, I insist, the spirit of the proposal is that, if we are agreed on forming the commission and with that composition, we should vote on it, and go ahead.

Sabino Hernandez

I would only like to explain the issue; allow me a little time. The difference between Comrade Pablo Pascual's proposal and that of Comrade Cesar Navarro: there is no difference. Pablo Pascual proposes that it be the commission as stated here, solely, and Comrade Navarro proposes that it not be stipulated that it would be chaired by the secretary general. Agreed? It is the same... I am asking those who proposed it. It's the same, isn't it? All right. Then Comrade Pablo Sandoval has the floor.

Pablo Sandoval

(We had agreed that we would not have to discuss it again, that we were going to move on to the vote. It has been explained. I would ask the chair to ask again whether we are going to continue the discussion or move on to the vote.)

(I wish to remind Comrade Luciano that there are no motions, according to the regulations....Let's continue, comrades. A vote of this kind must leave the

opinions totally established, so that there will not be the slightest doubt regarding the decision-making. Comrade Sandoval has the floor.)

I think that Pablo Pascual's proposal is not a matter of its being well-intended, in quotes, but I think that he is seeking a solution to this problem with this proposal. However, I believe that, owing to the specific challenging made here regarding the secretary general, it does have a political importance and implication if it is not made explicit now that he will not chair that commission. It has acquired a political connotation which, whether we like it or not, will be present if the secretary general of this Central Committee is eliminated as chairman of this commission. For this reason, I think that a vote should be taken on the proposal made by the Political Commission. It appears to me that there are three proposals: first, the one made by the Political Commission; second, the one made by Cesar Navarro and Pablo Pascual and, third, the one made by Comrade Castaneda O'Connor. It seems to me that it should be voted on now.

Pablo Pascual

No, comrades, look: what I am saying is merely that we should remove the problem of who is going to chair that commission. I didn't say what Pablo Sandoval said: that Pablo will not chair. Let it be understood, comrades. The commission will decide, and Pablo Gomez (please) has not been banned from chairing this commission. This is my proposal; please don't interpret it. What I am saying is just that we should solve this problem. If it is not resolved, comrades, I shall not maintain a proposal in which there is a proposal from the Political Commission and that of Pablo Pascual. That is schizophrenia. So, I insist, in the matter of this proposal, that if the problem is not cleared up or resolved, I simply withdraw my proposal.

(Just a moment; yes, fine. You have the floor....Comrades, please, please, I call for order. We'll continue to hear the views of other comrades. Comrade Antonio Becerra has the floor. Then Raymundo, and then Arnoldo.)

Antonio Becerra

Comrades, all this time that we have been talking, we have been doing so about implicit things, and if we had used it on what ultimately seems to be this party's fundamental problem, namely, the presence of Pablo Gomez in the position of secretary general, and the existence of this Political Commission, at least we could by now have solved this problem, if we began to question ourselves from the beginning. But I regret that this problem was brought up, because, if we had been summoned for this, damn, we would have made the effort to bring more or less prepared opinions and we would have collected information, and we would have demanded a different type of report, so as to be able to deal with concrete issues. I think that, as for the proposal made by the Political Commission, as it has been made, if we accept it, it would in a way be the response rejecting my initial speech that we have been discussing on ground level. Because that proposal would mean that we on this commission

are willing to have heard, to a large extent, no more nor less than the voice of the one who has chaired it; which has been, or apparently is the fundamental problem of this party, namely, the Political Commission. And we would not have to call upon Pablo Gomez to inform us on the commission regarding one matter or another. And also, if we accept this proposal, we would prevent the party from thinking that we are putting Pablo Gomez on the bench of the accused, and the Political Commission as well. The problem of the secretary general and the problem of the Political Commission are only two of the enormous number of problems that this party has; and now we are cutting them down to these two. And if we find a solution for them, comrades, we shall be left without a solution again, because we are not directly embarking on the real problems, clearly and candidly. I consider the Political Commission's proposal the best proposal if (as has been remarked here) all our speeches are governed by a political desire to surmount our problems; it seems the best one to me.

(Comrades, with the kind request that you be brief, please. Comrade Raymundo Cardenas).

Raymundo Cardenas

I would like to make a proposal that attempts to pick up the thread brought by Pablo Pascual, in making his proposal, and also to consider what Comrade Navarro said, and a little of what Alejandro said, also; in addition to considering that the statement to the effect that if Pablo chairs Alejandro will not participate, I think that this is only a matter of exclusion for Pablo. The problem that I see is this: If it is decided, comrades, that Pablo is not to chair, it means that this Central Committee is taking away all of the comrade's potential and authority. But there is also the other problem, already mentioned, that there would be no participation. I would like to suggest the following: that the resolution state that any of the comrade members could chair; that it say that; but I would like Comrade Alejandro to give assurance that if Pablo chairs, he will not leave. (Laughter.) Otherwise, comrades, otherwise the problem is not removed. That is, with my proposal I am stating concretely what Cesar stated; and Alejandro mentioned that there was presumptuousness in the commission in claiming that Pablo should chair. All right, let it not be decided that Pablo should chair, but let it be stated explicitly that anyone could chair, and let the comrade state that, all right, he is willing to participate under the chirmanship of any comrade.

Arnoldo Martinez Verdugo

Comrades, the proposal from the Political Commission has not been withdrawn, it cannot be withdrawn, because it was a collective proposal. For example, I uphold it. In any event, the comrades could be asked if a recess is held, and the Political Commission reexamines this. It could be withdrawn collectively. But I think that as the issue has been stated, no; that proposal still stands. I wish to stress that it seems to me that if we are going to make corrections, comrades, we should ask Comrade Alejandro to correct this

position; because he did state categorically, as an argument for serving on the commission or not, the problem of Pablo, Pablo's chairmanship. So, this is inevitable; it has already been stated; it is not an issue that will remain here. In the atmosphere that exists in PSUM now, and outside, in the press, this will have a political connotation that will hurt the party, not Pablo; it will hurt the party. So I think that Comrade Alejandro should make an effort to eliminate this obstacle; because it is not really an essential issue for taking up the deepseated problems. And the other one would, comrades, whether we like it or not, and whether or not that is the intention; it would become a political problem for the party.

Alejandro Gascon

Comrades, I agree that a commission should be appointed; I agree that this commission could be the one appointed; I agree that the convened commission should appoint the person to chair the activities, whoever it may be. The only thing that occurs to me, as a method, is that the Central Committee should not be forced to say exactly: "The one chairing this commission is the secretary general"; because then much of the value of this commission would be lost. Because prerequisites have already been placed on this commission, and all the arguments put forth in opposition, I could claim to be on behalf of precisely how this commission should operate. If, as Raymundo says, that has not been stated, and the commission decides who will chair it, all right, I have no problem with that. It appears to me that the resolution expressed in this way is limiting the right and the very functions of the Central Committee to appoint that commission and to have the work organized as it should be. I am not vetoing anyone; I have said so clearly; I am vetoing the fact that one must necessarily have forced upon him a godfather to gather the people, as if we members of the Central Committee were children and lacked full rights for making decisions on that commission. That's all. This seems improper to me. Moreover, everything that has been said about my not having made any mention of that is a soap opera.

(Pardon, one question. This means that any member of the commission could chair it, and you would remain on it.)

Naturally, I would serve on the commission, I would work on the commission in a disciplined manner, and let anyone that the commission decides chair it. Why does the resolution have to be put that way?

(All right, comrades. Shall we declare a 5-minute break? We ask that you please don't leave.)

Pablo Gomez

The Political Commission proposes this to surmount the situation that we are in. So, I would say, I shall read the entire Point of Agreement: "The Sixth Plenum of the PSUM Central Committee resolves to continue the discussion on the matters relating to the formation and operation of the Central Committee organs. Therefore, the Central Committee is forming a specific commission, for

the sole purpose of submitting a proposal to the Central Committee itself, at its next plenum, on the formation and operation of the Political Commission and the Secretariat. Said specific commission will elect from among its members the one to chair it. The specific commission is comprised as follows: Pablo Gomez, Alejandro Gascon Mercado, Arnoldo Martinez Verdugo, Rolando Cordera, Pablo Pascual, Manuel Stephens, Sabino Hernandez, Salvador Castanera, Sergio Almaguer, Cesar Navarro, and Horacio Garcia Perez. Date and signature of the Sixth Plenum of the Central Committee." Now, the Political Commission suggests to the commission that is established, operationally among them, or else, all at one time, if there is no objection, by a certain date, that it take the commission's members into consideration. A few days may possibly have to elapse before the proposals can be made more definite and the views of the various comrades who have spoken here and the other members of the commission can be elaborated on a little more. It may even be that, within 8 days, on Tuesday, let's say, the commission could meet, become formed and start working immediately. That is the proposal.

(The comrades who are members of the plenum are asked whether they agree with the proposal that has just been read. If they do, please express approval by a show of hands. Thanks. Opposed? Abstentions? The Point of Agreement has been adopted unanimously, comrades. As for the date of the meeting, comrades: Tuesday, the 31st, at 1800 hours. Only the members of the commission. The commission members are asked whether they agree to meet on Tuesday, the 31st, at 6 p.m. The meeting would be in the Central Committee. If you agree, comrades, or, is there any...those on the commission. Is anyone opposed? The problem is that there are state conferences to attend on those dates; nearly all of them have been included, nearly 50 or 60 percent of the conferences are set for that date and the next Saturday and Sunday.)

(I would propose Friday, 3 August, so as not to interfere with any conference).

(But it would interfere. There is no chance of holding several consecutive sessions.)

(All right, Thursday, 2 August. Are any comrades on the commission opposed? Thursday, 2 August at 6 p.m. in the Central Committee offices. Comrade Rodolfo.)

(We understand that the proposals made at this plenum are being transferred to the next one.)

(Well, yes. They are going to the commission; and, of course, the commission will adopt them. Yes. The matter relating to the Sonora state congress hinges on this same point. Comrade Arnoldo Martinez Verdugo had proposed that the Central Committee receive the report (let's see if I am correct) that it should receive the report from the Central Committee, and should give an opinion on it and make a decision. Is that report approved or rejected? That is what he proposed.)

(In the conclusions made by Pablo (if I understand him correctly) he proposed that the report be received.)

Cesar Navarro

Comrades, I think that, regardless of the rather varying positions (the fact is that we are diverse) of the members of the commission that was appointed to work in Sonora, because different views have been expressed about the results of its work, about the party's situation in Sonora and about the progress of the process of unity, I think that, aside from all these views, we are not in any way questioning the commission nor the commission's work. That has not been the intention. Finally, it is a congress; it turned out as the comrades had planned it; there are different opinions of the results brought about, or achieved in the congress. I think that what we should do is simply receive that report prepared by the commission; receive it as such. But it would not be fitting to make a political judgment of the commission's work; this, more than anything, could, owing to the party's very situation in Sonora, if we began to interpret, cause virtually a political judgment whereby we would be almost tacitly questioning the Sonora congress itself. This is a report from a commission; let's receive it. This is what the commission offered; it could do no more, it could do no less. I don't think that the comrades could do more than the party in Sonora could offer. I don't believe that the comrades consider its work a failure. It is just that the party in Sonora, unfortunately, has the same situation that it had 2 years ago. Nothing has happened other than more or less what has been happening over 2 years, comrades. I don't think that it is responsible for not having achieved the unity process; there we must start working on the reconstruction of the unity process in Sonora, just as we did at the national congress. I think that the legality of a State Committee exists, but I know that there are actually comrades who will not accept it and will not accept its leadership. This is not the first time that this has happened in Sonora, comrades; I have attended at least three congresses in Sonora; there are comrades who have also attended other congresses; and I know that that will actually occur. There will, actually be no political recognition of the party, on the one hand, and of a committee which will lead only one sector of the party, on the other. That is the situation, comrades. What we must construct, in any event, what we must seek is the method for the intervention of this organ, the Central Committee, in integrating this unity process on the basis of the concrete struggles that can be waged by the party's members, and it could be found there. Unfortunately, it will not be in the internal existence, in the political discussion of the party in Sonora that one could find part of the solution to the problem. It will be found in the extent to which, with different proposals for the party's work and for the concrete struggle, our comrades can engage in the daily, everyday action of the masses' struggle. Therefore, I think that it would be improper to interfere more, and to return to the same situation of virtually indirectly condemning this Sonora congress, something that would in no way contribute to the unity process beginning in Sonora, based on the existence of a State Committee.

Juan Luis Concheiro

Comrades, I think that we must adopt a position on this issue; in other words, the party was not united at the Sonora congress. The Central Committee commission had that mandate from the national congress and the Central Committee. So, we arrived at a congress at which the division was deepened. This is a fact. In other words, the situation there is this: out of 21 elected, 20 are from Red-UGOCM, and there are no comrades from Navojoa, there are no comrades from Huatabampo; they are not from any of the merging organizations which have joined PSUM. We must adopt a position on this. I think that we are acting badly when there is a problem, merely, of the Central Committee's not assuming a position; because it will occur that there will be a sizable portion of the party in Sonora waiting for a position from the Central Committee, which the Cenral Committee should....No, they aren't from the Jacinto Lopez UGOCM; they are from other organizations; but they are in PSUM, they joined PSUM and they are working on behalf of PSUM. So, what is minimally acknowledged by the Central Committee is that we are not progressing with unity. On the contrary, while the State Committees elected previously had representation in the various positions, today there is a state committee which has no more than just one position, and it has the opposition of the comrades from other organizations and the comrades who joined PSUM. The Central Committee cannot act as if this has not happened; because the Second National Congress assigned us to work for unity and to plan a party unity congress in Sonora. The commission, it is not a matter of work, too much or too little, good or bad; in other words, we are not judging the commission's work. We are stating the reality of what happened in PSUM in Sonora, and creating conditions for progressing with the prospects of a unity congress. If we remain silent, we support a congress which was excluding, which excluded a sizable portion of the party, not only in numbers but based on their participation and their struggle. So, I think that...the other one, comrades, and it must be said very clearly, the other position, of remaining silent and with nothing happening, means pushing the comrades who were a minority to leave this party, not having found opportunities for development in this party, within the context of the statutes. Because those comrades were opposed to the resolutions of the Second National Congress, opposed to that resolution. But they yielded to the resolution of the Second National Congress, and now the Central Committee simply remains silent; We are causing those comrades not to have a channel or conditions for work inside PSUM. Take care, comrades, that they don't come here to us with apparent good intentions. What is being attempted is to take the comrades from Navojoa, Huatabampo, Canandea and San Luis-Rio Colorado, and a considerable portion of the comrades from Hermosillo, out of the party. If that is the goal, they had better not try to keep us from speaking.. Let's adopt political resolutions, let's not make ourselves deceased, that is, by assuming a political position. For us to remain silent here, and for the Central Committee to say absolutely nothing, means taking a position and supporting the situation whereby excluding stances and the crushing of the minority by the majority are what will prevail in the party, and in the struggle in the states; and I don't think that this is fitting on the path that we have initiated at this Central Committee plenum.

Arnoldo Martinez Verdugo

Comrades, I think that this issue would lead us to another debate. Therefore, I believe that if we agree with what has been stated here by Comrade Cesar, that might be sufficient. I think that what is involved is essentially the point brought up by Cesar; in other words, that we should assume the responsibility for continuing to work on behalf of the party's unity in the state of Sonora. I think that we could discuss it at length, it would be worthwhile; but I don't think that we can do so at this stage of the plenum. I adhere to Cesar's proposal.

(Comrades, if you insist on taking the floor, or, after this proposal, everything is settled. All right. So the resolution is...Cesar...All right, let's take it from the taping, as it was stated by Comrade Cesar Navarro. But it's already taped, isn't it? Not the introduction, but concretely.)

Cesar Navarro

That this Central Committee, in view of the fact that it was impossible to achieve the party's complete unity in the state of Sonora, favors continuing to give an impetus to this unity process and providing for the party's comrades in that state.

(All right. Do you agree, comrades? Please, the comrades who agree...)

(But Juan Luis has an objection, doesn't he?)

(Yes, but he is not voicing it. All right, thanks. Opposed, comrades? One opposing vote, thanks. Abstentions? Ten abstentions.)

Concluding Agreement

Mexico City ASI ES in Spanish No 115,3 Aug 84 p 12

["Point of Agreement," passed at conclusion of Unified Socialist Party of Mexico Sixth Central Committee Plenum Debate, Mexico, D.F., 23 July]

[Text] Point of Agreement

The Sixth Plenum of the PSUM Central Committee resolves to continue the discussion on the matters relating to the formation and operation of the Central Committee organs.

Therefore, the Central Committee is forming a specific commission, for the sole purpose of submitting a proposal to the Central Committee itself, at its next plenum, on the formation and operation of the Political Commission and the Secretariat. Said specific commission will elect from among its members the one to chair it.

The specific commission is comprised as follows: Pablo Gomez, Alejandro Gascon Mercado, Arnoldo Martinez Verdugo, Rolando Cordera, Pablo Pascual, Manuel

Stephens, Sabino Hernandez, Salvador Castaneda, Sergio Almaguer, Cesar Navarro, Horacio Garcia Perez.

Mexico, D.F., 23 July 1984

Sixth Plenum of the Central Committee of the Unified Socialist Party of Mexico

2909

CSO: 3248/15

END