Down with Cuban revisionism!

1 – Introduction

In the late 1980’s, in Cuito Canavale, a village in south-eastern Angola, a battle took place between the representatives of the two superpowers that strived against each other for world dominance at the time: on one side, there were the racist South-African forces supported by Washington (imperialist USA); on the other side, there were the social-fascist armed forces of Angola and Cuba supported by Moscow (social-imperialist Soviet Union).

Each side had its own greedy capitalist-imperialist interests to defend, and therefore the Cuito Canavale battle was a ruthless struggle in the pursuit for profit maximization. The superpower which emerged victorious from this battle would have free way to absolute political-economic control over Southern Africa and over the region’s inestimable resources, raw materials and workforce (and of course, from this, the door would be open to exclusive absolute dominance over the entire African continent). As the aim of all kinds of imperialism is profit maximization through conquering neo-colonial markets, none of the imperialist superpowers involved wanted to loose this opportunity to have one of the world’s wealthiest regions in its hands. Consequently, the Cuito Canavale battle was extremely brutal and bloody, with many of the mercenaries from both sides being killed or harmed. However, the side financed by social-imperialist Soviet Union ultimately achieved victory. Since then, the ideologues and admirers of Soviet social-imperialism and of Cuban social-fascism have been praising this episode to the skies:

“Cuba's role in Angola illustrates the division between those who fight for the cause of freedom, liberation and justice, to repel invaders and colonialists, and those who fight against just causes, those who wage war to occupy, colonize and oppress.” (Isaac Saney, Cuba and Southern African Liberation: the unknown story, edition in English)

The purpose of this article is to unmask this intolerable falsification of history. With this text, we aim at presenting our own Stalinist-Hoxhaist view about the reactionary activities of the Cuban mercenaries in Africa at the service of Castroist fascism and of Soviet social-imperialism.

Of course, this cannot be properly done without an analysis of the origins and fundamentals of Cuban revisionism and of its total subservience towards social-imperialist Soviet Union. After all, Castroist Cuba’s intervention in Africa didn’t happen by ease. It was the result of a sequence of facts which began much before Cuba’s 1959 anti-socialist pseudo-revolution. Cuban revisionists always tried to depict their social-fascist regime as being “socialist”:

“Cuba (...) is the first socialist state in America. Cuban revolution initiated the establishment of socialism in Latin America.” (Documents of the Revisionist Party of Cuba, The historical development of Cuban revolution, 1964, translated from version in German language)
But as we shall see, these words are mere lies. Cuban bourgeois pseudo-revolution and the Castroist-Guevarist regime it implemented never had anything to do with socialism. Indeed, Cuban revisionism represents one of the most perverse kinds of revisionism because it managed to cultivate a “romanticized” aura around itself that still deceives many workers nowadays. There are many toilers who firmly reject all the other social-fascist states, but when it comes to Castroist Cuba, they tend to accept it due to its allegedly “democratic” and “popular” nature. Moreover, due to its “leftist” demagogy and their regime’s “socialistic” appearance, Cuban revisionists continue to contribute to the discredit of communist movement and ideology. In this article, we will try to unmask the veritable reactionary, pro-capitalist, pro-imperialist and anti-communist character of Cuban revisionism.

2 – Origins and fundaments of Cuban revisionism

2.1 – A “socialist” revolution which never existed

Throughout their history, Cuban workers were invariably and constantly exploited by one imperialism or another. During several centuries, Cuba was exploited by Spanish imperialism, which exterminated Amerindian population and brought African slaves in order to transform Cuba into a giant sugar plantation. In late 1800’s and early 1900’s, American bourgeoisie (who were then in the process of imperialist ascension) were attracted by Cuba’s resources and managed to expel Spanish imperialists in 1902, turning Cuba into an American neo-colony which “enjoyed” a purely formal independence. American imperialists preferred to keep Cuba as a neo-colony, as this form of colonialism is more able to mislead the oppressed masses, keeping them away from genuine communist ideology and stuck on the false idea that they are living in a “free” country.

But not even the most cunning masquerades could deny the fact that Cuba was totally dependent on American imperialism. In 1895, 95 % (!) of Cuban external trade was in the hands of the American imperialist bourgeoisie. When the 1959 fake “revolution” took place, the giant monopolist bank Corporate Finance owned by Morgan and Rockefeller controlled practically the totality of Cuban productive sector – from sugar (the island’s main production) to mines, energy and tobacco. During the first half of the XX century, Cuba was always one of the main receptors of American capital penetration. These facts alone are sufficient to reveal Cuba’s dependence on American imperialism. This dependence was more than intense – it was truly shocking, and we dare to affirm that there were certainly many traditional colonies which were not so dependent on their respective metropolises as Cuba was dependant on American bourgeoisie (this is indeed one of the characteristics of neo-colonialism: far from diminishing, the dependence of neo-colonies towards their respective masters becomes greater than ever). As we have already referred, Cuba’s neo-colonial dependence achieved scandalous levels: for example, Cuba was one of the world’s main sugar productors; however, it did not even possessed industries to transform its products. As a result, Cuba exported raw sugar, but it had to import refined sugar!

American control over Cuba was so intense that the island’s economy remained nothing more than a mere appendix of the American imperialist economy – during those years,
the sole purpose of Cuban production was to satisfy the needs for maximum profits of the American imperialisms. Nearly all the wealth produced by Cuba was automatically and immediately exported to the USA. Cuba provided American capitalism with raw materials such as sugar and coffee and absorbed the surplus manufactured commodities and capital made in the USA in favour of the American billionaires and against the interests of Cuban toilers – a typical neo-colonial situation. And this is openly admitted even by American and British bourgeois publications:

"Having at last established itself as a free republic (1902), Cuba became dependent upon the United States (...)" (New Encyclopaedia Britannica, Volume 3, Chicago, 1992, edition in English)

“(…) the United States obtained the right to oversee Cuban foreign and internal affairs as well as to establish a naval base at Guantanamo Bay.” (Encyclopedia Americana, Volume 8, Danbury (EUA), 1981, edition in English)

Of course, together with economic control, American imperialist bourgeoisie didn’t loose time also establishing political control. They imposed a fascist dictatorship on Cuban people, putting their puppet Fulgêncio Batista in power. Due to all this, Cuba had also been transformed into a playground for American wealthy classes, with the island being invaded by 5 star hotels, first-class restaurants and luxurious casinos. All this while the vast majority of Cuba people didn’t have access to minimum sanitary conditions, let alone to adequate health and teaching system. In fact, the immense majority of Cuba population was analphabet and could not afford health care. This must be mentioned, because it is important to understand the charm and enchantment that things like free health care, free teaching system and social-security exercised over ultra-exploited Cuba workers at the point of making them easy prey for the revisionist manipulators who deceitfully present social-fascism as socialism.

But at this moment, we will focus our attention on the bourgeois movement that was born in Cuba in the 40’s and 50’s. This movement was composed by members of the Cuban “patriotic” bourgeoisie who were tired of seeing the pro-American bourgeoisie compradore who controlled Batista getting all the alms given by its American imperialist masters. Initially, this section of the bourgeoisie used some “nationalist” slogans and its objective was to occupy a better place within capitalist-imperialist bourgeois-dominated world “market”. Instead of an explicitly colonialist dominion over the island, with American billionaires directly owning the country’s productive sector, the Cuban “national” bourgeoisie wanted a hidden dependence which would at least give her some apparent control over the means of production. Indeed, this “patriotic” section of the Cuban bourgeoisie didn’t even wanted complete expulsion of American imperialism – it just wanted a share of profits a little bigger. In this sense, the Cuban “national” bourgeoisie was far less ambitious than the Chinese national bourgeoisie in Mao’s epoch, for example, which never hesitated in totally defeating all other imperialisms in its quest for transforming China into the world’s dominant imperialist superpower. Indeed, as we will understand, both these bourgeoisies had similar purposes, but due to the differences of geographical, demographical and resources’ dimensions between China and Cuba, the first country became imperialist while the second one remained dependent.
But let’s return to historical events. The anti-Batista movement organized by Cuban “national” bourgeoisie was unsurprisingly constituted by the sons and daughters of those Cuban bourgeois families who were determined at getting their hands into some of the profits taken by the American imperialists bourgeoisie and by the bourgeois compradore. However, these representatives of Cuban “patriotic” bourgeoisie soon understood that they would have to follow the path of armed struggle if they truly wanted to accomplish their objectives. It was by that time that Fidel Castro appeared as one of the main leaders of the armed movement of this nationalistic bourgeoisie against the total dominion of the American imperialists and their Cuban lackeys. The first relevant action of this armed movement happened on 26th July of 1953, when Castro and his bourgeois group attacked an unit of Batista’s army (the famous Moncada’s barracks). However, this attack ultimately failed and Castro was imprisoned until 1955, when he went to Mexico and organized a group called “26th July Movement” composed by 82 fighters recruited from the ranks of the Cuban “radical” bourgeoisie who desperately wanted to assume political and economical control of the country. Indeed, most of these “revolutionary fighters” came from privileged backgrounds. Fidel (who was a bourgeois lawyer) and his younger brother Raul (who would later also become a chief figure of Cuban social-fascism) were sons of a wealthy landowner family of the kind that would be part of the landed bourgeois class. Their contact with students in the University of Havana was contact with sons and daughters of the privileged exploitative owning classes like themselves. They were never interested in forming a party of any kind but only in working through the Cuban national bourgeois conspiratorial clique. Therefore, Fidel’s and Raul’s father was a landlord of “nationalist” leanings (obviously, a member of the Cuba national bourgeoisie) and Che Guevara (who joined the movement at that moment) came from a prosperous Argentinean family and had an academic degree in Medicine. Therefore, the image of a brave group of “Marxist-Leninist combatants” born from the oppressed and exploited working masses who would have supposedly “assumed the leadership of Cuban people’s struggle against American imperialism” is totally false. And it is important to note this, because this phoney picture is one of the myths spread by Cuban revisionists to mislead workers in what respects to the veritable origins and purposes of the Cuban 1959 bourgeois and anti-communist pseudo-revolution. This is not to deny that some of those who joined Castro and Guevara came from the exploited classes. Of course, there were workers who were deceived by the “anti-imperialist” and “progressive” rhetoric of Cuban national bourgeoisie and who believed that to support Castro would mean the end of the atrocious oppression affecting Cuban proletariat. But, as we shall see, Castro’s and Guevara’s combatants were very far from being Marxists.

In December of 1956, Castro’s bourgeois fighters finally managed to enter Cuba by sea in a boat called Granma (the name of the newspaper of the future Cuban social-fascist regime that still exists until nowadays) and they established an operative center in Sierra Maestra (a mountainous formation in Cuba). Shortly after this, Castro and Guevara had managed to strengthen their bourgeois movement with the support of Cuban national bourgeoisie who provided them with weapons and ammunitions. In the first months of 1958, Castro brothers and Guevara were leading around 300 combatants in their quest for replacing one bourgeois tyranny by another. During that year and until the so-called Cuban “revolution” on the 1st January 1959, Castro’s forces were involved in battles with the feeble army of Batista. And now it is time to kill another myth spread by Cuban social-fascists: that even before had assumed power, Castro and his colleagues...
were already deeply hated and feared by American imperialists and that their victory against Batista’s forces was totally opposed by American imperialism. This is a total lie.

Indeed, since the mid 1950’s, relationship between Batista and his American bosses had seriously deteriorated. And this because Batista’s openly pro-capitalist and pro-imperialist stands had become a problem to the interests of American imperialists, because it was allowing many Cuban workers to understand that their desperate situation was the result of American imperialist bourgeoisie’ domination and that it was necessary to combat it in order to achieve a better life. In this situation, Batista’s brutal tyranny represented an immense danger because it could even lead to the acquirement and development of an authentic communist ideology among Cuban toilers – American imperialist bourgeois class’s worst nightmare. Therefore, American capitalist tycoons had already decided that Batista’s clique had to be replaced by another one who would use a somewhat more “democratic” and “patriotic” mask in order to mislead Cuban workers and to keep them away from Marxism-Leninism while permitting the maintenance of American capitalists’ control over the island. These intentions were clearly assumed by the representatives of American bourgeois government at the time. Already in 1957, Robert Hill, then responsible for the US State Department’s relations with Congress, told Earl Smith (the newly-appointed US Ambassador to Cuba) that:

“You are assigned to Cuba to preside over the downfall of Batista. The decision has been made that Batista has to go.” (Hugh Thomas, The Cuban Revolution, London, 1986, edition in English)

Indeed, also Guevara himself confirms our words. In 1961, he declared that:

“The monopolies, as is common in these cases, began to think of a successor to Batista, probably because they knew that the people were opposed to him (...).” (Ernesto Guevara, Cuba - Exception or Vanguard?, London, 1969, edition in English)

Unsurprisingly, this entire context meant that Batista’s forces were deeply demoralized and weakened:

“Batista’s soldiers, demoralized by the general repudiation of the government they served and by the accelerated corruption among their own officers and elsewhere... simply melted away as a fighting force after mid-1958. Batista now saw all the elements of his power eroded, his large army useless, his political support at home non-existent, his henchmen looking for exile, and the Washington backing he had so long enjoyed withdrawn.” (Philip Bonsal, Cuba, Castro and the United States, Pittsburgh, 1971, edition in English)

“Batista’s commanders were beginning to despair.” (Hugh Thomas, The Cuban Revolution, London; 1986, edition in English)

Shortly before loosing power, Batista launched an offensive against Castro’s combatants, but it was useless. Batista’s armed forces had become:

“A demoralized gaggle of corrupt, cruel and lazy officers without combat experience.” (Hugh Thomas, The Cuban Revolution, London, 1986, edition in English)
Therefore, far from being opposed to American imperialist interests, Batista’s defeat and overthrown was totally in accord with their plans. This truth denounces the deceitful idea that Cuban revisionists love to reaffirm: that a tiny group led by Castro and Guevara had managed to defeat an huge, colossal, massive, powerful, well equipped and trained army supported and backed by American imperialism’s almighty forces. William Pawnley, an American diplomat and bourgeoish close to President Eisenhower even affirmed that:

“(…) the US government had been taking urgent steps to remove Batista from power…. William D. Pawley, the former Ambasssador to Peru and Brazil and a personal friend of President Eisenhower, was about to be sent as a secret emissary to negotiate with Batista, Pawley would be authorised to offer Batista the opportunity to live with his family in Daytona Beach, Florida (…). The key aspect of the plan was that Pawley would be authorised to speak to Batista for President Eisenhower.” (Ramon L. Bonachea & Marya San Martin, *The Cuban Insurrection: 1952-1959*, New Brunswick (USA), 1974, edition in English)

So, as can be observed, Castro’s small forces in defense of Cuban national bourgeois interests were only able to defeat Batista because their objectives coincided with those of American imperialism at the time. This means the complete destruction of the Castroist/Guevarist claims that “Cuban revolutionaries triumphed over a gigantic army supported by American imperialist superpower by military means”:

“They (Castro’s forces) did not defeat Batista’s army in any military sense.” (Theodore Draper, *Castro’s Revolution: Myths and Realities*, 1962, edition in English)

“The collapse of Batista’s army was far more a political and psychological phenomenon . . . than a defeat by a superior enemy force.” (Theodore Draper, *Castroism: Theory and Practice*, 1965, edition in English)

Indeed, this truth had already been perceived by comrade Enver, who accurately said that:

“It is a fact, which nobody can deny, that the participants in this revolution (i.e., Cuban 1959 revolution) took up arms and went to the mountains, but it is an undeniable fact also that they did not fight as Marxist-Leninists. They were liberation fighters against the Batista clique and triumphed over it precisely because that clique was a weak link of capitalism.” (Enver Hoxha, *The Fist of the Marxist-Leninist Communists Must Also Smash Left Adventurism, the Offspring of Modern Revisionism (From a conversation with two leaders of the Communist Party (Marxist-Leninist) of Ecuador)*, 21st October of 1968, edition in English)

But who would be chosen by American imperialists to replace Batista? It would have surely to be someone who had a certain “curriculum” of anti-Batista opposition, in order to give Cuban workers the false impression that Batista’s overthrown had represented a veritable change of political-economic system while keeping everything the same. American imperialist bourgeoisie’ choice fell on Colonel Ramon Barquín (who was later replaced by Castro himself in American preferences), a member of nothing more nothing less than of Castro’s and Guevara’s “26th July movement”! So, far from having waged a “fierce revolutionary war” in order to defeat Batista, Castro’s supporters were
chosen by American imperialism itself to replace Batista in fulfillment of its capitalist interests. But how did this happen? In truth, Castro’s forces, as representatives of Cuban national bourgeoisie, utilized a very wise strategy: they soon understood that Batista was not serving American imperialism well and that, more sooner than later, American imperialist bourgeoisie would expel him from power. Therefore, they started to do their utmost to convince American imperialists that they were, in fact, the best candidates to replace Batista by a regime which would keep Cuban proletariat subjected to harsh exploitation and which would ensure the perpetuation of American domination over the country while using a more “democratic” or even “progressive” mask so that Cuban workers would never feel tempted to adhere to authentically revolutionary ideologies.

Of course, this was never exactly true, because Cuban national bourgeoisie’s objective was to put an end to American imperialism’s absolute dominion over the island and not to allow its continuation. But even in this, Cuban “patriotic” bourgeoisie was extremely cunning: it perceived that it would have never the chance of attaining power if it antagonized American imperialist bourgeoisie. So, Castro’s and Guevara’s pro-bourgeois and anti-socialist “26th July movement” did its best to keep American imperialism at its side, even because they would never find a best manner of having Batista out of their way than by having an ultra-powerful imperialist power overthrowing him. And this masquerade organized by the representatives of Cuban national bourgeoisie was successful in deceiving American bourgeoisie. Castro himself was a main player in this scenario fabricated by Cuban “patriotic” bourgeoisie. As early as 1958, he openly affirmed that:

"We have no plans for the expropriation or nationalization of foreign investments here. Foreign investments will always be welcome and secure here.” (Fidel Castro, Why we fight, in Coronet, 1958, edition in English)

In first place, this affirmation is certainly a firm exposure of all those who persist in treacherously presenting anti-Marxist Castro as an “orthodox bolshevist” and a “resolute communist”. Indeed, even after Cuban 1959 pseudo-revolution took place, Castro visited the USA and he declared that his journey’s purpose was to ensure the safety of foreign investments in Cuba:

"Castro told a television audience . . . that he was going to the US to secure credits.” (Hugh Thomas, The Cuban Revolution, London, 1986, edition in English)

And indeed, as we had already said, at that time, Cuban national bourgeoisie did not even have the pretension of expelling all of American imperialist investments and influences on Cuba – it only wanted to eliminate enough of them in order to achieve a favorable place within capitalist-imperialist bourgeois-dominated world “market” world market and a greater share of profits. As can be concluded, we are very far from genuine Marxist-Leninist purposes and positions. Indeed, there are not even the smallest signs of Marxism-Leninism in what respects to Castro’s pro-bourgeois “26th July movement”. On the contrary, American bourgeoisie supported Castro’s movement because they saw it as an anti-communist movement. During that same visit to the USA, Castro gave interviews which were widely broadcasted in American television and in which he openly said:
"I am not a Communist, nor do I agree with communism." (Fidel Castro, Meet the Press’ Programme, version in English)

These were the exact words used by Castro. And the capitalist bourgeois-owned media of the USA confirmed his assertions:

"Dr. Castro . . . has stated repeatedly that his movement is not Communist and that if Cuba can obtain some degree of prosperity, Communism cannot grow there." (Newspaper Times, 20th April 1959, edition in English)

"Dr. Fidel Castro . . . went before the National Press Club here today to repeat his assurances made so often during his visit to the capital that he means nothing but friendship to the United States, that there are no Communists in his Government, that he has no plans to expropriate any foreign holdings in Cuba." (Newspaper Times, 21st April 1959, edition in English)

"Castro ... is not only not a Communist, but decidedly anti-Communist." (Herbert Matthews, New York Times, 16th July 1959, edition in English)

Indeed, Castro even managed to get CIA’s help in the struggle in favor of the greedy class interests of Cuban national bourgeoisie due to his ardent anti-communism which, of course, charmed CIA’s fascist leaders:

“(…) Castro was prevailed on to meet the CIA's chief expert on Communism in Latin America, a Central European named Droller: the two talked privately for three hours, and afterwards Droller told Lopez Fresquet: 'Castro is not only not a Communist, he is a strong anti-Communist fighter." (Hugh Thomas, The Cuban Revolution, London, 1986, edition in English)

And those who think that Castro could have only pretended to be an anti-communist in order to temporarily please American imperialists for strategical purposes are equally mistaken. In Cuba, Castro used to tell his colleagues and friends of the “26th July movement” how much he hated communism and everything related with it. He reached the point of declaring to them that:

“(…) Our revolution is not red, but olive-green, the color of the rebel army.” (Fidel Castro cited in: Guia del Pensamiento politicoeconomico de Fidel, (Guide to the Politico-economic Thought of Fidel), Havana, 1959, edition in English)

"Communism is a system that suppresses liberties, the liberties which are so dear to man." (Fidel Castro cited in: Theodore Draper, Castroism: Theory and Practice, 1965, edition in English)

"Communism is the dictatorship of a single class and I . . . have fought all my life against dictatorship." (Fidel Castro cited in: Hugh Thomas, The Cuban Revolution, London, 1986, edition in English)

Firstly, we must state that it is not surprising that Castro defined himself as openly anti-communist. After all, we can never forget who he was representing: the exploitative interests of Cuban national bourgeoisie who would never want that Cuban oppressed
working classes adhered to genuine communist ideology. And this is quite understandable – after so many efforts to accomplish predominant political-economic control over Cuba against the will of the bourgeoisie compradore and of American imperialism, Cuban “patriotic” exploiters would do their utmost not to lose everything in result of an eventual socialist revolution of Cuban toilers. Therefore, it was doing its utmost to have its armed representatives (Castro’s and Guevara’s 26th July movement) spreading anti-communist venom among Cuban masses. Indeed, if everything had occurred in accord with the initial plans of Cuban national bourgeoisie, Castroist regime would have been an explicitly anti-socialist nationalistic regime similar to all those which appeared not only in Latin America, but also in other parts of the world (like that of Argentinean Perón and of Brazilian Getúlio Vargas which, by the way, also used to launch “revolutionary” “leftist” appeals and who depicted themselves as the “defenders of the shirtless” – that is, of the poor – with the objective of deviating toilers from true communist ideology by convincing them that their hope was in Perón’s and in Getúlio’s bourgeois-capitalist system of state charity. Indeed, if Perónism and Varganism had also adopted some “Marxist-Leninist” phraseology, the final result would be strikingly similar to Castroism).

However, as we shall see, Cuban national bourgeoisie was forced to modify its plans and to install a social-fascist regime becoming a neo-colonial satellite of Soviet imperialists.

And in what respects to Castro’s false and ultra-reactionary claims that “communism denies liberties which are so dear to men”, we wonder to what “dear liberties” fascist Castro is referring to. From what we perceive, he was certainly referring to the “dear liberty” of exploiting the workforce of wage slaves or to the “dear liberty” of living a luxury life at the expenses of workers’ misery. Indeed, this kind of “liberties” will surely be suppressed under socialism and communism, to Castro great disappointment. But what could we expect from a bourgeois lawyer, the son of an affluent landowner? His class origins determined Castro’s way of thinking and would determine it until nowadays, because Castro never stopped from being staunchly anti-communist (indeed, we dare to affirm that if he had remained explicitly anti-communist instead of adopting a social-fascist ideology he wouldn’t have caused so many damages to the advancement of world socialist revolution). So, Castro had clear conscience about whose class interests he serves and defends – those of his own class of birth: Cuban national bourgeoisie.

And besides this, we have also to underline not only Castro’s reactionarism, but also his perverse manipulation and treacherous use of Marxist-Leninist concepts. He affirms that “communism is the dictatorship of a single class”, but this is a total lie. “Communism” and “dictatorship” are mutually exclusive words. And this because any form of state government is proof of the existence of a class dictatorship - according with the teachings of the 5 Classics of Marxism-Leninism. Consequently, the inevitability of class dictatorships will only be definitively avoided precisely in communism – a stateless, classless and propertyless society which necessarily and inevitably excludes any form of class dictatorship for the simple reason that there are no classes or state governments (i.e. class dictatorships) in communism.

Anyway, we guess that when Mr. Castro affirms that “communism is a class dictatorship” he is probably referring to the stages that come before communism: the
construction of a socialist society which is necessarily, automatically and inevitably based on the establishment of a proletarian dictatorship. So, yes, of course that socialism is the dictatorship of a single class: that of the proletariat, which is the only truly revolutionary class in the world. Of course that all these Marxist-Leninist-Stalinist-Hoxhaist truths are anathemas to Cuban revisionists, who frontally deny the necessity of both proletarian dictatorship and of proletarian class leadership of the revolution as the pro-capitalist lackeys they always were and continue to be.

Finally, we will only express our astonishment towards Castro’s unbelievably hypocritical declaration that “I have fought all my life against dictatorship”. It is truly amazing to hear this from someone who always did his utmost to advance and consolidate the dictatorship of Cuban national bourgeoisie (later transformed into a bourgeoisie compradore of social-fascist type), including through the establishment of a revisionist state and of the development of an anti-socialist ideology who has caused inestimable sufferings and damages not only to Cuban exploited masses, but also to the entire world proletariat. And Castro’s reactionary liberal ideologies are clearly perceivable in his own speeches:

“There will be freedom for those who speak in our favor and for those who speak against us and criticize us. There will be freedom for all men because we have achieved freedom for all men. (…) we shall follow a single precept, that of respect for the rights and feelings of others.” (Fidel Castro, The Revolution Begins Now, January 1959, edition in English)

This is completely contrary to the most basic principles of Marxism-Leninism-Stalinism-Hoxhaism. True, during socialist and communist construction criticism and self-criticism must be allowed within defined circumstances, even because comrade Enver once said that “a country where a man is afraid of criticizing another man is not a socialist country”. But all criticisms and self-criticisms must be kept within the limits of Marxist-Leninist-Stalinist-Hoxhaist ideology. Criticisms and self-criticisms coming from outside our ideology and directed against it will never be tolerated neither allowed, because to permit them would have to give free reign to all kinds of bourgeois-capitalist-revisionist ideas that would jeopardize socialist construction and would deviate workers from their proletarian ideology. But Castroists are opposite to all this. For them, since their exploitative and anti-socialist class regime was already established, to make fake appeals to “free criticism” would give them a certain “democratic” and “popular” outlook in front of laborers’ eyes without having to change absolutely anything about their oppressive bourgeois rule. Equally astonishing are Castroist hypocritical concerns about “freedom for all” and about “others’ feelings”.

This “concern” for “freedom and respect” does not surely extends to Cuban workers who were always systematically exploited, repressed, abused and subjected by Castroists to the most perverse wage slavery under “socialistic” disguises. Thus, Castro’s worries are exclusively directed in favor of Castroist bourgeoisie. At least we, Stalinist-Hoxhaists, openly admit that one of our main goals is to lead world proletariat in the combat for the complete and definitive annihilation of all capitalist-imperialist-revisionist elements and ideologies in the world in order to open the path to the successful construction of a stateless, classless and propertyless society at a global scale. And it is obvious that we are not going to allow exploiters to be “free” neither are we going to “respect the feelings” of those who have ruthlessly slaughtered, enslaved and robbed the workers for thousands of years!
After this, we will only call the attention to the fact that all this explains why the USA was the very first country (!) to recognize Castroist regime. In 3rd January 1959, American imperialist bourgeoisie were already very happy about Castro’s coming to power, and they transmitted their optimism to their lackeys of the US State Department:

"US Department of State officials are . . . optimistic about the new Cuban government's future economic and political policies." (Robert Scheer & Maurice Zeitlin, Cuba: An American Tragedy, Harmondsworth, 1964, edition in English)

And on 8th January 1959, American capitalist regime sent a message of recognizance to Castroist government expressing:

"The sincere goodwill of the Government and people of the United States towards the new Government and the people of Cuba.” (US Department of State, Bulletin, Volume 40, No. 1,022 (26 January 1959), edition in English)

In truth, American imperialist bourgeoisie did not loose time in recognizing it because they were convinced that Castro’s ascension to power was beneficial to them. Indeed, American imperialists firmly believed that they would receive a share of profits and of control over Cuba superior to that Cuban Castroist national bourgeoisie was willing to give them; they believed that complete control over Cuba that they had enjoyed until then would remain untouched with the advantage that now they would count with a puppet regime much more able to deceive workers and to keep them attached to bourgeois-capitalist ideology. That’s why they promptly supported and recognized Castro’s regime.

During some time after the 1959 anti-socialist pseudo-revolution, Castroist national bourgeoisie was busy consolidating its class power and therefore it did nothing to destroy American imperialist bourgeoisie’ illusions – even because a direct confrontation with American imperialism could be lethal to the newly-born and unconsolidated Castroist bourgeois regime.

Concluding, we can affirm that until some months after Cuban 1959 anti-socialist “revolution”, American imperialists were very contented with Castro and were convinced they had found the right man to serve their greedy predatory and profitable class interests. It was only when Cuban national bourgeoisie finally felt that its class power was sufficiently consolidated to start accomplishing its aims of appropriating the profits resulting from the exploitation of Cuba’s resources, means of production and workforce, thus taking them from the hands of American imperialist bourgeoisie that Cuban-American relations began to get frozen.

Some time after the 1959 anti-socialist pseudo-revolution, Castroists launched a so-called “agrarian reform” whose purpose was to confiscate the lands belonging to American capitalist multinationals and to the bourgeoisie comprador. However, this “land reform” was a masquerade from beginning to end. Cuban “patriotic” exploiters used a very clever strategy: they distributed some tiny amounts of land to poor landless peasants in order to give themselves a “popular” colour. However, what did they do with the lion share of lands which had belonged to former exploiters? They used the already well known technique promoted by all kinds of social-fascist regimes of the world: to “expropriate”, “nationalize” and even “socialize” the land in words while
transforming it into private property of the new ruling classes in deeds. And this was the veritable goal of Castroist “agrarian reform”:

"The first Agrarian Reform Law (…) turned the cattle ranches into granjas (state farms)." (Martin Kenner & James Petras, *Fidel Castro Speaks*, London, 1970, edition in English)

These “granjas” (state farms) were given to the members of Cuban national bourgeoisie who become the true owners of the land – at the detriment of Cuban peasants, who fed many illusions about Castroist “agrarian reform” but who ended up being as much exploited by the new “patriotic” landowners as they were by former American bourgeoisie. By this time, Cuban Castroist bourgeoisie opted by pretending to “nationalize” and to “socialize” the land in order to inculcate in Cuban workers the wrong idea that the new regime was “popular” and even “progressive”. Indeed, as soon as it seized power, Castroist bourgeoisie was relatively quick understanding that it should abandon its former explicitly anti-communist ideology and policies if it wanted to successfully exploit Cuban workers. Castroist bourgeoisie remembered well what had happened to Batista, who had lost the support of American imperialists and who was consequently expelled from power because his assumedly fascist features contained the danger of fostering Cuban toilers’ communist conscience (and this ideology of Castroist bourgeoisie to replace an explicitly fascist ideology by a social-fascist one with the aim of maximizing profits and of perpetuating capitalist dictatorship will be fully confirmed and completed when Soviet social-imperialists occupy Cuba and turn it into another one of their neo-colonies).

At this point, it is important to notice that this “land reform” is another of the many myths invented by Cuban revisionists, who try to present this as having been some kind of “peasant revolution” – we cannot forget that one of the main ideological characteristics of Cuban revisionism is its pretension of depicting itself as “a peasant ideology” while totally despising both peasants and the proletariat in favour of social-fascist ruling classes. This is an aspect that Cuban revisionism and Castroism share with a lot of other revisionist and social-fascist ideologies like Maoism, for example. Later in this article, we will reflect about all these questions related with the ideological characteristics of Cuban revisionism.

Castroist “agrarian reform” was anti-communist in its very essence. Referring to the laws that implemented it, Castro declared:

“(…) we must declare that we make laws only for the benefit of the nation (…). We do not make laws by - hate, as we do not hate anybody.” (Fidel Castro, *The Revolution Begins Now*, January 1959, edition in English)

This statement by Castro is totally reactionary and anti-socialist. It reminds us of fascist speeches about “national interests over class interests”. Castro affirms that his pro-capitalist “agrarian reform” was made by pure “national interests” and not by “hate”. Castro’s attitude is nothing new. Just like all fascists, capitalists and revisionists, he insists in qualifying as “national interests” the interests of the oppressive classes he serves. Unsurprisingly, Castro is depicting the interests of Cuban national bourgeoisie (his own class) as being synonym of the overall interests of Cuba in an attempt to opportunistically promote the union of all Cubans against American imperialism and its
local lackeys in benefit of Castroist “patriotic” national bourgeoisie’s greedy class interests of profit maximization. Castro tries to inculcate in Cuban workers the false idea that the class interests and aims of Cuban national bourgeoisie are also their own and that American imperialism and its Cuban servers are the only enemies that must be combated. Comrade Enver has denounced this anti-socialist notion long time ago, stressing that to accomplish true emancipation, toiling masses have to defeat and eliminate both external oppressors (foreign imperialisms, bourgeoisie of compradore type, etc) and internal oppressors (national “patriotic” bourgeoisie which is equally exploitative and repressive):

“Socialism is in struggle with capitalism, the world proletariat is locked in a merciless and continuous struggle with the capitalist bourgeoisie, the peoples of the world are in struggle with their external and internal oppressors. The world proletariat is guided in the struggle by its Marxist-Leninist ideology (…).” (Enver Hoxha, *Imperialism and the Revolution*, Tirana, 1979, edition in English)

It is also very interesting to note Castro’s stating that “we don’t hate anybody”. Every communist knows that class hate is an inherent part of class society – as long as classes are not completely eliminated and annihilated, each class is determined to hate its antagonists within class society. After all, there must be class hate in a world where a tiny minority scandalously enriches itself through killing and condemning zillions to unbearable exploitation, degradation and destitution. As staunch defenders of the Cuban anti-American bourgeoisie, Castro and his supporters necessarily hated their class enemies: American imperialists and their local lackeys, but also Cuban working classes. But this concern of Castro ensuring that the new Cuban exploiters and oppressors “don’t hate anybody” is just ridiculous and it is proof of their bourgeois-capitalist character. Indeed, only exploitative classes and their reactionary anti-communist lackeys like Castro try to conceal their class hate towards the workers in general and the proletariat in particular with the aim of hiding the predatory and tyrannical nature of their political-socio-economic order. We, Stalinists-Hoxhaists, don’t have the slightest problem about assuming that we deeply hate all class enemies of the world proletariat because they try to prevent the world socialist revolution. Indeed, proletarian class hate is something entirely natural and healthy since it is directed towards the right class targets and accompanied by a firm and full embracement of Marxism-Leninism-Stalinism-Hoxhaism. The promotion and fostering of proletarian class hate against all kinds of oppressors and exploiters is so essential to the acquisition of a genuinely communist conscience by world workers that it can decisively determine whether world socialism and world communism will be victorious or not.

But let’s return to historical events. Contrary to the lies of Cuban national bourgeoisie – whose objective is to mislead Cuban peasants through pleasing them with false promises of “land for all” in order to turn them into an instrument to establish and buttress its own exploitative class order – Castroist state farms are far from being some kind of “peasant paradise”. Reality within those “state farms” was something else. As we have already referred, Castroist “agrarian reform” was nothing more than a mere redistribution of Cuba’s land in favour of the interests of Cuban national bourgeoisie. As the new landowners they were, Cuban “patriotic” oppressors did not hesitate before starting to savagely exploit the peasants. So, in theory, Castroist state farms are “cooperatives”, but in truth they were and continue to be true concentration camps were
Cuban peasants are turned into wage slaves and are exploited to the bone by the new dominant classes:

"The NIAR (National Institute of Agrarian Reform) appointed the manager of the enterprise. . . . The workers were paid about $2.50 a day." (Hugh Thomas, *The Cuban Revolution*, London, 1986, edition in English)

And we should note that this salary can be severely cut. Indeed, Cuban national bourgeoisie treats peasants in a despotic and arrogant manner:

"NIAR administered the cooperatives from above without in the least taking their members' wishes into account, giving them any voice in their affairs, or even holding pro forma meetings." (Theodore Draper, *Castroism: Theory and Practice*, 1965, edition in English)

Indeed, working and living conditions within the “cooperatives” and the “state farms” owned by the new Cuban oppressors were so unbearable and slavagist that peasants rapidly started to loath anything which them:

"In November 1961, Castro himself remarked that the peasants had become so 'allergic' to the cooperatives that they 'feared' the very word. In June 1962, Rodriguez reported that the cooperatives had become 'dead organisms' (...)." (Theodore Draper, *Castroism: Theory and Practice*, 1965, edition in English)

In fact, contrary to what happened in Bolshevist Soviet Union and in Socialist Albania, where the state of proletarian dictatorship made all investments in all economic fields (including in agriculture), in Castroist Cuba the same never happened. Contrary to what occurred in Soviet Union of comrades Lenin and Stalin and in comrade Enver’s Albania (where all means of production entirely belonged to all workers), in social-fascist Cuba peasants must pay for the right to use the means of production belonging to bourgeois-capitalist state. Therefore, besides usual exploitative wage slavery, Cuban peasants also have to endure the exploitation that comes from the speculative prices imposed by the new oppressors. This situation has always constituted a serious obstacle to the development and diversification of Cuban agriculture which remained backward and monocultural – what jeopardizes peasants’ working and living conditions but maximizes the profits of Castroist bourgeoisie (and of its future imperialist and social-imperialist bosses).

So, as can be concluded, peasants’ wishes or well-being counted for nothing to the new Cuban exploiters. They were only worried taking advantage of the fact that, due to its nature, the peasantry is a class relatively easy to deceive if we use apparently “popular” and “progressive” slogans. Not only Cuban national bourgeoisie, but also many other national bourgeoisie throughout the world knew and continue to know this very well. It is true that Cuban population at that time was mainly constituted by peasants, but even if this was not the case, even if Cuban proletariat was numerically relevant, Cuban Castroist bourgeoisie would always try to use peasantry as a means to advance its class interests. And this because it is far more risky for national bourgeoisie to try to mislead the proletariat - who is an inherently revolutionary class that can easily acquire a communist class consciousness. In our Declaration of war against Maoism, we noted that also Maoist ideologues and organizations defending the interests of national
bourgeoisie in their respective countries did their utmost to keep peasants at their side in their struggle against the bourgeoisie compradore and foreign imperialisms, on one side, and against proletarian socialist revolution, on the other side. When the power of national bourgeoisie is already sufficiently consolidated, the social-fascist and revisionist state of Maoist type displays its true face and implacably represses peasants together with all other workers. And so was the case with Cuban Castroist bourgeoisie: while it needed the support of Cuban peasants to consolidate its class power against the bourgeoisie compradore, against American imperialism and also against proletarian socialist revolution, it invaded Cuban peasants’ minds with slogans about a “peasant revolution”. As Cuban peasants were brutally exploited by American imperialist landowners and their Cuban lackeys, they easily adhered to the lies of Cuban Castroist bourgeoisie and took their side. However, as Cuban national bourgeoisie started to feel that its class control over the country was more or less secured (but who was completely mistaken about this, as we will see), it also begun to show peasants its real ugly face by imprisoning them in “cooperatives” that were slave labor camps.

But things started to get complicated to Cuban Castroist bourgeoisie when it expropriated sugar plantations that belonged to American imperialist multinationals:

"The agrarian reform law involved the expropriation of the American-owned sugar-mills and plantations in Cuba - covering 1.7 million acres of land, representing a total investment of about $275 million (...)." (Keesing's Contemporary Archives, Volume 12, edition in English)

Amidst its euphoria for having finally the opportunity of exploiting Cuban workers to its own advantage, Cuban national bourgeoisie erroneously though to have its oppressive class dominion fully assured and “forgot” that American bourgeoisie would never tolerate any kind of jeopardizing of their profitable predatory interests. And we must take into account that even in this, Castroist bourgeoisie made proof of its deeply reactionary and anti-socialist character by granting the oppressive expropriated American imperialists and their compradore lackeys generous indemnizations and compensations:

“The owners of the lands we intend to distribute shall not be robbed; they will be compensated. They will be paid in government bonds, payable in 20 years, which will produce 4.50% interest yearly.” (Fidel Castro, When the people rule, January 1959, edition in English)

Any Stalinist-Hoxhaist knows that when a genuine socialist revolution led by the proletariat takes place and the respective proletarian dictatorship is established, all means of production must be expropriated, socialized and put under workers’ control within the shortest possible period of time (to prevent exploiters from having time and means to organize reprisals against the new proletarian socialist power) and without indemnizations. Comrade Lenin stressed that immediately after the triumph of the Great October Socialist Revolution, capitalist owners (including landowners) were promptly expropriated “without indemnizations”. (Lenin, L’économie et la politique à l’époque de la dictature du prolétariat, Oeuvres choisies, Volume II, translated from version in French language)
And also Albanian Marxists-Leninists explicitly reinforced the necessity of expropriating the oppressors without giving them any kind of indemnizations:

“The essential fundament of Albanian nationalizations was the deeply revolutionary method through which they were accomplished: the method of total and immediate expropriation without providing capitalist owners any kind of indemnizations. (...) Thus, in Albania we did not resorted to transitory neither to intermediary stages and we also always refused state capitalism. Obviously, we firmly rejected any attempts of total or partial indemnization towards the capitalist owners (...). To indemnify them and to accept cooperation with them – under any form – would mean allowing them to use their money and their privileged positions in order to achieve monetary accumulation.” (Documents of the Party of Labour of Albania (PLA), Études politiques et sociales, translated from version in French language)

As can be concluded, this Marxist-Leninist principled attitude of Soviet and Albanian Marxists-Leninists is on the antipodes of that of Cuban revisionists: Castro was even worried about openly ensuring that “landowners will not be robbed” by giving them indemnizations. We, Stalinists-Hoxhaists, perfectly know that the landowners are the true thieves – they are the ones who mercilessly exploit and repress peasants for the sake of their class greed, they and the other capitalists are the ones who rob workers’ surplus value to satisfy their insatiable gluttony for profits. And this is also why it is so important that the proletariat can expropriate capitalist exploitative owners without indemnizations: it is a manner of making the workers led by the proletariat feel that they are now absolutely free to exercise their class dictatorship, that they are not obliged by any of the oppressive burdens which existed under bourgeois-capitalist wage slavagist rule. Moreover, as Albanian comrades had already observed, to indemnify exploitative owners and classes would also be synonym of giving them monetary means to destroy socialist revolution and to undermine proletarian dictatorship. With the money they get through indemnizations, they would be able to offer class privileges in return for the help of anti-socialist elements to restore capitalist-imperialist-revisionist slavagist system. That’s why it is so crucial not to give indemnizations to exploitative classes and to capitalist owners, specially taking into consideration that in the initial stages of socialist construction the proletarian dictatorship is still not yet fully consolidated, Marxist-Leninist-Stalinist-Hoxhaist ideology has still not absolute dominance and there are still abundant bourgeois-capitalist-revisionist anti-communist elements ready to take the first opportunity to aid their capitalist-imperialist-revisionist bosses to reconquer their former class positions and their former exploitative and wage slavagist rule.

In both Soviet Union of comrades Lenin and Stalin and also in comrade Enver Hoxha’s socialist Albania, Soviet proletariat and Albanian proletariat (in alliance with the peasantry and the soldiers) were led by authentic Marxist-Leninist parties which guided them towards the implementation of proletarian dictatorship and during socialist construction. And in both those countries, expropriations of exploiters were done in a relatively quick manner: for example, Albanian Marxist-Leninists began to expropriate the means of production belonging to the exploiting classes during Albanian Liberation War, thus even before they had attained power. But besides this, neither Bolshevist Soviet Union neither Enver’s Albania ever wasted a single penny in indemnizations given to exploiters. To “indemnify” the exploiters who sucked workers’ blood for
millenniums is completely contrary to the most fundamental teachings of Marxism-Leninism-Stalinism-Hoxhaism, which demand that expropriations and socializations must be quick, efficient and violent (in case that exploiters try to resist, as always happens).

But we don’t even have to look to the examples of genuinely socialist countries. Even within the parameters of national bourgeoisies looking for a bigger share of political-economical control of their countries, Cuban Castroist bourgeoisie is very supple. Indeed, Cuban national bourgeoisie’s “agrarian reform” was far less ambitious and “radical” than that made by Chinese national bourgeoisie during Mao’s epoch, for example. While this last one expropriated the means of production belonging to foreign imperialists and their lackeys without giving them any indemnization, Cuban “patriotic” exploiters granted them compensations which were even superior to those given in countries under American imperialist domination (!):

"The rates of interest proposed on the bonds were higher than the General MacArthur’s Agrarian Reform in Japan... The law of Agrarian Reform, on analysis, turned out to be very modest (...)." (Hugh Thomas, The Cuban Revolution, London, 1986, edition in English)

So, here are news to all Castroists of the world: conservative and pro-imperialist general MacArthur is more “revolutionary” than your rotten social-fascist idol. And this can also be applied to Guevara, because he played an important role in Cuban internal and external policies during and after the country’s 1959 bourgeois pseudo-revolution.

But returning to historical events, American imperialists expressed their dissatisfaction with Castroist bourgeois “land reform” by sending an official note to Cuban government on June 1959 stating that:

"A widespread redistribution of land, which might have serious adverse effects on productivity, could prove harmful to the general economy.” (New York Times, 12 June 1959, edition in English)

Needless to say that American bourgeoisie couldn’t care less about what was good or bad to Cuban economy since their profits continue to be maximized. Their “serious concerns” about the effects of Castroist land reform over Cuban economy were solely related with their anger of seeing how all their properties and productive means were going directly to the hands of Cuban “patriotic” exploiters. In this attitude of American imperialists, we also perceive some range towards the fact that they felt deceived by Castro. After all, the man who had looked like the ideal candidate to keep their dominion over Cuba turned to be only using them as a mean to get rid of Batista in order to advance the interests of the class he was really serving: Cuban national bourgeoisie. No wonder that American bourgeoisie started feeling a deep hostility towards Castroist regime. And this enmity can be perceived throughout all history of Cuban-American relations after June 1959.
2.2 – Becoming a neo-colony of Soviet social-imperialists

At this point, Soviet social-imperialists make their first appearance. We were in early 1960, at a time in which Khrushchevist revisionism had already took control of political-economic power in Soviet Union, having restored capitalism internally while simultaneously consolidating the country as an imperialist superpower externally. Although comrade Enver Hoxha still hadn’t made his glorious and valiant speech against Soviet revisionism, division between those who supported Khrushchev’s revisionism and those who refused it had already been consummated. And it was in this context that the new Soviet dominant classes put their imperialist eyes on Cuba.

In February 1960, by occasion of an official visit that Anastas Mikoyan (First Deputy Prime Minister of revisionist Soviet Union) paid to Cuba, many documents and agreements were signed, the most important being one in which Soviet social-imperialists:

"Agreed to grant Cuba a loan of $100 million . . . bearing a 2.5% interest.”
(Keesing's Contemporary Archives, Volume 12, edition in English)

Relatively to this, we must take into account that the true profits rate that Soviet social-imperialists took from their neo-colonial dominance over Cuba was much higher than these 2.5% of interest (which, by the way, were sharpening increased as soon as Moscow’s capitalists felt that their rule over Cuba was firmly ensured). And since the first agreements were signed, Soviet revisionists determined that USSR’s credits and money had to be used for purchasing Soviet products at highly inflated prices. According to official numbers, Soviet social-imperialists charged 11% to 53% more for machinery than the price of comparable machines in the West. And a similar situation happened with sugar they bought to Cuban social-fascists; as Soviet imperialists resold that sugar at usurer prices to their Eastern Europe colonial satellites, thus making outrageous profits thanks to this kind of unequal trade which was always the trademark of Soviet social-imperialism:

“It is through unequal trade that the Soviet Union realizes the surplus value generated by the export of capital. In essence, it is little more than a bookkeeping arrangement as to whether the profit comes back to the USSR in the form of interest or in the form of superprofits from sales when the sales are tied by trade agreement to the export of capital.” (Red Papers 7: How Capitalism Has Been Restored in the Soviet Union and What This Means for the World Struggle, edition in English)

This situation alone is a blatant proof of the anti-socialist nature of Castroist regime, because a genuine proletarian dictatorship never signs such enslaving “agreements” nor accepts credits or money from non-socialist countries (and Soviet Union was a revisionist and social-imperialist country):

“Capitalism never makes investments, provides loans, or exports capital to other countries without first calculating the profits it will realize for itself. (...) There are also other forms of according credits, like those practiced with those pseudo-socialist states which are trying to disguise the capitalist course on which they are
proceeding. These are large credits provided in the form of trade credits which, of course, must be repaid within a short time. These are provided jointly by many capitalist countries, which have calculated in advance the economic as well as political profits they will draw from the recipient state, taking into account both its economic potential and ability to pay. In no case do the capitalists provide their credits for the construction of socialism. They provide them to destroy socialism. Therefore, a genuine socialist country never accepts credits, in any form, from a capitalist, bourgeois, or revisionist country.” (Enver Hoxha, *Imperialism and the Revolution*, Tirana, 1979, edition in English)

Besides this, Soviet social-imperialists also signed a trade agreement with Castroist bourgeoisie according to which Cuba would exchange sugar by Soviet oil. And this was the turning point. From that moment on, American imperialist bourgeoisie made no more efforts to hide their hate towards Castroist bourgeois regime:

"The United States quickly interpreted Castro's . . trade deal with the Soviet Union in 1960 as meaning that Cuba had become a Communist satellite.” (William A. Williams, *The United States, Cuba and Castro: An Essay on the Dynamics of Revolution and the Dissolution of Empire*, New York, 1962, edition in English)

"The new American policy - not announced as such, but implicit in the actions of the United States government -- was one of overthrowing Castro by all the means available to the US short of the open employment of the American Armed Forces in Cuba.” (Philip Bonsal, *Cuba, Castro and the United States*, Pittsburgh, 1971, edition in English)

"Beginning in March 1960 the United States began to work for the downfall of the Castro regime.” (Lilia Ferro-Clerico & Wayne S. Smith, *The US Trade Embargo*, 1988, edition in English)

In fact, American imperialists knew very well that Castro’s Cuba and Khrushchev’s Soviet Union had nothing to do with communism. They only felt indignant with the fact that their former exclusive and absolute control over Cuba was now more distant than ever. Furthermore, capitalist controlled newspaper “New York Times” claimed that, due to the newly signed treaty between Cuba and revisionist Soviet Union, “USA will loose all control relatively to the production and supply of Cuban sugar”. And, indeed, these claims were understandable: as we had already stated, sugar production represents the immense majority of Cuba’s overall production. In what was a typical example of neo-colonial monoculture system, in 1958, sugar counted for 81% of Cuban exportations. Sugar production covered around 1.8 millions of km2 of which the vast majority belonged to American multinationals. Therefore, American imperialist bourgeoisie were seeing their former main provider of profits in Cuba being put under control of their major rival: social-imperialist Soviet Union. It was in this moment that American imperialists start launching their famous hysterical campaign against “the danger of Castroist socialist contamination”. Cuban revisionists and their supporters around the world try to present it as an “undeniable proof that Cuban revolution was socialist, because otherwise American imperialists would not be so scared over it”. But this kind of ridiculous “arguments” will never deceive us, Stalinist-Hoxhaists. We know very well that it was not Cuban alleged “socialism” (which, in truth, never existed) that caused fear to American imperialist bourgeois class, but the example that Castroist
bourgeoisie set: that of a country which managed to successfully get rid of American control (even if it was only to later fell under the control of another imperialist superpower). American imperialists were afraid of the risk of contamination of this kind of national bourgeois struggle that could seriously menace the predatory interests’ of American tycoons not only in Latin American but also in the rest of the world. After all, American imperialists demanded an exclusive control over productive means and economic assets/resources of the countries under their sphere of influence – like had happened with Cuba during many decades. From the moment they understood that Castroist bourgeoisie would not fulfill their desires of remaining Cuba’s absolute masters, they promptly started trying to oust Castroist bourgeoisie from power as soon as possible also in order to prevent Soviet penetration on Cuba (an island just a few miles away from USA’s Southern Coast). Indeed, Castro’s false reputation as being a “radical and dangerous Bolshevist” and a “red monster” was deliberately promoted by the ideologues of American imperialism and of its allies around the world in order to justify their actions against Castroist Cuba. This kind of ridiculous propaganda was spread among USA’s anti-communist allies (thus encouraging them to take part in the quest of American imperialists for having their Cuban profits back through overthrowing Castroist bourgeoisie). However, we dare to affirm that American bourgeoisie also had another purpose with this: to depict Castroist Cuba (where peasants lived in slave camps and where workers were utterly exploited and treated like garbage) as an example of “socialism”. As time passed, American imperialism strengthened its determination in demonizing socialism through presenting Cuban social-fascism as a “communist tyranny”. With this, it aimed at preventing world workers in general and world proletariat in particular from adhering to the glorious Marxist-Leninist-Stalinist-Hoxhaist ideology; and indeed, if we believe that such a dreadful and exploitative regime as the Castroist one is “socialist”, our willingness to follow and to struggle for socialism will totally disappear. No peasants, no workers, no soldiers, no proletarians will ever want to combat for the implementation of such a despotic, oppressive, exploitative, oppressive, wage slavagist, social-fascist, pro-imperialist, capitalist-revisionist and anti-communist system like the one which is ruthlessly ruling Cuba since 1959. The strategy of American imperialist ideologues is precisely to use Castroist bourgeois regime as a mean to discredit communist ideology and movement, thus perpetuating capitalist-imperialist totalitarian world order (and unsurprisingly, this same strategy was quickly adopted by all kinds of anti-communists).

But of course that we can never forget that Cuban revisionists are as guilty and hypocritical as American imperialist bourgeoisie, because they themselves enthusiastically contribute to this kind of anti-socialist propaganda machinations due to the nature and characteristics of their own social-fascist ideology (later, we will see how).

So, faithfully following the orders given to it by capitalist multinationals, American government prepared to impose economic sanctions against Cuba through:

"Introducing a bill into the Senate which gave President Eisenhower power authority to cut the Cuban sugar quota if there should be need.” (Hugh Thomas, The Cuban Revolution, London, 1986, edition in English)

And American bourgeoisie went even further. In March, 1960 they determined:
"The formal American decision to arm and train an exile army was . . . made.”
(William A. Williams, The United States, Cuba and Castro: An Essay on the Dynamics of Revolution and the Dissolution of Empire, New York, 1962, edition in English)

"President Eisenhower accepted a recommendation of the Central Intelligence Agency to begin to arm and train Cuban exiles.” (Hugh Thomas, The Cuban Revolution, London, 1986, edition in English)

And Cuban-American relations went from bad to worse when American oil companies still based on Cuba were forced to refine Russian oil as a consequence of the Cuban-Soviet treaty above mentioned:

"The three large oil refineries in Cuba -- Texaco, Royal Dutch and Standard Oil - were told by the government that a large consignment of Russian oil, in pursuance of the accord of February, would soon arrive, and they would henceforth be asked to process 6,000 lbs. crude oil a day." (Hugh Thomas, The Cuban Revolution, London, 1986, edition in English)

Of course, they refused to refine Soviet oil:

"The great oil companies at last replied that they would not process Russian oil.”
(Hugh Thomas, The Cuban Revolution, London, 1986, edition in English)

In face of the determination revealed by Cuban revisionists in forcing American oil companies located in the island to refine Soviet oil (thus promoting the expansion, development and strengthening of the economy of its major imperialist rival through allowing it to fulfill the treaty and to receive Cuban sugar), USA’s bourgeois class decided to put an end to all aids to Cuba, affirming that Cuba wasn’t:

"(…) no longer in the national and hemispheric interests of the United States.”
(Keesing's Contemporary Archives, Volume 12, edition in English)

As retaliation against this, Castro determined that oil refineries belonging to those American multinationals which refused to refine Soviet oil would be nationalized:

"Castro signed the order saying that the Texaco oil refinery in Santiago had to refine the Soviet crude oil or be expropriated. . . . On 30 June the Esso and Shell refineries were taken over in Havana." (Hugh Thomas, The Cuban Revolution, London, 1986, edition in English)


American imperialists still tried to force Castroist bourgeoisie to abandon its pro-Soviet path and to deliver control over Cuba to American imperialism through deciding that USA would refrain from buying Cuban sugar. Eisenhower himself organized this strategy:
"Eisenhower decided to go the whole hog. On July 6 he reduced the quota for Cuba by 700,000 tons." (Hugh Thomas, The Cuban Revolution, London, 1986, edition in English)

"Eisenhower stated that 'this action amounts to economic sanctions against Cuba. Now we must look for to other moves -- economic, diplomatic and strategic.'" (Lilia Ferro-Clerico & Wayne S. Smith, The US Trade Embargo, 1988, edition in English)

Comprehensively, the purpose of this policy was to overthrow Cuban Castroist bourgeoisie and to replace it with the former pro-American bourgeoisie compradore. And in theoretical terms, we have to admit that this tactic could be successful because, as we have already explained, Cuba’s economy was mainly dependent on sugar exports to the USA – if they stopped, the entire island would stop. However, American imperialists “forgot” about Soviet social-imperialists, who saw in this situation an opportunity to conquer one more satellite country to their side:

"(This strategy) was calculated to bring the Castro regime to its knees. But immediately Russia stepped in and agreed to take the 700,000 tons of sugar." (Peter Taaffe, Cuba: Analysis of the Revolution, London, 1975, edition in English)

"The Soviet Union immediately stepped in to announce that it would buy the 700,000 tons of sugar cut by the United States.” (Lilia Ferro-Clerico & Wayne S. Smith, The US Trade Embargo, 1988, edition in English)

Of course, Soviet social-imperialists were not doing this by charity towards Cuban people: they had a very well defined interest – to have Cuban Castroist bourgeoisie under their control in order to put their disgusting hands over Cuba’s natural and human resources in order to extend their bourgeois-capitalist, neo-colonialist, social-fascist, wage slavagist, exploitative, oppressive and anti-communist sphere of influence with the aim of maximizing their profits (just like American imperialists had done before). And Castro quickly fulfilled their plans by totally antagonizing American imperialist bourgeois class through announcing supposed “expropriation” and “nationalization” of all American properties in Cuba:

"On July 5, Cuba . . . retaliated for the Sugar Act by nationalizing all US businesses and commercial property in Cuba.” (Lilia Ferro-Clerico & Wayne S. Smith, The US Trade Embargo, 1988, edition in English)

"The Cubans expropriated all US-owned property.” (Theodore Draper, Castroism: Theory and Practice, 1965, edition in English)

As can be concluded, this is the origin of the deliberately spread legend about the “nationalizations done by Castro against American interests” as being a proof of the “revolutionary and socialist character of the Cuban revolution”. It is obvious that this is completely false. Just because a certain regime expropriates and nationalizes does not necessarily mean that it is socialist. Quite on the contrary, it can solely mean that the regime in question is launching a maneuver intended at redistributing the property over major means of production in favor of a determined branch of the bourgeoisie. The so-called “public sector” that exists in many capitalist countries and in all revisionist nations also exists in Castroist Cuba. But this is far from being a sign and much less a
“proof” of a supposedly “socialist character”. If this was true than great part of imperialist and/or capitalist countries would be “socialist”. This “nationalized sector” – which is in truth state capitalist - is paid at expenses of working classes in favor of the profits of the bourgeoisie – who rules it for its own purposes and who is the true owner of it. Of course, the ridiculous “popular” phraseology used by many bourgeois-revisionist ideologues relatively to this anti-socialist “public sector” never managed to mislead comrade Enver Hoxha, who genially remarked in its book “Eurocommunism is anticommunism” that:

“As very lengthy experience has already proved, state capitalism is supported and developed by the bourgeoisie, not to create the foundations of socialist society, (…), but to strengthen the foundations of capitalist society, of its bourgeois state, in order to exploit and oppress the working people more. Those who run the «public sector» are not the representatives of the workers, but the men of big capital, those who have the reins of the whole economy and the state in their hands. The social position of the worker in the enterprises of the «public sector» is no different from that of the worker in the private sector; his relationship to the means of production, to the economic management of the enterprise, the policy of investments, pay, etc., is the same. The bourgeois state, i.e., the bourgeoisie, appropriates the profit of these enterprises.” (Enver Hoxha, Eurocommunism is Anticommunism, Tirana, 1980, edition in English)

Indeed, in Cuban case, nationalizations and expropriations of American properties were everything but socialist, they were a mere operation led by Castroist bourgeoisie in order to definitively eliminate the last remnants of power and control that American imperialists and their local lackeys still hold over Cuba in political-economic terms. Indeed, this epoch marked a relevant transition in the status of Castroist bourgeoisie. Before its involvement with Soviet social-imperialism, it was mainly a bourgeoisie of nationalistic type aimed at achieving more favorable conditions within capitalist-imperialist world “market” controlled by bourgeoisie to obtain maximum profits (we had already told this many times). But since Soviet social-imperialists set foot on Cuba, Castroist bourgeoisie transformed itself into a typically oppressive class of compradore type which served the interests of Soviet social-imperialism above everything else. This meant that, in less than three years, Cuba went from being an American neo-colony into being a Soviet neo-colony. Castroist bourgeoisie was a lackey of the new Soviet capitalists as much as former pro-USA bourgeoisie had been of American imperialist bourgeoisie.

But why did this happen? In truth, Castroist bourgeoisie soon understood a very simple thing: that if it persisted in its former plans of an “independent” “nationalist” course, it would be only a question of time before American imperialism managed to recover total control over the island again. This was evident due to many factors. The first one was the economic factor. American imperialist bourgeoisie had ensured that no one of its allies would ever buy sugar from Cuba. For example, they prevented:

"Countries receiving US aid to use these funds to buy sugar from Cuba.” (Keesing's Contemporary Archives, Volume 12, edition in English)

On October 1960, USA officially imposed an embargo / blocus:
"On all exports to Cuba (...)." *(Keesing's Contemporary Archives, Volume 12, edition in English)*

If Castroist bourgeoisie did not manage to be supported by Soviet social-imperialism, it would rapidly fall apart, because monocultural and profit-oriented Cuban economy could never endure such a violent embargo:

"The embargo . . . was intended to serve as a deterrent to other countries (...), that is, to thus protect the interests of US property owners.” *(Lilia Ferro-Clerico & Wayne S. Smith, *The US Trade Embargo*, 1988, edition in English)*

Moreover, USA imperialist bourgeoisie were doing all they could to have their former neo-colony back into their reigns:

"In August 1960 Mr. Richard M. Bissell approached Colonel Sheffield Edwards to determine if the Office of Security had assets that may assist in a sensitive mission requiring gangster-type action. The mission target was the liquidation of Fidel Castro." *(Tad Szulc, *Fidel: A Critical Portrait*, London, 1987, edition in English)*

The retaliatory response of Cuban Castroist bourgeoisie to all these attempts by American imperialism to overthrow it was to expropriate and nationalize more foreign-owned companies and also some Cuban-owned enterprises whose owners were linked with Western imperialisms:

"The Government nationalized all Cuban-owned banks and 382 other companies, including most of the large industrial, commercial and transport companies.” *(Keesing's Contemporary Archives, Volume 12, edition in English)*

"The Government acquired possession of all the 161 mills in Cuba. . . . The other enterprises affected included all textile factories, 8 railways, 47 commercial warehouses, 13 department stores, 11 coffee companies, 6 distilleries, 16 rice mills and 11 cinema circuits.” *(Keesing's Contemporary Archives, Volume 12, edition in English)*

These measures served as retaliation against USA imperialist bourgeois class, against its Western allies who promptly sided with their imperialist master against Castroist regime; and at the same time, these phony alleged “nationalizations” opened the path to the appropriation of all productive means, resources and workforce in Cuba by Soviet social-imperialists and to their total, absolute and exclusive neo-colonialist domination over the island in all aspects and sectors. Indeed, a very important lesson to take from this episode is the destruction of the image provided by Cuban revisionists that American imperialism had allegedly “imposed an economic embargo” and “started trying killing Castro” because Cuba would be a supposed “symbol of a different social system that American imperialists hate” (i.e. “socialism”). This is a complete masquerade organized by Cuban revisionists to deceived working masses: Castro’s capitalist “expropriations” and “nationalizations” and subsequent American retaliations (embargos, killing attempts, etc.) are all included in the context of a rivalry between two imperialist superpowers who strived to take control over Cuba in order to maximize their profits. Nothing more, nothing less than this. Even the famous historical episode of Cuban missile crisis in early 1960’s was also a mere Vie between imperialist USA and
social-imperialist Soviet Union trying to surpass each other in their strive for exploitative domination over world in general and over Cuba in particular.

And Castroist bourgeoisie perception that its reign would not last much longer if it had no support against American bourgeois class was reinforced when American government ended diplomatic relations with Cuba and even more when it organized and launched the well known “Bay of Pigs Invasion” destined at defeating Castroist rule and at reconquer their former exploitative, colonial exclusive and absolute dominance over the island’s means of production and natural, economic and human resources.

"Although the CIA was entrusted with the day-to-day operation of the Cuban counter-revolutionary force, the overall planning was debated in Washington at the highest level by what was called ‘the special group —a group of officials of the State Department, Pentagon, CIA and White House, who met periodically about Cuba.” (Haynes B. Johnson, The Bay of Pigs: The Invasion of Cuba by Brigade 2506, London, 1964, edition in English)

Therefore, operations were organized by top officials of American imperialist bourgeois class with the help of “Cuban exiles” (who still nowadays insist in presenting themselves as “strugglers for democracy and freedom in Cuba” but who are nothing more than members of the Cuban pro-American bourgeoisie compradore trying to reconquer their former class positions and privileges).

Unfortunately for American imperialists, the “Bay of Pigs operation” was a total failure, with more than 1,200 men being captured by Castroist forces. In spite of its failure, the “Bay of Pigs” invasion made clear to Castroist bourgeoisie that other operations similar to that would certainly follow, and if it had the luck of being able to defeat the first of them, perhaps it would not have the same luck with the second. This together with the already mentioned economic and political pressures turned the situation of Castroist bourgeoisie desperate. American imperialism was at that time the most powerful in the world in political-economical-military terms and it was determined in regaining Cuba under its exploitative sway. In this situation, there were only two options for Castroist bourgeoisie: or it surrendered to American imperialism (whose reconquer of control over Cuba would be more or less inevitable) or it sided with someone who could provide it efficient protection and safety against American bourgeoisie. And who could offer this kind of safety against an ultra-powerful superpower? Only another ultra-powerful superpower, of course!

During the epoch of socialism in a single country, if Castroist Cuba was a truly socialist nation, it could have managed to defend itself and to maintain its socialist socio-economic system only by relying on its own forces, as Bolshevik Soviet Union and socialist Albania did. However, as Castroist bourgeoisie installed a capitalist regime, it had to maintain its class tyranny against the will of Cuban toilers. And the truth is that during the first stage of socialism, small countries like Cuba or Albania can only successfully rely on their own forces if they are following an authentically socialist path, if working masses destroy all exploiters, concentrate all means of production in their hands and are led by the proletariat and by a genuine Marxist-Leninist-Stalinist-Hoxhaist party which implements proletarian dictatorship towards socialism and communism. Only in such conditions can a small country resist all kinds of imperialist invasion. Comrade Enver’s Albania was able to do this because it followed a truly
socialist path. On the contrary, Castroist Cuba could have never done this because it remained a capitalist nation which was inherently subjected to imperialist penetration.

It is crystal clear that when opting for putting itself under the domination of Soviet social-imperialism, Castroist bourgeoisie knew very well that it would have to give up its former plans of freely exploiting Cuban workers and resources to its own exclusive advantage, but it had no other option: if it put itself under the sway of Soviet social-imperialism, perhaps it could continue receiving some small share of profits as alms given by Soviet social-imperialists; while if it insisted in facing American imperialism on its own it would rapidly be overthrown and would lose any chance of collecting even the smallest amount of profits and class privileges.

Therefore, as we can conclude, the endless cupidity, arrogance and gluttony of American bourgeoisie contributed greatly to force Castroist bourgeoisie to accept a semi-colonial status under Soviet social-imperialist influence:

"Cuba became much more dependent on the Eastern countries than it had been on the United States.” (Boris Goldenberg, The Cuban Revolution and Latin America, London, 1965, edition in English)

Besides this, the “socialistic” and even “Leninist” rhetoric treacherously used by Soviet social-imperialists may have also pleased Castroist bourgeoisie, who quitted its former openly anti-communist ideology by a social-fascist one better able to mislead, oppress and exploit Cuban workers in accord with the desires of Soviet revisionists. Together with simple rhetoric, Castroist bourgeoisie imported also all the masquerades used by Soviet revisionists not only in their own country but also in the other nations under their sphere of influence and whose objective was to pretend that socialism still existed there (an apparent “Marxist-Leninist” party, “communistic” phraseology, a spurious “centralized” and “nationalized” economy, etc.). Indeed, Soviet social-imperialists knew that this false “socialist” appearance was vital to the maintenance and extension of their sphere of influence, because it permitted to deceive many workers who believed that Soviet Union was still the genuine socialist country that had been under comrades Lenin and Stalin. In this manner, not only they got the support of many parts of toiling masses against other rival imperialisms, but they also avoided genuine socialist revolutions within countries under their dominion, because if the camp of Soviet imperialism was already “socialist”, then proletarians of those nations included in that camp who believed this would never think about doing a socialist revolution or about establishing a proletarian dictatorship – this would not make any sense, since “socialism” and the “proletarian dictatorship” were already allegedly “implemented” there (thus, eternally perpetuating Soviet imperialists’ capitalist, exploitative, oppressive, wage slavagist and tyrannical class rule, allowing them to endlessly maximizing profits). Of course, as time passed and anti-revisionist movement developed, Soviet social-imperialists experimented increasing difficulties in keeping workers away from authentic Marxism-Leninism, but when Castroist bourgeoisie assumed power – in the late 50’s and early 60’s – anti-revisionism was still adapting itself to the new conditions, and therefore the mentioned lies of Soviet social-imperialists were still quite efficient among the majority of world proletarians and workers.

Of course, Soviet social-imperialists also knew that an essential condition to maintain world workers convinced about those lies was that it had to support countries that had
also a “Marxist-Leninist” appearance in order to pretend that Soviet neo-colonialist sphere of influence was truly “socialist”. This was the main reason behind Castroist bourgeoisie sudden “adherence to Marxism-Leninism” in late 1961:

"The revolution in Cuba was officially declared a socialist revolution.” (Blas Roca, *New Stage in the Cuban Revolution*, 1961, edition in English)

Castroist bourgeoisie understood clearly that if he wanted to enjoy from the protection of Soviet social-imperialism against American imperialism, it had to give a “socialist” appearance to its own class reign. Otherwise, support from Soviet capitalists-imperialists would not be granted and the menaces of American bourgeoisie would continue reigning like a Damocles’ sword over the heads of Castroist bourgeoisie. As bourgeois ideologues recognize:

"Castro soon saw . . . that the Soviets were not likely to provide the defense umbrella he wanted unless Cuba was a “Marxist-Leninist” state. Only then would there be an imperative for them to come to his defense. Thus, (…) in a transparent effort to force the Soviets to guarantee Cuba's security, Castro declared his revolution to be socialist.” (Wayne S. Smith, *US-Cuba Relations: Twenty-Five Years of Hostility, 1959-1984*, 1985, edition in English)

Giving a false “socialistic” appearance to Castroist regime allowed Soviet revisionists to affirm that they were “helping a fraternal Marxist-Leninist country”, thus justifying and legitimizing Cuba’s economy submersion in Soviet imperialist credits and exploitative “aids” through the use of fake “communist phraseology”. Relatively to this, comrade Enver noted that:

“The Soviet revisionists are disguised capitalists. They betrayed socialism. The Soviet revisionists provide “aid” to other countries, but they do this from imperialist positions, while a socialist country is always inspired by Marxism-Leninism and by fair internationalist reasons when helping the others.” (Enver Hoxha, *Conversation with a delegation coming from the Popular Republic of Congo (Brazzaville)*, October 1970, edition in English)

“Soviet social-imperialism even conceals its expansionist aims under the slogan of «aid for the proletarian revolution».” (Enver Hoxha, *Reflections on China*, volume II, Tirana, edition in English)

And indeed, consequences of Soviet imperialist domination over Cuba were plainly visible in the fact that it only reinforced basic inequalities of Cuban economy and of its monocultural and unilateral character. Comrade Enver noted this:

“Although the capital investments by the imperialist states in Latin America led to the setting up of some modern industry, particularly the extracting industry as well as light and food processing industry, these investments have been a very great hindrance to the general economic development of the Latin-American countries. The foreign monopolies and the neo-colonialist policy of the imperialist states have given the economic development of these countries a distorted, one-sided form, a mono-cultural character, turning them simply into specialized suppliers of raw materials: Venezuela - oil, Bolivia - tin, Chile copper, Brazil and
Colombia - coffee, Cuba, Haiti and the Dominican Republic - sugar, Uruguay and Argentina - livestock products, Equador bananas, and so on.” (Enver Hoxha, *Imperialism and the Revolution*, Tirana, 1979, edition in English)

Thus, Cuba became a giant sugar plantation even more than it had been under American rule. These kind of neo-colonial relations didn’t allow that Cuba could ever build a diversified industrial base, because Soviet social-imperialists would never allow that Cuba could become truly independent by managing to fabricate its own means of production through the development of heavy industry. And Castroist bourgeoisie did everything it could to please their new Soviet masters to keep itself in power. It intensified greatly the production of sugar for export. That’s why in August of 1963:

"Castro announced . . . that his whole new economic policy was postulated on a spectacular increase in sugar production, aimed at reaching 10 million tons by 1970 (thus doubling 1950’s sugar production). Agricultural diversification went backward instead of forward. For example, rice production had advanced to a high point of 181,000 tons in 1957, two years before Castro, and plunged to 95,400 tons in 1962, after three years of Castro.” (Theodore Draper, *Castroism: Theory and Practice*, 1965, edition in English)

This economic neo-colonial exploitative subservience towards Moscow capitalists demanded that Castroist bourgeoisie engineered plans:

"Which provided for an increase in sugar production by 35-40% to reach some 8.7 million tons by 1980.” (Keessing's Contemporary Archives, Volume 22, edition in English)

These megalomaniac plans of the Castroists were a failure. In 1977-1978, Cuba produced around 6 million tons of sugar – little more than half the values Castroists had fixed to be attained in 1970. This was due to the lack of modernized infrastructures of Cuban economy that still subjected it to weather causalities. But Cuban revisionists were determined at following their monocultural neo-colonial course. Cuban social-fascist ideologue Rafael Rodriguez once affirmed that “it is better to produce sugar to buy rice than to try to produce both sugar and rice.” As can be observed, this stand is in total opposition with development in Bolshevist Soviet Union and in Socialist Albania, where economy was diversified while always giving priority to heavy industry of means of production in order to ensure country’s total independence from foreign imperialism and from bourgeois-capitalist-revisionist world.

On the contrary, Cuba had been forced to put its economy in total accord with the interests of Soviet social-imperialists who were now treating Cuba as an appendix of their imperialist economic world: the affirmations we made in the beginning of this article relatively to economic conditions in Cuba during American rule are also entirely applicable to the epoch of Soviet social-imperialist rule (with the eventual safeguard that Soviet social-imperialist dominance over Cuban was, in certain aspects, even more intense than that of American imperialism).

And what about Che Guevara? What were his positions relatively to Cuban subjection towards Soviet social-imperialism?
During many decades, all sorts of myths surrounding Guevara have circulated, most of them invented by capitalists and revisionists. In order to keep workers away from authentic communist ideology, world bourgeoisie fabricates petty-bourgeois “leftist” idols like Guevara. Guevara’s legends still populate the minds of many workers around the world, so it is important to destroy these false impressions which only serve the predatory interests of world dominant classes. Guevara’s image has even become a veritable commercial product, another instrument of profit in the hands of capitalists of all kinds. For example, Swiss capitalist multinational monopoly Swatch recently launched a watch with Guevara’s portrait. Even government of Carlos Menem, which is known for its prompt assistance to American imperialism in the Gulf War I and for its unconditional subservience towards world finance capital and its social-Darwinist World Monetary Fund, demanded that Che should be celebrated because “he was a great Argentinean”. Especially among young workers, there is much talk about Guevara’s alleged “heroic, courageous and rebel Marxist personality” and about his “unconditional opposition to imperialism and oppression”. However, experience teaches us that one of the parameters that distinguishes true anti-revisionists from false “anti-revisionists” is the stand adopted towards Che Guevara. In fact, we note that many of alleged “anti-revisionists” that do not spare efforts in hiding behind “Marxist-Leninist” and even “Stalinist” masks do not hesitate in openly defending Che. For example, the site: http://espressostalinist.wordpress.com/category/revisionism/castroism/, is one of those phoney “anti-revisionist” sites that pretend to be defending true socialism and communism. The referred site even apparently praises comrade Enver’s socialist Albania and talks about “the 5 Heads of Marxism-Leninism” (although it does not recognize Enver Hoxha as a Classic, but only refers to his “valuable contributions to Marxism-Leninism” – therefore, to unmask this site means also to contribute to the implementation of our 2013 slogan: "Down with the 4 and 1/2ists!") The 4 and 1/2ists are those who don’t recognize comrade Enver as the 5th Classic of Marxism-Leninism, but only as someone who made “enriching contributions” to it. This stand is synonym of complete anti-communism because to refuse one of the Classics means to reject all of them as a whole. Contrary to the neo-revisionists of the “Expresso Stalinists”, we cannot merely consider comrade Enver Hoxha as having made mere “valuable contributions” to communist movement and ideology. It is absolutely necessary and indispensable to recognize him as the authentic 5th Classic of Marxism-Leninism-Stalinism-Hoxhaism, as the proletarian leader that truly developed of the teachings of Marx, Engels, Lenin and Stalin after the death of this last one and in the context of world capitalist-imperialist-revisionist encirclement). The referred site publishes amounts of apparently “anti-revisionist” slogans and articles, including some allegedly criticizing “Castroist revisionism”. But far from being anti-revisionist, this site is in fact neo-revisionist (“anti-revisionist” in words, but revisionist in deeds). One of the major proofs of this is precisely the unwavering defence of Guevarist revisionism that is made by the site:

“(…) the best revolutionary in the Cuban movement was Che, since he both upheld Stalin and sided with the Sino-Albanian bloc during the Sino-Soviet Split.” (http://espressostalinist.wordpress.com/category/revisionism/castroism/, Cuban Revisionism, 2011, version in English)

This statement is illustrative of the kind of “arguments” utilized by the site’s editors to justify their embrace of Guevarist revisionism. In first place, Che never upheld
comrade Stalin from truly Marxist-Leninist positions. All he said was that Krushchevists had condemned Stalin because they had been mislead by “imperialist propaganda”. This position from Che has long been used by its defenders to give him a more “anti-revisionist” outlook. However, if we pay attention, far from truly defending comrade Stalin’s legacy, Che is in fact excusing Khrushchev revisionists from having prevented communist construction in Soviet Union. With his position, Che is trying to pass an image of innocent ingenuous Krushchevists being cunningly deceived by Western imperialism who had supposedly maliciously forced them to make their infamous anti-Stalin report. Needless to say that this is completely false. Krushchev revisionists knew very well what they were doing, they acted with the clear purpose of restoring capitalist exploitation and wage slavery in Soviet Union and they successfully did it. It is true that they could have been encouraged by Western imperialists’ lies, but it would be ridiculous to think that Krushchevists would have been some kind of deceived “victims” of anti-Stalinist calumnies. Indeed, with his positions, Che tries to give the idea that “Khrushchevist intentions were good, but they were misled by Western imperialism.” Despite their attempts, pressures and contributions to capitalist restoration in Soviet Union, Western imperialists-capitalists cannot be blamed more than Krushchevists themselves for elimination of socialism in that country. Krushchevists revisionists indeed acted as defendants of the interests of world imperialism in general and of Western imperialism in particular, but they annihilated Soviet socialist society consciently and deliberately; and not as inoffensive well-intentioned “victims” that would have been mislead by world imperialism-capitalism. With this kind of positions, Che is in fact promoting reconciliation with Soviet revisionism in general and with Khrushchev in particular. And we must not forget that Che publicly took this stand in the middle 60’s, when anti-revisionist movement was growing and unmasking the pro-capitalist aims of Soviet revisionists. In this context, Krushchevists and the other Soviet revisionists needed someone with a certain “anti-revisionist” and “revolutionary” phraseology that could deviate workers from that movement and bring them back to the claws of Soviet bourgeois-capitalist-imperialist clique. And the ideal person soon appeared: it was Che Guevara, who preached reconciliation with Krushchevists by depicting them as good communists who had naively succumbed to the sneaky anti-Stalinist strategy of Western imperialists. What Guevara says is that capitalist-imperialist restoration in Soviet Union through destruction of socialism was not Krushchevists’ fault, therefore there is no reason to reject them as anti-socialists. Instead, true anti-revisionists should unite with Krushchevists, thus being subjected to the poisonous influence of their bourgeois-reactionary pro-capitalist anti-communist theories. From this, the path is open to full reconciliation and acceptance of Khrushchev/Soviet revisionism in particular and of revisionism in general. So, we can conclude that also with his fake “defense of Stalin”, Che was in fact doing his utmost to defend Khrushchevism and to serve the interests of Soviet revisionists in infiltrating and destroying the world anti-revisionist movement through presenting themselves as having nothing to do with capitalist-imperialist restoration neither with socialism’s destruction in Soviet Union (by the way, the manner in which Guevara blames Western imperialism for this is also very convenient to Soviet revisionists, because while “freeing” them from responsibility for socialisms’ disappearance in Soviet Union in front of the most conscient workers’ eyes, it also allows them to direct the anger of these anti-revisionists workers towards Western imperialism – which was their main rival in the context of their own social-imperialist ascension). And it is this that the neo-revisionists of the “Expresso Stalinist site” (what a
ridiculous name…) dare to present as being “proof of Guevara’s anti-revisionist defence of Stalin”!

And what about Guevara’s supposed adherence to the so-called “Sino-Albanian bloc”? Once more, Che did not do this from truly Marxist-Leninist anti-revisionist stands. As we will see soon, Che fully supported Khrushchevist neo-colonization of Cuba and even publicly defended that Cuban economy should be totally shaped and organized in accord with the interests of Soviet imperialists. Here it is what “anti-imperialist” and “nonconformist” Guevara said about Soviet social-imperialist barbarous penetration in Cuba which accentuated the country’s configuration as a massive sugar provider:

"We must change our entire system of production to adapt it to those countries that supply us with (...) materials." (Ernesto Che Guevara cited in: Boris Goldenberg, The Cuban Revolution and Latin America, London, 1965, edition in English)

And who were the countries who supplied Cuba with materials in exchange for sugar at that time? They were the countries of the so-called “Eastern bloc”, that is, the satellite countries under the neo-colonial rule of Soviet imperialism. So, Guevara is demanding that everything in Cuban economy should be rethinked and readapted in order to serve the profit maximization of Soviet capitalists in the most efficient possible manner. As can be concluded, he was not even in the least worried about Cuban workers in general and about Cuban proletarians in particular, let alone with the advancement of socialist revolution – all he wanted was to satisfy his Soviet bosses. And we must never forget that Soviet social-imperialism was as bloody, as greedy, as exploitative, as reactionary, as pro-capitalist and as anti-communist as American imperialism, for example. In essence they are just equal. This is very interesting because most of those who assume themselves as Guevarists love to claim their “firm opposition to American imperialism”, when the truth is that their detestable “hero” defended an imperialism which was at least as predatory as American imperialism. Indeed, in a certain sense, it was even more hypocritical than this last one because while American imperialists always openly assumed their anti-communism, Soviet social-imperialists treacherously used phony “Marxist-Leninist” phraseology to mislead world workers in order to conquer new neo-colonial “spheres of influence” and to maximize their profits.

Anyway, as time passed, we note that Che suffered disappointment relatively to the actions of Soviet imperialists. In fact, Che was a defender of the interests of “radical” sections of national bourgeoisie. He participated in 1959 Cuban anti-socialist bourgeois-capitalist pseudo-revolution at the side of Cuban national bourgeoisie against American imperialism, but he wrongly thought that Cuban experience would serve as an example to “radical” sections of the national bourgeoisie in other countries. In fact, Castroist Cuba started to follow a neo-colonialist path of subservience towards Soviet social-imperialism. In the beginning, Che favoured this penetration and perceived it as a mere help to reconstruct Cuban ruined economy. Che’s alleged “criticisms” and “disagreements” with Soviet revisionists started when he realized that Soviet “comrades” were imperialists just like all others: they wanted to establish exclusive socio-economic-political dominion over Cuba and to transform it into another of their neo-colonial satellites. On the contrary, Che wanted Cuban national bourgeoisie to freely exploit the island as it pleased without interferences from world imperialist powers. Che represented that faction of Cuban national bourgeoisie which insisted in facing the pressures of American imperialist bourgeoisie all alone and whose hopes of
getting all profits for itself without having to give them to foreign imperialists—capitalists suffered great disillusion when the bourgeois factions around Castro accepted Soviet neo-colonialism in return for protection and maintenance in power.

Moreover, Che also noted that it was not only in Cuba that far from helping world national “anti-imperialist” bourgeoisie to get rid of imperialist competitors for profits, Soviet revisionists were themselves engaged in their own imperialist profitable expansion and were preventing those “radical” national bourgeoisie from accomplishing their class objectives. Such is the origin of so-called “Guevara’s opposition to Soviet imperialism”. Che once described Soviet trade policy towards Cuba and other undeveloped countries as being “imperial exploitation” not because he was attacking Soviet revisionism and imperialism from truly Marxist-Leninist positions, but because he defended that the right to exploit each country’s resources, means of production and workforce in search for profit maximization should belong to each nation’s national bourgeoisie and not to foreign imperialist powers (of course that this goal is condemned to fail, because on one side, while capitalism exists, imperialism is always inevitable and there will always be imperialist powers plundering the other nations against the interests of national bourgeoisie. But on the other side, as there are no alternatives neither “third ways” besides capitalism and socialism, when world socialist revolution finally triumphs, national bourgeoisie will be eliminated and annihilated as exploitative classes, thus also frustrating Guevara’s aims. As can be concluded, Che’s pro-national bourgeois purposes are destined to fail anyway).

And by the way, contrary to what the neo-revisionists of the “Expresso Stalinist” site affirm, Che never had anything to do with the principled combat that Albanian Marxist-Leninists consistently waged against Soviet revisionism and social-imperialism. During his life, Guevara ignored and despised comrade Enver’s socialist Albania. On the contrary, Che deeply sympathised with Maoist China and he never lost an opportunity to eulogize it because he saw it as the fulfilment of his own dreams: a nation whose national bourgeoisie managed to truly defeat bourgeois compradore and to get rid from foreign imperialist yoke while establishing itself as the absolute dominant class freely exploiting and oppressing Chinese workers (indeed, by that time, Chinese national bourgeoisie was even preparing the grounds for its own imperialist ascension through the transformation of China into a superpower – as we had already explained in DWM I, II and III, Mao’s fake “anti-Khrushchevist” struggle was due to the fact that Chinese revisionists wanted to replace Krushchevists as leaders of world social-fascist movement in order to mislead world workers in favour of their own imperialist aims). It was this that Che wanted to have happened in Cuba. But reality was in total opposition with what he had idealized: Cuba had become a Soviet neo-colony and most part of the country’s national bourgeoisie had abandoned its former plans of independent course in favour of subservience towards Soviet imperialism. Today’s neo-revisionists love to depict Che’s departure of Cuba in the mid 1960’s as being proof of the “opposition between him and Castro”. Also accordingly with the social-fascists of the “Expresso Stalinist” site, “Marxist-Leninist” Guevara would be in disagreement with revisionist Castro, when the truth is that both of them were completely pro-capitalist. The only difference was that Castro and the bourgeois factions that supported him were ready to content themselves with some alms given by Soviet imperialists in exchange for being kept at power against American imperialism. They did not mind about forgetting their former plans of an “independent” course in favour of letting Cuba become a Soviet neo-colony. On the other side, Guevara defended that Cuban national bourgeoisie should not
give up its aims of controlling its own country in its entirety without interferences from foreign imperialist powers. This is why neo-revisionists of the “Expresso Stalinist” affirm that “Guevara rebelled against Castro’s pro-Soviet policies”. In order to “prove” their affirmations, they publish this quotation from Guevara:

“I see this Movement (Castro’s 26th July movement) as one of the many inspired by the bourgeoisie’s desire to free themselves from the economic chains of imperialism. (…) It is in that spirit that I joined the struggle; (…) ready to leave when the conditions of the struggle would shift toward the right.” (Ernesto Che Guevara cited in: http://espressostalinist.wordpress.com/category/revisionism/castroism/, Cuban Revisionism, 2011, version in English)

Unfortunately to the neo-revisionists of the mentioned site, if this citation proves something, it is the correctness of our own words: Che is here assuming that he participated in Cuban 1959 anti-socialist pseudo-revolution with the goal of helping Cuban “radical” national bourgeoisie getting rid of American imperialist enslavement in order to be able to accumulate the profits coming from the exploitation of Cuban labourers in its own hands. And relatively to Che’s assertion that “I was ready to leave when conditions of the struggle would shift toward the right”, it merely indicates that Guevara predicted that perhaps his aims would not be fulfilled and that he understood that most elements of the Cuban national bourgeoisie would promptly surrender their former projects of “independent path” in favour of any imperialism able to safeguard them against American imperialist bourgeoisie that continued trying to reconquer Cuba. Our affirmations are further buttressed by Che’s famous statement at the United Nations on December 11, 1964:

“We have maintained that peaceful coexistence among nations does not include coexistence between exploiters and the exploited.” (Ernesto Che Guevara cited in: http://espressostalinist.wordpress.com/category/revisionism/castroism/, Che Guevara’s Writings Against Soviet Revisionism, 2011, version in English)

Of course, neo-revisionists of the “Expresso Stalinist” present this assertion from Che as some kind of confirmation that Guevara would have indeed been opposed to Khrushchevist theory of the “peaceful coexistence” between capitalism and socialism. But if we pay attention to it, we will note that when mentioning the “exploiters and exploited”, Guevara is not referring to two groups of people, but to two groups of countries/nations: the ones which exploit (the imperialist ones) and the ones which are exploited (the non-imperialist ones). Instead of rejecting peaceful coexistence between exploiters and exploited in every country and as a whole, Che is here promoting the “anti-imperialist” struggle of the exploited nations. But within each exploited nation there are also exploiters, namely the bourgeoisie. And what is the faction of the exploitative classes within exploited nations that aims at defeating foreign imperialism? It is the national bourgeoisie, who inclusively uses “revolutionary” slogans with the goal of winning workers’ support against foreign imperialism by making them believe that, just like them, national bourgeoisie is also part of the “exploited” and therefore its interests are the same of those of toiling classes. With this objective, “radical” and “patriotic” bourgeoisie deceives workers with false “anti-imperialist” phraseology to hide the fact that despite its “leftist” shibboleths, it is as oppressive, as predatory and as anti-communist as any other faction of the exploitative classes. So, Che is advocating
that world national bourgeoisie should struggle against imperialist powers in order to win the right of freely exploit and repress the workers in their respective nations without having to see the profits going to the hands of foreign imperialists. Che even affirmed that national bourgeoisie should never give up this goal even if its fulfilment “costs millions of atomic victims” (to use Guevara’s own words - of course, we Stalinists-Hoxhaists, defend the same relatively to the accomplishment of world socialism and world communism, but we do this in order to permit the total and definitive emancipation of workers and not to allow that a certain faction of the bourgeoisie can maximize profits. Even in this, Guevara is just equal to all other capitalists and imperialists, who don’t hesitate in murdering zillions if that ensures them maximum profit accumulation).

Let’s repeat that we, Stalinists-Hoxhaists, refuse theory of “peaceful coexistence” between exploiters and exploited as a whole and also between exploiters and exploited within every nation, be it imperialist or not, because contrary to Che we don’t defend the greedy interests of national bourgeoisie around the world.

And relatively to Che’s alleged “condemnation” of the implementation of “market socialism” (that is, of capitalism) in the “Eastern bloc” that is presented by the neo-revisionists of “Expresso Stalinist” as a supposed “sign of Guevara’s anti-revisionism”, Che was not in the least worried about the return of exploitation, oppression and alienation in result of capitalist-imperialist restoration in those countries. He was only concerned about the fact that if capitalist-imperialist restoration was too open and explicit, this could cause workers to understand that those countries were not socialist anymore and that all sufferings and troubles that were being brought upon them were a consequence of revisionist deviations that implemented capitalism-imperialism again. Guevara was a staunch defender of state capitalism as the best manner to hide the exploitative and oppressive nature of bourgeois-capitalist and pro-imperialist social-fascist states under “red Marxist-Leninist” disguises and he feared that adoption of “Yugoslav model” and of classic capitalism would make workers realize what revisionism truly is and would cause them to embrace true communist and anti-revisionist ideology (thus abolishing the existence of all exploitative classes around the world, including of national bourgeoisie).

The neo-revisionists from the “Expresso Stalinist” site think they can mislead world proletarians with this kind of lies, but they are profoundly mistaken. Che remains one of the main ideologues of Cuban revisionism/social-fascism. Their defence of Guevarist revisionism and anti-communism completely unmask neo-revisionist “Expresso Stalinist” site and causes its ridiculous “orthodox Stalinist” and “anti-revisionist pro-Hoxhaist” cloaks to fall apart. This site is totally infected with anti-communist, pro-capitalist and anti-Stalinist-Hoxhaist poison. World workers perfectly know that its “denouncement” of Castroist revisionism is a total masquerade:

“Cuba’s system is much more progressive than the savage neo-liberal policies pursued by the rest of the US client states in Latin America. (…) We must (…) uphold its right to self-determination in the face of the half-century-long embargo against Cuba designed to hamper its success as a more leftist political system.” (http://espressostalinist.wordpress.com/category/revisionism/castroism/, Cuban Revisionism, 2011, version in English)
In first place, it is false that Cuban social-fascist system is more progressive than pro-American neo-liberal fascist dictatorships. Of course, fascism is not at all "progressive" and therefore, logically, one kind of fascism (social-fascism, in this case) cannot be "more progressive" than all others. Neo-revisionists from the “Expresso Stalinist” are shamelessly promoting the cloaks and lies fabricated by Castroists to convince workers that Cuban revisionist regime is socialist when in truth it is fascist disguised under “socialist” masks – that is, social-fascism. With this, they are in fact affirming that social-fascism (of which Castroist Cuba is a blatant example) is better than the other formats of fascism, when the truth is that to say that fascism is worse than social-fascism means to be totally submerged in the darkest anti-communism. All types of fascism are worse; the content and all their consequences for the working class are equally worse. Or we accept all kinds of fascism (including social-fascism) or we reject all kinds of fascism (including social-fascism). It is not possible to condemn fascism without completely condemning all its formal types, including social-fascism, of course. In exchange, to defend one of them is to defend all, as neo-revisionists from “Expresso Stalinist” do. After all, all types of fascism are substantially equal and share the same objectives. That is why it is impossible to have a double standard relatively to them: or we support all of them or we condemn and refuse all of them. There may be different forms of fascism, but their bourgeois-capitalist class content is totally equal. They are historical phenomena and always changing there forms accordingly to the development of the subjective and objective factors of the particularities of a capitalist society (particularities of the crisis of the bourgeoisie) – however: in essence, in character, in nature - they are all identical – they are the expression of the counter-revolutionary character of the brutal bourgeois exploitative and wage slavagist oppressive dictatorship [both the changing from "democracy" to fascism and the change of different forms of fascism (and vice versa) depends on many objective and subjective factors - last not least on the level of the consciousness of the working class and its actual, objective strength as a revolutionary class. Neither we communists nor the working class have any choice of "preferring" the form of fascism we like to combat at best. We have to prepare the working class for the revolutionary destruction of fascism independently from its special formal appearance. We have to work out our special strategy and tactics according to every different form or changing forms of the bourgeois dictatorship].

Therefore, by defending social-fascism (respectively, its Cuban version) as being a “progressive” order, neo-revisionists from “Expresso Stalinists” are indeed also defending fascism as a whole (namely, all its different formats). As all formal types of fascism are substantially equal, to defend one is automatically synonym of also supporting all others, even because what is not truly revolutionary is necessarily reactionary: between all different formats of fascism, a position which defends one of them is automatically reactionary (even if that position pretends to “condemn” the others, this doesn’t change its reactionary character). Concluding, the neo-revisionists from “Expresso Stalinist” are criticizing fascism as a whole in words, but are defending it in deeds through their treacherous depiction of capitalist, exploitative, repressive and wage slavagist social-fascism as being a “progressive” system.

Of course, this does not prevent us from concluding that there can be certain cases when social-fascism can difficult the revolutionary task of spreading our Marxist-Leninist-Stalinist-Hoxhaist ideology and of promoting the acquisition of a genuinely communist consciousness among proletarians and workers. For example, on one side, we have Castroist social-fascist tyranny, with its “red” masks whose goal is making Cuban
labourers believe that the totalitarian bourgeois-capitalist tyranny which is oppressing them is “socialism”. Taking into account that most (not to say all) of Cuban workers never experimented true socialism, that they do not have adequate information about Bolshevist Soviet Union and about Socialist Albania, that they lack any kind of Stalinist-Hoxhaist ideological formation, we have to admit that the lies of the Cuban revisionists about “socialist construction in Cuba” have good probabilities of successfully convincing Cuban proletarians and workers. In these conditions, it is normal that Cuban toilers see “socialism” as a repressive and exploitative order that denies them freedom, while Western-type capitalism appears as a “system of liberty”. American imperialist propaganda also contributes to the spreading of this false image. This is the origin of the fascination that many Cuban workers feel towards American capitalism (although their enthusiasm quickly dies when they realize that there is an abyssal difference between what American imperialist bourgeois class affirms to be and what it truly is). Therefore, it can be more difficult for us to convince Cuban workers about the correctness of our Marxism-Leninist-Stalinist-Hoxhaist ideology, because first we have to show those workers that we are defenders of genuine socialism and not of Castroism; that Cuban revisionist exploitative oppressive tyranny has absolutely nothing to do with true socialism/communism and that we are indeed in opposition to Cuban social-fascism and want its definitive annihilation.

On the other side, it is much easier to attract to our authentically communist ideology those workers who live in the pro-American fascist neo-liberal regimes of Latin America. And this because these regimes must display - to a certain degree - the predatory class character of the capitalist state in front of the eyes of the workers in a more open way, without so many of the subterfuges and masks used by social-fascisms in general and by Cuban social-fascism in particular, thus allowing workers to see wage slavagist order as it really is, thus understanding that a better life can only come through elimination of the capitalist-imperialist system. So, what of these anti-communist regimes are easier to unmask? What of them show the inherent and inevitable predatory, reactionary, exploitative, oppressive and anti-communist character of the capitalist state in a more explicit manner in front of the workers? What of them are more able to facilitate the acquisition of a genuine communist conscience and embracement of Stalinism-Hoxhaism? These last ones, of course. The truth is that there is no pure form of fascism just like there is no pure form of social-fascism (these pure forms only exist in theoretical constructions) and that even "open" fascism makes use of different hidden masks with the purpose of deceiving the working classes (it is well known that, for example, Hitler-Fascism was hidden behind national-'socialism'. Indeed, bourgeoisie would avoid establishing pure fascism due to its obvious historical negative lessons and its rejection by the working class – and even by the petty-bourgeoisie). We should not underestimate the negative influence of new “progressive” cloaks of some reactionary regimes in Latin America, such as in Morales’ Bolivia, in Chavist Venezuela, etc. [indeed, these bourgeois-capitalist regimes which are turning their countries into neo-colonies of Chinese imperialism attempt at hiding their exploitative, repressive, oppressive, pro-imperialist and anti-communist class nature by depicting themselves as being “great friends” of bourgeois-capitalist-revisionist wage slavagist Cuba with the aim of taking advantage of the country’s fake “red socialist” masks and of its supposed “combat against American imperialism” (which, by the way, is presently the main rival of Chinese imperialism in the quest for maximum profits through exclusive dominance over world resources, markets and workforce. As can be observed, once more these regimes are acting in complete consonance with the predatory class interests and aims.
of Chinese social-fascist and social-imperialist monopolist bourgeoisie in discrediting and destroying American imperialism) to present themselves as also being “anti-imperialist” and even “socialist”. Accordingly with these bourgeois-capitalist Latin-American regimes, their “friendship” with Castroist oppressive, social-fascist, exploitative and pro-imperialist Cuban regime would automatically mean that they are also allegedly “socialist”]. Concerning Brazil, we have already fulfilled this task successfully (see: Down with Brazilian Neo-Revisionism!). It is our duty to unmask the reactionary character of these regimes (which hide behind slogans of "social reforms" or even "socialist" phraseology), with the same intensity with which we unmask Cuban social-fascism. The more enlightened the masses of Latin America are and the more politically conscious they become, the more the reactionary regimes are forced to deceive the working masses with phony "socialist" phrases.

Generally speaking, the unmasking of social-fascism is more difficult for the working class because it is disguised fascism - thus hidden behind the mask of "socialism". Therefore, a Stalinist-Hoxhaist organization is indispensable for the working class, for the necessary purpose of the total unmasking of social-fascism. The socialist revolution is the only alternative for the abolition of the inevitability of all kinds of fascism, inclusively the forms of social-fascism.

Indeed, this perfectly applies to the replacement of Batista-fascism (which, by the way, also used many “popular” masks to deceive workers) by Castroist social-fascism. To avoid another new form of Cuban fascism, the socialist revolution and the dictatorship of the proletariat is needed for the construction of socialism - as the only guaranteed bulwark against the inevitability of all kinds of fascism.

In the general-line of the Comintern (SH) we wrote:

"Our goal is the abolition of the inevitability of social-fascism. This means - to destroy the influence of neo-revisionism (like happens with the "Expresso Stalinist" site, which defends and paves the way to social-fascism). The guaranteed abolition of the inevitability of social-fascism is only possible by means of the socialist world revolution." (Documents of the Comintern (Stalinist-Hoxhaist), General-Line of the Comintern (SH), 2001, version in English)

In fact, the experiences with periods of different forms of fascism help the working class to draw more easily its conclusions about the general nature of fascism and the meaning of the inevitability of fascism as long as the bourgeoisie is in power. The only alternative for the abolition of the inevitability of fascism – no matter its different formal appearances:

- THAT IS THE SOCIALIST REVOLUTION OF THE WORKING CLASS!

And what about the assertion that “we have to support Cuba because American embargo against it has the purpose of destroying a different leftist political system”? This statement is totally reactionary. By saying this, neo-revisionists of the “Expresso Stalinist” are in fact promoting the Cuban revisionist myth according to which social-fascist Cuba would represent a “different leftist system” (that is, socialism) in opposition to the one symbolized by American capitalist-imperialist bourgeois class. In
truth, the purpose of American embargo against Cuba is not to destroy an allegedly “different social system”, because there are no substantial differences between Castroist capitalism and American capitalism. Its aim is to regain former absolute and exclusive colonial dominion over Cuba, is to install there a pro-American puppet regime entirely faithful to the interests and desires of American tycoons. Nothing more than this.

And as if this was not enough, the neo-revisionists of the “Expresso Stalinist” pretend to “criticize Castroism” on one side, but on the other side they publish praises to Castro and to Cuban anti-socialist “revolution” on their wicked site (see: Happy 86th, Fidel Castro Ruz and PCMLE: Fidel Castro Ruz, the most outstanding soldier of the Cuban revolutionary process). In fact, while affirming to “denounce Castroism”, neo-revisionist site “Expresso Stalinist” is indeed promoting reconciliation with it.

But let’s return to our criticisms against Guevara. The legends and myths surrounding Guevara and his participation in the implementation of Cuban social-fascism are also constantly used by Cuban revisionists to romanticize their anti-socialist regime. As the brilliant 5th Classic of Marxism-Leninism, comrade Enver soon understood who Guevara truly was. We have already quoted this statement from comrade Enver about Guevara in a lot of occasions, but we will do it once more because it is always worthwhile:

“Who was Che Guevara? (…) He was a rebel, a revolutionary, but not a Marxist Leninist as they try to present him. (…) The views of Che Guevara and anyone else who poses as a Marxist and claims "paternity" of these ideas have never been or had anything to do with Marxism-Leninism. (…)” (Enver Hoxha, The Fist of the Marxist-Leninist Communists Must Also Smash Left Adventurism, the Offspring of Modern Revisionism [From a conversation with two leaders of the Communist Party (Marxist-Leninist) of Ecuador], 21st October of 1968, edition in English)

With this affirmation, comrade Enver managed to give a perfect description of Guevarism’s essence in only a few words. And Guevara was – together with Castro – also one of the main defenders of Castroist Cuba’s “integration” in the so-called “socialist international division of labor”:

"In his report on his Soviet tour on June 4, 1963 Castro made known that an international division of labor' was necessary.” (Theodore Draper, Castroism: Theory and Practice, 1965, edition in English)

This “socialist international division of labor” is a pseudo-Marxist term invented by Soviet revisionists in order to hide the fact that they were leading a typically exploitative and neo-colonialist world empire whose goal was to accumulate assets and profits through leading the economy of each country under their sway towards a perilous specialization only in those products which were profitable in accord with the interests of the new Soviet capitalists. This was what also occurred with Cuba and with its sugar production. Comrade Enver understood very well what the “socialist international division of labor” imposed by Soviet revisionists was all about:

“(…) the Party of Labour of Albania has resolutely condemned and denounced the treacherous line of the Khrushchevite revisionists, who, for their own nationalist and chauvinist interests, have tried and are trying to impose an anti-socialist
economic policy with capitalist and imperialist aims (...). Under the disguise of the so-called international division of labor, specialization and cooperation, the Khrushchevite revisionists are trying to obstruct the real industrialization of these countries to exploit them as sources of agricultural and mineral raw materials and as markets for the sale of industrial goods, to make them economically dependent and, on this basis, to undermine their economic and political independence, force them to submit to the revisionist dictate.” (Enver Hoxha, Report to the 5th Congress of the PLA, November 1966, edition in English)

“(…) Soviet Union is implementing a typically neo-colonialist policy. The economies of these countries (Soviet satellites) have been transformed into appendages of the Soviet economy. (…) The revisionist-imperialist «theories» on «the socialist community», «the socialist division of labor», «limited sovereignty», «socialist economic integration», etc., also, serve this neo-colonialist policy.” (Enver Hoxha, Imperialism and the Revolution, Tirana, 1979, edition in English)

So, we wonder: where is the famous “revolutionary courage” so many times attributed to Guevara? We sincerely hope that this text can contribute to elucidate all those who erroneously think that wearing a Che Guevara t-shirt is synonym of being a Marxist-Leninist. It is time for the world workers to definitively get rid of Guevara’s revisionism through full embracement of the only truly revolutionary and communist ideology: Marxism-Leninism-Stalinism-Hoxhaism.

And equally amazing are the declarations of other Castroist leaders to justify their complete subservience towards Soviet imperialism:

"We are now aware that we can overcome monoculture solely by developing that same monoculture further.” (Alban Lataste in Borba (Struggle), 28 December 1964, edition in English)

So, in accord with Cuban revisionists, neo-colonial dependence on monoculture can be overcome through … intensifying it more and more! This astonishing phrase was said during a bilateral conference between Cuban revisionists and Yugoslav revisionists. And this is quite natural because only perverse revisionists can understand each other. Indeed, Castroism and Titoism have a lot in common, especially in what respects to their refusal of party leadership in revolution through relegating it to mere “orienting” functions:

“What are the functions of the party? They are orienting functions. The party orientates in all aspects.” (Fidel Castro, Revolution Cubaine, translated from version in French language)

To this, we will let the 5th Classic of Marxism-Leninism answer by us. In his great book “Yugoslav self-administration, capitalist theory and practice”, comrade Enver literally demolishes Titoist social-fascist ideology in its fundamentals and declares something which can be considered as a direct reply to Castro’s anti-socialist notions about the role of the party:

“The negation of the role of the communist party in the construction of socialism and the reduction of this role to an «ideological» and «orientating» factor is in
open opposition to Marxism-Leninism. The enemies of scientific socialism substantiate this thesis by «arguing» that leadership by the party is allegedly incompatible with the decisive role which should be played by the masses of producers, who, they claim, should exercise their political influence directly, and not through the communist party, because this would bring about «bureaucratic despotism»! Contrary to the anti-scientific theses of these enemies of communism, historical experience has shown that the undivided leading role of the revolutionary party of the working class in the struggle for socialism and communism is absolutely essential. (…) «Bureaucratic despotism» is a characteristic of the capitalist State, and it can never be attributed to the leading role of the party under the system of the dictatorship of the proletariat, which from its nature and class character, is sternly anti-bureaucratic.” (Enver Hoxha, Yugoslavia self-administration, capitalist theory and practice, Tirana, 1978, edition in English)

Now, we shall analyze the main features of the social-fascist system established by Castroist bourgeoisie under the total control of Soviet social-imperialists. Just like happened and continues to happen with all kinds of revisionist bourgeoisie, the main objective of Castroist bourgeoisie was to establish a regime which could have a “socialist” appearance while remaining totally capitalist and neo-colonial in content. But how did Cuban revisionists fulfill this purpose? This is what we will see.

3 – Castroist-Guevarist ideology

3.1 – “Marxist-Leninist” credentials

As we had already stated, Castroist ideology is a branch of revisionism which was born from the necessity of the Cuban pro-social-imperialist bourgeoisie to hide its tyrannical and exploitative class rule under “socialistic” cloaks. Moreover, for the most part of its history, Castroist ideology also pretended to be “the ultimate expression of revolution in Latin American conditions”. Its most correct name would perhaps be Castroism-Guevarism, because Castroism is mainly constituted by the anti-communist ideas of Fidel Castro and Che Guevara, although there were other revisionist ideologues like Regis Debray who also contributed to its development. However, for simplification reasons, we will refer to it hereafter solely as “Castroism”.

In order to adequately understand the emergence of Castroism, we must note that Cuban “communist” movement had a long tradition of opportunist and revisionist ideologies must before Castro came into scene. After the victory of the October Revolution in 1917, some communist groups of Cuba were created who welcomed and followed the line of Leninism. The Communist Party of Cuba was founded in 1925, and during its first years it followed a correct line in accord with Stalinist directives of the former Comintern. During those first years, the CPC valiantly struggled against Batista dictatorship and against the American imperialists who supported it against the interests Cuban ultra-exploited working classes.

The CP of Cuba – became member of the Comintern by decision of the VI World Congress of the Comintern. The CP of Cuba took part at the Comintern's Latin-
American-Conference of Buenos Aires, in 1928/29. This Conference was helpful for the alignment of the “Bolshevization” of the CP of Cuba. In 1930/31 the Comintern created its “Caribbean Bureau” in New York which was dissolved in the middle of the 30ies.

In March 1932, the South-American Bureau of the Comintern published a programmatic document called: “La lucha por el Leninismo en America Latina”. In this document was included the polemic letter of Stalin on the history of Bolshevism to the editors of the magazine “Proletarskaja Revoljucija” and “Las Tareas de los Partidos Comunistas en el Frente Ideológico”.

It should be mentioned that, in autumn 1929, the CP of Cuba struggled uncompromisingly against the “right danger” and against the “reconciliators” in its own ranks. This struggle ended with a defeat because of the fact that the Comintern had successively dropped its Stalinist line in the middle of the 30ies. Many Stalinist leaders of the CP of Cuba were exchanged by the “Rightists”. This period can therefore be called as the historical root of Castro's social fascism – a consequence of the revisionist decisions of the VII World Congress of the Comintern.

In preparation of the VII World Congress there was the notoriously famous “Conference of Montevideo” which took place in Moscow, October 1934. This Conference was the basis for the liquidationalist revisionist line of the new “people's front policy of the Comintern.

So it was not by chance that the Comintern dissolved its special “Secretariat of Latin-America” in 1935 [founded in May-June 1928]. The dissolution was decided by the new revisionist leadership of the Comintern.

In consequence, the CPC later adopted a reformist line that deviated the party from the interests of Cuban toilers. This adoption of revisionism coincided with the sadly famous 1935 VII Congress of the Comintern in which Dimitrov defended the abandonment of Stalinist principles in favor of a capitulationist strategy in face of capitalist-bourgeois-revisionist parties, ideologies and classes with the false pretext of “combating nazi-fascism” by relying on the representatives of the socio-economic system that gives birth to that same nazi-fascism: capitalism-imperialism. Dimitrov’s anti-socialist rightist theories deny the essential independence that must exist between the proletarian Marxist-Leninist party and all non-communist forces, and eventually contributed to the seizure of power by revisionists not only in Soviet Union, but also in many other countries. Not Stalin’s teachings on social-fascism were the reason for the defeat of the anti-fascist front of unity, however its revisionist betrayal and withdrawal by Dimitrov. Not the bloc-building with the social-democrat leaders - 80 years ago - or with the revisionists and revisionists of today - can abolish the inevitability of fascism, however only the dictatorship of the proletariat which is based on the violent overthrow of the dictatorship of the bourgeoisie by means of the socialist revolution of the proletariat. However, a thorough analysis of Dimitrov’s revisionism is something that does not belong to the scope of this article. Therefore, we will only state that the ascension of Dimitrov’s bourgeois-capitalist ideas concurred with the ascension of Blas Roca to “C”PC’s leadership. Blas Roca was a well known ideologue of Cuban revisionism (he was even significantly called the Cuban “Browder”) who never hesitated in putting Dimitrov’s anti-socialist thesis into practice. The situation within the “C”PC was in total accord with comrade Stalin’s wise words:
“The victory of rightist deviation within communist parties of capitalist countries means the ideological degeneration of communist parties and the intensification of social-democracy. (…) This means the consolidation of capitalism, as social-democracy is the main agent of capitalism among working class. Therefore, the victory of rightist deviation in communist parties of capitalist countries created the necessary conditions to the perpetuation of capitalism.” (Stalin, *Les Questions du Léninisme*, 1931, translated from the French edition)

In fact, at the 10th Plenum of the Central Committee of the “C”PC in July 1938, Blas Roca openly defended an agreement between the “C”PC and fascist Batista:

“Asked if we would come to an agreement with Batista, we reply quite openly . . . that it all depends on Batista’s attitude to the basic problems of democracy.” (Blas Roca, *Speech at 10th Plenum of CC of the CPC*, cited in K. S. Karol, *Guerrillas in Power: The Course of the Cuban Revolution*, London, 1971, edition in English)

Of course, Batista understood quite easily what Cuban revisionists perceived by “democracy”. In return for support, Batista legalized the “C”PC:

“The Communist Party was legalized for the first time in its 13-year history on September 25, 1938.” (Robert J. Alexander, *Communism in Latin America*, New York, 1957, edition in English)

“The rise of the Communists (read: revisionists) to influence . . . was due to their deal with Batista, whereby they were given complete freedom of action and positive government aid in the trade union field in return for political support for Batista’s presidential ambitions.” (Robert J. Alexander, *Communism in Latin America*, New York, 1957, edition in English)

Of course, in the meantime Batista continued to exploit, repress and abuse Cuban proletarians and workers as much or even more than before, but as Cuban revisionists couldn’t care less about this, as Cuban revisionists were solely interested in getting some bourgeois class privileges, they fully supported fascist Batista even knowing that he was a political puppet massacrating Cuban toiling masses in favor of American bourgeois imperialist companies. Cuban revisionists were not in the least ashamed of affirming that fascist Batista was “progressive”:

“Colonel Batista has become an integral part of the progressive forces. We must work openly for the support of the masses for Batista’s policies.” (R. A. Martinez, *The Latin American Significance of the Cuban Democratic Upsurge*, cited in *World News and Views*, April 1939, edition in English)

Needless to say, the “C”PC became an enemy of Cuban laborers’ aspirations and interests through supporting a regime which brutally exploited and slaughtered them. But it is easy to see that Batista’s purpose in legalizing the “C”PC was to give his regime a certain “popular” and even “leftist” outlook to deceive Cuban workers hiding its pro-American bourgeois-capitalist-imperialist class nature, thus convincing them to support his fascist regime. Batista pretended to be “democratic” through legalizing Cuban revisionist party. Of course, if the CPC had remained loyal to Marxism-Leninism, if he had remained loyal to Stalinist line, Batista would have never legalized
it because he would have perceived that the CPC was a truly revolutionary party menacing the entire capitalist-imperialist system. But as the CPC was transformed into an opportunistic corpse in the context of the abandonment of Stalinist principles by the world communist movement, then Batista knew that “C”PC didn’t represent any real threat to the exploitative system neither in Cuba, neither in USA, neither elsewhere – it had become a totally inoffensive reformist party whose aim was to help American bourgeoisie keeping their bloody reign over Cuba through giving their puppet Batista a more “democratic” and “popular” color with the goal of making Cuban workers renounce to the acquirement of a genuine Marxist-Leninist ideology and to the accomplishment of true socialism and communism [with this same purpose, Cuban bourgeoisie compradore at the service of American imperialist bourgeoisie even allowed the existence of some pro-capitalist and anti-socialist “trade-unions” (organized by Eusebio Mujal) and under the total control of their fascist puppet Batista].

Such was the state of Cuban “communist” movement decades before Castro!

And we must repeat that the attitudes and positions taken by the revisionist leaders of the “C”PC after 1935 are a blatant example of the degeneration caused by Dimitrov’s anti-socialist “united front” which defends that fascism should be fought through union with the same classes and ideologies which engender it: capitalist-bourgeois classes and ideologies. Therefore, why shouldn’t the revisionists “unite” with fascists themselves? In fact, Cuban revisionist leader Blas Roca was never tired from proposing “united fronts” around fascist Batista:

“We fight for a great national united front.” (Blas Roca cited in W.Z. Foster, The Congress of the CP of Cuba, February 1939, edition in English)

As can be concluded, Cuban revisionists submitted workers’ interests and aspirations to those of the exploitative classes by defending an “united front” open to everyone – including to the pro-American bourgeoisie compradore. In this manner, through defending the preservation of bourgeois rule, Cuban revisionists allowed oppressive classes to retain their political-economic sway by preventing toilers from ever achieving power. After all, without abolishing capitalist productive relations and without installing proletarian dictatorship, the bourgeoisie will always remain as dominant class because it will remain as the class which controls the means of production and the productive relations which form the material base of society. Only through an authentic socialist revolution and through the implementation of proletarian dictatorship can workers expropriate the bourgeoisie and not only annihilate it as a class, but also eliminate all its ideological and cultural influences. There is no other way to assure the victory of socialism and communism.

The reactionary cooperation between Cuban revisionists and fascist Batista went so further that in 1944 Batista:

“T ook two CP Ministers into his Cabinet.” (Peter Taaffe, Cuba: Analysis of the Revolution, London, 1975, edition in English)

And as if this was not enough, Cuban revisionists decided to modify their party’s name to “Popular Socialist Party of Cuba” in an opportunistic effort to supposedly “increase party membership” through cooperation with the bourgeoisie.
Cuban revisionists were so happy with their counter-revolutionary collaboration with fascists that they even forgot a very simple truth: Batista had only legalized the “C”PC because it coincided with the interests of Cuban dominant classes at the time, that is, because this was in agreement with the interests of Cuban pro-American bourgeoisie. When the Second World War finished and the so-called “cold war” started, American imperialists ordered Batista the illegalization of the P’S”PC, as this was a party which still qualified itself as “socialist” – even if it was so only in name. In early 1950’s everything bearing the word “communist” or even “socialist” was too much for American bourgeoisie to bear. Therefore, the P’S”PC was legalized again:

“Batista outlawed the Party in 1953.” (Robert Scheer & Maurice Zeitlin, Cuba: An American Tragedy, 1964, edition in English)

In face of this, one might expect that perhaps Cuban revisionists would perceive that repressive class character of capitalist state cannot be eliminated through peaceful means and would rectify their errors by adopting an authentic Marxist-Leninist-Stalinist line and by engaging in armed struggle against fascist Batista and its American bosses. But we would be mistaken if we thought so. Cuban revisionists were incurable opportunists and anti-socialists. Even facing Batista’s furious repression, Cuban revisionists repeatedly affirmed that they would be:

“Resisting the government with every peaceful expression of the popular will.” (Popular Socialist Party, Letter to the 26th of July Movement, 1957, edition in English)

Indeed, Cuban revisionists proudly announced their opportunist and pro-capitalist stands after 1959 anti-socialist pseudo-revolution:

“During most of the years of the tyranny, the Party tried to avoid violence.” (Theses of the Executive Committee of the Popular Socialist Party, April 1959, edition in English)

This stand of Cuban revisionists is in total opposition to veritable Stalinist-Hoxhaists principles:

“The revolution (…) cannot triumph on the peaceful road. Lenin (…) always put the main stress on revolutionary violence, because the bourgeoisie never surrenders its power voluntarily.” (Enver Hoxha, Imperialism and the Revolution, Tirana, 1979, edition in English)

Indeed, revolutionary violence is an indispensable tool to advance socialist revolution. To reject revolutionary violence is to turn impossible the effective implementation of proletarian dictatorship, with the logical consequence of abandoning any possibility of ever accomplishing socialism and communism. Without revolutionary violence, not only capitalism and imperialism can never be defeated and eliminated, but also the exploitative fundaments of their oppressive socio-economic system and productive relations can ever be annhilated. Revolutionary violence is the key which opens the doors of the future classless, stateless and propertyless society – that’s why world capitalists, world imperialists and world revisionists fear it so much.
In fact, the P “S” PC did not even see the armed struggle of Cuban national bourgeoisie against pro-American Batista with favorable eyes. Cuban revisionists perceived it as “violent gangsterism”. Consequently, the P”S”PC did not participate in 1959 Cuban bourgeois revolution by any means. However, when Castro’s guerrillas achieved power, the revisionist leaders of the P “S”PC understood that they had no other option besides supporting the new “revolution”:

"The Party . . . supports the new regime.” (Theses of the Executive Committee of the Popular Socialist Party, April 1959, edition in English)

However, it is only from the moment that Castroist bourgeoisie is forced to search for the help and protection of Soviet social-imperialists against American imperialist bourgeoisie that it starts getting interested in the P “S”PC. And this because, as we have already explained in this article, one of the main requisites needed by Castroist bourgeoisie to receive the support of Soviet social-imperialists was giving its class rule a certain “socialist” appearance. Soviet social-imperialists demanded this because it was the only manner to continue misleading world workers making them believe that they had to support Soviet Union because it was “a socialist country which strived for the advancement of the revolution by helping all the other socialist countries”, when the truth is that since Khrushchevist takeover, former Bolshevists Soviet Union had been turned into a ferocious imperialist superpower struggling to extend its sphere of influence by transforming countries like Cuba in its neo-colonial satellites. Of course, the new Soviet capitalists and also the pro-Soviet satellite bourgeoisie (including Castroist bourgeoisie) were engaged in doing their utmost so that world proletariat would never understand this, because otherwise Soviet revisionist empire would be in serious danger if it had to face the anger of world workers combating for authentic socialism.

Concluding, Cuba had to appear as a “socialist” country. But how could this masquerade be efficiently done without a “Marxist-Leninist party”? Any bourgeois regime which pretends to be “socialist” will not convince anyone without this.

As the anti-Marxist “26th July movement” had not anything similar to a party, Castroist leaders felt tempted to use P “S” PC to their perverse purposes. Indeed, although completely revisionist, the P “S” PC was the only political party in Cuba which had the word “socialist” in its official designation, that is, it had a last remnant of “leftist” appearance.

However, there was a big problem: P “S” PC’s openly anti-communist past. For the Castroists, the bigger problem was that P “S” PC’s leaders’ explicit support for fascist Batista (including active participation in its regime) was still very fresh in the memory of Cuba workers. That is why although Castroists initially thought about adopting and presenting the P “S” PC as their own party, they later abandoned this idea. After all, for Castroists who strived to depict themselves as “the representatives of a new popular and socialist regime ending with decades of fascist repression imposed by American imperialism”, adherence to a party which was so deeply involved in Batista’s tyrannical pro-American policies would have been impossible:

”Fidel could not simply join the PSP without losing face. . . . A new organization, which did not have to bear the burden of the PSP's long and chequered history.
was obviously preferable.” (Theodore Draper, *Castro’s Revolution: Myths and Realities*, 1962, edition in English)

In fact, what Castroist bourgeoisie truly wanted was to get the help of the revisionist leaders of the P “S” PC in order to build a new party under Castroists’ control:

"Castro insisted from the outset that the 'old' Communist Party be absorbed into a 'new' Communist Party under his leadership."


It is obvious that this new “communist party” under Castro’s leadership would be the chosen one to play the role of “Marxist-Leninist party that is governing a socialist country” in accord with Soviet social-imperialist demands.

Consequently, in March 1961, Castroist bourgeoisie determined that all existing movements (the “26th July movement”, the P “S”PC, etc.), should be united in the Integral Revolutionary Organization (IRO).

And some time later, in December of 1961, the IRO became the “United Party of the Socialist Revolution”. However, one should not be deceived by its “unitary” name-sounding. This UP “S” R was in fact composed by multiple bourgeois-capitalist parties and had nothing to do with the authentically Marxist-Leninist-Stalinist-Hoxhaist monolithic proletarian party that must lead any genuine socialist revolution. Within the UP “S” R:

"Each party retained its identity and autonomy.”


As can be concluded, this means the existence of various bourgeois-capitalist parties, thus tearing into pieces the legend about supposed existence of a “single party” system in revisionist social-fascist Castroist-Guevarist Cuba and configuring a situation which is on the antipodes of the former CPSU led by comrades Lenin and Stalin and of comrade Enver’s PLA. Both these parties defended a single ideology: Marxism-Leninism and were led by a single class: the proletariat (although there was an alliance with peasantry and with soldiers, one should not forget that it was the proletariat alone who always led the revolution in both Bolshevist SU and in socialist Albania).

Moreover, it is obvious that the UP “S” R represented in fact the existence of multiple parties, which is totally contrary to the ABC of Marxism-Leninism-Stalinism-Hoxhaism, according to which in the state of proletarian dictatorship during socialist construction, there can only be a single party representing the united interests of all workers under proletarian leadership (contrary to what happens in bourgeois-capitalist society, where antagonist classes have antagonist interests which demand the formation of various parties to represent them). For example, referring to the Democratic Front in socialist Albania, Comrade Enver Hoxha always underlined that:

“This Front is not a political party, nor a coalition of parties: in our country, there are no other parties besides the Party of Labour of Albania.”

(Enver Hoxha cited by Gilbert Murry in *Enver Hoxha contre le revisionisme*, Paris, 1972, translated from version in French language)
Indeed, and contrary to what happened in all capitalist-revisionist states, neither in Bolshevist Soviet Union, neither in comrade Enver’s Albania was ever allowed any kind of “union” or of “coalition” between the working masses and the bourgeoisie, not even with the “radical” faction of that same bourgeoisie (after all, all bourgeois sections without exception are equally predatory, no matter if they are openly reactionary and anti-communist or if they prefer to use “progressive”, “democratic” or even “popular/leftist” cloaks). Being authentic Marxist-Leninist parties, the CPSU (B) and the PLA never permitted the penetration of bourgeois-capitalist-revisionist influences within the ranks of the proletariat, because otherwise communist conscience among workers would be gravely jeopardized, proletarian dictatorship would be dangerously weakened and socialist construction would be impossible (thus opening the path to capitalist-imperialist restoration, including the inherent return of wage slavery, exploitation, oppression, alienation, etc…) 

Moreover, comrade Enver used to affirm that:

“(…) the political parties express the interests of determined classes. Only an absurd opportunism can defend the presence of non-proletarian parties within the system of the dictatorship of the proletariat, foremost after the edification of the economical base of the socialist system. This evolution, far from constituting a violation of freedom, is in fact consolidating the authentic proletarian democracy. The character of a social order is not determined by the number of parties. It is determined by its economical base, by the class which controls the state power, by the state policy which is or not at the service of the broad masses. The modern revisionists (…) deny the leading role of the proletarian party in what concerns the seizure of power and the edification of socialism. Their propaganda even argues that it is possible to achieve socialism having the bourgeois and the petty-bourgeois parties as the main leading forces. (…) This conception represents a total betrayal of the Marxist-Leninist principles and of the revolutionary cause of the working class.” (Enver Hoxha cited by Gilbert Mury in Enver Hoxha contre le revisionisme, Paris, 1972, translated from version in French language)

“(The genuine Marxist-Leninist party is the party of the working class only and bases itself on the interests of this class. This is the decisive factor for the triumph of the revolution and the construction of socialism. Defending the Leninist principles on the party, which do not permit the existence of many lines, of opposing trends in the communist party, J. V. Stalin emphasized: the communist party is the monolithic party of the proletariat, and not a party of a bloc of elements of different classes).” (Enver Hoxha, Imperialism and the Revolution, Tirana, 1979, edition in English)

These genial criticisms from comrade Enver perfectly suit Castroist social-fascism. Indeed, the UP “S” R - and its successor: the Castroist “Communist” Party of Cuba - are an amalgam of different bourgeois party factions with different interests and which completely excluded the proletariat and all other laborers; indeed they were in irreconcilable class antagonism with these last ones. In these conditions, they could have never been genuine Marxist-Leninist parties. Indeed, there were contradictions within them from the very beginning. The UP “S” R was clearly a party absolutely dominated by the bourgeoisie. Nonetheless, as time passed, a division was consummated between two different revisionist factions: the bourgeois members
belonging to Castroist faction on one side, and the bourgeois members belonging to the leadership of the P “S” PC. The contradictions were related to different stands towards the development of openly private enterprise in Cuban economy. Castroist faction defended the end of explicit private enterprise and its replacement by state capitalism, while former leaders of the P “S” PC defended that openly private business should be fostered.

"Private enterprise . . . is still necessary.” (Blas Roca cited in Hugh Thomas, The Cuban Revolution, London, 1986, edition in English)

In truth, this contradiction was not a contradiction of principles, as both factions ultimately defended private property and enterprise (state capitalism is just another form of it). But this is natural because also both factions were bourgeois and pro-capitalist, therefore they could never hold substantially opposite views. What was happening in this occasion was that Castroists were representing the interests of former Cuban national bourgeoisie that was being now turned into a pro-Soviet compradore class, while former P “S” PC’s leaders were representing a different section of the bourgeoisie. Indeed, they seemed to represent a section whose interests and aims were closer to those of Cuban national bourgeoisie who refused Soviet social-imperialist dominance and who didn’t want to give up its former dreams of exploiting Cuban workers on its own. The former leaders of the P “S PC defended the notion that the new Cuban regime should be an alliance between various classes and that was important:

"To preserve and strengthen the alliance of all revolutionary and popular forces represented by the working class, the peasantry, the petty bourgeoisie and the national bourgeoisie.” (Theses of the Executive Committee of the Popular Socialist Party, April 1959, edition in English)

This idea is taken from Maoist revisionism, which also proposes a “class alliance” under bourgeois dominion as a form of preventing the coming to power of the proletariat. Even bourgeois ideologue Theodore Draper quickly noted that leaders of the P “S PC:

"Borrowed from Mao Tse-tung the concept of the 'four-class' bloc or alliance, made up of the middle class, peasants, workers and national bourgeoisie.” (Theodore Draper, Castroism: Theory and Practice, 1965, edition in English)

In the DWM I, II and III, we have already analyzed this Maoist theory, therefore we recommend to all those interested to read them, even because this article must be completed with other documents of the Comintern (Stalinist-Hoxhaist). We will only add that P “S” PC wanted to keep explicitly private property as a mean to keep the referred class alliance under bourgeois dominion. But these plans of the P “S” PC leaders were condemned to failure. The now pro-Soviet bourgeoisie represented by Castroist faction didn’t want to share neither political power neither property over means of production with any other sections of the bourgeoisie. And to accomplish this, it was crucial to concentrate all Cuban productive sectors in its hands through developing state capitalism, even because in this manner the help and protection provided by Soviet social-imperialists would be ensured. After all, together with the existence of an apparently “Marxist-Leninist party”, also the existence of a false “planned and socialized economy” was essential to construct Castroist Cuba’s “communist” disguise. Through developing state capitalism, Castroist bourgeoisie
would accomplish two major objectives: on one side, it would please Soviet social-imperialists and it would deceive Cuban toiling masses preventing them from understanding the true exploitative class character of Castroist state by using “red” cloaks; and on the other side, it allowed them to use Soviet imperialist support to buttress its control over Cuba in order to definitively destroy the last remnants of influence of all other sections of Cuban bourgeoisie which might had interests incompatible with those of the new pro-Soviet Castroist rulers.

Anyway, Castroist bourgeoisie did not hesitate in using these contradictions to eliminate the influence of the leaders of former P “S” PC within the UP “S”R. Castroists wanted the UP “S” R to be under their exclusive control. Therefore, on 26 March 1961, Castro “denounced” P “S” PC’s leader Aníbal Escalante:

"Castro singled out Aníbal Escalante for some of the most withering accusations in his formidable arsenal of sarcastic invective. Cubans were informed that Escalante had created ‘a counter-revolutionary monstrosity’ in IRO, that he had built up his own machine to take over the party and the government.” (Tad Szulc, Fidel: A Critical Portrait, London, 1987, edition in English)

And:

"Castro made it abundantly clear that he was striking through Escalante at many others.” (Theodore Draper, Castro’s Revolution: Myths and Realities, 1962, edition in English)

Indeed, many of the revisionist leaders of P “S” PC were thrown away: Escalante was forcibly exiled, Blas Roca was expelled from public activities, etc. As time passed, all those who opposed Castroist faction within the UP “S” R rapidly realized that there were only two options for them: or they accepted the new absolute dominance of Castroist pro-Soviet compradore bourgeoisie over Cuba or they would be promptly purged. Unsurprisingly, as the opportunists they were, the vast majority of them didn’t mind about giving up their former positions to embrace Castroist ones since they could continue enjoying from class privileges through supporting Cuban pro-Soviet bourgeoisie represented by Castro. And this was how Fidel Castro:

"(…) has stepped forward (…) as the final authority." (Theodore Draper, Castroism: Theory and Practice, 1965, edition in English)

Although Castroist bourgeois predominance was decided at this moment, the struggle against the leaders of the P “S” PC and the “independentist” bourgeois factions they represented continued until the late 1960’s. In 1965, the UP “S”R changed its name once more, this time to “Communist Party of Cuba” (while fully maintaining and even intensifying the bourgeois-capitalist and anti-communist character inherited from its antecessor: the UP “S”R). In the same year, Fidel Castro was also announced as the “C” PC’s General-Secretary and the newspaper “Granma” (the official newspaper of Cuban social-fascism) was founded.

In the end, Castroist pro-Soviet bourgeoisie had prevailed in all political, economical and ideological fields and applied its plans of developing state capitalism. As pro-capitalist analyzers of Cuban social-fascism remark:
"The government destroyed the last vestiges of private enterprise during the so-called 'revolutionary offensive' (...)" (Hugh Thomas, *The Cuban Revolution*, London; 1986, edition in English)

"The state . . . between 1967 and 1970 nationalized all remaining private production." (Economist Intelligence Unit, *Country Profile: Cuba*, 1987-88, edition in English)

Of course, contrary to what ideologues of Western capitalism-imperialism affirm, private property and private enterprise were never abolished in Cuba, they were merely transformed from their open type into the social-fascist type – thanks to Cuban social-fascists, private owning over Cuban productive means was transferred from the claws of American imperialists to the claws of Soviet social-imperialists.

Contrary to what Cuban revisionists want us to believe, capitalism was perfectly perpetuated in Cuba – it was never eliminated there, not even for a single second. Nationalizations and expropriations are not in the least synonym of elimination of capitalism, let alone of socialist construction (indeed, scores of bourgeois-capitalist regimes like that of Nicaraguan Sandinistas, of Nasser, of Perón, of Getúlio Vargas, of Sukarno, of Nkrumah, of Sankara, etc. have also made expropriations and nationalizations with similar anti-socialist and pro-capitalist-imperialist purposes of those that took place in Castroist Cuba). Expropriations and nationalizations can only be part of socialist construction if they are made under the firm leadership of an authentically Marxist-Leninist party and if the expropriated means of production are put directly in the hands of the working classes led by the proletariat. As in Cuba such a genuinely Marxist-Leninist party didn’t exist since late 1920’s / early 1930’s and as Castroist bourgeois-capitalist state (established in 1959) never represented proletarian power, then these so-called “nationalizations” and “expropriations” are nothing more than a ridiculous masquerade whose aim is to keep workers away from Marxism-Leninism-Stalinism-Hoxhaism through convincing them that they are living in a “socialist regime” and therefore there is no need to strive for things like the elimination of wage slavery, the implementation of workers’ rule, etc because all this has already been “accomplished” (and the same can be said about the fake “Marxist-Leninist” phraseology and the other “red” masks used by ultra-reactionary Cuban social-fascism to hide its true bourgeois-capitalist-revisionist and anti-communist character).

But these kinds of social-fascist masquerades are totally natural given the aims and nature of Cuban revisionism. Cuban “revolution” was anti-communist from the very beginning. One of the main principles of Marxism-Leninism is that a truly socialist revolution can only be led by the proletariat. If this is not the case, then this means that the revolution in question is not socialist. Comrade Lenin had already underlined many times that only the proletariat could efficiently lead a truly socialist revolution:

"The proletariat . . . alone is able . . . to retain power sufficiently long to suppress completely all the exploiters as well as all the elements of disintegration." (Lenin, *The Immediate Tasks of the Soviet Government*, March-April 1918, edition in English)

However, Cuban anti-socialist pseudo-revolution was not in the least led by the proletariat. Western bourgeois ideologues understood this:
"Neither in its first, nor in its second phase can the revolution be described as proletarian; the proletariat . . . had taken little part in the struggle." (Boris Goldenberg, *The Cuban Revolution and Latin America*, 1965, edition in English)

"Labour had in no way participated in the revolution." (Jose R. Alvarez Diaz, *The Road to Nowhere: Castro's Rise and Fall*, 1965, edition in English)

"The alleged role of the working class in this (Cuban) revolution is fanciful." (Theodore Draper, *Castro's Revolution: Myths and Realities*, 1962, edition in English)

But they were not the only ones. Also Cuban revisionists confirm the absence of participation of the proletariat in Cuban anti-socialist pseudo-revolution:

"Working class action could not be the decisive factor owing to a number of circumstances.” (Blas Roca, *The Cuban Revolution in Action*, August 1959, edition in English)

Indeed, even Castroists themselves openly assume that:

"Our revolution is not a revolution made by labor unions or wage workers in the city or by labor parties, or by anything like that.” (C. Wright Mills, *Listen, Yankee: The Revolution in Cuba*, 1960, edition in English)

If there were still doubts about the anti-proletarian character of Cuban pseudo-revolution, these statements elucidate us. This fact alone is proof that Cuban bourgeois pseudo-revolution could never be socialist. Due to the position it occupies relatively to the means of production, due to its working and living conditions, the working class (i.e., the proletariat) is the most revolutionary class of all. It is much more able than any other of getting rid of bourgeois-capitalist prejudices and ideas in order to acquire a communist conscience. During all their lives, the 5 Classics of Marxism-Leninism were never tire of stressing the necessity of proletarian leadership for an authentic socialist revolution. For example, comrade Enver Hoxha always did his utmost to apply this basic principle of Marxism-Leninism in Albania, even though this was an overwhelming peasant country by the time Albanian Marxist-Leninists achieved power. But Enver knew that to have the proletariat leading the revolution is essential to the success of socialism (in Albania and elsewhere) and therefore he was never intimidated by the fact that Albanian population was mainly peasant. During the National Liberation War in Albania, the few proletarians had been leading the revolutionary war activities. However, in many cases, Albanian working classes were so scarce that they tended to be almost inexistent. In face of this, Albanian comrades led by Enver developed a plan which is a lesson of revolutionary determination to all communists around the word: with the internationalist help of Stalinist Soviet Union, Albanian communists created the Albanian proletariat. In fact, they developed the heavy industry of means of production to ensure the country’s total and definitive independence and consequently and simultaneously with this they also fostered the formation of a strong Albanian working class which never stopped increasing in numbers until 1985 (by the time of comrade Enver’s death, the number of Albanians working in industry was about to surpass the number of those working in agriculture (!). And if revisionism had not taken over Albania, this situation would have been surely intensified). This is model and lesson to all those disgusting revisionists who try to hide their refusal of this
fundamental principle of Marxism-Leninism by arguing about “countries’ particular conditions” and that “in our country, it is not possible to fulfill the principle of proletarian leadership because there is no proletariat whatsoever” (indeed, this kind of false “arguments” used by bourgeois-capitalists, revisionists and social-fascists of all colors is also a pretext not to develop the heavy industry of means of production, thus preventing their respective countries from becoming truly independent and keeping them in neo-colonial exploitative, oppressive subservience in order to maximize the bloody profits of world imperialists). Nowadays, it is very rare to find a country where proletarian classes are as absent as they were in 1945 Albania, but even if this is the case, Albanian Marxists-Leninists showed us that there can be no false excuses for not following this major socialist principle: if there is no revolutionary proletariat, then we, Stalinists-Hoxhaists, will create it and will put it leading the revolution towards socialism and communism!

In Albania, this new proletariat whose very existence was promoted and consolidated by the PLA was always put in the leadership of socialist revolution. This proletarian leadership was even mentioned in Albanian 1976 Constitution:

The People's Socialist Republic of Albania is based on the unity of the people round the Party of Labour of Albania and it has as its foundation the alliance of the working class with the cooperativist peasantry under the leadership of the working class.” (Article 2 of the Constitution of People’s Socialist Republic of Albania, December of 1976, edition in English)

What a contrast with the wicked Cuban revisionists, who totally neglect and refuse the leading role of the proletariat in the revolution! But what could we expect if Cuban bourgeois pseudo-revolution was never intended to be socialist?

And comrade Enver always insisted in his genial writings about the indispensability of proletarian leadership in all aspects of socialist and communist construction. While criticizing Eurocommunism, comrade Enver made a remark which is also totally applicable to Castroists:

“The small number of the working class in Albania did not hinder it in the least from playing its hegemonic role because it had at the head its Communist Party, which was guided by the teachings of Marx, Engels, Lenin and Stalin. The correct line of our Party, which responded to the situation and the interests of the broad working masses, made it possible to achieve the great unity of the people around the working class in a single front under the sole and undivided leadership of the Communist Party. (…) In negating the hegemonic and leading role of the working class in the revolution and the construction of socialism, the Eurocommunists could not but abandon also the role and mission of the communist party, as it is defined by Marxism- Leninism and as it has been confirmed by the long history of the world revolutionary and communist movement.” (Enver Hoxha, Eurocommunism is Anti-communism, Tirana, 1980, edition in English)

Therefore, if Cuban proletariat did not participate in the 1959 bourgeois pseudo-revolution, then who led it? If we believe in Castroists’ words, Cuban anti-socialist pseudo-revolution would have been led by the peasantry. This is indeed one of the main ideological characteristics of Castroism: Castroist ideologues tend to define themselves
as “representatives of the peasantry”. Castro himself did not hesitate in qualifying his fake “revolution” as having a peasant nature. He affirmed many times that it was:

"A peasant revolution." (Fidel Castro cited in Theodore Draper, *Castro’s Revolution: Myths and Realities*, 1962, edition in English)

"The revolution was principally the work of the dispossessed peasantry of Cuba.” (Fidel Castro cited in Theodore Draper, *Castroism: Theory and Practice*, 1965, edition in English)

And also reactionary Guevara insisted in this lie:

"The strength of the revolutionary movement centered around the peasants at first.” (Ernesto Guevara, *On Sacrifice and Dedication*, in *Venceremos! The Speeches and Writings of Ernesto Che Guevara*, 1969, edition in English)

"The guerilla fighter is above all an agrarian revolutionary. He interprets the desires of the great peasant mass.” (Ernesto Guevara, *Guerrilla Warfare*, 1969, edition in English)

Firstly, even if Cuban revisionists were saying the truth, even if their pseudo-revolution had been indeed led by the peasantry, this would only confirm its anti-communist nature. A veritable socialist revolution can never be led by the peasantry, but only by the proletariat. Peasantry has not proletariat’s intrinsic revolutionary character and is foremost a vacillating class. If it is not led by the proletariat, it will be only a question of time before the bourgeoisie regains its class power through deceiving and empoisoning peasants with its anti-communists ideologies and falsehoods:

“Experience shows that the peasantry can play its revolutionary role only if it acts in alliance with the proletariat and under its leadership. The Albanian peasantry was the main force of our revolution, however it was the working class, despite its very small numbers, which led the peasantry, because the Marxist-Leninist ideology, the ideology of the proletariat, embodied in the Communist Party, today the Party of Labour, the vanguard of the working class, was the leadership of the revolution. That is why we triumphed not only in the National Liberation War but also in the construction of socialism.” (Enver Hoxha, *Imperialism and the Revolution*, Tirana, 1979, edition in English)

But the fact is that, contrary to what Castroists affirm, Cuban pseudo-revolution wasn’t led by the peasantry. Just like Maoist revisionism, also Cuban social-fascists defended “peasant leadership in the revolution” in words, but were against it in deeds:

"As for the peasants, most of them remained passive during the whole period (of the revolution).The revolution was not a peasant revolution.” (Boris Goldenberg, *The Cuban Revolution and Latin America*, London, 1965, edition in English)

"The peasantry never had its hands on any of the levers of command of the revolution, before or after the victory.” (Theodore Draper, *Castro’s Revolution: Myths and Realities*, 1962, edition in English)
And indeed, if we take into account the manner in which peasants were treated by occasion of Castroist “agrarian reform”, it is not difficult to conclude that Cuban pseudo-revolution was made not by but against the peasantry (and also against all Cuban workers). Earlier in this article, we had already explained how peasants had been instrumentalized in benefit of the interests of the class who truly led Cuban 1959 anti-socialist revolution: Cuban national bourgeoisie (later turned into a pro-Soviet bourgeoisie compradore). In truth, just like it had done with peasantry, Cuban national bourgeoisie also used other non-proletarian classes to accomplish its aims. After all, we may not forget that Cuban petty-bourgeoisie middle classes faced difficulties and were oppressed by American dominion over Cuba, who favored pro-American bourgeoisie at their detriment. Through promises of a much more comfortable position within capitalist order, Cuban petty-bourgeoisie and middle class intellectuals were manipulated by Cuban national bourgeoisie, who used them in order to do the “revolution” without ever resorting to the peasantry or to the working classes (whose conscience awakening and consequent demands for true socialism could be lethal to Cuban national bourgeoisie):

"The armed struggle was initiated by the petty bourgeoisie. The political leadership of the armed struggle was in the hands of the petty bourgeoisie.” (Blas Roca, *The Cuban Revolution in Action*, August 1959, edition in English)

"The frustrated young intellectuals . . . played a leading role.” (Boris Goldenberg, *The Cuban Revolution and Latin America*, 1965, edition in English)

"The Cuban revolution was exclusively a middle-class revolution. (…) The revolution was made and always controlled by sons and daughters of the middle class (i.e., of the petty-bourgeoisie).” (Theodore Draper, *Castro’s Revolution: Myths and Realities*, 1962, edition in English)

This description has the merit of definitively destroying the myths about the “Cuban 1959 workers’ revolution” or even about Castro’s “peasant revolution”. The truth is that Cuban pseudo-revolution was a bourgeois-intellectual revolution directed against American imperialists’ absolute control over Cuba. But of course that we cannot forget that bourgeois ideologues like Draper and Goldenberg are seeing things from their own pro-capitalist point of view and they “forget” a very simple fact: the petty-bourgeoisie and the intellectuals are totally incapable of any kind of independent class action – they always have to be led by another class who is able to conquer them to its side. Comrade Lenin, the 3rd Classic of Marxism-Leninism, reflected deeply about the question of the nature, aims, role and characteristics of petty-bourgeoisie and he reached the following conclusions:

"The petty bourgeois democrats are incapable of holding power.” (Lenin, *Theses for a Report on the Tactics of the RCP*, 3rd Congress of Communist International, June 1921, edition in English)

"Owing to the basic features of its economic position, the petty bourgeoisie is incapable of doing anything independently.” (Lenin, *The Proletarian Revolution and the Renegade Kautsky*, October-November 1918, edition in English)
"The petty bourgeoisie . . . cannot, by the very economic nature of things, be anything else than the expression of class impotence." (Lenin, *The Tax in Kind*, April 1921, edition in English)

Indeed, petty-bourgeoisie is an appendix of the bourgeoisie’s class rule, and it can only achieve some kind of initiative under the dominance and control of the bourgeoisie. Therefore, and contrary to what Western capitalist ideologues affirm, the fact that petty-bourgeoisie played a significant role in Cuban anti-socialist pseudo-revolution means just one thing: that the class who was truly in control was the bourgeoisie, namely its national section. One cannot say that “Cuban revolution was led by the petty-bourgeoisie” for the simple reason that petty-bourgeoisie is incapable of playing an independent dominant role in a revolution (indeed, the petty-bourgeoisie is not even a class, but an intermediary social group between the working classes and the bourgeois-capitalist exploitative classes) – if the petty-bourgeoisie manages to achieve some positions of authority or influence, it is always under bourgeois leading control and only in cases when it coincides with the interests of that same bourgeoisie. Long time ago, comrade Lenin had already noted this with remarkable accuracy:

"The petty bourgeois democrats have always tailed after the bourgeoisie as a feeble appendage to them.” (Lenin, *Lessons of the Revolution*, July 1917, edition in English)

"The petty bourgeois democrats always serve merely as a screen for the dictatorship of the bourgeoisie, and a stepping stone to its undivided power.” (Lenin, *Theses for a Report on the Tactics of the RCP*, 3rd Congress of Communist International, June 1921, edition in English)

"The petty bourgeoisie are in real life dependent upon the bourgeoisie and follow the bourgeoisie in their outlook.” (Lenin, *The Tasks of the Proletariat in Our Revolution*, September 1917, edition in English)

Therefore, when the class character of Cuban anti-socialist 1959 “revolution” is wrongly depicted as “petty-bourgeois”, the world workers must be familiarized with these teachings of comrade Lenin in order to understand that such thing as a “petty-bourgeois revolution” does not exist – so-called “petty bourgeois revolutions” are in fact purely bourgeois revolutions because petty-bourgeoisie cannot lead neither control a revolution due to a variety of socio-economic and ideological factors that transform the petty-bourgeoisie into a social group which inherently serves the interests of the bourgeoisie (or at least of a certain faction of it: in Cuban case, it served Cuban national bourgeoisie).

3.2 – Cuban social-fascist “model”: an anti-communist weapon in the hands of world capitalists-imperialists

But the reactionary and anti-communist nature of Castroism does not end here. One of the major features of Castroism is that it claims that Cuban 1959 anti-socialist
revolution must be the base and model for all revolutions in Latin America. And the reason for this was that, accordingly with Castroists, the fact that a few men were capable of making a revolution in Cuba meant that this tiny country could perfectly be the initiator of overall revolutionary process in Latin America. Castro wanted to be recognized as the leader of Latin American “revolutionary process” and that his 1959 anti-socialist “revolution” should be considered as the inspirer of it:

“Cuban revolution contributed decisively to international revolutionary movement.” (Fidel Castro, The guide that enlightens our Path, 1975, translated from version in German language)

"The Cuban Revolution constitutes the vanguard of the anti-imperialist movement of Latin America." (Declaration and Resolutions of the Latin American Solidarity Organization (LASO) Conference, in Granma, September 1967, edition in English)

Of course, it is easy to understand that Castroist plans of “extending the example of Cuban revolution throughout Latin America” were in complete agreement with Soviet imperialist aims of extending their sphere of influence in that area. Undoubtedly, Soviet imperialists instructed Castro to propagandize Cuban “experience”. After all, we must note that this was a continent traditionally under the rule of Western imperialisms in general, and American imperialism in particular. Soviet social-imperialists were never too successful in achieving influence in Latin America. In these conditions, the transformation of Castroist bourgeoisie into its faithful lackey was a dream come true to Soviet imperialists. Finally, they had managed to put a Latin American country under their control. No wonder that they desperately wanted that Cuban “example” was rapidly spread all over Latin America. If this occurred, then the entire continent would be turned into a gigantic Soviet neo-colony composed of many puppet bourgeoisie-capitalist, oppressive, social-fascist, wage slavagist, anti-communist states dependent on Soviet predatory imperialist, enslaving and exploitative capitals and “credits”. And indeed, Castroist Cuba’s “socialistic” appearance was also favorable to this, because it deceived and continues to deceive many Latin American workers who believed and continue to believe that Cuba was and is a truly socialist country and who were and are able to strive for the implementation of its example in their respective nations. We have to remark that Latin America was and still is one of the most exploited regions of the world. Since XVI century, world imperialists were never tired of massacring, abusing and oppressing Latin American workers in their quest for appropriation of this continent’s highly profitable resources. And during XX century, this situation was aggravated – by time Cuban anti-socialist “revolution” took place, the immense majority of Latin American countries had shockingly unequal societies where the darkest poverty lived side by side with the most unbelievable wealth – something which continues to occur nowadays all around the world. Consequently, it is easy to perceive the charming that Castroist “revolution” exercised (and still exercises) over miserable Latin American toilers. For many of them, to defend Castroism and Cuban bourgeois pseudo-revolution was to defend socialism in their own countries, it was to defend the end of local reactionary bourgeoisie and of imperialist absolute control over their nations (which was mainly exercised by American imperialism). For these Latin American workers lacking a consistent Marxist-Leninist ideological formation, Cuban “revolution” looked as a promise of a better life without oppression and exploitation. They were not able to understand that by defending the spreading of Castroist “revolution” they were in fact helping the fulfillment of Soviet social-imperialist
interests towards Latin America. With this, we do not want to blame Latin American workers. It was not their fault. They only supported Castroism because they were not taught and educated accordingly with genuine Marxist-Leninist principles. Most of them knew nothing about socialist Albania, and even about Bolshevist Soviet Union their knowledge was superficial and came mostly from what the Soviet revisionists wanted them to know. In fact, many of them abandoned Castroism when they realized that social-fascist Cuba had become a neo-colonial subservient lackey of Soviet social-imperialist predatory goals. As comrade Enver remarked:

“(…) in Latin America the peasantry and the working class, which has emerged from its ranks, have a rich militant revolutionary tradition gained in the ceaseless struggles for freedom, land, work and bread, a tradition which has been developed further in the battles against the local bourgeois class and foreign monopolies, against American imperialism. The peoples of Latin America rank among the peoples who have fought and shed their blood the most against their internal and external oppressors and exploiters. In these battles they have had more than a few victories, and not minor ones either, but the complete victory of democratic freedoms, the wiping out of exploitation, securing national independence and sovereignty, has still not been won in any Latin-American country.” (Enver Hoxha, Imperialism and the Revolution, Tirana, 1979, edition in English)

Indeed, we are sure that Latin American workers will understand Castroism’s inherently exploitative and oppressive character and will refuse it. After all, we cannot forget that Latin American workers have a valuable revolutionary tradition and they will certainly constitute one of most outstanding detachments of the future world revolutionary red army that will defeat world capitalism and world imperialism in accord with the principles of Marxism-Leninism-Stalinism-Hoxhaism.

But let’s return to our analysis of Castroism. This type of revisionism denies the most fundamental teachings of the 5 Classics of Marxism-Leninism. Accordingly with Castroism, there is no need for a Marxist-Leninist party in the leadership of the revolution. Indeed, there is no need for a Marxist-Leninist party at all:

"Who will make the revolution in Latin America? Who? The people, the revolutionaries, with or without a party." (Fidel Castro cited in Regis Debray, Revolution in the Revolution? Armed Struggle and Political Struggle in Latin America, 1968, edition in English)

"Fidel Castro says that this vanguard (of the revolution) is not (…) the Marxist-Leninist party (...). In Cuba it was not the party that was the directive nucleus of the popular army.” (Regis Debray, Revolution in the Revolution? Armed Struggle and Political Struggle in Latin America, 1968, edition in English)

"The Cuban revolution has established that it is possible to do the revolution without a vanguard Marxist-Leninist party of the working class." (Regis Debray, Strategy for Revolution, 1970, edition in English)

"At the present juncture, the principal stress must be laid on the development of guerilla warfare and not on the strengthening of existing parties or the creation of
new parties.” (Regis Debray, Revolution in the Revolution? Armed Struggle and Political Struggle in Latin America, 1968, edition in English)

Needless to say that this is a completely anti-communist notion. To deny the absolute and inevitable necessity of a monolithic communist party of Leninist-Stalinist type in which Marxism-Leninism-Stalinism-Hoxhaism is the only allowed ideology and which is the exclusive vanguard of a sole class: the proletariat is synonym of denying the possibility of socialist revolution. And by denying this, we are also automatically denying all the following stages: the implementation of proletarian dictatorship, the fulfillment of socialist construction, advancement towards communism, etc. because all these subsequent stages can never be accomplished without a socialist revolution. And a socialist revolution can never be accomplished without an authentically communist proletarian party based on democratic centralism as configured by comrade Lenin. The communist party of Leninist-Stalinist type is the crucial key to open the door towards socialism and communism because it is the main instrument through which the proletariat is organized, trained and prepared for assuming its historical leading role in the socialist revolution. That’s why the Marxist-Leninist party is the only possible vanguard of this socialist revolution. The existence of a Marxist-Leninist party is the touchstone of the implementation of proletarian dictatorship and, consequently, of successful socialist and communist construction. As comrade Enver accurately affirmed relatively to the Albanian situation:

“Despite the innumerable difficulties we encountered on our road we scored success one after another. We achieved these successes, in the first place, because the Party thoroughly mastered the essence of the theory of Marx and Lenin, understood what the revolution was, who was making it and who had to lead it, understood that at the head of the working class, in alliance with the peasantry, there had to be a party of the Leninist type. The communists understood that this party must not be communist only in name but had to be a party which would apply the Marxist-Leninist theory of the revolution and party building in the concrete conditions of our country, which would begin the work for the creation of the new socialist society, following the example of the construction of socialism in the Soviet Union of the time of Lenin and Stalin. This stand gave our Party the victory, gave the country the great political, economic and military strength it has today. Had we acted differently, had we not consistently applied these principles of our great theory, socialism could not have been built in a small country surrounded by enemies, as ours is.” (Enver Hoxha, Imperialism and the Revolution, Tirana, 1979, edition in English)

“The negation of the role of the communist party in the construction of socialism and the reduction of this role to an «ideological» and «orientating» factor is in open opposition to Marxism-Leninism. The enemies of scientific socialism substantiate this thesis by «arguing» that leadership by the party is allegedly incompatible with the decisive role which should be played by the masses of producers, who, they claim, should exercise their political influence directly, and not through the communist party, because this would bring about «bureaucratic despotism»! Contrary to the anti-scientific theses of these enemies of communism, historical experience has shown that the undivided leading role of the revolutionary party of the working class in the struggle for socialism and
communism is absolutely essential. As is known, leadership by the party is a question of vital importance for the fate of the revolution, and the dictatorship of the proletariat. It reflects a universal law of the socialist revolution. Lenin says, «...the dictatorship of the proletariat cannot be realized except through the Communist Party». The direct political influence of the working masses in socialist society is not in any way hampered by the communist party which represents the working class, whose interests do not run counter to the interests of the other working people. On the contrary, it is only under the leadership of the working class and its vanguard that the working masses participate broadly in governing the country and realizing their interests. In a genuinely socialist country, such as Albania, the opinion of the working masses on important problems is directly solicited. There are countless examples of this from the discussion and approval of the Constitution to the drafting of economic plans, etc., etc. «Bureaucratic despotism» is a characteristic of the capitalist State, and it can never be attributed to the leading role of the party under the system of the dictatorship of the proletariat, which from its nature and class character, is sternly anti-bureaucratic.” (Enver Hoxha, Yugoslavia self-administration, capitalist theory and practice, Tirana, 1978, edition in English)

The communist party of Leninist-Stalinist type allows the proletariat to be tempered with iron discipline and with a profound ideological formation which will allow it to efficiently play its historical leading role as the vanguard of the socialist revolution, as the main architect of defeat and annihilation of bourgeois-capitalist socio-economic-ideological order, as the only authentically revolutionary guide that can effectively lead all workers towards a stateless, classless and propertyless society. All those who deny the necessity of a Marxist-Leninist proletarian party are automatically refusing communist ideology in its entirety, like happens with Castroists who replace Marxist-Leninist party by tiny guerrilla sects without any kind of links to the working masses [indeed, Castroism shares another similarity with Maoism when declaring that “the party is the army”, i.e. that the army commands the party. In fact, as we have already stated many times, what determines everything is the class who controls political, economic, social and military power. And in social-fascist Cuba, the class who detains all these fields of power is the bourgeoisie (and in Castroist Cuba, just like in all other bourgeois-capitalist-revisionist regimes, the army was always one of main tools used by Castroist bourgeoisie to repress the working masses and to maintain its tyrannical class rule). Therefore, also military power and the army are in its hands. Thus, in Castroist Cuba, bourgeois, anti-socialist, pro-capitalist and pro-imperialist army is surely above the party which, by the way, is very far from being a Marxist-Leninist party].

These kinds of Castroist notions reveal a total lack of a Marxist-Leninist world outlook and are totally opposite to what happened in comrade Enver’s Albania and in Bolshevik Soviet Union, where armed struggled was firmly led by a genuine communist proletarian party and where:

“...The guns belonged to the proletariat and were commanded by the Bolshevik party and not the other way round.” (Documents of the Comintern (Stalinists-Hoxhaists), Neo-revisionism or Leninism?., 2004, edition in English)

At first sight, Castroist-Guevarist defense of “armed guerrillas” might sound “revolutionary” and even opposed to revisionism. However, it is in truth totally
coincident with revisionist aims, because through advocating bourgeois-capitalist failing utopic palace putsches under “socialist” masks, Castroist-Guevarist ideology destroy working classes’ confidence in socialist revolution and in Marxism-Leninism. By using fake “leftist” and even “Marxist-Leninist” cloaks, Castroist-Guevarists are able to accomplish what assumedly rightist reformists cannot, namely to prevent proletarians from acquiring a truly communist conscience and from establishing their dictatorship. Thanks to their anarchist-type putsches, Castroists-Guevarists manage to discredit an indispensable tool to the accomplishment of socialism: the armed struggle, as they inculcate in toilers’ minds the false impression that armed struggle is invariably and inevitably linked with bourgeois-adventurist activities and therefore it can only lead to failures. Castroism-Guevarism only advances the interests of bourgeois-capitalist-imperialist-revisionist bourgeois dominant classes because by distancing themselves from laboring masses and by pretending that revolution can be made by a small group of false anti-socialist “heroes” completely isolated from the laboring classes, Castroists are condemning socialist revolution to collapse. More than this, they are discrediting this same revolution in front of workers – after all, if toilers are convinced that only those “heroes” can liberate them and if these “heroes” failed, then workers think they are condemned to be exploited and oppressed forever. In truth, the masses led by their Marxist-Leninist party are the only ones who can liberate themselves. This principle is irreplaceable and undeniable.

Comrade Enver always underlined that:

“(…) the only truly great heroes and really brave proletarian revolutionaries are those who proceed from the Marxist-Leninist philosophical principles and put all their physical and mental energies at the service of the world proletariat for the liberation of the peoples from the yolk of the imperialists, feudal lords and others. (…) Castroism, disguised as Marxism-Leninism, is leading people, even revolutionaries, into left adventurism. This trend appears to be in contradiction with modern revisionism. Those who are ideologically immature think thus, but it is not so. The Castroists are not opposed to the modern revisionists. On the contrary, they are in their service. The separate courses each of them follows lead them to the same point. (…) whenever the Soviet revisionists fail to prevent the masses of the working class and the people from carrying out the revolution, this trend steps in and, by means of a putsch, destroys what the revisionists are unable to destroy by means of evolution. The Soviet revisionists and all the traitor cliques which led the revisionist parties preach evolution, coexistence and all those other anti-Marxist theories we know. From the terms it employs, left adventurism seems more revolutionary, because it advocates armed struggle! But what does it mean by armed struggle? Clearly — putsches. (…) The authors of the theory that the “starter motor” sets the “big motor” in motion pose as if they are for the armed struggle, but in fact they are opposed to it and work to discredit it. (…) What sort of Marxism-Leninism is this which advocates attacking the enemy, fighting it with these “wild” detachments, etc. without having a Marxist-Leninist party to lead the fight? There is nothing Marxist-Leninist about it. Such anti-Marxist and anti-Leninist theories can bring nothing but defeat for Marxism-Leninism and the revolution, as Che Guevara's undertaking in Bolivia did. This trend brings the theses of the armed uprising into disrepute. What great damage it causes the revolution!” (Enver Hoxha, The Fist of the Marxist-Leninist Communists Must Also Smash Left Adventurism, the Offspring of Modern Revisionism (From a conversation
Besides this, we have also to note the obviously “decentralized” and anarchist ideologies that pour out of this anti-party Castroist theory. Indeed, accordingly with anarchists, one of the great “sins” of communists is precisely their unwavering defense of the necessity of a proletarian party of Leninist-Stalinist type, a party within which fierce proletarian discipline would reign – certainly an anathema to all anarchists, whose bourgeois-capitalist ideology demands that they staunchly refuse anything that is able to efficiently prepare the proletariat to lead the socialist revolution (after all, anarchism’s main purpose is to prevent socialism and communism). Indeed, anarchists are among the most arrogant and presumptuous of all anti-communist ideologues. In early XX century, comrade Stalin brilliantly unmasked their true nature and purposes in his book “Anarchism or socialism?” But in spite of this, anarchists do not give up their goals of keeping workers away from Marxism-Leninism-Stalinism-Hoxhaism, as this is the only ideology able to really lead them towards a stateless, classless and propertyless society. Relatively to Cuba, they state that:

“(With Castro’s ascension), a along period of terror began.”


“Cuban anarchists explained that they did not struggle against Batista in order to establish a new dictatorship, but to abolish all dictatorships.”


In first place, we note that anarchists try to win workers’ support and to deceive them about their true bourgeois-capitalist character through depicting themselves as “victims” who “wanted to abolish all dictatorships but who eventually could not prevent the ascension of Castroist terrorist tyranny”. This is false. The ascension and maintenance of bloody bourgeois-capitalist exploitative despotisms like that of Castro is precisely what anarchists want and struggle for. Through their denial of proletarian discipline, of the necessity of a proletarian party of Leninist-Stalinist type and of a fierce proletarian dictatorship able to annihilate all oppressors and anti-communist enemies, anarchists are in fact keeping capitalist system alive, there are in fact refusing the only manner to accomplish socialism and communism. Their defense that state can be abolished immediately after their anarchist anti-socialist “revolution” is indeed a defense of the exact opposite: of the perpetuation of capitalist-revisionist oppressive state. And this because without the implementation of the proletarian dictatorship, without a strong communist vanguard party leading the masses, bourgeois-capitalist exploiters will never be eliminated, their influences and interests will remain untouched and it will be only a question of time before they reconquer their former class positions, with all evil consequences for workers. A more or less long period of proletarian dictatorship is absolutely indispensable to definitively and completely destroy all exploiters and oppressors, to truly annihilate them in all senses. Otherwise, they will be always able to organize themselves, to resist and to use the promise of bourgeois class privileges to corrupt workers to their side. This is why the tireless combat against former exploiters
in ideological and social fields is also so important. To deny this means to deny any possibility of ever achieving socialism, means to reduce the historical necessity of communism to a mere utopia. This is precisely anarchists’ objective. One just has to pay attention to their ridiculous claims about Cuba. Anarchists hoped that after Batista’s defeat, state would miraculously fall apart and all class dictatorships would be abolished by magical arts. It is obvious that this could never happen. At that time, there was not even an authentic communist party in Cuba, the country’s “revolutionary movement” was (and continues to be) totally dominated by revisionists and pro-capitalists (including the anarchists). In these conditions, it is crystal clear that after Batista’s defeat, and unless circumstances changed, Cuban bourgeois revolution had not the slightest possibility of be transformed into a socialist revolution and Cuban laborers lacking a Marxist-Leninist party vanguard would not be able to acquire a truly communist conscience and to install a proletarian dictatorship towards socialism and communism. And through the spreading of their fantasies about “state’s magical disappearance” and of their staunch refusal of proletarian dictatorship of MLSH type (the only efficient way to really abolish state), anarchists greatly contributed to this situation, they greatly contributed to workers’ deceiving that opened the path to the ascension of Castroist bourgeoisie and to the subsequent establishment of social-fascism in Cuba. Anarchists always defend the ridiculous chimera that consists in believing that capitalist-imperialist-revisionist oppressors will gladly accept workers’ revolution, that they will be very happy to be deprived of their greedy class privileges. The Classics of Marxism-Leninism always insisted that exploiters never surrender their class power and privileges in a peaceful and voluntary manner, therefore, proletarian dictatorship will be workers’ best weapon in the war against all exploiters who want to have wage slavagist order back. By rejecting this, anarchists become the greatest defenders of state, by rejecting this, they become the greatest defenders of capitalist-imperialist class dictatorship, they become the greatest defenders of all kinds of oppression and exploitation. And of course, they also become the greatest defenders of fascist and social-fascist states like Castroist Cuba. Anarchists hypocritically complain about Castroist repression and even dare to compare the Great October Revolution with Castro’s bourgeois anti-socialist “revolution”:

“Castro’s courts applied long prison sentences and even death sentences.”

“The tragedy of non-Bolshevist revolutionaries after Lenin’s victory was repeated 40 years after, when Castro took power and repressed all non-communist Cuban revolutionaries.” (http://www.anarchismus.at/anarchistische-klassiker/augustin-souchy/7270-augustin-souchy-die-kubanischen-libertarios-und-die-castro-diktatur, Augustin Souchy, Cuba libertarians and Castro’s dictatorship, 1975, translated from version in German language)

It is obvious that the goal of the anarchists is to discredibilize Marxism-Leninism, is to present it as being equal and synonym of Castroist tyrannical social-fascism. We, Stalinists-Hoxhaists, reaffirm that revisionist-capitalist Cuba has absolutely nothing to do with true socialism/communism. By the way, we take this opportunity to praise Leninist offensive against anarchist bourgeois ideologues who tried to deviate Russian workers from Bolshevism in order to reinstall former capitalist-feudal exploitation. Indeed, this is the truth behind anarchists’ fake “libertarian” slogans: they only serve to
hide that anarchists only want to see proletarians and toilers eternally under the yoke of wage slavery and of capitalist-revisionist wage slavagist totalitarian state. They do everything they can to accomplish that, namely by attempting at discrediting the only ideology capable of authentically show workers the path to emancipation from all oppression and exploitation. Comrade Lenin and Soviet Bolshevists acted absolutely correctly when they used the powers of Soviet proletarian state to repress and to annihilate anarchist disease. In the future, world proletariat led by the Comintern (SH) will do exactly the same at a global scale.

And contrary to what anarchists say, Castro did not repressed them because they were not communists, as bourgeois Castro and his false “revolutionaries” were also never communists, as Cuban 1959 anti-socialist pseudo-revolution and consequent social-fascism had never anything to do with communist ideology. Cuban anarchists were repressed due to the simple fact that their usefulness to the interests of Cuban national bourgeoisie had ended. While fighting for power, Cuban national bourgeoisie needed some false “revolutionaries” whose “libertarian” slogans would deviate workers from genuine communist ideology. This was very important, as Cuban national bourgeoisie could never let that all its efforts to seize power and class privileges against the will of American imperialists and their local lackeys were thrown overboard if Cuban workers adhered to Marxism-Leninism, formed a proletarian party and made an authentic socialist revolution. This would be Cuban national bourgeoisie’s worst nightmare. That’s why it needed the anarchists to play the role of “freedom fighters” whose anti-communist ideology turned them inoffensive to Cuban national bourgeoisie’s interests and who had the great advantage of having a certain “independent” appearance. This characteristic was essential to Cuban national bourgeoisie, because it made anarchists emerge in front of Cuban workers’ eyes as having nothing to do with any bourgeois faction, thus being able to mislead workers and to keep them away from MLSH in a much more efficient manner than if they appeared as the ideological lackeys of Cuban national bourgeoisie they truly were. That is why Cuban bourgeois factions around Castro supported and even promoted the anarchists during anti-Batista struggle. Of course, after victory in 1959 anti-socialist pseudo-revolution, after having seized power, Castroist bourgeoisie was not willing to endure anarchists’ ridiculous “libertarian” screams. Anarchists had already served their purpose: they had helped to prevent workers from acquiring a communist consciousness and from embracing MLSH, thus safeguarding bourgeois wage slavagist system/capitalist exploitative state and allowing Cuban national bourgeoisie (later turned into a social-fascist bourgeoisie compradore) to attain power. Therefore, Castroist bourgeoisie decided to put anarchists out of its way. It was since then that Cuban anarchists started shouting against “Castro’s repressive dictatorship”. So, as can be concluded, anarchists’ pretensions of “anti-Castroist struggle” are mere façade. Anarchists were in fact among the greatest contributors to the ascension of Castroist bourgeois anti-communist and social-fascist tyranny. Behind their pompous auto-qualifications of “freedom fighters” and “libertarian ideologues”, anarchists are in fact among the staunchest and most efficient supporters and perpetuators of bloody bourgeois-capitalist-imperialist-revisionist dictatorship and of its respective totalitarian class state.

But let’s return to our analysis of Castroist-Guevarist revisionism. Of course, if Castroists openly admitted that they didn’t need a Marxist-Leninist party to be the vanguard of Cuban 1959 anti-communist “revolution” because this was never intended to be a socialist revolution, then their anti-party ideas would not be as harmful as they
are. It is obvious that a communist party of Leninist-Stalinist type is only indispensable in the context of a socialist revolution. A bourgeois revolution like that which took place in Cuba does not need any Marxist-Leninist vanguard party at all. But the problem is that Castroists do not openly recognize the bourgeois character of their “revolution”. They strive to dress it with “socialist” clothes. Their ideology is so harmful and dangerous because of this: they try to present as “Marxism-Leninism” theories which are totally bourgeois, reactionary and anti-communist in the same manner as they try to present as “socialist” a regime which is revisionist to the bone.

For example, they try to convince Latin American workers that their anti-party notions are “creative developments of Marxism-Leninism applied to Latin American conditions”, so that laborers feel tempted to adhere to this kind of anti-communist Castroist garbage.

As a consequence of Cuban social-fascisms’ liberal-anarchist ideologies, Castroists-Guevarists replace proletarian discipline and democratic centralism by the most perverse forms of bourgeois individualism. This is indeed one of the characteristics of Castroism-Guevarism that always charmed bourgeois intellectuals like Jean-Paul Sartre, Albert Camus and many others of the same kind who tirelessly screamed against what they called “Stalinist peril” and who saw in the Cuban bourgeois pseudo-revolution the quintessence of their anti-communist dreams about a liberal spontaneist anti-socialist revolution giving origin to an anarchistic-capitalist utopia which would serve as inspiration to write innumerable of their nauseating “best-sellers” – all this promptly sponsored and financed by the exploitative wage slavagist bourgeoisie who own and who hold exclusive control over mass media.

With the help of their French ideologue Debray, Cuban revisionists launched a gigantic campaign against the necessity and configuration of the communist party of Leninist-Stalinist type. They opportunistically affirm that such a party is perfectly dispensable because it only brings "the plethora of commissions, secretariats, congresses, plenary sessions, meetings, etc" which are the cause of "the vice of excessive deliberation" which "hampers the tactical independence which is demanded in the conduct of military operations" [here, we can note Castroist-Guevarist notion that military struggle must have absolute priority over all other kinds of struggle – contrary to the Stalinist-Hoxhaist principle affirming that political, economic, social and military struggle must be efficiently combined (while always giving primacy to political struggle) in order to conquer workers to our ideology and to advance towards genuine socialist revolution and proletarian dictatorship. In social-fascist Cuba, Castroist bourgeoisie holds total control over the army, but this will change soon, when Cuban soldiers finally join Cuban workers and peasants in the overthrown and annihilation of bourgeois-capitalist-revisionist and pro-imperialist exploitative, oppressive, repressive and wage slavagist tyranny in accord with the principles of Marxism-Leninism-Stalinism-Hoxhaism].

As can be concluded, behind Castro’s and Debray’s anti-party liberal-anarchist positions, one can perceive their fear of everything related with genuinely proletarian organization and discipline that is inherent to a party of Marxist-Leninist-Stalinist-Hoxhaist type and their defence that bourgeois-capitalist leaders of the Castroist party must have total freedom to exercise their despotic authority serving the interests of social-fascist bourgeoisie and of its imperialist bosses without being bothered by “excessive deliberation”, that is, without being dependent on anyone else. And indeed,
this is what occurs within the so-called “Communist” Party of Cuba: the leadership around Castro brothers does not have any kind of contacts with workers, governing through totalitarian methods and taking into account only what is better for their imperialist and social-imperialist masters in order to continue enjoying from their class privileges. Furthermore, Castroism-Guevarism also promotes the bourgeois individualist myth of the “super-leader”:

"In Cuba, military (operational) and political leadership have been combined in one man: Fidel Castro." (Regis Debray, Revolution in the Revolution? Armed Struggle and Political Struggle in Latin America, 1968, edition in English)

According to Debray, Cuban “experience” could be described simply as:

"(…) the line of action of which Fidel Castro, the leader of the Cuban Revolution, is the incarnation." (Regis Debray, Revolution in the Revolution? Armed Struggle and Political Struggle in Latin America, 1968, edition in English)

Of course, that is why there is no need for a party of Leninist-Stalinist type. Castroists advocate that this “hero leader”, this “revolutionary incarnation” with a semi-divine status will “resume in his person all qualities” (to use Debray’s own words). Thus, why would this “superior leader” listen to the inferior beings he guided? And needless to say that this “perfect revolutionary” does not need party congresses neither party meetings for nothing (for instance, Castroist “Communist” Party of Cuba was officially founded in 1965, but it only had its first “Congress” in 1976, thus more than a decade after. This testifies Cuban revisionists’ dispise for any kind of collective decisions, even because their “party congresses” only serve to Castroist bourgeoisie’s reaffirmation of its exploitative class power. Cuban labourers are totally excluded from these “congresses”). And after all, why would this “semi-divine revolutionary” need them? This “hero leader” who “has all qualities” already knows everything, he has absolutely nothing to learn neither to listen, workers must follow him without any questions (which, by the way, could not be more convenient to the class interests and goals of the social-fascist bourgeoisie - of which this “super leader” is a mere puppet) and he must be free to “reconstitute” the so-called “communist party” as he pleases in agreement with the interests of the revisionist exploitative classes that control him:

"This reconstitution (of the "party") requires the (…) suspension of party democracy (…)." (Regis Debray, Revolution in the Revolution? Armed Struggle and Political Struggle in Latin America, 1968, edition in English)

Is this the famous “Cuban democratic socialism” that Castroist supporters around the world are never tired of eulogizing?

Moreover, Debray goes even further with this anti-communist delirium and affirms that this “super leader” is nothing less that the “startling innovation that has been introduced into the theory of Marxism-Leninism.” So, accordingly to Debray, we Stalinists-Hoxhaists are totally misled when we affirm that Marx, Engels, Lenin, Stalin and Hoxha are the 5 Classics of Marxism-Leninism. We should immediately replace them all by Castro and by himself, who are allegedly the true “developers of Marxism-Leninism” (Cuban revisionists qualify the promotion of bourgeois individualism and of
capitalist-fascist autocracy, despotism and personality cult as a “development of Marxism-Leninism”).

And Guevara also encouraged all this by affirming that “the aim is for all qualities to be united in one person”. And indeed, in social-fascist Cuba, this worship of an idealized Fidelist “hero-leader” has served to alienate workers and to make them forget not only that capitalist exploitation and wage slavery remained untouched in Cuba despite Castroists’ “revolutionary” shibboleths, but also to prevent them from noticing the absence of any kind of genuine proletarian party of MLSH type that is the key to achieve genuine socialism and communism (as can be noted, everything about Castroism-Guevarism is in total consonance with bourgeois-capitalist aims).

And the same can be said about Castroist assertion that “revolution” can perfectly be made through some tiny guerrilla groups. These small bourgeois-intellectualist foquist guerrilla groups are also intended to “replace” the above mentioned authentically communist party and its collective iron proletarian discipline. In truth, Castroist ideologues still continue to stubbornly insist in the fable according to which a dozen men lead by Castro and Guevara managed to defeat Batista’s supposed “almighty army”. As we have already analyzed in this article, this is a total lie. In 1959, Batista’s army was weakened and its “defeat” by Castro’s guerrillas was only possible because it was in agreement with the interests of American imperialism at the time. Batista’s overthrown was not due to Castro’s and Guevara’s ridiculously overrated “revolutionary and military merits”, but to the accomplishment of the goals of American bourgeoisie in expelling Batista. This is the historical reason behind Che’s famous affirmation that:

"Popular forces can win a war against the army.” (Ernesto Guevara, Guerrilla Warfare, 1969, edition in English)

Yes, of course popular and workers’ forces can win a war against the army. They are able to do this if they have their own red army at their side always under the leadership of the proletarian Marxist-Leninist party. In Albanian National Liberation War, working people triumphed over nazi-fascist imperialist invaders under unspeakably difficult conditions. And contrary to what happened with Castro’s and Guevara’s bourgeois intellectualist guerrillas, Albanian toilers and their Marxist-Leninist proletarian vanguard were never supported by any imperialist superpower. Albanian comrades had to lead popular struggle on their own in very harsh conditions, and they were victorious only thanks to their firm, principled and unwavering adherence to Marxism-Leninism-Stalinism.

But even in the context of a bourgeois revolution, popular forces can indeed be a decisive factor in its triumph. For example, in China, popular forces (mostly peasant) contributed greatly to the victory of Chinese national bourgeoisie of Mao’s epoch against Kuomintang’s powerful pro-western compradore army. But in Cuba not even this happened; Castro’s and Guevara’s guerrillas had no links to popular working masses and they didn’t defeat Batista in any military sense (in fact, Castroist-Guevarist bourgeois-capitalist anti-socialist guerrillas could have never triumphed against Batista and much less against almighty American imperialists through military means, because in small counties like Cuba and Albania this is only possible when armed struggle is firmly led by a genuine communist proletarian party following a totally correct Marxist-
Leninist-Stalinist-Hoxhaist line free from opportunisms and revisionisms of any kind, like occurred in Albania with comrade Enver’s PLA). Therefore, Castroist falsehood that “tiny groups of popular warriors” guided by anti-communist ideologies and forces can defeat ultra-powerful armies is based on an historical myth which does not have the slightest correspondence with reality.

And as if this was not enough, Castroists still declare that the “vanguard” of the “socialist revolution” can perfectly be composed by non-communists:

"In every country where armed struggle exists, the guerilla movement is the vanguard, even though it be composed of men of different ideologies." (Declaration and Resolutions of the Latin American Solidarity Organization (LASO) Conference, in Granma, 17 September 1967, edition in English)

As can be observed, Castroism explicitly denies the necessity of establishing Marxism-Leninism as the exclusive dominant ideology, which is in full agreement with Castro’s and Guevara’s anarchist-liberal ideologies. Every true communist knows that it is impossible to accomplish socialist revolution without a vanguard exclusively composed of authentic communists. Indeed, this statement from Castroists reveals their ideological anti-communist and pro-capitalist nature. On one side they claim to defend the “socialist revolution”, but on the other side they affirm that this “socialist revolution” can be led by a vanguard constituted by people defending all kinds of pro-capitalist and reactionary ideologies. In fact, if we look attentively to the manner in which Castroists defined this question when referring to “men of different ideologies”, we can conclude that Castroists are in favor of including even open anti-communists in their “vanguard”. That is, Castroists aim at making a “socialist revolution” without socialists / communists and without socialist and communist ideology! Of course, in the end nothing of this is surprising because it is an inevitable consequence of Castroism’s bourgeois-capitalist nature.

Castroists were always ready to embrace and praise all bourgeois-capitalist cultural trash. Albanian diplomats witnessed this first hand, because socialist Albania maintained diplomatic relations with Cuba taking into consideration the interests of both Albanian and Cuban working masses in keeping a friendly relation. In their external and diplomatic policies, Albanian Marxists-Leninists always distinguished each country’s laboring classes from their respective capitalist, imperialist and revisionist oppressors (comrade Enver’s socialist Albania only rejected to have any kind of relations with imperialist superpowers and with openly fascist states). Therefore, they maintained diplomatic relations with Castroist Cuba in accord with this principle and without ever making any kind of concessions to Cuban social-fascism. Thus, in 1967, one of the U.S students visiting Cuba wrote on his diary that Albanian diplomats in Havana noted that:

“(…) there was a great influx of bourgeois culture, in the music on the radio, the English, French, U.S. movies, etc. Then he went into a criticism of the Cuban film Memorias de Subdesarrollo (Memories of Underdevelopment), partly about its not condemning for (as) taking the clothes from him, for his being let off in the trial, and also for not really condemning him. He also objected to the love (not sex) scenes. He said that movies should educate the working class and that anyone who made a film like that in Albania would have his head cut off. He also objected to the modern art style paintings and posters (...).” (Conversation with Xhustin
This situation is in total agreement with Castroist-Guevarist refusal of prevalence of socialist realism in the artistic and cultural field:

"Why endeavor to seek in the frozen forms of socialist realism the only valid recipe? Let us not attempt to condemn all post-mid-19th-century art forms from the pontifical throne of realism-at-all-costs. That would mean committing the Proudhonian error of the return to the past, and straitjacketing the artistic expression of the man who is born and being formed today." (Ernesto Guevara, *Man and Socialism in Cuba*, edition in English)

Here it is “Marxist” Guevara at his best! So, socialist realism is “frozen” and “surpassed”. To defend its dominance would be equivalent to “Proudhonianism”. According to Guevara, people have to be totally free to choose any artistic expression they like, including the most degenerated and perverse forms of bourgeois-capitalist “art”.

In first place, it is incredible how someone like Guevara who rejects the very existence of a Marxist-Leninist party dares to accuse others of Proudhonisnism, that is, of anarchism (Proudhon was one the founders of anarchist ideology). Guevara and all other Castroist and revisionist ideologues are the ones who owe a lot to Proudhonian anarchism with their staunch refusal of Marxist-Leninist party authority, of democratic centralism, of proletarian dictatorship, etc. We, Stalinists-Hoxhaists, defend the absolute prevalence of socialist realism over all other forms of artistic expression. Indeed, elimination of all other artistic lines in favor of the implementation of socialist realism as the one and only form of art allowed under world proletarian rule is one of our main goals in the field of cultural policies. And this because only socialist realism is genuine art, all the other “artistic” currents are totally disgusting and defend exploitation and alienation. Only socialist realism educates workers in the spirit of Marxist-Leninist-Stalinist-Hoxhaist ideology, only socialist realism inculcates in toilers’ minds direct and clear messages which buttress their determination in constructing socialism and communism. All other forms of “art” are not worth of that name, like happens for instance with the horrible “abstract art” or with the disgusting “pop art” which are rubbish invented by the capitalists to empoison workers. Socialist realism is the only form of art which deserves to have a place within future world socialist society, it is the only form of artistic expression which is ideologically healthy and safeguards workers’ minds from bourgeois-capitalist-revisionist influences (indeed, Castroists were always great fans of decadent capitalist way of life. Before Cuban 1959 anti-socialist pseudo-revolution, Cuba was literally occupied by brothel-casinos. After Castro’s guerrillas seized power, these casinos were closed. But Fidel Castro staunchly opposed this and promptly demanded their reopening! Undoubtedly, one more proof of Castroism’s totally degenerated nature).

But this is very far from being the only issue in which Guevara displays his anti-communism. Che Guevara also held idealist views which were centered on the idea of “collaboration” between oppressors and oppressed. In 1965, while visiting Algeria, Che Guevara said that “the development of the liberated countries should be paid by the socialist camp”. Besides the fact that this statement is infinitely closer to charity than to
revolutionary Marxism (here we can perceive Castroist-Guevarist attempt to reduce socialism to a mere false “redistributive” issue) and that the development of a certain country must be primarily accomplished by its own workers in the process of socialist construction, and not due to some “charitable help” from outside, we should also ask to what “socialist camp” Che Guevara was referring. In 1965, Khruschev’s treason was totally consummated. Soviet Union had been transformed into an imperialist superpower dominated by the new revisionist bourgeoisie which fiercely exploited the oppressed peoples. But Che Guevara wanted the social-fascist and capitalist Soviet Union to pay for “the development of the liberated countries”! This was completely impossible because social-imperialist Soviet Union had not the slightest interest in developing the semi-colonial oppressed countries. On the contrary, Soviet bourgeoisie did its utmost to keep those countries in state of bondage in order to exploit them more easily. But Che’s statement clearly reveals that he advocates “cooperation” between the exploited proletarians of the semi-colonial countries and Soviet imperialist exploiters. Thus, we see how Guevarism aims at paralyzing and denying the irreconcilable contradictions between exploited and exploiters in benefit of an alleged “cooperation” between them.

Moreover, Guevara was also one of the promoters of Castroisms’ utopian idea that socialism and communism can be developed simultaneously (!) irrespective of the objective conditions of productive forces’ development. Sebastian Balfour, a bourgeois historian who dedicated great part of his career to the study of Cuban pseudo-revolution asserts that Guevara encouraged:

"The belief among Castro and his closest supporters that they could force the stages of development and create in a short time the conditions for a communist society, one in which each person received according to his or her needs and gave according to his or her capacity. Orthodox Marxism insisted that without the development of the productive forces on a massive scale not even socialism was possible. . . . Che Guevara . . . argued on the contrary that Cuba's alliance with the developed Soviet bloc made it possible to jump stages in the transition towards socialism." (Sebastian Balfour, *Castro*, 1990, edition in English)

This Guevarist proposal is just astonishing. Here is bourgeois-intellectualist Guevara affirming that both socialism and communism can perfectly be constructed in a few years thanks to allegiance with … Soviet social-imperialism! This “theory” from Guevara is so revoltingly reactionary that we don’t even know where to start with our criticisms against it. Firstly, this “idea” from Guevara is closely linked with the plans of Castroist bourgeoisie to reduce the cost of workforce in Cuba with the aim of maximizing profits. In fact, in industry and among particularly skilled workers, wages for many jobs were cut under the slogan “workers renounce gains which today constitute privileges.” This Castroist slogan had a “revolutionary” and “socialist” outlook, but it was totally opposite to socialist principle “to each according to its work”, which means that people should receive different pay for different work, accordingly with the quantity and quality of their contributions to society. During socialist and communist construction, these differences must be restricted (and even eliminated) through raising the general wage level, and never through severely and constantly cutting it. In truth, Cuban social-fascists act just like explicit capitalists: they do their utmost to pay workers as little as they can. But they had to hide this reactionary purpose under “red” slogans, and so depicted workers’ salary cut as being part of the so-called
“simultaneous construction of socialism and communism” as proposed by Guevara. Secondly, Guevara seems to think that “developed Soviet bloc” had already achieved socialism and communism because otherwise they could never help Cuba to achieve it, too. But to describe social-fascist “Eastern bloc” as having accomplished socialism and communism is to be totally submerged in the frozen waters of the darkest reactionarism. Undoubtedly, this was the case of Guevara, who used to express his belief that Soviet imperialism would strive to implement socialism and communism in Cuba. But Soviet social-imperialism was one the deadliest enemies of socialism and communism, it would never defend or construct them neither in Cuba neither anywhere around the world. On the contrary, Soviet social-imperialism struggled for destroying socialism and for restoring capitalism throughout the globe in search for neo-colonial control and profit maximization. But of course, perhaps we should ask what Castroists-Guevarists understand by “socialism”. For them, if the rule of Cuban pro-Soviet compradore bourgeoisie is “socialism”, thus Soviet social-imperialist control over Cuba could also be qualified as “aid to socialist construction”…

Just like also occurs with other revisionist currents (like Maoism), also Castroists love to present their wicked social-fascist ideology as “a peasant ideology”:

"The revolution (in Cuba) was principally the work of the dispossessed peasants.” (Fidel Castro cited in Theodore Draper, Castroism: Theory and Practice, 1965, edition in English)

"The possibility of the triumph of the popular masses of Latin America is clearly expressed by the road of guerilla struggle based on a peasant army." (Ernesto Guevara cited in (Theodore Draper, Castroism: Theory and Practice, 1965, edition in English)

"The terrain of armed struggle in underdeveloped America must be primarily the countryside.” (Ernesto Guevara cited in Regis Debray, Strategy for Revolution, London, 1970, edition in English)

Of course, this is a masquerade because Castroism is in truth a bourgeois ideology. It only used a “pro-peasant” mask in order to win the peasantry to the side of Cuban national bourgeoisie (as it had to avoid resorting to the help of the tiny but inherently revolutionary proletariat). Through false promises about an alleged “peasant revolution” and “peasant power”, Castroists conquered oppressed peasants to their side. These peasants believed that to support Castroism would ensure them the end of millenary exploitation affecting them. When they finally realized that far from relieving them from exploitation, Castroists were in fact intensifying it even more, it was too late. Castroists had already consolidated their state power and their repressive apparatus in defense of the interests of Cuban national bourgeoisie which had been transformed into a pro-Soviet bourgeoisie of the compradore type. Indeed, it is quite comprehensible the use of a “pro-peasant” phraseology by Castroists – after all, we cannot forget that the vast majority of population not only in Cuba, but also all over Latin America was composed by peasantry. In order to accomplish support of the majority of Latin American toiling masses (which were peasant masses) and to use them as a powerful massive instrument against class rivals, Castroists quickly understood they would have to seduce peasants. Otherwise, how could Castroists convince them to support the
exportation of Cuban “revolution” to their respective countries in accord with the interests of Soviet social-imperialists?

Also Maoists used and applied this same strategy / tactic to deceive peasants. We had already analyzed how Maoist organizations accomplished this in our DWM I, II and III. And Castroist foquist reactionary theories (that were also used by many other bourgeois-capitalist-revisionist, pro-imperialist, social-fascist and anti-communist cliques such as those of reactionary Nicaraguan Sandinistas, of anti-socialist Vietnam, etc.) which give complete predominance to rural areas as “genuinely revolutionary arenas” in detriment of urban areas and of the proletariat are also frighteningly similar to Maoism:

"Localized insurrections . . . will gradually spread to the cities (…).” (Regis Debray, Revolution in the Revolution? Armed Struggle and Political Struggle in Latin America, 1968, edition in English)

"The possibility of the triumph of the popular masses of Latin America is clearly expressed . . . in the taking of the cities by way of the countryside.” (Ernesto Guevara cited in Theodore Draper, Castroism: Theory and Practice, 1965, edition in English)

And we are not the only ones noting the striking similarities between Maoism and Castroism-Guevarism relatively to the refusal of proletarian leadership in the revolution and its replacement by peasantry (of which the prevalence of rural areas over urban areas as “the main revolutionary arenas” is a logic consequence):

"Guevara's theory strikingly resembles Mao's on primacy of the countryside as the most favorable revolutionary terrain." (Theodore Draper, Castroism: Theory and Practice, 1965, edition in English)

We have already explained that despite Castroists’ “pro-peasant” shibboleths, they never had the intention of truly letting peasants lead the revolution – on the contrary, Castroists’ purpose was initially to favor the interests of Cuban national bourgeoisie and later to favor the interests of Soviet social-imperialism in Latin America and all over the world. The use of “peasant” cloaks by Castroists was always subordinated to these objectives. And besides Maoism, there is also another branch of revisionism which bears undeniable similarities with Castroist-Guevarist theory that “revolution must start in the countryside and spread itself to the cities”: Cambodian revisionism. It is true that Cambodian revisionism is itself deeply influenced by Maoism, but it is impossible not to perceive that Guevara’s anti-proletarian screams about “the taking of the cities by way of the countryside” are equivalent to Pol Pot’s sadly famous ideas of “encirclement of the city by the countryside” that brought so many sufferings upon Cambodian workers (in our DWM II, the “Pol Pot question” is briefly analyzed by us).

Being a revisionist ideology, Castroism is not in the least able to solve contradictions within class society. In 1982, in his speech to the 4th Congress of Cuban “Communist” Youth, Castro made the following affirmation:

“If someone works more because he will earn more, this is a positive attitude that will increase production. But it does not contribute to the formation of a
Here, we perceive the incapacity to conciliate economic development and the strengthening of socialist conscience. These two apparently contradictory interests can only be harmonized in the context of a truly socialist society where exploitative productive relations have been genuinely abolished: under socialism, economic development solely benefits workers (and not to any kind of internal or external exploiters), thus contributing to the consolidation of their love and loyalty towards collective property and communist ideology. This harmonization was successfully accomplished in the Soviet Union of comrades Lenin and Stalin and also in comrade Enver’s socialist Albania. But Castroists totally despise these basic laws of socio-economic development, and therefore they will never manage to solve this contradiction for the simple reason that it can only be solved under true socialism and Castroist bourgeois regime is utterly anti-socialist. Indeed, this can be noted even in the wage differences that always existed in Castroist Cuba (and that have been accentuated even more in recent times):

“(…) he (Albanian diplomat in Cuba) disagreed with the idea of the historical salary [the position of Cuba at that time that anyone, particularly professionals, who supported the revolution and stayed would not have their salaries reduced – editor’s note] and leveling wages by fixing the high ones and raising the low ones, and said that in Albania they leveled from the two directions. (…) He says a minister in Cuba gets about 500 pesos a month, while a worker might get 150, and by just raising the lower wage it would take a very long time until they reached the same level.” (Conversation with Xhustin Papogorgi, Third Secretary of the Embassy of the People’s Republic of Albania in Cuba, 27th September 1967, edition in English)

And we must remark that this is the difference between a minister and a worker, the difference between Cuban toilers’ salaries and those of the “state enterprises’ administrators” (the members of Castroist bourgeoisie) would be much greater; in fact, they are abyssal at the point of maintaining wage slavery and private property and accumulation - which were never abolished in Cuba.

Unsurprisingly, Castroism also entirely rejects anything related with proletarian dictatorship:

"The Marxist notion of working class power is absent from Castro's thinking. In Castro's political theory, socialism became not so much a question of power, but one of distribution.” (Sebastian Balfour, Castro, 1990, edition in English)

In truth, this supposedly “distributive” nature of Cuban revisionism is closely related to the implementation in Cuba of a bourgeois “welfare state” which still nowadays misleads many proletarians and workers around the world and serves as a pretext to idealize Cuban social-fascism. We will reflect about this issue later in this article.

Comrade Lenin said a long time ago that the acceptance or refusal of proletarian dictatorship is the main aspect that distinguished, respectively, true communists from revisionists. And this because comrade Lenin considered the question of proletarian dictatorship as being one of the most important issue relatively to socialist and
communist construction. Comrade Lenin used to affirm that those who are genuine communists are characterized by their firm defense of proletarian dictatorship – in opposition to reformists and revisionists who reject it. These assertions from comrade Lenin are entirely applicable to Castroists, who do not even mention the words “proletarian dictatorship” in their pro-capitalist constitution of 1976. Instead of that, they hypocritically affirm:

“Art. 1. Cuban Republic is a socialist State of workers and peasants and also of all other manual and intellectual toilers.” (Article 1 of the Constitution of Republic of Cuba, December of 1976, edition in English)

Castroists do not even try to hide their anti-Marxism when declaring Cuba as a “state of workers and peasants” – without any reference to proletarian power, let alone to proletarian dictatorship (which, let us not forget, are entirely rejected by Castroist-Guevarist political-socio-economic-ideological bourgeois-capitalist, oppressive, exploitative, wage slavagist, pro-imperialist, revisionist, social-fascist and anti-communist order). We already know that revisionist Cuba is the opposite of a workers’ socialist state (i.e., it is a social-fascist state), and Castroists do not even try hard to hide this.

Castroist Constitution is on the antipodes of socialist Albania’s fearless Stalinist Constitution:

“Article 2: The People's Socialist Republic of Albania is a state of the dictatorship of the proletariat, which expresses and defends the interests of all the working people.” (Article 2 of the Constitution of People's Socialist Republic of Albania, December of 1976, edition in English)

Albanian Marxists-Leninists always made abundantly clear that theirs was a state of proletarian dictatorship. And they declared this openly and proudly. This is visible even by the place occupied by the referred quotation declaring Albania as a state of proletarian dictatorship: in the beginning of the second article of Albanian 1976 Constitution. The first article of this Constitution states that Albania is a socialist republic (contrary to what happens with Castroist Cuba, whose official name does not even contain any reference to socialism) and just after this, the country is declared as a proletarian dictatorship before everything else. Albanian comrades didn’t positioned things like this by ease, it contains a message: comrade Enver’s Albania was first and foremost a socialist state and a proletarian dictatorship (by the way, all these affirmations that we are making concerning Albanian Constitution are also applicable to the socialist Constitutions of the USSR of comrades Lenin and Stalin). And Castroists didn’t decide not to mention proletarian dictatorship in their Constitution by ease, either. They had also their own message: definitive refusal of the main instrument aimed at breaking exploiters’ resistance, of the main instrument through which proletarians exercise their class power and destroy all the remnants of bourgeois-capitalist-imperialist order by violent means, of the sole manner through which socialism and communism can be successfully accomplished. In the end, rejection of proletarian dictatorship is synonym of refusal of Marxist-Leninist-Stalinist-Hoxhaist ideology as a whole. This because proletarian dictatorship is something so essential, so crucial to achieve the mentioned goals that since the moment we refuse it, we automatically reject everything related with communist ideology, we automatically adhere to the side of
world capitalists-imperialists-revisionists, to the side of world reactionaries. If it is not possible to eliminate exploitation and oppression without the implementation of a violent armed proletarian dictatorship, then to refuse it means to embrace perpetuation of exploitation and oppression – because everything which is not communist is automatically anti-communist. Such is the case with Castroists, who have always strived to protect bourgeois rule; by rejecting proletarian dictatorship, they are rejecting socialism and communism in their entirety, they are defending the eternal maintenance of wage slavery. This is the undeniable truth and when time comes the world proletariat will know it and will give Castroists the treatment they fully deserve. They can make attempts to romanticize their social-fascist ideology and regime as much as they like – in the end facts are facts: Castroism = anti-communism.

And unfortunately to Castroists, not even all their reactionary lies and masquerades allowed them to fulfill the gluttony interests of their Soviet imperialist bosses through spreading and exporting Cuban social-fascist “example” throughout Latin America in order to turn this continent into a Soviet neo-colony ready to be exploited to the bone by Moscow’s capitalists. With the exception of Guevara’s failed attempt to do this in Bolivia (and which ultimately caused his death), Castroist-Guevarist “model” was never applied anywhere outside Cuba.

4 – Neo-colonial exploitative subservience of Cuban social-fascism towards Soviet social-imperialism

4.1 – Political consequences

Comrade Enver once accurately affirmed that:

“The Latin-American peoples cherished many hopes, had many illusions, about the victory of the Cuban people, which became an inspiration and encouragement to them in their struggle to shake off the yoke of the local capitalist and landowner rulers and American imperialists. However, these hopes and this inspiration soon faded when they saw that Castroite Cuba was not developing on the road of socialism but on that of revisionist-type capitalism, and faded even more quickly when Cuba became the vassal and mercenary of Soviet social-imperialism.” (Enver Hoxha, Imperialism and the Revolution, Tirana, 1979, edition in English)

“Castro is an anti-Marxist bound with Soviet chains.” (Enver Hoxha, The Superpowers, 1986, edition in English)

In fact, as time passed, social-fascist Cuba became more and more subservient towards Soviet social-imperialism. We have already explained the causes that made Castroist bourgeoisie abandon its former plans of independent nationalistic course in favor of becoming a pro-Soviet compradore class. We will only say that, with time, those causes intensified even more.

American imperialism enormously accentuated its pressures over Cuba and was engaged in maneuvers with its Western capitalist allies to isolate Castroist regime. In
1962, as a result of American demands, Cuba was officially expelled from the Organization of American States (OAS) and the embargo against it was extended:

"Upon his inauguration as President, in January of 1961, John F. Kennedy set out to gain the support of the Organization of American States, which he saw as a prerequisite to an effective embargo. He succeeded. At the 8th Meeting of the OAS Foreign Ministers, held a year later in January of 1962 at Punta del Este (Uruguay), Cuba was excluded from the Inter-American system and an arms embargo was imposed.” (Lilia Ferro-Clerico & Wayne S. Smith, The US Trade Embargo, 1988, edition in English)

Indeed, shortly after this, all American countries (with the exception of Mexico) cut off diplomatic relations with Cuba fulfilling the desires of American imperialists, who justified their efforts to isolate Castroist Cuba with hypocritical reasons, like saying that “Cuba was expelled from OAS because its Marxist-Leninist regime is incompatible with democratic principles” and other “arguments” of this kind. It is obvious that neither Castroist Cuba had never anything to do with Marxism-Leninism; neither fascist-bourgeois USA was in the least worried about democracy. American imperialists were only using their fake concerns with “democracy” as a mask to hide the true reason behind Cuba’s expulsion: through isolating Castroists, American imperialists were attempting at weakening Soviet imperialist influence over Latin America. Until then, American bourgeoisie had been Latin America’s absolute exploiters and rulers, but when Castroists put Cuba under Soviet control, American imperialists felt their dominion over Latin America menaced, as Cuba could perfectly serve as an entrance door that Soviet imperialists would use to penetrate in the other Latin American countries. The fact that Castroist regime had succeed in depicting itself with “socialistic” colors that exerted (and still exert) great attraction over impoverished Latin American workers was also a motive of great worry to American imperialists, specially because they understood very well that behind Castroist efforts to “export Cuban revolution” and to “defeat American imperialism” there was Soviet social-imperialism ready to take over Latin America and to transform it into its neo-colony, thus depriving American imperialists of their profitable control over this continent. American bourgeoisie remembered what had happened with Cuba and didn’t want the same to occur anywhere else. That’s why they struggled to weaken and isolate Castroist regime through all means, including by freezing all Cuban assets on US banks and by aggravating pressures against Cuba by imposing:

"An embargo on (...) all US trade with Cuba.” (Keeseing's Contemporary Archives, Volume 13, edition in English)

And American bourgeois government also determined that:

"No government financed cargoes could be shipped from US ports on any foreign-flag vessel engaged in trade with Cuba.” (Keeseing's Contemporary Archives, Volume 14, edition in English)

In this situation, Castroist bourgeoisie felt even more compelled to put itself under Soviet imperialist rule as a manner to protect itself against American imperialist bourgeois class’s persecution, even because social-fascist Soviet Union and its neo-
colonial satellites were becoming the majority of the countries having relations with Cuba. In 1968, Albanian Embassy to Cuba underlined:

“(…) how dangerous it is for Cuba to rely on the revisionist countries for aid, since they will give it when Cuba says what they like and hold back when Cuba criticizes them.” (Conversation with Xhustin Papogorgi, Third Secretary of the Embassy of the People’s Republic of Albania in Cuba, 27th September 1967, edition in English)

And in truth, without Soviet oil and without being able to sell its sugar to the revisionist countries of the “Eastern bloc”, Cuban economy would rapidly fall apart and Castroist bourgeois reign would not last a second more. Being conscient of Castroist desperate need for economic relations and military support, Soviet social-imperialists took the maximum advantages they could from this: one of the main conditions imposed by Soviet imperialists on Castroists was that they would have to adopt a foreign policy which was completely favorable to their expansionist exploitative interests.

And the first great opportunity for the Castroists to show their loyalty towards their social-imperialist bosses came sooner than later. In 1968, as a response to the policies of the pro-Western section of the Czech bourgeoisie (which wanted to get rid of Moscow’s domination and to replace it by American imperialism, implementing classic capitalism instead of state capitalism), a coalition of revisionist states composed by Bulgaria, Hungary, Poland and East Germany brutally invaded Czechoslovakia under Soviet social-imperialist command with the assumed purpose of overthrowing the pro-Western bourgeoisie from power and of reinstalling a pro-Soviet puppet regime that ensured the perpetuation of Soviet imperialists’ sphere of influence and profit maximization. Of course, this invasion was anything but pacific, with the forces sent by the referred revisionist countries launching a wave of bloody repression against Czech workers. The anti-revisionist Marxist-Leninist world movement promptly denounced the invasion, but even some of those who usually supported revisionist social-imperialist Soviet Union were forced to at least pretend to “condemn” this explicit show of social-fascist barbarity. On the contrary, Castroists took this chance to convince Soviet imperialists that they could count on Cuba as one of theirs lackey-states. Thus, Castro made a public statement in which he openly endorsed Soviet-ordered invasion of Czechoslovakia. In fact:

“Castro had little option other than to support the Soviet action. Increasingly isolated abroad, its guerilla strategy in tatters, and saddled with a massive trade deficit, the Cuban regime could not afford to lose Soviet support.” (Sebastian Balfour, Castro, 1990, edition in English)

Of course, the fact that Cuba was supposedly “isolated” (that is, opposed to Western imperialists-capitalists due to its allegiance with Soviet social-imperialism and with the revisionist “Eastern bloc”) and that its economy was in ruins is not a justification for Castroist support for social-imperialist aggression. Castroist Cuba’s distressed conditions were brought by Castroists bourgeois-capitalists themselves, who were always opposed to socialist construction preferring to defend a capitalist way of development by selling their country to social-imperialism in exchange for being kept at power as pro-Soviet puppets. Indeed, this situation is one of the uncountable examples in which “Castro’s Soviet chains” (to which comrade Enver often referred to) are clearly revealed.
And until the disappearance of Soviet imperialism in the early 90’s, Castroist policies and stands never stopped from being increasingly pro-Soviet; it is true that occasionally Castroists pretended to “criticize” revisionist social-imperialist Soviet Union, but this was all fake. Indeed, we affirm that these ridiculous “criticisms” supposedly directed by Castroists towards Soviet Union were fabricated with social-imperialist agreement and connivance. And this because Soviet social-fascists also supported revisionist Cuba due to another motive: Cuba was generally regarded as a nation of the so-called “third world” (an anti-socialist concept invented by Mao), as an underdeveloped country. Therefore, Soviet imperialists used Cuba as a mean to deviate supporters from the “third-world non-aligned movement” and to attract them to their sphere of influence. After all, by the 60’s Soviet imperialists were deeply feeling the rivalry of this social-bourgeois movement, even because it was dominated by Chinese revisionists – their main competitors for winning leadership of world social-fascist movement. In face of this, Soviet social-imperialists had all interest in weakening this “non-aligned third world movement” by having a pro-Soviet satellite country which could play the role of their representative within the “non-aligned third world movement”. Castro was chosen by Soviet capitalists to be:

"The main spokesman of the thesis that the Soviet Union was the natural ally of the Third World against Western imperialism, as against the argument put forward by China, among others, that the Soviet Union and the United States were both imperialist powers.” (Sebastian Balfour, Castro, 1990, edition in English)

It is obvious that Castroist Cuba could never successfully manage to do this if it always held positions absolutely coincident with those of Soviet capitalists. Consequently, a very clever strategy was launched – in all major questions, Castroist Cuba would invariably side with Soviet social-fascism and social-imperialism. But besides this, Castroists-Guevarists would sporadically publish “anti-Soviet criticisms and disagreements” in order to provide Cuba a somewhat “independent” and “non-aligned” outlook. These phony “criticisms” would never put in question the fundamentals of Castroist Cuba’s subservience and neo-colonial dependence towards Soviet social-imperialism, they solely aimed at convincing those workers who supported the already mentioned “non-aligned third world movement” to transfer their support to Castroist Cuba (and thus, to imperialist Soviet Union). In this manner, while thinking they were defending a “non-aligned” country, they were in fact defending a pro-Soviet social-fascist satellite, thus contributing to the strengthening of Soviet revisionist exploitative empire. This cunning strategy was so efficiently put in practice that in 1979 Cuba was even chosen as the host country of the VI Non-Aligned Summit with Castro becoming the chairman of the movement during four years. In this Summit, Castro affirmed the usual Castroist shibboleths about “struggle against imperialism” and reached the point of stating that:

“Cuba is a socialist country. (...) We are friends of Soviet Union (...).” (Documents of the Revisionist Party of Cuba, Havana: Declaration of the VI. Summit of bloc-free [non-aligned] countries, 1979, translated from version in German language)

Castroists call “socialism” to the most perverse social-fascism and they call “friendship” to the most disgusting neo-colonial exploitative subservience. Indeed, Castroist pretensions at “representing the third world” were always subordinated to Soviet interests. For example, Castroists tried to weaken the positions of American imperialists
by advocating their expulsion from Puerto Rico (as Cuban revisionists always strived to turn Puerto Rico from an American colony into a Soviet one) and they were also always very careful not to show too much sympathy towards revisionist China (that would later become an imperialist superpower, but which at that time was already Soviet imperialists’ main rival for leadership of world social-fascism and of world social-imperialism). And the day came when those pretensions had to be sacrificed in favor of support to Soviet social-imperialist expansionist policies. It all happened when Soviet Union invaded Afghanistan in 1979. This put Castroists in a very difficult situation, because on one side they could not support Soviet actions without totally destroying their “non-aligned, third world” cloaks; but on the other side, not to defend Soviet expansionist activities was unthinkable for them. Due to a series of factors which were already explained, Castroists were forced to do their utmost to ensure the support of Soviet imperialism towards them. This was why Castroists finally decided to defend Soviet invasion of Afghanistan, thus loosing all credibility in their entitlement to be considered as “leaders of the oppressed”:

"Cuba's official support for Soviet intervention in Afghanistan, barely three months after the 6th non-aligned conference, deeply undermined Castro's claim to the moral leadership of the Third World. . . . Cuba could not oppose the Soviet action without endangering its relationship with Moscow. When the Non-Aligned Movement came to vote on a UN resolution condemning the intervention, Cuba was among the 9 nations that backed the Soviet Union against 56 that supported the resolution." (Sebastian Balfour, Castro, 1990, edition in English)

With all this, we don’t want to glorify the “non-aligned third world movement”. Its condemnation of Soviet social-imperialism in general and of its invasion of Afghanistan in particular had nothing to do with defense of genuine internationalist principles, but was merely due to the fact that Chinese social-fascists who controlled that movement realized that to condemn Soviet actions could be a good manner of weaken their main rivals. The anti-communist character of this movement and of the “three world theory” was correctly denounced by comrade Enver in his books “Imperialism and the Revolution”, “The Superpowers”, “Reflections on China”, etc:

“The theory of «three worlds» is against the proletarian revolution, and replaces it with the bourgeois-democratic revolution. This anti-Marxist theory eliminates the decisive leading role of the proletariat in the revolution, lumps all the forces together under one umbrella or in one bag, calling them the «third world» and giving them that role and those attributes which these forces do not possess, and with this «world» denies the socialist world. (...) According to this theory, to be an undeveloped country means to be a socialist country. This theory is simply anti-Marxist and reactionary, it means to consider all the undeveloped countries with bourgeois capitalist systems as socialist countries." (Enver Hoxha, Reflections on China, Volume II, March 22, 1977, Tirana, 1979, edition in English)

Particularly referring to the “non-aligned movement” and to its “Havana meeting”, comrade Enver cleverly denounces that:

“This force is "non-aligned" only in name (...). The preparation of the Havana meeting is an utter fiasco. Although the meeting will be held and many speeches
will be made there, it will be completely abortive. It will bring the peoples of the world nothing of benefit.

In Havana there may even be clashes and opposition from the supporters of the Soviet Union, which wants to emerge as champion of the "non-aligned world". In fact paper Pravda is raising a big fuss about this meeting, saying that these forces of the "non-aligned countries" is important and must be strengthened. (...) the revisionist Soviet Union is calling on this world to join with it, to abandon China's "third world" and not link itself with the United States of America. In the long run, the Soviets are asking this "world" to preserve the status quo. (...)

Indeed this policy, if it can be called a policy, is a fiction, a castle built on sand, but not without definite purposes. It is a modus vivendi invented by world capitalism to preserve its neo-colonialist empire by deceiving the peoples that allegedly the policy pursued by the leaders of these countries which are called "non-aligned" but which, in fact, willingly or unwillingly are all satellites (...) of American imperialism and other capitalist powers, is an "independent policy outside blocs".

All these countries and their states are hopelessly in debt hence their economy is a sick appendix of big world capital which makes the law in these countries, dictates their policy, maintains or brings down the cliques which lead them, according to the needs and the policy of joint companies of big finance capital.” (Enver Hoxha, The Superpowers, 1986, edition in English)

Initially, this “non-aligned movement” was founded by Titoites who tried to establish their own sphere of influence, but as time passed Titoites were eventually overcome by Chinese revisionists as leaders of the “non-aligned” movement. Chinese social-fascists added Mao’s chauvinist, anti-socialist and reactionary “third world theory” to the movement and turned it into nothing more than a masquerade utilized by them in their quest for extending their influence in order to transform China into an imperialist superpower – as they managed to do. Countries belonging to the so-called “non-aligned third world movement” are neither “independent” or “non-aligned”. They were and are mere neo-colonies of imperialist powers that use their adherence to this anti-socialist movement to deceive workers about the reactionary nature of the regimes ruling these countries.

But let’s return to Castroist subservience towards Soviet imperialism. Despite their ridiculous efforts to deny this, the fact is that Castroist Cuba’s dependence on social-fascist and social-imperialist Soviet Union was so intense that everything perceived to be opposed to it was forbidden in Castroist Cuba. For example, in 1968, Albanian diplomats present in Cuba noted that:

“We asked whether Albanian literature was available in Cuba, like in news stands, etc. and were said no because it always attacks the Soviet Union and it is divisive.” (Conversation with Xhustin Papogorgi, Third Secretary of the Embassy of the People’s Republic of Albania in Cuba, 27th September 1967, edition in English)

As can be concluded, Castroists were so deeply engaged in subservience towards Soviet social-fascists and social-imperialists that they could not bear even the slightest criticism towards them. All those who condemned Soviet social-imperialism and Cuban
social-fascism from truly Marxist-Leninist positions were promptly qualified as “divisive” by Castroists. This is already a very old technique used by the opportunists: to depict anti-revisionists who criticize them as being “divisive”, when the truth is that revisionists and social-imperialists are the ones who truly encourage division through their anti-communist betrayal, through their defense of capitalism and imperialism, through their attempts to make proletarians and workers give up the struggle for definitive abolition of exploitation and oppression. In this case, refusal of Albanian socialist literature was also very convenient to Castroist aims, as it prevented Cuban workers from becoming acquainted with the fact that in Albania an authentic proletarian dictatorship led by a genuine Marxist-Leninist-Stalinist party was successfully advancing towards socialism and communism in accord with the principles of communist ideology – thus on the antipodes of revisionist and social-fascist Cuba.

And together with the deepening of subjection towards Soviet social-imperialism, Castroism’s revisionist features were also accentuated. Faithfully following Khrushchevist pro-capitalist defense of “peaceful revolution” against the teachings of Marxism-Leninism, Castroists started to declare more often that the epoch of violent socialist revolutions had surpassed. Indeed, in the famous Conference of 81 Communist and Workers’ parties in Moscow in 1960, while comrade Enver bravely unmasked Khrushchevist treason and its restoration of capitalism within comrade Stalin’s socialist world camp, Castroists cowardly supported Khrushchevist “peaceful road to socialism”. Every Stalinist-Hoxhaist knows that this “peaceful socialist revolution” is incompatible with the most basic laws of socio-economic development. It is impossible to implement proletarian dictatorship, socialism and communism without resorting to armed violence. To affirm the contrary is to be totally reactionary and anti-communist. To refuse revolutionary violence in socialist construction means to entirely refuse Marxist-Leninist-Stalinist-Hoxhaist ideology.

But Castroists were never interested in implementing proletarian power, neither in constructing socialism or communism, so they gladly joined social-fascist chorus in defense of “peaceful road to socialism”. In 1971, Castro visited Chile, where bourgeois reformist Allende had been elected as the country’s president. Some revisionists like to treacherously qualify Allende’s election as being the start of the “Chilean path to socialism”. Of course, Allende never intended to construct socialism in Chile, his govern never managed to go beyond the limits or to attack the fundaments of bourgeois-capitalist system. But during this visit, Castro made a very interesting assertion:

"He (Castro) was asked repeatedly if he supported the Chilean path to socialism considering that it contradicted the Cuban experience. “We find no contradiction;” he said." (Fidel Castro cited in Sebastian Balfour, Castro, 1990, edition in English)

However, one the most scandalous examples of Castroist Cuba adherence to Soviet fascist foreign policy was undoubtedly its involvement in pro-Soviet neo-colonialist wars in Africa. African continent had always been a privileged ground for inter-imperialist rivalries. In late 60’s and early 70’s, both American imperialism and Soviet social-imperialism were engaged in expelling the last traditional colonialists in order to replace them by their own neo-colonial dominion. Both imperialist superpowers wanted to surpass each other by becoming Africa’s new absolute ruler. In 1974, when Brezhnev
visited Cuba, Castroist support for Soviet colonialist foreign policies was confirmed by
affirming:

"The complete identity of views (between Cuba and the Soviet Union) regarding the present world situation." (Keesing’s Contemporary Archives, Volume 20, edition in English)

Moreover:

"Cuban praise of the Soviet Union was uncommonly ardent.” (William E. Ratliff, Castroism and Communism in Latin America: 1959-1976, 1976, edition in English)

At that time, Castroists were never tired of expressing their “friendship” towards the other Soviet satellites and neo-colonies. They made several visits to them. During a visit to social-fascist Czechoslovakia, East Germany and Soviet Union, Castro was even awarded the Order of Lenin, in which was a nauseating insult to the revolutionary memory and legacy of the 3rd Classic of Marxism-Leninism who dedicated his life struggling against all kinds of revisionism and for world socialist revolution. Castroists also had very warm relations with monarcho-fascist North Korea, revisionist Vietnam and reactionary Tito’s Yugoslavia. During these trips, Castroists and the other social-fascists published joint communiqués in which they hypocritically proclaimed their:

“(…) identity of views and loyalty to Marxism-Leninism.” (Documents of Revisionist Party of Cuba, Socialist vanguard in American continent, translated from version in German language)

Of course, by that time only comrade Enver’s socialist Albania was still loyal to Marxism-Leninism. All other countries, including Castroist Cuba and all those which were part of the degenerated revisionist Soviet camp, were and are completely anti-communist, pro-capitalist and pro-imperialist. They were and are bourgeois and social-fascist regimes where workers were and are savagely exploited and oppressed. They have absolutely nothing to do with Marxism-Leninism. Indeed, the presentation of social-fascist tyrannies as being “Marxist-Leninist countries” only contributes for the discredit of Marxism-Leninism and to the misleading of world workers relatively to what authentic Marxism-Leninism truly is, aims and represents.

In face of this, it is unsurprising that Soviet imperialists demanded that their Castroist lackeys sent thousands of troops in defense of their expansionist goals in Africa. Indeed, Castroist leaders had already visited many African countries like Algeria, Guinea, Sierra Leone, etc. In 1972, they paid official journeys to all these nations where they took the opportunity to spread their anti-socialist ideas and also to defend the interests of their Soviet social-imperialist masters in extending their bourgeois-capitalist, neo-colonialist, wage slavagist, social-fascist, exploitative, oppressive and anti-communist sphere of influence with the aim of maximizing their profits. In their report relatively to these visits, they affirm to be “impressed” with the:

“(…) socialist transformation of these countries.” (Documents of the Revisionist Party of Cuba, Report of Fidel Castro’s journey, 1972, translated from version in German language)
So, Castroists affirm that countries like Algeria, Guinea and Sierra Leone, which had expelled their former colonialists only to fall into the hands of the new imperialist superpowers, are “becoming socialist”! These countries are completely dependent on one imperialist power or another in political, economic and social fields (just like Cuba, for that matter). In these nations, exploitative productive relations and capitalist rule always remained untouched, despite the “popular”, “leftist”, “non-aligned” and even “socialist” shibboleths used by its bourgeois-revisionist leaders to mislead workers, thus preventing genuine socialist revolution.

However, among all African countries, there were two where the intervention of Cuban mercenaries at the service of Soviet imperialists was particularly intense: Angola and Ethiopia.

We will start by reflecting about Angolan case. Even before the country’s independence from Portuguese colonialism, Castroists had already sent soldiers to help pro-Soviet People’s Movement Liberation of Angola to seize power. Cuba:

"Sent some 12,000 troops to Angola to assist the revolutionary struggle of the People's Liberation Movement of Angola.” (William E. Ratliff, Castroism and Communism in Latin America: 1959-1976, 1976, edition in English)

Of course, Castroists couldn’t care less about the oppression exercised by Portuguese colonialism over Angolan workers. They were sending troops to Angola in order to save their own skin – if they refrained from doing this, they would be exposed to the anger of both imperialist superpowers and they would be torn into pieces by them. American imperialism continued trying to destroy Castroist system and to reconquer its former positions in Cuba; and if they refused to advance Soviet social-imperialism’s goals, then they would loose Soviet support that was indispensable to the maintenance of their social-fascist order against American attacks and pressures. Consequently, Cuban revisionists’ claims that “we went to Africa and gone away with nothing but the coffins of our sons and daughters who died in the struggles to liberate this continent” is a shameful lie (of course, this is not to deny that many of those Cuban soldiers who intervened in Africa were indeed sons and daughters of Cuban working masses. However, while some of them were forced to go to Africa by Castroists, there were also others who were completely misled by the falsehoods of Cuban social-fascists and of Soviet imperialists, thus firmly believing that they went to Africa to defend “peoples’ liberation” and even “socialism”). Just like had happened with Soviet invasion of Czechoslovakia, Castroist bourgeois class had no option besides supporting Soviet revisionist, capitalist, repressive, exploitative, oppressive, colonialist, anti-communist, social-fascist, social-imperialist policies (exactly like those of any other imperialism) if it wanted to keep its anti-socialist, neo-colonial, capitalist-revisionist, exploitative, repressive, oppressive power:

“So far as their social-imperialism is contending for world domination with U.S. imperialism. Both groups of imperialists seek to smash or subvert anti-imperialist struggles of the African people. Three things make the Soviet Union a dangerous threat in their drive for world power. First, the Soviet economy is monopoly state capitalism, and its development is on the rise whereas U.S. monopoly capitalism wanes. Second, it parades as a “socialist country” and the “natural ally of liberation struggles.” Finally, it has its (...) puppets like Cuba (and Vietnam) to
cloak its designs (...). In Africa, the Cuban authorities and army serve their Soviet masters well. Workers demand that both superpowers get out of Africa. In Azania, Zimbabwe and Namibia, the people, are struggling to throw off U.S. and British imperialism. In Angola and Ethiopia, the people are waging armed struggle to throw off Soviet social-imperialism. Contention between the two superpowers leads toward World War III. But in the struggles against imperialism and social-imperialism, the peoples of the world will claim their future!”

Taking advantage of African workers’ aspirations to real emancipation and to socialism, Castroists intervened in Angola as pro-Soviet mercenaries during the 70’s and 80’s using “red” and “socialist” cloaks in order to conquer the support of Angolan laboring masses and of all other African workers through making them believe that Cuban-Soviet social-fascist intervention would liberate them from the harsh oppression and exploitation they had been enduring for centuries. In 1989, an American bourgeois newspaper stated that:

"Over the past 13 years more than 300,000 Cubans have served there (in Angola)."

(Financial Times, 17 February 1989, edition in English)

Indeed, their presence was essential to allow that Soviets could successfully defeat American imperialisms’ attempts to control Angola and to permit the establishment of a pro-Soviet social-fascist regime in this country which would ensure the interests of Soviet social-imperialists in extending their neo-colonial empire over Africa:

“In 1976, Cuban troops and heavy artillery went to Angola, supposedly to help resist an invasion from South Africa which threatened newly-won independence. But the Cubans ended up providing direct military support to one of three liberation’ groups (the pro-Soviet one) against the other two. Over 150,000 Angolan people died in the resulting civil war. (...) In 1977, Cuban mercenaries assisted and trained Katangese gendarmes in their preparations to attack Zaire from Angola. These Katangese were once used by U.S. imperialism to murder Patrice Lumumba; now, the Soviet Union tries to use them (under Cuban tutelage) to overthrow an anti-Soviet government. Cuban authorities claim their army is in Africa because the African people ask for assistance in liberation. Some apologists add that anything that helps overthrow U.S. imperialism (...) is progressive. It is quite clear that the Angolan people did not invite assistance from Cuba or anywhere else. The Angolan people’s forces were split into three groups. After liberation from Portugal, progressives all over the world hoped for unity and a peaceful settlement between the three, free from outside interference. Only the pro-Soviet group invited Cuban mercenaries, not to secure liberation but to defeat the other two organizations and insure Soviet hegemony over Angola. (...)Whatever the excuse, sending troops from one country to another is the tactic of imperialists, not anti-imperialists or socialists. The presence of Cuban troops lays the foundation in Africa for Soviet domination by force of arms if other methods do not work. Thanks to Cuban work in Angola, that country now groans under social-fascism (socialist in name, fascist in deeds). The Soviets and East Germans control the political, economic and military situation in the country. The
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Comrade Enver perfectly perceived what was involved in the so-called “Angolan question”:

“As a means to penetrate into Africa and elsewhere, the Soviet revisionists employ and spread slogans of a socialist color in order to deceive the peoples who aspire to liberate themselves, to liquidate oppression and exploitation, and who know that the only road to complete national and social liberation is socialism. The Soviet Union also involves its allies, or better, its satellites in its interference. We are seeing this concretely in Africa, where the Soviet social-imperialists and their Cuban mercenaries are intervening on the pretext that they are assisting the revolution. This is a lie. Their intervention is nothing but a colonialist action aimed at capturing markets and subjugating peoples. The intervention of the Soviet Union and its Cuban mercenaries in Angola is of this nature. They have never had the slightest intention of assisting the Angolan revolution, but their aim was and is to get their claws into that African country which had won a certain independence after the expulsion of the Portuguese colonialists. The Cuban mercenaries are the colonial army dispatched by the Soviet Union to capture markets and strategic positions in the countries of Black Africa, and to go on from Angola to other states, to enable the Soviet social-imperialists, too, to create a modern colonial empire. Under the cloak of aid for peoples' liberation the Soviet Union and its mercenary, Cuba, are intervening in other countries with armies equipped with artillery and machine-guns, allegedly to build socialism, which does not exist in either the Soviet Union or Cuba. These two bourgeois-revisionist states intervened in Angola in order to help a capitalist clique seize power, contrary to the aims of the Angolan people who had fought to win their freedom from the Portuguese colonialists. Agostinho Neto is playing the game of the Soviets. In the struggle against the other faction, in order to seize power for himself, he called in the Soviets to help him. The struggle between the two opposing Angolan clans did not have anything of a people's revolutionary character. The fight between them was a struggle of cliques for power. Each of them was supported by different imperialist states. Agostinho Neto emerged the winner from this contest, while socialism did not triumph in Angola. On the contrary, following the intervention from abroad, Soviet neo-colonialism has been established there. Social-imperialist China, too, is making great efforts to penetrate into the former colonial and semi-colonial countries.”

(Enver Hoxha, Imperialism and the Revolution, Tirana, 1979, edition in English)

These words from comrade Enver totally confirm our assertions. And it is equally important to note that comrade Enver was never misled by Cuban and Soviet lies about “internationalist solidarity towards African revolution”. He always saw this Cuban-Soviet intervention exactly as it was: nothing more than a neo-colonial attack aimed at defeating the influence of a rival imperialism in order to grant profit maximization to Moscow’s capitalists-imperialists through using the help of Cuban social-fascist mercenaries. And of course, they also had the goal of preventing African proletariat from embracing genuine communist ideology which would allow it to become truly free and independent. After all, African workers can only achieve authentic and definitive
freedom and independence if they unite with all other world workers in the struggle for world socialist revolution and for the implementation of proletarian dictatorship towards world socialism and world communism under the leadership of the Comintern (SH) in accord with the principles of Marxism-Leninism-Stalinism-Hoxhaism. There’s no other way and Cuban revisionists know this very well.

In the beginning of this article, we described the battle which took place in Cuito Canavale (Southern Angola). Contrary to what Castroists claim, the objective of this battle was not to “liberate Southern African peoples”, but to decide whose superpower would extend its sway over the region.

Castroists affirm that without Cuban mercenaries, South African racists would have probably won the Cuito Canavale battle and Namibia’s independence and the end of open apartheid in South Africa would have been delayed:

“It was a critical turning point in the struggle against apartheid. From November 1987 to March 1988, the South African armed forces repeatedly tried and failed to capture Cuito Cuanavale. In southern Africa, the battle has attained legendary status. It is considered the debacle of apartheid: a defeat of the South African armed forces that altered the balance of power in the region and heralded the demise of racist rule in South Africa.

Cuito Cuanavale decisively thwarted Pretoria's objective of establishing regional hegemony (a strategy which was vital to defending and preserving apartheid), directly led to the independence of Namibia and accelerated the dismantling of apartheid. The battle is often referred to as the African Stalingrad of apartheid. Cuba's contribution was crucial as it provided the essential reinforcements, material and planning. (…) Havana deployed 40,000 Cuban troops supported by 30,000 Angolan and 3,000 SWAPO troops.” (Isaac Saney, Cuba and Southern African Liberation: the unknown story, edition in English)

In first place, we observe Castroist usual misrepresentation of reality. They present their intervention in Africa at the service of Soviet social-imperialists and against South-African pro-American troops has having been determinant to Angola’s defense, Namibia’s formal independence and to the end of South African apartheid [also bourgeois-capitalist Guinean politician Amílcar Cabral, another lackey of Soviet social-imperialists, praised Castroist Cuba’s neo-colonialist activities in Africa affirming that Cuban mercenaries were helping African workers “to be independent and free” (Amílcar Cabral quoted in Isaac Saney, Cuba and Southern African Liberation: the unknown story, edition in English)]. But this is not true. What happened is that all this coincided with the interests of Soviet imperialism. South African explicitly racist regime was a pro-American puppet regime, it represented American imperialist interests in the region. Consequently, if Soviet social-fascists / social-imperialists wanted to achieve control over that same region, they would have to defeat South African regime because that would mean the weakening of American imperialism in Southern Africa (and of course, from this, the door would be open to exclusive absolute dominance over the entire African continent by Soviet social imperialists-capitalists). If their social-imperialist interests demanded that South African racist regime had to be supported, then Soviet imperialists would have not hesitated in supporting it – everything depended on what was more benefic to the expansion of bourgeois-capitalist, neo-colonialist,
wage slavagist, social-fascist, exploitative, oppressive and anti-communist sphere of influence and on what was more benefic to the maximization of their profits. And as Castroists had no other choice besides serving Soviet imperialism, if their social-fascist and social-imperialist masters had ordered them to combat at the side of South African racist troops, they would have done it. Castroists would have fought in favor of whoever was beneficial to Soviet social-imperialist interests. It happened that in the historical context in question, the most advantageous to Soviet capitalists-imperialists was to defeat and weaken South African regime in order to expel their greatest rival in the region – American imperialism. Therefore, Cuban mercenaries joined the efforts of Soviet revisionists to accomplish this. Castroists love to boast that they “fought for the cause of liberation, freedom and justice through contributing to the liberation of Africa from colonialism, oppression and racism”. But this is a lie. On the contrary, they helped Soviet revisionists and social-imperialists to impose their own colonialist and oppressive rule over Africa. For example, in Angola and in Namibia they significantly contributed to the buttressing of social-fascist tyrannies that still nowadays kill, steal, abuse and exploit Angolan and Namibian workers. And in what respects to racism, the fundamentals of apartheid were untouched in South Africa. As we have already explained in other articles, besides the formation of a tiny black bourgeoisie created with the agreement of the wealthy white bourgeoisie, everything remains the same in that country. Explicit apartheid was replaced by hidden apartheid. As can be concluded, there is no reason to glorify what does not deserve to be glorified. Social-fascist Castro’s Cuba was the lackey of Africa’s colonization by Soviet social-imperialists:

“The Cuban people do not want to wear the jackboot of social-imperialism. The use of Cuban troops in Africa has come about because the leadership of the country has sold the land and the people in bondage to the Soviet Union. (...) The Cuban army has earned a worldwide reputation as a band of mercenaries in service to Soviet social-imperialism. As U.S. monopoly capitalists lose (...) domain after another to national liberation struggles, the new tsars of the Soviet Union seek to take over as masters of the world. The Cuban army plays an important role in their plans. As a (...) country which has already won independence from U.S. imperialism, Cuba reinforces Russia’s boast that the Soviet Union is “the natural ally of national liberation struggles” (...). If fighting is necessary to consolidate Soviet influence in a particular country or region, the social-imperialists prefer that the others fight each other while they remain comfortably hidden in the background. Events in Africa over the past decade and more prove the Cuban army’s reactionary function on behalf of Soviet social-imperialism.”

Also ridiculous is Castroists’ pompous assertion that “Cuito Canavale was the African Stalingrad”. Once more, their haughtiness is outrageous. They are comparing Cuito Canavale with the glorious battle of Stalingrad. Both battles are incomparable in terms of significance and also in terms of dimension. Stalingrad was a massive battle which involved many millions of soldiers, but it was foremost a combat between two opposite and irreconcilable socio-economic systems: on one side, socialist Soviet Union led by comrade Stalin; on the other side, fascist-imperialist armies led by Nazi Germany. That is also why Stalingrad was such a dreadful battle – it could not have been middle terms there, one of the sides had to perish so the other could survive. On the contrary, the
Cuito Canavale battle was merely a part of a reactionary and predatory war between two imperialist superpowers for the hegemony over the African continent. Nothing more than that. To declare that Cuito Canavale is comparable to Stalingrad is even offensive to the memory of all those who gave their lives so that Bolshevist Soviet Union could defeat nazi-fascist barbarous aggression.

Castroists try to impose bourgeois ideological distortion of the history of the African liberation movement into the heads of world workers in general, and of African workers in particular to convince them about their false “progressive” and “socialist” nature. The class struggle of the African proletariat and the solidarity of the world proletariat write the history of liberation – and nobody else. The only country in the world which really supported the liberation struggle in Southern Africa was Socialist Albania and the Marxist-Leninist World Movement with comrade Enver Hoxha at the head and not social-fascist Cuba. Castro’s Cuba was the lackey of the African colonization by the Soviet social-imperialists. To affirm the contrary is synonym of trying to hide the bourgeois-capitalist, neo-colonialist, pro-imperialist, wage slavagist, exploitative, oppressive, revisionist, anti-communist and social-fascist character of Castro’s Cuba.

And Castroists go further with their mystifications:

“Cuban involvement in Southern Africa has been repeatedly dismissed as surrogate activity for the Soviet Union. This insidious myth has been unequivocally refuted. (…) In his acclaimed book, 'Conflicting Missions: Havana, Washington and Africa, 1959-76', Piero Gliejeses demonstrated that the Cuban government - as it had repeatedly asserted - decided to dispatch combat troops to Angola only after the Angolan government had requested Cuba's military assistance to repel the South Africans, (…) and the Soviet Union had no role in Cuba's decision and were not even informed prior to deployment. In short, Cuba was not the puppet of the USSR.” (Isaac Saney, Cuba and Southern African Liberation: the unknown story, edition in English)

Unfortunately for the Castroists, reality is very different from the reactionary legends they invent. And the image of Castroist Cuba acting independently of Soviet interests is precisely that: a legend. Castroist “arguments” that “Cuba was not a Soviet puppet because Soviet leaders were only informed about Cuban intervention in Africa after its happening” do not hold any water. Far from proving that Castroist Cuba was not a pro-Soviet lackey, they manage to reveal the incredible intensity of the neo-colonial exploitative subservience of Cuba towards Soviet imperialists. Indeed, Castroists were so intensely involved in satisfying Soviet social-imperialist demands that they didn’t even need formal orders coming from Moscow to intervene in regions were the interests of Soviet social-fascists and social-imperialists were at stake. This was also a manner of winning the favors of Soviet social-imperialists - in this way, Castroists aimed at prove that their promptness to defend the expansion of Moscow capitalists’ exploitative empire was something mechanical and immediate. With such loyal servers as Castroists, Soviet social-imperialists didn’t need to tire themselves giving instructions and orders. Castroists saved them from dispersing their energies with these efforts. Castroist dependence on Soviet revisionists had reached such a profound level that it even dispensed express commands from the Soviet imperialists – Castroist Cuba was ready to serve its masters in an automatic form without waiting for direct orders. It is impossible
to imagine a more subservient position towards Soviet social-imperialism than the one embraced by Castroists. And as if this was not enough, they still dare to declare that:

“Cuba’s solidarity with Angola’s liberation struggle it is the highest expression of the combat against imperialism and neo-colonialism.” (Documents of the Revisionist Party of Cuba, *A demonstration of proletarian internationalism and solidarity between Cuban and Angolan peoples*, translated from version in German language)

“Cuba’s role in Africa provides countries with technical assistance, especially through sending medical personnel there.” (Documents of the Revisionist Party of Cuba, *Cuban engagement in Angola*, translated from version in German language)

“On 15 November 1987 Cuba decided to reinforce its forces by sending fresh detachments, arms and equipment, including tanks, artillery, anti-aircraft weapons and aircraft. Eventually Cuban troop strength would rise to more than 50,000. It must be emphasized that for a small country such as Cuba the deployment of 50,000 troops would be the equivalent of the U.S. deploying more than a million soldiers, or Canada more than one hundred thousand. The Cuban commitment was immense. Fidel Castro stated that the Cuban Revolution had 'put its own existence at stake. (...) We put everything at stake in that action.” (Isaac Saney, *Cuba and Southern African Liberation: the unknown story*, edition in English)

The first phrase is so hypocritical and anti-socialist that we will not even waste our time commenting it; it has already been answered throughout this article. In what respects to the second one, once more Castroists display their ideology to cover their social-fascist and pro-imperialist actions with “humanitarian” masks. African workers do not need Cuban medical personnel for nothing. They are able to solve their problems by themselves without intervention from revisionists. But this is quite natural. Just like they do in Cuba, also in Africa Castroists aim at deceiving workers through giving them some ridiculous alms. This is a strategy widely used by them. Indeed, in their long speech at the Conference of Communist Parties of Latin America and Caribbean, Castroists also talked a lot about the “welfare state” of bourgeois social-democratic type they managed to establish in Cuba:

“(…) in Cuba, the vast majority of children frequent the teaching system (...) the number of people with academic degrees has exponentially grown (...) and Cuba is one of the three most advanced American countries in what respects to healthcare with 10.330 doctors (...).” (Documents of the Revisionist Party of Cuba, *Conference of Communist Parties of Latin America and Caribbean, 1975*, translated from version in German language)

They always use this to deviate workers’ attention from the reactionary nature of Cuban social-fascist state and from the pro-capitalist and anti-socialist character of Castroism. Indeed, in that same speech, they present the “struggle against American imperialism” (as if Latin American workers do not have any other enemies...) and the “achievement of democratic rights” (the implementation of this kind of reformist system) as being synonym of “socialism”. They even depict Cuba as an example to be followed. Obviously, Castroists are fulfilling their anti-communist purposes by trying to inculcate in workers’ minds the false idea that the existence of an healthcare and a teaching system is equivalent to socialist construction, that to have access to bourgeois “social-
security” is equivalent to socialism. With this, they aim at keeping proletarians away from authentic anti-revisionist ideology by convincing them that they just have to implement a social-democratic “welfare state” in their countries to live in a “socialist society”. Accordingly with this theory from Castroists, there is no need to annihilate oppressive socio-economic productive relations neither to struggle against bourgeois-capitalist-revisionist influences, neither to destroy the resistance of the bourgeois exploiters through violent revolutionary means, neither to socialize the means of productions, neither to establish a proletarian dictatorship under the leadership of a genuinely Marxist-Leninist party, etc… For Castroists, to “construct socialism” it suffices to implement a “social security” system paid by the workers’ extremely heavy taxes and “contributions” (which are stolen from laboring classes by social-fascist pro-imperialist bourgeoisie under the false deceitful pretext of “being needed to construct socialism”) which will extinguish their revolutionary flame and communist conscience in order to perpetuate capitalist, imperialist and revisionist exploitative reign. This is one of the most dangerous characteristics of Castroist revisionism, whose fundaments are very similar to those of European pro-capitalist “social-democracy”.

Relatively to the third statement, obviously that Castroists gave it all for the success of Soviet expansionism in Africa. After all, social-imperialists are not sentimentalists; if social-fascist Cuba had failed providing them with adequate assistance and because of this they had lost any chance of dominance over Africa, Castroists would have been in serious troubles. Soviet social-imperialists would have feel tempted to replace them by another clique of servants more able to satisfy their needs in their imperialist adventures. Castroists knew this very well, they knew that they had to do their utmost so that their social-imperialist bosses were successful in their quest for hegemony over Africa – otherwise, it was Castroist bourgeoisie’s own rule and class privileges that would be endangered. Therefore, we completely agree with Castro when he says that “we (i.e., Cuban social-fascists) put everything at stake in that action.”

And all this can also be applied to Cuban intervention in the Horn of Africa, particularly in Ethiopia. Castroist participation in wars taking place in that region was again determined by Soviet expansionist interests. Everything started when pro-American Somali regime invaded Ethiopia’s region of Ogaden:

"Cuba's participation in the . . . war between Ethiopia and Somalia . . . responded more to Soviet than Cuban interests. The Somali forces, newly armed by the United States, invaded the Ogaden desert. In a move to legitimize its growing military support for Ethiopia, the Kremlin asked for Cuban troops to be involved in the campaign. . . . Strengthened by 15,000 Cuban soldiers and massive Soviet arms shipments, the Ethiopian forces . . . by February 1978 had driven the Somali army back across the frontier.” (Sebastian Balfour, Castro, 1990, edition in English)

"By January 1978 . . . there were several thousand Cuban troops on the ground, supplied with tanks, artillery and other heavy weapons provided by the Soviet Union.” (Wayne S. Smith, US-Cuba Relations: Twenty-Five Years of Hostility, 1959-1984, 1985, edition in English)

“(…) in the Horn of Africa, the social-imperialists played back and forth between Somalia and Ethiopia. First Somalia was the favored Soviet ally. But the Somalis got wind of Soviet intentions to dominate their country and kicked the social-
imperialists out. Now, Kremlin policy dictates that Somalia is “reactionary” while
Ethiopia is really “progressive.” After a massive arms buildup in Ethiopia, the new
tsars provoked a war between the two countries in 1978. The fascist regime in
Ethiopia relied heavily on the Cuban army in fighting that war. Today, the Cubans
remain to help Ethiopia contain national liberation struggles in Eritrea and
Ogaden.” (http://www.marxists.org/history/erol/ncm-1a/nv-cuba.htm, The Cuban
15, 1979, edition in English)

As can be concluded, no matter how much Castroists scream that the participation of
their mercenaries in African inter-imperialist wars “was guided by proletarian
internationalism”, the truth remains the same: Castroists were pro-Soviet social-fascist
lackeys whose goal was to ensure victory of Soviet imperialists over their rivals:

“The Soviets are predominant in Ethiopia. They send there weapons and Cuban
mercenaries who are fighting to occupy the territory of Ogaden and possibly the
whole of Somalia. Somalia was formerly under the wing of the Soviets, but the
United States of America intervened, of course indirectly, and Somalia let the
Soviets down and occupied the provinces of Ogaden and Harar. Fierce fighting is
going on there now (...). The Cuban army has now become a "Foreign legion" of
the Soviet Union and is being used as a mercenary army especially in Africa, in
Ethiopia against Somalia. There the Cuban mercenary troops are leading the
Ethiopian troops and, at the same time fighting to liquidate Somalia, in other
words, to create a new Soviet colony there. They achieved this in Angola, where the
Cubans, assisted by the Soviets, supported Neto, brought him to power, and
maintain a considerable number of mercenaries there to this day to fight Neto's
opponents, that is, the tools of the Americans and the other former colonizers, in
order to firmly establish the Soviet influence in that country and turn it into a
Soviet market. Similar situations are developing in Rhodesia, Zambia, and in the
Sudan. The use of mercenaries has become fashionable today. World capitalism
uses mercenaries to fight the peoples who rise to win their freedom and national
independence, to throw off the yoke of foreign imperialist exploiters and their local
allies. The mercenaries are described as liberation armies that "defend" the
sovereignty and freedom of the respective peoples.” (Enver Hoxha, The
Superpowers, 1986, edition in English)

And we have to mention that in what respects to Ethiopia, Castroist intervention
allowed the maintenance of one of the most disgusting and awful social-fascist regimes
that ever existed: that of Mengistu Hailemariam, the leader of the Derg, the executioner
of Ethiopian people:

“The Ethiopian regime is not progressive by any honest standards. It is a fascist
junta which slaughters the Ethiopian people and tries feverishly to suppress two
national liberation movements of its own with Soviet arms and Cuban troops.”
(http://www.marxists.org/history/erol/ncm-1a/nv-cuba.htm, The Cuban Army:
Mercenaries for social imperialism, The New Voice, Vol. VIII, No. 17, October 15,
1979, edition in English)

For Mengistu, to assassinate Ethiopian workers by hunger and thirst was a normal way
of governing (also in this, Mengistu is equal to all other capitalist-imperialist-revisionist
rulers). But Castroists couldn’t care less about this, they were only worried in granting the satisfaction of Soviet social-imperialists as a mean to keep their exploitative class reign over Cuban workers – all the rest was irrelevant to them. Consequently, they didn’t mind about openly supporting fascist Derg, which savagely repressed Ethiopian proletariat, since it could contribute to Castroist bourgeoisie’s maintenance in power. Relatively to Ethiopian situation, Castro arrogantly remarked that:

“We have the right of sending militar advisers to Ethiopia if this country’s government needs them.” (Documents of the Revisionist Party of Cuba, *Cuban engagement in Angola*, translated from version in German language)

Of course, everybody knows that these Cuban militar “advisers” were used by Mengistu’s Derg to organize fascist repression against Ethiopian toilers and to oppress peoples like those of Tigray and of Eritrea that were striving for self-determination. So, Castro is totally mistaken. Cuban social-fascists didn’t have the right of intervening in a foreign country contributing to the subjection of its working masses to a despotic regime which only served the interests of Moscow’s capitalists-imperialists.

“President Fidel Castro of Cuba said, “... Yankee imperialism seeks to question Ethiopia’s right to defend its territorial integrity and unity against the Eritrean secessionists.” *(Granma*, May 7, 1979) Of course, Cuba can decide who are the “secessionists” and who are the legitimate liberation forces in Africa!” (http://www.marxists.org/history/erol/nem-1a/nv-cuba.htm, *The Cuban Army: Mercenaries for social imperialism, The New Voice*, Vol. VIII, No. 17, October 15, 1979, edition in English)

Cuban social-fascists didn’t have the right to jeopardize oppressed peoples’ combat for independence. And they even reached the point of receiving Mengistu in an official visit to Cuba! During a week, Mengistu and his colleagues of the Derg were in Cuba eating, drinking and partying at the expenses of Cuban workers. And Castro was not ashamed to affirm that:

“Mengistu is a staunch defender of Marxism-Leninism.” (Documents of the Revisionist Party of Cuba, *Mengistu Hailemariam visits Cuba*, translated from version in German language)

Is Mengistu really a defender of Marxism-Leninism? Well, everything depends on what we understand by “Marxism-Leninism”. If we consider Marxism-Leninism in accord with the teachings of the 5 Classics (Marx, Engels, Lenin, Stalin and Enver Hoxha), then Mengistu is the opposite of a Marxist-Leninist, he is a social-fascist. But if like Castro we think that to impose a fascist despotism over an entire people and that to sell one’s own country to Soviet imperialists is “Marxism-Leninism”, then Mengistu is certainly a “Marxist-Leninist”. If to be a “Marxist-Leninist” is to let Moscow’s capitalists-imperialists voraciously consume nation’s resources at the point of condemning working masses to a deadly famine, then Mengistu is certainly a “Marxist-Leninist”. If to be a “Marxist-Leninist” is to drench in blood any attempt by oppressed nations to achieve their right to self-determination is to be a “Marxist-Leninist”, then Mengistu is certainly a “Marxist-Leninist”. Qualifications do not alter the essence of things.
It is estimated that around half million of poor died in the Ethiopian famines of the 70’s and 80’s caused by Mengistu’s pro-Soviet capitalist policies. And thousands more were slaughtered by Derg’s fascist repression during the same period. Castroist social-fascists are responsible for each one of these terrible deaths because they deliberately and willingly supported Mengistu’s pro-Soviet imperialist state capitalist totalitarianism. When world socialist revolution is victorious and the world proletariat establishes its dictatorship, Castroists will pay for everything they did and continue to do against the cause of workers’ emancipation.

These were some of the main political consequences of Castroist subservience towards Soviet social-imperialism. We will now reflect about the economic effects of this same subservience.

4.2 – Economic consequences

The acceptance by the Castroists of a neo-colonial status under Soviet imperialist sway eventually led to the consolidation of the pro-capitalist economic features that had always been defended and practiced by revisionists, social-fascists, anti-communists Castroists:

“Following the Cuban revolution (...) the government moved closer to the Soviet Union, fearing attack or subversion from the United States only 90 miles away. The Soviets used that concern and that opportunity to turn Cuba into a neo-colony and a pawn of social-imperialism worldwide. Soviet domination has destroyed the Cuban economy. (...) Today, there are only giant enterprises with a single crop—sugar. Soviet social-imperialism has made Cuba a single-crop economy, much as U.S. imperialism did in the early 1900’s. (...) a Cuban-Soviet agreement called for Cuba to abandon industrialization in favor of increased sugar production. (...) Then, in 1972, Cuba was integrated into the Soviet-controlled Council for Mutual Economic Assistance (CMEA). Today, control of the Cuban economy rests with the Cuban-Soviet Commission of Economic, Scientific and Technical Collaboration, where “socialist co-operation” gives way to maximizing sugar production in Cuba. The Cubans are dependent on the Soviet Union for fuel, factories, machinery parts and other goods. They are $6 billion in debt to the Kremlin bosses. All hopes of an independent Cuban economy vanish in the face of this blatantly imperialist domination.” (http://www.marxists.org/history/erol/ncm-1a/nv-cuba.htm, The Cuban Army: Mercenaries for social imperialism, The New Voice, Vol. VIII, No. 17, October 15, 1979, edition in English)

As we have already noted, Cuban economy was never a socialist economy, it was never a genuinely planned economy in accord with the principles of Marxism-Leninism-Stalinism-Hoxhaism, and we must stress that the existence of such a planned and socialized economy is an essential condition for the complete and definitive elimination of the exploitative, oppressive, repressive, wage slavagist capitalist-imperialist bourgeois system, it is a crucial requisite for accomplishment of true political-socio-economic independence and to the defeat of all kinds of anti-communist enemies. And this because only through such a planned and socialized economy can the proletariat and the workers fully dominate socio-economic laws, thus firmly and definitively
establishing and buttressing their class power through putting production in general and agreeing productive relations and forces in particular at the total service of socialist and communist construction and of socialist and communist society. Indeed, as soon as 1967, Albanian diplomats in Cuba correctly remarked:

“(…) the lack of a real planned economy (…)” (Conversation with Xhustin Papogorgi, Third Secretary of the Embassy of the People’s Republic of Albania in Cuba, 27th September 1967, edition in English)

However, until the late 60’s, Castroists continued to hide their inherently capitalist exploitative economic system behind “socialistic” masks, namely by developing state capitalism. Nonetheless, as revisionist Soviet Union advanced towards the abandonment of state capitalism and its replacement by classic capitalism, this same course was also imposed on Cuba. Initially, Castroists were afraid of it, as to weaken state capitalism would mean the weakening of their “red” cloaks that deceive Cuban workers and keep them away from authentic socialism. But they soon understood that, once more, they had no choice. Cuba was now totally dependent on Soviet social-imperialism, its dependence on it was equivalent to the former pro-American one. In 1972, Cuba was totally submerged in capitals and “credits” coming from the Soviet imperialist bloc’s common “market”, the COMECON (the Council for Mutual Economic Assistance). And during that decade, Castroist forms of state capitalism had been limited as ordered by Moscow capitalists-imperialists:

"A new Soviet-style system of Economic Management and Planning was gradually introduced in the second half of the 1970s. . . . The new economic system uses market instruments. . . . State enterprises have been decentralized . . . and enjoy more independence to hire and dismiss labor, request loans and make investment decisions. (…) The efficiency of Cuban enterprises is measured by a set of indicators, with profit as the main one." (Carmelo Mesa-Lag, The Economy of Socialist Cuba: A Two-Decade Appraisal, 1981, edition in English)

“Castro was not sparing in his attacks on excessive centralisation in economic planning.” (Sebastian Balfour, Castro, 1990, edition in English)

Therefore, in accord with this “new system of direction and planning” (as it was called by Castroists, although there was never any kind of economic planning in revisionist Cuba at the exception of that aimed at maximizing the profits of Castroist bourgeoisie and of its Soviet social-imperialist masters), factories in social-fascist Cuba should finance themselves and decide their own budget, prices are fixed according to the cost of production, the managers of factories and industries which produce the highest rate of return on their investment are paid according to their social position and also according to the profitability of their enterprises, the workers are paid in correspondence with the profitability of the enterprises they work for and they can lose their jobs if production is revealed to be cheaper without them (that is, workers are paid austerely according to their productivity determined by quantity of work or by whether or not they meet the production’s objectives of their jobs – in other words, whether they can work quickly and profitably). So, as can be concluded, Castro had not the slightest problem about making opportunistic and pragmatically changes in his own ideology in order to put it in accord with the desires of Soviet social-fascists and social-imperialists. In a party Congress taking place at the time, he referred that: “(…) money, prices, finances,
budgets, taxes, credit, interest and other commodity categories should function as indispensable instruments…to decide on which investment is the most advantageous; to decide which enterprises, which units (…) performs best, and which performs worst, and so be able to take relevant measures.” In truth, we have to admit that Castro was not making any concessions of principle due to the simple fact that he was merely transferring his preferences from one form of capitalism to another, he was only openly assuming that laws governing Cuban economy had always been and continue to be the laws of capitalism. The option between state capitalism and classical capitalism has been made by all bourgeois regimes in agreement with their class interests at a certain moment. And it does not represent any substantial dilemma – there are occasions when a given bourgeoisie takes more advantages of practicing a more “planned” capitalism and there are other occasions when it takes more advantages from a more classic type of capitalism. This can never obliterate the fundamental class question: everything depends on what class is in power. While the bourgeoisie is not defeated by a socialist revolution and by the implementation of a proletarian dictatorship, then socio-economic system will always be exploitative and oppressive. It is irrelevant if the bourgeoisie in question chooses to follow a “planned” state capitalism or a more “liberal” capitalism. Therefore we have to condemn those revisionists and social-fascists which try to depict “planned” and state capitalism as being “positive” or even as being “socialism” and capitalism of classic type as being “negative” and “reactionary”, because all kinds of capitalism are invariably and inevitably repressive and slavagist. The same can be said about Castroist Cuba, where the so-called “economic reforms” beginning in the 70’s and the 80’s did not represent any change in the fundamental characteristics of Cuban social-fascism: it continued to be as tyrannical, as reactionary and as anti-socialist as ever. Indeed, Cuban “economic reforms” were equivalent to those occurring in the revisionist Soviet Union during the same period. They resulted from revisionists’ restoration of capitalism in the 50’s which allowed penetration of foreign imperialist credits also within Soviet Union and that ultimately lead to the elimination of the last remnants of “socialist” appearance in the revisionist Eastern bloc. This strategy was carefully planned and organized by American and Western imperialisms who cunningly knew how to use revisionist anti-socialist features and concessions to their own advantage in destroying a powerful rival. Comrade Enver sagely noted that:

“It (American Imperialism) will exploit the Soviet Union, will draw fabulous profits from it, which will serve to strengthen its world empire. Besides this, the introduction of American capital into the Soviet Union will cause even the smallest remnants of the victories of the Great October Socialist Revolution to be eliminated very quickly, will bring about the dismantling of the Soviet Union as a union of republics. This is the objective of American imperialism: to destroy the Soviet Union as a dangerous rival capitalist power. The «wiseacres» will say: «This will be difficult to achieve». On the contrary, this is easily achieved when you come off the rails of Marxism-Leninism.” (Enver Hoxha, Reflections on China, volume II, Tirana, edition in English)

Contrary to what was announced by Castroists, these “economic reforms” imposed by Soviet revisionists not only did not solve any of the contradictions caused by state capitalism but also led social-fascist Cuba towards a deep finance-economic crisis from which it never recovered. This crisis was further intensified due to Castroist pro-capitalist dogmatism. Indeed, they tried to solve the contradictions of capitalism resorting to capitalism itself through implementing a new series of “economic reforms”
under the name of “Rectification Process”. The purpose of this “Rectification Process” was allegedly to “decentralize Cuban economy”, but in fact it became a symbol of Castroist embracement of classic capitalism. For example, in 1987, Castroist bourgeoisie approved a new law on joint ventures, concessions and “free economic zones” that opened revisionist Cuba’s doors to Western capitalist-imperialist companies:

"Cuba had repeatedly stated its interest in attracting foreign investment and offers Western investors the chance to participate in joint ventures with the right to remit profits and with the attractions of stable legislation and special guarantees against expropriation.” (Economist Intelligence Unit, Country Profile: Cuba, 1988-89, edition in English)

"The Cuban Chamber of Commerce actively promotes joint ventures with foreign firms and information on Cuba's joint venture law was made available (…).” (Economist Intelligence Unit, Country Report: Cuba, 1991, edition in English)

"Foreign investment is being sought ever more eagerly, mostly via joint ventures. An estimated 60 joint ventures are now in place, with another 100 in the pipeline. Joint venture and product sharing agreements now exist with 29 countries, including several in Europe.” (Economic Intelligence Unit, Country Profile: Cuba, 1991, edition in English)

And the then president of the Cuban Chamber of Commerce authorized the establishment in Cuba of “free trade zones where private foreign investors could set up export-import businesses” and ensured to Western capitalists that Cuba was eager to allow foreign investment of up to 100% in enterprises. As can be observed, Castroist positions are on the antipodes of those of a truly Marxist-Leninist state. For example, Albanian comrades always had the concern of not letting any kind of foreign investments or credits coming from capitalist-revisionist countries penetrate in socialist Albania, because they knew very well that:

“Through these so-called credits (…), the big capitalist concerns and the states to which they belong bring great pressure to bear on the recipient states and peoples, and keep them under control. (…) On the other hand, these credits, which the big monopolies provide (…) are links of the imperialist chain around the necks of their own peoples.” (Enver Hoxha, Imperialism and the Revolution, Tirana, 1979, edition in English)

That is why Albanian communists decided to expressly establish in Albanian 1976 Constitution that:

“The granting of concessions to, and the creation of, foreign economic and financial companies and other institutions or ones formed jointly with bourgeois and revisionist capitalist monopolies and states, as well as obtaining credits from them, are prohibited in the People's Socialist Republic of Albania.” (Article 28 of the Constitution of People’s Socialist Republic of Albania, December of 1976, edition in English)
This article 28 of the Albanian 1976 Constitution has already been quoted by us in other articles, but we always find it to be indispensable. In fact, the presence within Albanian 1976 Constitution of this article is a clear sign of its authentically Marxist-Leninist character. For example, the revisionist Constitution of social-fascist North Korea not only does not include any article like this, but it even openly encourages foreign imperialist penetration in the country.

The proletariat of any nation who genuinely aims at constructing socialism can never neglect the necessity of putting into practice the fundamental principle contained in the article 28 of Albanian Socialist Constitution. Otherwise, capitalist restoration would be a mere matter of time because since capitalist-imperialist multinationals are permitted to freely dominate a country’s economy, they will inevitably also dominate its socio-political system. And it is obvious that bourgeois companies are not there to protect socialism, they will do their utmost to destroy it and to reinstall wage slavery and exploitation over workers.

Of course, Castroists did not have to face this kind of problems. They were not and are not worried about defending socialism against imperialist harassment because there was never socialism in Cuba. On the contrary, they were very busy encouraging Cuba’s transformation from a compradore country which was only open to Soviet imperialism into a compradore country open to world imperialism as a whole:

"It was made clear that all foreign investment was welcome, including in such areas as oil exploration, nickel, capital goods, textiles and agriculture (...)." (Keesing's Record of World Events, Volume 38, edition in English)

In 1992, Castroists also created new economic laws:

"So that foreign ownership of property in joint ventures and private foreign investment in Cuban enterprises can be allowed. Cuban companies will also be permitted to import and export without seeking permission from central government, thereby ending the state monopoly on foreign trade. There are now 88 autonomous Cuban companies functioning independently and as many as 240 foreign companies operating in Cuba." (Economist Intelligence Unit, Country Report: Cuba, 1992, edition in English)

Indeed, despite US embargo, there were many American companies which were interested in investing in Cuba and in taking profits from the nation’s resources. However, American imperialist bourgeois class never agreed with the requests of Castroist bourgeoisie to put an end to its embargo against Cuba, which is maintained until nowadays. To American imperialists, it is not enough that Castroists are willing to let American multinationals penetrate and exploit Cuba. They want more than this: American imperialist bourgeoisie want to reconquer their former exclusive control over Cuba, they want to be Cuba’s only masters and while Castroists continue to refuse this to them, they will never give up their attempts to weaken and to overthrow Castroist bourgeoisie. In fact, Castroists know very well that if American imperialists regained absolute control over Cuba, they would rapidly expel Castroist bourgeoisie in order to replace it with a more reliable pro-American puppet clique free from all the “socialistic” masks that Castroists still insist in using to mislead the workers and proletarians. Consequently, while able to prevent its own overthrowing, Castroist bourgeoisie will do
its utmost not to let American imperialist bourgeoisie reconquer their former positions in Cuba.

As we had already stated, the results of this adoption of classic capitalist economy by Castroists Cuba were disastrous. The serious problems inherited from the times of state capitalism not only were kept unsolved but they were even aggravated.

One of those problems was workers absenteeism. In Castroist Cuba, workers feel that they are being exploited by Castroist bourgeoisie and its imperialist and social-imperialist masters, they perceive that they are not laboring in their own favor but in benefit of the oppressors. Absenteeism can never exist in a genuinely socialist country, where toilers are educated in the spirit of revolutionary enthusiasm and where they know that everything they achieve in any field will entirely revert to their own advantage, even because in a socialist country exploiters are no longer holding state power and therefore they are not able to exploit workers neither to steal and accumulate the surplus value they produce. In socialist countries, working classes know that Marxism-Leninism is the ideology of their liberation, and they are eager to give everything to socialist and communist construction because they know that there is no other manner of definitively free themselves from bourgeois-capitalist-imperialist-revisionist brutal oppressive rule.

But as Castroist Cuba is a social-fascist state where wage slavery remained untouched, workers do not had the slightest incentive to go to work in order to increase the profits of the dominant classes:

"The clearest indication that something was wrong was the epidemic of absenteeism throughout the country. Castro himself noted in August and September 1970, some 20% of the workforce was absent on any given day, while in Oriente in August 1970 52% of agricultural workers failed to show up for work. . . . (…) By 1970 . . . it was clear that this political model was not functioning well. The most obvious signs was the widespread absenteeism and the low levels of productivity registered.” (Sebastian Balfour, Castro, 1990, edition in English)

What a tremendous contrast with the revolutionary Marxist-Leninist generations of Bolshevik Soviet Union and of Socialist Albania, whose heroic and tireless attachment to socialist work turned there countries from feudal neo-colonies into modern industrialized and independent nations in a question of few decades! And we cannot forget Castroist practice of forcing Cuban toiling masses (proletarians and peasants) to work as slaves in sugar fields with the purpose of advancing the greedy class interests of Soviet imperialists and of the other imperialists that control Castroist bourgeoisie both past and present – and who were and are counting on Cuban sugar to ensure and maximize their profits. Cuban revisionists call this “voluntary labor”, but it has nothing of voluntary. On the contrary, workers are obliged to perform this work and they are paid nothing for it: they forcibly work for free so that Castroist bourgeoisie can please its imperialist and social-imperialist bosses with many tons of highly profitable sugar, thus granting its own perpetuation in power. In fact, these Cuban workers are nothing more than slaves. Workers who refuse to enter this scheme are implacably repressed. Indeed, we must take into account that in order to deceive workers, Castroists affirm that this “voluntary work” is “necessary to accomplish socialism” and that, therefore, those workers who refuse it are “reactionaries”. Of course, this represents a terrible
misrepresentation of what socialism truly is. To those uninformed Cuban workers, “socialism” appears as being synonym of Castroist totalitarianism. In first place, contrary to what happens in an authentically socialist society, in revisionist Cuba there is not the slightest base for workers being engaged in true voluntary work because productive socio-economic relations retained their exploitative and oppressive nature. Only with socialist and communist construction can workers perform authentically voluntary revolutionary work. And secondly, it is time for Cuban workers to understand that their enslavement is not a result of socialism, but of the maintenance of bourgeois-capitalist class relations.

As a logic consequence of Castroist Cuba’s dependence on Soviet social-imperialism, the country was submerged in the debt crisis affecting neo-colonial countries. However, Castroist leaders still attempted to justify Cuba’s desperate situation by affirming that:

"Without Soviet assistance Cuba would be facing economic disaster and bankruptcy' with its 'sequel of starving people and hundreds of thousands of unemployed.” (Keessen’s Contemporary Archives, Volume 26, edition in English)

Fidel Castro himself defended that “it will be necessary to increasingly depend on Soviets due to the decrease in sugar production”. Here we perceive colonialism’s typical features. Cuban economy is monocultural almost in its entirety because Soviet imperialists ordered that it should mostly produce what was more profitable to Moscow capitalists-imperialists given Cuba’s conditions: raw sugar. Therefore, if the production of this product suffers a decrease by any reason, Cuban economy will be jeopardized as it had no other relevant means to support itself, as it had been configured as an appendix of Soviet imperialist system and had not (and still hasn’t) the capacity to maintain itself independently. Vital socialist principle of “relying on one’s own forces” (at least during the stage of socialism in one country) which allowed Bolshevist Soviet Union and Socialist Albania to resist capitalist-imperialist political-socio-economic invasion and encirclement was always very far from Castroist bourgeoisie’s minds. They invariably rejected this crucial principle with the pretext that it would allegedly be “incompatible with Cuba’s specific conditions” and other ridiculous excuses of the same kind whose only purpose is to justify their anti-communist and social-fascist policies that condemned Cuba to the most atrocious neo-colonial exploitative subservience towards world imperialism in general, and Soviet social-imperialism in particular. Comrade Enver always denounced this point of view defended by Cuban revisionists:

“The Albanian experience proves that even a small country with a backward material and technical base can experiment a great and general economic and cultural development, can grant its independence and can also defeat the attacks of world capitalism and imperialism if that country is conducted by a veritable Marxist-Leninist party, if that country is decided to fight until the end for its ideals having confidence in their achievement.” (Enver Hoxha, Report to the VIII Congress of the PTA, Tirana, 1981, translated from the French language)

“Let us take, for example, the question of the economic construction of the country, the development of the socialist economy relying on one's own forces. This principle is correct. Every independent, sovereign socialist state must mobilize the entire people, and define its economic policy correctly, must take all measures for
the proper and most rational exploitation of all the wealth of the country, and administer this wealth thriftily, must increase it in the interest of its own people and must not allow it to be plundered by others. This is a main, basic orientation for every socialist country (…) If (...) relations among states are based on the exploitation of small, economically weak states by big and powerful states, then such «aid» must be rejected, for it is enslaving.” (Enver Hoxha, *Imperialism and the Revolution*, Tirana, 1979, edition in English)

And we must stress that in the only true socialist countries that ever existed (in Soviet Union of comrades Lenin and Stalin and in comrade Enver’s Albania), the key principle of “relying on one’s won forces” was never reduced to exportations being superior to importations. Indeed, in both these countries, capitals invested in economy always came entirely from the country’s own accumulation funds (with the exception of that brief period in late 1940’s/early 1950’s when Enver’s Albania received supplementary internationalist aid from Stalinist Soviet Union. And this never affected socialist Albania’s independence in the least, because comrade Stalin’s Soviet Union was also a country genuinely constructing socialism. Socialist countries can perfectly receive aid from other socialist nations because this internationalist aid has not an exploitative and oppressive nature, it cannot engender capitalism and contributes to the strengthening and advancing of socialism). On the contrary, social-fascist Cuba was and is constantly invaded by enslaving credits and capitals coming from capitalist-revisionist imperialist powers. This alone shows that Castroist Cuba can never construct real socialism, and much less real communism.

But let’s return to our account of the economic consequences that subservience towards world imperialism and social-imperialism brought upon revisionist Cuba.

As Cuban capitalist and neo-colonial economy was getting into a desperate situation, Castroist bourgeoisie had also to face their country’s indebtedness towards world banking tycoons. This because in 1984:

"The Cuban National Bank signed an agreement with a consortium of creditor banks rescheduling $100 million of its medium-term debt due to 110 commercial banks in 1984 over a 9-year period.” (Keesing's Contemporary Archives, Volume 31, edition in English)

Like always happens, capitalist banks arranged things so that Castroist Cuba’s debt would only increase with time through imposing prohibitive spread rates whose goal was to ensure that Cuba would be permanently indebted towards them. And they were successful in this:

"By the mid-80s . . . a sharp decline in global social product was evident. . . . By 1986 Cuba had a record deficit of over $199 million. . . . Furthermore, Cuba (...) accumulated a debt of over $6 billion.” (Sebastian Balfour, *Castro*, 1990, edition in English)

By now, it is more than obvious that Castroist Cuba could never be a socialist country. Those who insist in affirming the contrary are in one of two situations: or they are totally blind or they are totally reactionary and anti-communist. Unfortunately, it is the second situation which applies to the vast majority of revisionist and neo-revisionist
ideologues for whom” Cuba is constructing socialism”. A truly socialist country can never have debts. Comrade Enver always stressed that a socialist country can never owe anything to capitalist-imperialist-revisionist world. If a determined nation has debts towards capitalist-imperialist-revisionist countries, companies or institutions, then this automatically means that the nation in question is not socialist. And if a country which has been constructing socialism accepts to be indebted towards the bourgeois world, then this means that this country has ceased to be socialist. Soviet Union of comrades Lenin and Stalin and Socialist Albania of comrade Enver never had any kind of debt towards capitalist-imperialist-revisionist nations. As comrade Enver sharply explains:

“The provision of such credits ensures the bourgeoisie markets for the sale of goods, the capitalists make colossal profits from the high interest rates charged, while the debtors are bound hand and foot to the creditors and the capitalist firms. (...) Apart from the extraction of capitalist profits, these credits, this «aid» and loans also have political objectives. The states which accord the credits aim to support and consolidate the political and economic power of particular cliques, which defend the economic, political and military interests of the creditor country. As the agreements on such credits are concluded between governments, they make the economic and political dependence of the debtor on the creditor even greater. The ruling cliques of the so-called socialist countries, like the Soviet Union, Czechoslovakia, Poland, etc., and now China, too, allow foreign capital to flow into their countries, because this capital serves the ruling cliques, while it is a heavy burden on the peoples. The Comecon countries are up to their necks in debt.”

(Enver Hoxha, Imperialism and the Revolution, Tirana, 1979, edition in English)

As a result of the hyper-indebtedness that Castroists brought upon Cuba, the situation of Cuban workers was deteriorating. World banking and financial capitalists tighten their claws over Cuba and demanded that the country pays its massive debts. Of course, Castroist government was incapable of fulfilling the impossible schedules imposed by banking bourgeoisie for payment:

"Cuba failed to repay either $16 million of principal or $3 billion in interest which had fallen due.” (Keesing’s Record of World Events, Volume 33, edition in English)

Shortly after this:

"Rescheduling talks with representatives of commercial banks collapsed.”
(Keesing's Record of World Events, Volume 33, edition in English)

In fact, capitalist bankers didn’t hesitate in taking advantages from this situation and used Castroist incapacity to pay as a pretext to exponentially increase the already usurer spreads and interests rates they had established. And who will suffer with this? Certainly not Castroist bourgeoisie, who continued enjoying its class privileges while transferring the debt crisis entirely to the shoulders of Cuban workers:

"Castro was calling for more sacrifices on the part of the Cuban people.”
(Sebastian Balfour, Castro, 1990, edition in English)

"The gravity of the country's economic situation demanded sacrifices from its citizens. Prices of non-essential items would be increased and the range of goods
subject to rationing would be widened.” (Fidel Castro, *Speech at the 3rd Congress of the Committees for the Defense of the Revolution*, edition in English)

It was in this context that “communist” and “revolutionary” Fidel Castro announced something which is very familiar to workers: austerity measures. Yes, “socialist” Cuba and its “Marxist-Leninist” leader Castro decided to condemn Cuban workers to misery so that world bourgeois imperialist bankers could have their abusive profits taken from the sweat and blood of Cuban proletariat and workers. This is very interesting because revisionist parties like the Portuguese Communist Party or the Communist Party of Greece (both staunch defenders of Castroist Cuba) spend their time talking against austerity measures and against the capitalist-caused debt crisis affecting European workers, but they hypocritically hide the fact that Castroist revisionist regime has been indebting itself and imposing austerity measures to Cuban toilers since long ago. This is a proof that there is no substantial difference between revisionist and openly capitalist-imperialist system, they have the same characteristics and consequences, no matter the lies spread by the social-fascists about the alleged “superiority” of revisionist order over explicitly capitalist order. And things in Cuba went from bad to worse:

"In order to reduce state subsidies, bus fares were raised by 100% and electricity charges by 40%.” (Keesing's Record of World Events, Volume 33, edition in English)

"The austerity measures which had been announced in late 1986 were retained.” (Keesing's Record of World Events, Volume 34, edition in English)

"The economy experiences severe contraction (...).” (ABRECOR, *Country Report: Cuba*, 1990, edition in English)

"The economy is now in its fourth year of austerity; consumer goods are in short supply.” (Financial Times, February 1989, edition in English)

Indeed, in 1988, the National Bank of Cuba officially stated that the country’s foreign debt had increased by $672 million during 1987 and totaled around $6 billion.

So, Castroist Cuba ended up completely invaded by and indebted to world finance capital, with all the inevitable disastrous consequences to Cuban proletariat and workers, which were subjected to sufferings and poverty because of Castroist dependence on imperialism, social-imperialism and finance world capitalism. This is what invariably happens when a country follows a non-socialist path. The ultimate effects are always the same: exploitation, exploitation and more exploitation.

And things even got worse when, in mid-80’s, pro-Western Gorbatchev’s clique seized power and started to implement Perestroika which would lead to the dismemberment and destruction of Soviet empire in early 90’s. This was tragic for Castroists, because it deprived them of economic relations and military protection provided by social-imperialist Soviet-dominated “Eastern bloc”. In 1990, Gorbatchev’s government announced that trade with Cuba:

"Mainly involving the exchange of Soviet oil for Cuban sugar and worth up to an estimated $3 billion annually would be phased out gradually.” (Keesing's Record of World Events, Volume 36, edition in English)
Shortly after this, as result of shortage of Soviet oil, oil rationing was introduced in Cuba. After centuries being shaped according to the interests of foreign imperialist powers and superpowers, Cuban economy was in ruins and was completely unable to feed its own people. In December 1990, it was announced that:

"Rationing was extended to all consumer goods, including foodstuffs.” (Economist Intelligence Unit, Country Profile: Cuba, 1991, edition in English)

In 1991, after the death of Soviet empire had been officially declared and COMECON had been dissolved, social-fascist Cuba was on the verge of bankruptcy, with austerity measures becoming much harsher and with more basic goods like food, oil, cigars, cigarettes and liquid gas being rationed. This together with the sharp fall in sugar prices in world capitalist-imperialist bourgeois-dominated world “market” that occurred in the same period turned life almost impossible to Castroist Cuba:

"Sugar prices in 1990-91 fell to levels described by Castro as rubbish-dump prices.” (Keesing’s Record of World Events, Volume 37, edition in English)

Moreover, all public works that had been encouraged by Soviet imperialist interests in Cuba were stopped and all Russian troops and military apparatus stationed in Cuba were ordered to return home. This lacking of the military protection that Castroists had counted on for safeguarding their regime against American imperialism frightened them very much. Official Castroist newspaper “Granma” declared that the withdrawal of those troops and equipments was:

"The equivalent of giving a green light to the United States to carry out aggressive plans against Cuba.” (Keesing’s Record of World Events, Volume 37, edition in English)

While mortally afraid of the fact that USA had now free reign to its anti-Castroist policies, Cuban revisionist bourgeoisie also perceived that Cuban economy showed no signs of being recovering from crisis. According to numbers coming from Cuban social-fascist sources, in 1991 Cuban economy contracted 25% and in 1992 it contracted 35% (!). And another thing that we have to note is that dependence on capitalism and imperialism only originate more dependence of the same kind. Castroist Cuba’s economy got into this terrible situation because Castroists sold the nation to Soviet revisionists-imperialists, who turned Cuba into a monocultural neo-colony and which demanded that Cuba should follow an anti-socialist policy of indebting itself and of subjecting to the sway of world capital. And Castroists’ faithful following of these instructions together with the disappearance of Soviet social-imperialists caused a severe crisis in Cuban economy which led to the need for more imperialist-capitalist penetration:

"The economic crisis in the wake of the collapse of trade former Soviet Union, leading to an estimated drop of 25-30% of gross domestic product (GDP) in 1991, had increased the urgency of foreign capital.” (Keesing’s Record of World Events, Volume 38, edition in English)
As can be concluded, Castroist anti-communist course submerged Cuba in a vicious circle of neo-colonial dependence towards world capitalism-imperialism that is still maintained nowadays.

In the meantime, Castroists pretended to oppose Gorbachev’s Perestroika by publicly “condemning” it and using this as pretext to allegedly “prove” their “loyalty to socialism”. But this is all fake. Castroist “economic reforms” and “Rectification Process” were essentially equal to Gorbachev’s Perestroika. Just like Perestroika was a logic consequence of capitalist restoration that had happened in the 50’s in Soviet Union and in its neo-colonial satellites, also Castroist “reforms” and “Rectifications” were the inevitable result of the pro-capitalist and anti-socialist path that Castroist bourgeoisie had been following since even before Cuban anti-communist 1959 pseudo-revolution. Indeed, Castroist Cuba is adopting classic capitalist features more and more. This has been noted by world bourgeoisie:

"Cuba's quiet assimilation of capitalist methods is most visible in tourism and in the priority projects." (Economist Intelligence Unit, Country Profile: Cuba, 1990, edition in English)

The main difference is that: while in Soviet Union state capitalism and the still remaining “red” masks were completely abandoned and the embracement of classic capitalism and of foreign imperialist penetration and dominance were openly assumed, in Castroist Cuba many of the “socialistic” cloaks used by Cuban revisionists were maintained until this moment. That is, Castroists cleverly understood that it could be more beneficial to them if they kept some of their “leftist” masks in order to deceive world workers in general and Cuban workers in particular. But even in this they will fail. World proletarians will not be misled by Castroism anymore. They know that revisionist Cuba is a bulwark of anti-socialist counter-revolution, that it is “socialist” in words but fascist, capitalist and pro-imperialist in deeds.

4.3 – Fidel Castro: paladin of anti-Stalinism

Furthermore, similarities between Gorbachev and Castro can be also perceived in Fidel’s famous 1992 interview to the newspaper “El Nuevo Diario”. In this interview, he didn’t make any effort neither to hide its anti-Stalinism, neither to hide its admiration and support towards ultra-revisionist Gorbachev. This interview reveals how far can Castroist cynicism go and we could never avoid commenting its most relevant parts, even because it is comrade Stalin’s glorious name that it is at stake here:

“I cannot say Gorbachev played a role in which he was aware of the destruction of the USSR because I have no doubt that Gorbachev intended to fight to improve socialism. We approved of Soviet efforts to improve socialism in the USSR. (…) I believe Stalin made big mistakes (…) I have criticized Stalin for a lot of things. First of all, I criticized his violation of the legal framework. I believe Stalin committed an enormous abuse of power. (…) In my opinion, the land socialization process should have begun earlier and should have been gradually implemented. Because of its violent implementation, it had a very high economic and human cost in a very brief period of history. I also feel that Stalin's policy prior to the war was...
totally erroneous. (...) I believe that it was a flagrant violation of principles to seek peace with Hitler at any cost, stalling for time. During our revolutionary life, during the relatively long history of the Cuban Revolution, we have never negotiated a single principle to gain time, or to obtain any practical advantage. (...) Stalin made a series of mistakes that were criticized by a large part of the world, and which placed Communists - who were great friends of the USSR - in a very difficult position by having to support each one of those episodes. (...) Finally, Stalin's character, his terrible distrust of everything, made him commit several other mistakes: one of them was falling in the trap of a German intrigue and conducting a terrible, bloody purge of the armed forces and practically beheading the Soviet Army on the eve of war.” (El Nuevo Diario, Interview with Fidel Castro, June 1992, edition in English)

In first place, only a revisionist like Castro can affirm that “Gorbachev intended to fight to improve socialism.” When Gorbatchev seized power in 1985, there were not even the smallest remnants of socialism to be “improved”. By mid-80’s, socialism was inexistent in revisionist Soviet Union and Gorbatchev’s clique only continued what Khrushchev had started: capitalist restoration in Soviet Union. The only difference was that pro-Western Gorbatchev’s clique abandoned and destroyed state capitalism (and also its false “socialist” cloaks) in Soviet Union – contrary to what had done its predecessors, who had preferred to keep it as a “red” disguise for revisionist Soviet Union’s imperialist nature. So, for Castro, to “improve socialism” is to replace state capitalism by classic capitalism. This notion is utterly reactionary and has as sole purpose to present as “socialist” certain regimes and socio-economic systems that don’t have absolutely nothing to do with socialism (like happens with that of social-fascist / revisionist Cuba). But this position from Castro is unsurprising. How could he disagree with Gorbatchev if Cuban revisionists apply policies which were and are essentially equal to those of Gorbatchev? After all, as we have already stated, also in Cuba state capitalism is being increasingly weakened and dismantled in favor of classic capitalism due to the pressures resulting from the intensification of imperialist penetration in Cuba (just like also happened in the Soviet Union). Indeed, the only relevant difference between both cases is that, by now, Castroists are insisting in maintaining a certain “socialistic” appearance as a form of preventing workers from acknowledging that Castroist Cuba was always a bourgeois-capitalist regime. Indeed, just like is occurring in Cuba, also in revisionist Soviet Union the implementation of classic capitalism caused that things like the social security system (healthcare, etc.) that existed under state capitalism were abolished. On one side, it represents worsening of living conditions for toilers; but on the other side, this is positive because it facilitates workers’ acquirement of a communist conscience through revealing the predatory and exploitative nature of capitalist state in front of their eyes without any of the former revisionist subterfuges. Anyway, Castro took the opportunity to express his admiration towards Gorbatchev’s social-Darwinist policies before starting with his attacks against comrade Stalin.

Accordingly with Castro, comrade Stalin committed “enormous abuses of power” and “violations of legal framework”. This accusation is unsurprising since all kinds of anti-communists have always directed these same accusations against comrade Stalin. When they affirm this, they are in fact expressing how furious they are against comrade Stalin’s tireless struggle against everything related with bourgeois-capitalist-imperialist exploitation. For capitalist ideologues like Castro, to impose a bloody system which
kills billions for profits is something perfectly acceptable and benefic. On the contrary, to combat for the abolition of this dreadful system and for the definitive economic, social and politic emancipation of workers against wage slavagists is to “commit enormous abuses of power.” Behind Castro’s hypocritical concerns about “Stalin’s abuses of power and violations of legality”, it is possible to perceive his deep anger towards the revolutionary proletarian dictatorship headed by comrade Stalin. Only a social-fascist reformist like Castro could be worried about “legality”. This even reminds us of bourgeois ridiculous expression “state of law” which is used by anti-socialist ideologues to hide the bourgeois class nature of capitalist state. Under comrade Stalin, Soviet toilers were only concerned about successfully constructing socialism and communism. In Bolshevist Soviet Union, laborers were never bound to bourgeois-capitalist concepts such as “legal framework”, “respect for legality”, etc. They had never enjoyed such a freedom before, the freedom of being able to exert their class dictatorship against all kinds of oppressors through their Marxist-Leninist party which was above all “legal” organs. And during proletarian dictatorship things cannot be different. So-called “legality” must be always subordinated to the interests of socialist and communist construction. Comrade Lenin even affirmed that proletarian dictatorship could never be limited by “law”:

“Scientifically speaking, the dictatorship (of the proletariat) is a power which is not limited by law (...) and which is directly based on violence.” (Lenin, cited by Stalin in Les Questions du Léninisme, 1931, translated from the French edition)

Also in socialist Albania this principle was applied. On the contrary, in Castroist Cuba, the opposite happened. In 1967, Albanian Embassy to Cuba remarked that:

“We almost immediately got into differences with the Cuban position. The first thing was the function of the party. (...) in Albania the party is above the state organs (...).” (Conversation with Xhustin Papogorgi, Third Secretary of the Embassy of the People’s Republic of Albania in Cuba, 27th September 1967, edition in English)

As can be concluded, in Cuba the “communist party” is a mere puppet and appendix of state organs and capitalist enterprises controlled by Castroist bourgeoisie serving its imperialist and social-imperialists bosses. Thus, when Castroists pretend to defend “state legality”, they are in fact defending their capitalist-revisionist dictatorship.

Moreover, Castro does its utmost to discredibilize Soviet workers’ power led by comrade Stalin and by Soviet Bolsheviks with the aim of preventing world and Cuban workers from understanding that socialist Soviet Union of comrade Stalin is in total opposition to social-fascist Castroist Cuba. That is why Castro attempts at striking anti-Stalinist fear in the minds and hearts of workers by depicting comrade Stalin as having been a bloodthirsty despot. Castro knows very well that the moment when workers finally understand what Stalinism truly is, when they finally understand that in comrade Stalin’s Soviet Union workers enjoyed living in a genuine proletarian democracy and were successfully constructing socialism, Castroist reign will not last for a single second more. Castroists have to demonize comrade Stalin so that working masses never comprehend that Stalinism is the only ideology which can lead them towards liberation from capitalist-imperialist-revisionist tyranny (thus also from Castroism). Indeed, with this kind of anti-Stalinist propaganda, Castro is also defending the interests of world capitalist-imperialists because besides keeping workers away from genuine socialist
emancipation by inculcating in them anti-Stalinist lies, Castro is allowing world capitalists-imperialists to keep exploiting world workers in general and Cuban workers in particular and to eternally perpetuate their totalitarian bourgeois order. And Castro continues with his anti-Stalinist screams. He depicts Stalinist socialization of agriculture as having been wrongly done and as having caused “great human and economic losses” due to repression. But this is false. On the contrary, comrade Stalin’s leadership of agriculture collectivization in Soviet Union was brilliant: in around 15-20 years, Soviet countryside went from being under a feudal domination where peasants were literally treated like animals into a liberated territory where land was put in the hands of all workers, where peasants (in alliance and under the leadership of the proletariat) were engaging a stern fight against all remnants of former exploiters and where Bolshevik Communist Party of the Soviet Union was educating the masses accordingly with the principles of Marxism-Leninism. In Stalinist countryside, peasants enjoyed an exponential increase in life conditions and productivity; and they were actively participating in the strengthening of Soviet proletarian dictatorship and in the construction of socialism and communism. All this is in total opposition to what happens in Castroist Cuba, where land was transferred from the hands of American imperialists to the hands of Soviet social-imperialists through Castroists lackeys. In Cuba, private property was never abolished at all. Workers and peasants continued to be subjected to wage slavery and oppression at the hands of the new exploiters. Still nowadays, Castroists insist in affirming that “Cuba was never a Soviet colony because, contrary to what had happened with American imperialists, Soviets never possessed a single mean of production in Cuba.” But this is just a masquerade to hide that Cuba was indeed a Soviet neo-colony. The “managers” and “administrators” of “state enterprises” (members of Castroist bourgeoisie) fiercely exploited (and continue to exploit) the workforce of Cuban laborers and transferred the profits made from it directly to the hands of Moscow’s capitalists and imperialists (today, they do exactly the same in favor of Chinese social-imperialists, who, as we shall see, replaced soviet social-imperialists as Castroist social-fascist, anti-communist, bourgeois-capitalist Cuba’s imperialist rulers), who had de facto absolute control over Cuba in all aspects (political-socio-economic terms, etc.) even because Castroists were totally dependent on the Eastern bloc’s markets and on Soviet military assistance to resist Western imperialist hostility. Therefore, yes, Castroists are right when they say that Soviet imperialism did never possess a single mean of production in Cuba – in fact, it possessed all means of production in Cuba.

And in what respects to Castro’s declaration about the existence of repression during comrade Stalin’s socialization of agriculture, this is the only true thing ever said by Castro. Indeed, there was repression during the referred period, and if things had occurred otherwise that would mean that agriculture had never followed a veritable socialist path in Stalinist Soviet Union. In those times, foreign imperialism was trying to destroy the Great October Revolution through all means, including by financing internal reactionaries who had been deprived of their class privileges and wanted to reconquer them. In these conditions, Soviet workers under the leadership of Soviet proletariat headed by the CPSU (B) and by comrade Stalin launched an offensive in order to defeat all reactionaries who aimed at destroying the revolution and condemning workers to former medieval conditions. This socialist offensive reached enormous proportions in the countryside because former landowners were ruthlessly attacking peasants and also the means of production (they set fire to the lands, to the machines, they killed cater, etc.) in an attempt to prevent socialist collectivization from being successfully
accomplished. But contrary to what had happened in other epochs, when peasants were massacred by the aristocrats with total impunity, for the first time Soviet peasantry counted with the strength of proletarian state at their side. All derived from the fact that the class who detained power had changed. While in ancient times, feudal-capitalist state had used its repressive powers to defend aristocrat minority and to oppress peasant majority, the state of proletarian dictatorship led by comrade Stalin used its repressive powers to defend peasant majority and to annihilate the parasitic minority of feudal-aristocratic landowners (and it is very interesting to note that Mr. Castro and all other capitalist ideologues only proclaim their concerns about repression when this repression started to be exercised by the exploited against the exploiters. They never directed nor direct a single criticism against the times when peasants were constantly and systematically massacred and abused by landowners). And so, all reactionaries and anti-communist criminals operating in Soviet countryside got the treatment they fully deserved; they were defeated and annihilated by armed Soviet peasants led by the proletariat and its Marxist-Leninist party vanguard. What occurred in Stalinist countryside was a true war between those who strived for socialism and those who wanted the return of capitalism and feudalism, between those who wanted to eliminate slavery and exploitation and those who wanted its maintenance and intensification. Stalinist collectivization of land and of agriculture could never had been more “gradual” than it was, because to slow down it would mean to give time and opportunities to former oppressors to get organized and ready to sabotage socialist construction in the countryside and elsewhere. In the end, Soviet workers led by comrade Stalin triumphed, but they only accomplished this victory due to their unwavering adherence to Marxism-Leninism-Stalinism and because they never hesitated about using harsh revolutionary violence against their class enemies. After all, this is also what Stalinism is: the buttressing and consolidation of socialist proletarian dictatorship through the efficient and fearless use of armed revolutionary violence against all kinds of bourgeois, capitalists, imperialists and revisionist bandits who want to restore their exploitative slavagist tyranny.

But all this constitutes an anathema to Castro, who even affirms that comrade Stalin’s non-aggression pact with Hitler was a “flagrant violation of principles”. He goes on saying that “we (Castroists) never made concessions in principles to obtain advantages.” It is truly astonishing to observe how fascist, bourgeois and anti-communist Castro, the lover of casinos, tries to give lessons of principles to comrade Stalin, the 4th Classic of Marxism-Leninism. We, Stalinists-Hoxhaists, will never tolerate this awful insult to the beloved revolutionary legacy of comrade Stalin, especially when it comes from the disgusting founder of a pro-capitalist ideology which denies each one of the pillars of Marxist-Leninist-Stalinist-Hoxhaist ideology, especially when it comes from someone who treacherously uses socialism’s and communism’s glorious name to perpetuate a social-fascist order which oppresses Cuban workers and which has sold Cuba to capitalism, imperialism and social-imperialism. The signing of the non-aggression pact between Nazi Germany and Bolshevist Soviet Union was a very illustrative example of comrade Stalin’s clever tactics. Of course, both parties knew from the very beginning that the non-aggression pact was meant to be broken. Nazi Germany never had the intention of keeping its word and comrade Stalin knew this very well, he knew that it would be a mere question of time before Nazi-fascism attacked the first country in the world which was successfully constructing socialism, even because to annihilate socialism was Nazi-fascism’s own essence and purpose. Thus, Castro’s assertions condemning the non-aggression pact because “war was ultimately unleashed” do not
hold any water. Neither Nazi Germany nor Bolshevist Soviet Union ever aimed at preventing an inevitable war between their two irreconcilable systems. However, this non-aggression pact interested to both parties because it would give time to Nazi-fascists to prepare their attack against Stalinist Soviet Union, on one side, but it also interested Bolshevist Soviet Union because it would give it time to prepare its defense and counter-offensive against Nazi-fascist attack (as indeed happened), on the other side. If comrade Stalin had refused to sign this pact, Bolshevist Soviet Union would have no sufficient time and opportunities to prepare its defense/counter-offensive and would have perished under Nazi-fascist barbarous aggression, in what would lead Nazi-fascist coalition towards victory in the Second World War II (after all, we can never forget that it was Stalinist Soviet Union who truly defeated Nazi-fascism, and not Great Britain, neither the USA, neither anyone else). So, far from violating any principles, comrade Stalin not only saved socialist construction in Soviet Union but also allowed its expansion thanks to the formation of the glorious Stalinist socialist world camp. This would not have been possible without signing the non-aggression pact. Thus, by condemning comrade Stalin’s signing of this pact, Castro is in fact defending Nazi-fascist triumph in WWII and the consequent elimination of any possibility of accomplishment of world socialism and world communism. But Castro is not the only revisionist holding this kind of views. Also fascist Trotsky (a pro-nazi collaborator) shared Castro’s opinions. Indeed, similarities between Castroism and Trotskyism are so striking that there is faction within Trotskyist movement that even rejects their traditional qualification of Castroist Cuba as being a purely “Stalinist” state and defends that it is in fact a “revolutionary and Marxist workers’ state” which, nonetheless, still suffers from “Stalinist bureaucratic influences”:

“A struggle to reform the workers’ state with bureaucratic deformations. That was the principled position of Lenin and Trotsky in Russia before Stalinism came to power (…). This should also be our principled position on the Cuban workers' state. Cuba is a workers' state (…).”

(http://www.marxists.org/history/etol/document/fit/whypolres.htm,
George Breitman, Why the Political Resolution Should Be Amended on the FI and Castroism, 1981, version in English)

So, as can be observed, some Trotskyists gave up their former attempts of totally denying any identity between their own ideology and Castroism. They understand that Cuban revisionists are in fact their ideological allies in the combat against the Comintern (SH) and world socialist revolution. Besides a few formal minor aspects which still divide them relatively to what is the better manner to keep workers away from authentic communism (for example, while Trotskyists defend that bourgeois-capitalist ideologies and forces should be free to form their own multiple parties under Trotskyist phoney “socialism”, Castroists advocate that workers are much better deceived and convinced about “socialist construction” if bourgeois-capitalist dominant classes maintain the façade of the “single communist party”. Trotskyists continue to dislike this position from Cuban social-fascists, which they insist in treacherously qualifying as a “Stalinist bureaucratic deformation in need of reform” in spite of the fact that Cuban revisionist party is a bourgeois-capitalist party without anything in common with the proletarian parties of Leninist-Stalinist type). The truth is that Castroists and Trotskyists are substantially equal, they have both a single objective: to eternally perpetuate world capitalist-imperialist wage slavagist bourgeois class ensuring that
world proletariat will never embrace Marxism-Leninism-Stalinism-Hoxhaism – the only ideology able to lead world workers towards socialism and communism.

However, we must note that this is still a relatively minority faction within Trotskyist movement. Majority of Trotskyists still insist in their old lie of depicting social-fascist Cuba as being an example of a “Stalinist state”:

“(…) the poor Cuban people are faced (…) with the heavy burdens of removing the degenerated weight of Khrushchevism-Stalinism brought in by Castro.”
(http://www.weisbord.org/Castroism.htm, Castroism – Deadly Danger to the Cuban Revolution, 1962, version in English)

“We can affirm that Stalinism allowed Fidel’s ascension. (…) They provided Castro with an ideology to govern with.”

We will not waste too much time with this nauseating Trotskyist calumny. Throughout this article, we demonstrate that Cuban Castroist social-fascism not only has nothing in common with glorious Stalinism, but it is sternly opposed to it, thus Stalinist ideology could have never had anything to do with Castro’s ascension and government. Trotskyists try to present Cuban wicked revisionist tyranny as being “Stalinism” only to discredit comrade Stalin’s legacy in front of eyes of world workers in order to keep them away from it. This is also the aim of Trotskyists’ attempt to put together Stalinism and Khrushchevism, as if they were entirely equal. Trotskyists discredit Stalinism through hiding its truly proletarian and communist nature by equating it with such a dreadfully pro-capitalism, pro-imperialist and reactionary ideology as Khrushchevism. In this outrageous manner, all exploitative and oppressive characteristics of Khrushchevism (namely its transformation of Soviet Union into a social-fascist state internally and into a social-imperialist superpower externally) are automatically attributed to the glorious teachings of comrade Stalin. But Trotskyists are the ones who do their utmost to prevent world socialist revolution and world communism, they are the ones who have everything in common with Khrushchevist revisionism.

In truth, Trotskyists never recovered from the tremendous defeat they suffered when they tried to destroy Stalinist leadership and to restore capitalism in Soviet Union through fabricating ridiculous theories about “permanent revolution” only to weaken Soviet proletarian dictatorship in favor of world imperialist penetration and destruction of socialist construction in Soviet Union. Trotskyists try to take advantage of every opportunity to deviate workers from Stalinist-Hoxhaist ideology which is the only ideology able to enlighten their path towards world socialism and world communism, towards definitive liberation, towards total elimination of all kinds of exploitation, oppression and alienation. Trotskyists (and all the other revisionists and anti-communists) do not want this to happen, they want proletarians and all other laborers to be eternally subjected to wage slavagist tyranny and to the predatory greed of world capitalism-imperialism. Therefore, they have to serve their world bourgeois bosses as best as they can through convincing world workers in general and Cuban workers in particular that Stalinism is synonym of the despotic repressive and abusive tyranny which is ruling Cuba since 1959. Indeed, if world proletarians and workers believe that Castroism = Stalinism, then they will surely loose any willingness to embrace Stalinist
ideology because they look at Castroist Cuba and they only see exploitation, wage slavery, oppression, suppression, autocracy, totalitarianism and cruelty towards workers. And from the moment they think so and refuse Stalinism, accomplishment of world socialist revolution, of world proletarian dictatorship, of world socialism and of world communism will be impossible, as none of these things can be achieved without resolute adherence and unwavering defense of the brilliant revolutionary teachings of comrade Stalin, the 4th Classic of Marxism-Leninism. Stalinism represents an irreplaceable and inestimable development of the Marxist-Leninist theory, and to deny Comrade Stalin’s contribution means to deny socialist revolution in itself. Stalinism is the vital and decisive factor which permits the victorious implementation and survival of the proletarian dictatorship. Consequently, to reject it is synonym of choosing the side of world capitalism-imperialism, of world reactionarism, of world anti-communism, of world bourgeoisie, is synonym of striving to condemn workers to endless subjugation to wage slavagist totalitarian, anti-socialist, oppressive and exploitative bourgeois capitalist-revisionist-imperialist order. To refuse Stalinist ideology means to deny the possibility of successful socialist revolution; and the negation of the possibility of successful socialist revolution is synonym of considering communism as an unrealizable utopia because the accomplishment of communism is dependent on the success of the socialist construction and on the revolutionary fierceness of proletarian dictatorship.

But let’s return to our analysis of Castro’s interview. Equally amazing are Castro’s claims that Stalinist purges have “weakened the Soviet army in the eve of war”. Firstly, and contrary to what Castro and all anti-communists affirm in order to discredibilize comrade Stalin, far from weakening Marxist-Leninist party and from being the result of a “German intrigue” (although many of the anti-communist elements annihilated in the purges were indeed at the service of German imperialism), the purges made within the CPSU (B) were absolutely necessary to strengthen the party through the elimination of totally real dangers: the danger of degeneration of Soviet proletarian party and state, the danger of infiltration of bourgeois, revisionist and anti-socialist influences within the ranks of Soviet workers which would open the path to capitalist restoration and to imperialist penetration with all the evils inherent to them. This situation was even more acute in the context of WWII, when foreign imperialism (Nazi-fascist imperialism, Anglo-American imperialism, etc…) were doing their utmost to destroy socialist construction in Soviet Union. Stalinist purges were an example of the intensification of class struggle during proletarian dictatorship and socialist construction. After all, we can never forget that after socialist revolution and during proletarian dictatorship, the class struggle doesn’t stop. On the contrary, it even increases its intensity because reactionary forces get desperate and launch their most lethal attacks against the new proletarian power:

“The proletarian dictatorship doesn’t mean the end of the class struggle; on the contrary, it continues through new ways. The proletarian dictatorship is the victorious class struggle of the proletariat which overthrew bourgeois political power. The bourgeoisie is defeated, but not destroyed nor extinct and continues not only to resist, but also to increase that resistance.” (Lenin, cited by Stalin in Les Questions du Léninisme, 1931, translated from the French edition)

Of course, the proletarian dictatorship is not only some kind of abstract ideological victory over the bourgeoisie. No. The proletarian dictatorship can only ensure the
edification of socialism and the “superior organization of the productive work” (Lenin) through the effective, definitive and complete annihilation of the imperialist-capitalist-revisionist order. Every Stalinist-Hoxhaist knows that is always necessary to strengthen the proletarian dictatorship in order to smash the bourgeoisie and to totally destroy the foundations of the capitalist political-socio-economical-ideological system. And it’s obvious that this process cannot advance without the use of revolutionary violence by the proletariat against anti-socialist counter-revolutionary forces. Intensification of class struggle will only stop when communist society is utterly ensured and the danger of capitalist restoration is totally surpassed. To affirm the contrary means to defend capitulationism and anti-communism, it means to defend the restoration of capitalist oppressive wage slavery in accord with Khrushchevist thesis according to which “socialism is irreversible”. This thesis only defends the interests of world bourgeois class because it weakens the proletarian dictatorship and permits the penetration of bourgeois-capitalist-revisionist-imperialist influences and elements within communists’ ranks.

Therefore, far from being a consequence of “Stalin’s distrust of everything” (which, by the way, was totally justified, as Bolshevist Soviet Union was completely surrounded by enemies), the purges were in fact a glorious example of the capacity revealed by Soviet workers led by their proletarian Marxist-Leninist-Stalinist party to resist, to combat and to annihilate all anti-socialist, bourgeois and pro-imperialist elements within the party, the state and the country as a whole. These purges were indeed a very good opportunity to display the impressive revolutionary talent and capacity of Soviet proletarian power during socialist construction. That is why world bourgeoisie and revisionists like Castro are until nowadays so afraid of Stalinist purges: they entirely identify themselves with the anti-communist elements that were eliminated by those purges. Indeed, social-fascist Castroists will certainly end in the same manner of all them as soon as world proletariat establishes its dictatorship at a global scale.

And in what respects to Castro’s false anti-socialist, revisionist and opportunist assertion that communists were “in a very difficult position by having to support” comrade Stalin and that “Stalin made a series of mistakes that were criticized by a large part of the world” (read: by all kinds of bourgeois-capitalist-revisionist-imperialist exploiters, oppressors, wage slavagists and anti-communists) we will only say that all genuine communists were, are and will always be very proud to unwavering defend, support and reaffirm comrade Stalin’s brilliant, authentically revolutionary and totally correct positions, teachings and policies.

In the already mentioned interview, Castro tries to disguise his fascist anti-Stalinism through pretending to “recognize Stalin’s merits”. But this ridiculous attempt will never deceive world laborers and proletarians. Comrade Stalin’s glorious name and legacy are immortal and invincible. Not even all capitalist-imperialist-revisionist calumnies can erase the fact that Stalinism is an irreplaceable contribution to workers’ liberation. Without faithfully following Stalinists principles, it is impossible to achieve socialism, and much less communism. Without following Stalinist principles, it is impossible to be victorious. Castroists also know this very well, and that is reason why they always try to keep world workers away from Stalinism with the objective of maximizing capitalist-imperialist profits through the perpetuation of world bourgeois class. But they will ultimately fail. In the future stateless, classless and propertyless world society there will be no place for Castroism.
Contrary to what happens in Cuba, where capitalist exploitative wage slavagist tyranny remains completely untouched, in Stalinist Soviet Union socialism was completely developed and the construction of communism was already prepared practically and theoretically. Indeed, one of the worst betrayals of the modern revisionists (of who Castroists are among the most perverse representatives) was the sabotage of the transition of the USSR to communism.

Therefore, in total opposition to the pro-capitalist and anti-communist teachings of Cuban revisionists, we find comrade Stalin’s teachings on communist transition. The positions of the Comintern (SH) on this issue are entirely based on the teachings of comrade Stalin concerning the transition to communism. These teachings are explained in comrade Stalin's famous book "The economic problems of socialism in the USSR", etc.

According to the Comintern (SH), Stalinism is precisely Marxism-Leninism in the period of transition from socialism "in one" country to socialism on a global scale, in general, and the period of transition from socialism "in one" country to communism in this country, in particular.

In first place, transition to communism cannot be accomplished if the primacy of politics over economics is not respected. Comrade Stalin used to state that productive forces play a preponderant role in production’s development:

"The new production is the most important and decisive power which allows the full development of the productive forces and without which the productive forces would be condemned to vegetate, as is currently the case in capitalist countries."

(Stalin, Economic Problems of Socialism in the USSR, Moscow, 1952, page 74, edition in English)

And comrades Marx, Engels and Lenin always stressed that socialism and communism are not two different socio-economic systems, as the mode of production in socialism and communism is substantially the same. Indeed, comrade Lenin used to affirm that as in socialism the means of production are already owned by the community, then socialism can be qualified as some kind of imperfect communism. In truth, socialism and communism are both stages of one and only socio-economic formation; however, they represent two distinct levels of development of that same socio-economic formation. Socialist relations of production are not “destroyed” in order to build communist relations of productions. But without fully developed socialist relations of production there can never be communist relations of production.

Stalinism teaches us that the correct preparation of the transition to communism is absolutely essential to decide whether the productive forces will continue to develop themselves or will instead languish, perish and degenerate. Comrade Stalin’s teachings prove that socialism cannot exist eternally, that it cannot stay the same forever. If socialist productive relations are not gradually transformed into communist productive relations, this is synonym of opening the path to capitalist restoration. Socialism must advance towards communism – otherwise, it will be liquidated. Foremost, we can never forget that socialism is always a mere temporary stage, a transitory epoch before the accomplishment of communism. In fact, socialism is an obstacle to the achievement of communism when it ceases to be seen as a temporary transition. If socialism is
perceived as an end in itself, then it will hinder the advancement towards the final stage of social development. If communist content remains stuck in former socialist forms, if these forms are not eliminated, if communist contents are not corresponded by communist forms, then not only communist development will be destroyed, but also socialist construction will be drawn back to capitalism.

Without class struggle, without the political leaders of the working class and its party to facilitate the development of socialist relations of production, without fighting against the restoration of capitalism, socialist society is not able to move forward to communism.

We, Stalinists-Hoxhaists, are against both reactionary ideologies that defend that communism can be accomplished through mere political revolutions (utopians) or through mere productivity gains (economicists).

These kind of pro-capitalist and revisionist currents and also all others whose purpose is to prevent socialism from advancing to communism create a breeding ground for the restoration of capitalism, encourage economic chaos restoring antagonistic contradictions and attempt to use bourgeois economicists and “spontaneists” fanciful theories to avoid transition to communism and, consequently, to allow the annihilation of socialism and capitalist restoration. Indeed, also the modern revisionists tried to abolish and annihilate the political economy of the proletariat with this same goal.

The transition from socialism to communism must necessarily include things like the elimination of commodities’ circulation, (with the exception of foreign trade in the special case of communist construction “in one” country which is still surrounded by capitalist countries. Comrade Stalin pointed that transition to communism in "one" country is not possible on completely all fields of economy. Foreign trade is the big exception. Indeed, the USSR was still forced to regulate trade relations to the capitalist world by the laws of commodities) of foreign exchange products, implementation of collective/public ownership of the means of production, abolition of the differences between town and countryside and between mental and physical labor, etc., etc.

The transition to communism is only possible when the productive forces and the relations of production are in agreement, when productive forces are released in order to be able to play their role in the transition from socialist relations of production to communist relations of production. The consistency of the communist forces of production and of communist relations of production is not only characterized by the fact that it results from the irrevocable and inevitable end of all antagonistic social class formations, but also by the fact that it marks the transition from non-antagonistic class society to a classless society. In other words, only in communism the productive forces and the relations of production can be in total consonance. For us, Stalinists-Hoxhaists, it's time to convince the world proletariat about the benefits of a classless society, so that the suffering of the process of disintegration of world capitalism will be finished as soon as possible thanks to the world socialist revolution.

Comrade Lenin once stated that:
"The requirement and condition for communism is the maximum centralization of mass production in the entire country." (Lenin, 1917-1923 Supplement, page 72, translated from version in German language)

Furthermore, one of the main instruments to open the path towards communism is the class struggle. We already know that class struggle can only be a driving force when it is led by a truly revolutionary class with the objective of eliminating those exploitative classes that take advantage of the flagrant opposition between relations of production and the productive forces. But besides this, dialectic materialism reveals that the essence of class struggle is such that it becomes the main driving force relatively to the removal and abolition of non-conformity between the character of relations of production and the character of the productive forces. The essence of the class struggle of the proletariat is the abolition of the inevitability of class society and the elimination of its inherent contradictions.

Indeed, even when communism has already been implemented, when the driving force of class struggle disappeared, this does not mean that the fighting against the remnants of class ideologies is over. The struggle against the remnants of reactionary class ideologies during communism will continue for a while before their final and definitive destruction. Of course, during communism the outdated methods of class struggle will be abandoned and replaced by modern methods of communist society, where people do not need to exert political pressure on other people.

The goal of today's class struggle of the world proletariat is not only to eliminate the shackles of the capitalist private property, but also to eliminate the inevitability of disagreement between the nature of relations of productions and the nature of productive forces, that is, to eliminate the inevitability of exploitation of man by man. Unlike Khrushchevist revisionism, Stalinism considers that the circulation of commodities is incompatible with the transition from socialism to communism. Under communism, there will be no more circulation of commodities, but there will be instead an exchange of commodities; they won’t be bought and sold on the market, but will be distributed among the producers.

Stalinism is the development of Marxist-Leninist doctrine of political economy during transition to communism and it teaches that the preparation for a real and not merely declarative transition to communism demands the fulfillment of three basic requisites:

Firstly, it is essential to favor the steady growth of production of means of production (heavy industry of means of production). Preferential growth of production of means of production is not only necessary because it must supply both its own activities and the activities of all other branches of the economy with equipment, but also because otherwise, expanded reproduction cannot take place.

Secondly, it is necessary to implement gradual transitory measures that need to be advantageous for collective farms, and consequently for the whole society in order to foster the transformation of collective ownership into public ownership. And in what respects to the circulation of commodities, this will also be replaced through gradual transitory measures. A system of exchange will be conducted by a central authority or by any socio-economic panel which can organize social production in the interest of
whole society. Thus, the challenge is to solve the contradictions between the productive forces and the relations of production through implementation of full public property and through the replacement of commodities’ circulation by commodities’ exchange.

Thirdly, it is necessary to achieve such a high cultural development of society so that all its members will experiment the full development of their physical and mental abilities, so that all members of society can receive an education that is appropriate to allow their active participation in the development of society; thus permitting that they can freely choose their professional occupation without being bound to a particular profession because of the division of labor. In order to accomplish this, it is crucial to adopt a series of changes. For example, the number of working hours must be reduced so that all members of society have free time to obtain an integral cultural formation. It is also necessary to promote the introduction of mandatory polytechnic education, as it is needed to allow the members of society to freely choose their profession without being tied to life to a particular one. All this is also essential to improve the living conditions and to increase the real wages of workers/employees at least twice, if not more, both through direct wage increase and also through the systematic reduction of prices of consumer goods.

Only after fulfilling all these conditions in their entirety, can the socialist formula "from each according to his ability, to each according to his work" be replaced by the communist formula "from each according to his ability, to each according to his needs".

During an interview on September 1927, comrade Stalin briefly described communist society as being a society:

a) where there is no private ownership of the means of production, but only one property: the social collective ownership of the means of production;

b) where there will be no classes and no state power, but where the producers of industry and agriculture will manage everything as the free association of workers;

c) where the economy will be organized according to a plan that will be based on the most advanced technology in industry and in agriculture;

d) where there will be no opposition between city and countryside, between industry and agriculture, etc;

e) where commodities and products will be distributed in agreement with the principle "From each according to his ability, to each according to his needs";

f) where Sciences and Arts will enjoy from such favorable conditions that they will surely experiment an unprecedented astonishing development;

g) where human personality, finally liberated from concerns about daily bread and the need to please exploitative dominant classes, will be truly free;

These are the main conditions for the transition to communism.
In total consonance with comrade Stalin’s teachings, the ultimate aim of the Communist International is the replacement of the capitalist world economy by the global system of communism. World communism is a world society that is free from the shackles of property, it is a global society which definitively abandons all remnants of oppression, of repression and of exploitation.

An authentic communist society is the only solution for humanity, because only communism can solve and remove the fundamental contradictions inherent to capitalist system - contradictions that threaten humanity with degeneration and destruction.

Instead of class societies - which destroy peoples’ lives and which inevitably cause countless wars - mankind will use all its energy to fight for the development and improvement of its own collective power.

Once the global system of communism has been accomplished, last remnants of private property will disappear and the capitalist-imperialist bourgeois-dominated world “market” (anarchic social production) will be replaced by a social production which will be planned accordingly to the needs of the fast-growing world community. With the destruction of the anarchy of production and of blind competition, with the implementation of a truly planned socialized economy and with the total and definitive annihilation of the exploitative, oppressive, repressive, wage slavagist capitalist-imperialist-revisionist bourgeois system, the inevitability of crises and of devastating wars will be irrevocably and inevitably abolished. In place of the gigantic waste of productive forces, the development of society will be led towards the spasmodic ordered arrangement of all material wealth and also towards the harmonious development of the economy through the unlimited development of the productive forces.

The abolition of private property and the death of all classes eliminate the exploitation of man by man. To work no longer means to labor for class enemy. From a mere mean of life, work becomes the first necessity of life. Poverty disappears, economic inequalities are removed, the suffering of the oppressed classes and the miseries of their material existence vanish. Hierarchy in the division of labor and the contrast between intellectual work and manual labor will be eliminated together with all traces of social inequality related to gender.

Analyzing the situation in 1928 Soviet Union, the program of the old Comintern stated that:

“Socialist productive forces have not been developed to the extent that the distribution of products is able to fully meet the needs of each person. The division of labor, that is, to assign job duties to specific groups of people is something that still exists, and therefore the contrast between manual and intellectual work still remains. The remnants of the old class divisions in society are still present, and consequently, the coercive proletarian state power cannot be abolished yet. There are still some traces of inequality. The opposition between intellectual work and manual work and between town and countryside remain undefeated. But all these remnants of the old society will certainly be removed. Since they are tied to a certain stage of development of productive forces, they disappear as humanity frees itself from slavagist capitalist order and learns to dominate the forces of
nature while advancing towards communism.” (Documents of the Comintern, Program of the Comintern, 1928, translated from version in German language)

Of course, all this is anathema to Cuban social-fascists, which not even had to find a manner to restore capitalism in Cuba for the simple reason that it is not possible to restore something which never ceased to exist.

These Stalinist teachings about the transition to communism are indispensable for the transition of world socialism to world communism and therefore very important to be defended by the Comintern (SH) against the modern revisionists (among which Castroists-Guevarists are included). That’s why we decided to include them in this article. To support comrade Stalin's transition to communism against Castro’s revisionism is crucial to unmask the true reactionary character of Cuban social-fascism.

5 – Development of Cuban social-fascism: since the early 90’s until nowadays

5.1 – Replacing one social-imperialist, neo-colonialist and exploitative domination by another

As we have observed, due to its neo-colonial exploitative subservience towards Soviet social-imperialism, Castroist Cuba had no economic independence and the qualitative structure of its economy remain essentially the same of the openly colonial period: Cuba remained an exporter of agricultural products (mainly sugar) while it was forced to import most of the equipment and consumption commodities, thus creating a growing economic subjugation relatively to its external "partners", and especially relatively to the credits granted by social-imperialist Soviet Union.

Since the 1970’s, sugar represented around 80% of Cuban exportations, and Cuban commercial balance suffers from a systematic deficit until nowadays (for example, between 1959 and 1976, Cuban external debt increased from US$ 105 to US$ 181 millions, and since the 80’s it has been exponentially increasing due to the intensification of imperialist penetration in the country. Today, social-fascist Cuba’s external debt towards world capitalism-imperialism and towards world banking/finance bourgeois class reaches the value of US$ 27 billions – and these are only the official Castroist numbers; the true figures are surely much higher. In fact, this figure does not include the massive debt that Castroist social-fascist bourgeoisie is accumulating towards Chinese social-imperialism and other imperialisms).

But with the disappearance of Soviet social-imperialism, Cuban sugar production experienced a decrease because of lack of economic structures and also due to the sharp price fall of sugar within capitalist-imperialist bourgeois-dominated world “market”. Therefore, in the 90’s, sugar still represented a considerable part of Cuban exportations, but its production diminished from 6 millions of tons per year to 3 millions of tons per year in the period between 1990 and 1998. By 2004, Cuban commercial balance suffered from a deficit which was higher than ever before (in social-fascist Cuba,
importations have always been superior to exportations, in 1964 these negative results in Cuban commercial balance were of US$ 0.3 billion and by 2004 it were of about US$ 2.8 billion – and we cannot forget that a country with a negative commercial balance is also an indebted country. Therefore, as we have already explained, to have a negative commercial balance was something unthinkable in Bolshevist Soviet Union or in Socialist Albania, whose commercial balances were always, systematically and invariably positive thanks to their authentically socialist economy which allowed them to successfully defeat capitalist-imperialist-revisionist encirclement). Indeed, this situation has been constantly aggravating since then, despite the new assets that tourism has brought to Castroist Cuba. Indeed, tourist sector has become Cuba’s main economic activity since 1996, year in which tourism brought more income to Cuban economy than sugar production for the first time.

Indeed, since 1991, the only sector of Cuban economy to have positive results is the so-called “services’ sector” linked with tourism. Nonetheless, these positive results are not enough to compensate the ruinous state of Cuban economy in all other sectors, and therefore they are not enough to free Cuban commercial balance from systematic deficit. And we must note than Cuban agriculture remains underdeveloped and that Cuban industry is almost inexistent (limited to a very few light industries linked with sugar production) – Castroist Cuba suffers from a total absence of heavy industry of means of production (which is, not by chance, the most indispensable sector to construct genuine socialism). This is a consequence of centuries of imperialist and social-imperialist exploitation and dominance which shaped Cuban economy in benefit of their greedy interests for profit maximization. Both in Bolshevist Soviet Union and in Socialist Albania, absolute priority was given to the establishment and development of a diversified industry of means of production able to ensure these countries’ independence in face of capitalist-imperialist-revisionist encirclement, attacks and pressures. This development of the heavy industry of means of production is also essential even because through preventing capitalist-imperialist-revisionist economic infiltration, it is simultaneously avoiding capitalist-imperialist-revisionist political, ideological and military infiltration. But as Castroist Cuba had never anything to do with authentic socialist construction, after the fall of Soviet social-imperialist empire, it turned to other imperialist powers in order to keep its neo-colonial economy functioning.

As we had already explained in this article, Castroist Cuba continued to face American embargo even after social-imperialist Soviet Union disappeared due to the fact that Castroist bourgeoisie always refused American imperialists’ demands for recovering their former exclusive control over Cuba, as this would involve an acute risk of being quickly overthrown from power (we cannot forget that American imperialists keeps Cuban pro-American bourgeoisie compradore of Miami waiting for the first opportunity to expel Castroists from power). Indeed, since 1990 that Cuban economy is being affected by lack of oil, lack of manufactured goods and from a systematic deficit in state capitalist enterprises. And besides this, we still have to note that levels of inflation in Castroist Cuba are very high. In face of this, Cuban social-fascists had to find a way of dealing with their disastrous situation. But given social-fascist Cuba’s economic, political and ideological features that were already indicated, it would be impossible for Castroists to set themselves on an independent course based on Cuba’s own forces, even because Cuban revisionist economy was and is typically capitalist and neo-colonial. Therefore, already in the early 90’s, Castroist bourgeoisie started searching for other
capitalist-imperialist powers which could provide markets to Cuban raw materials and which could sell manufactured goods to the island. Firstly, Castroist Cuba relied on European Union (a rival of American imperialism). In mid-90’s, official numbers underlined that most part of Cuban foreign trade was with EU. However, as time passed, Castroist bourgeoisie soon faced the same dilemma that had impelled it to subservience towards Soviet social-imperialism: it continued to be American imperialist bourgeois class’s target, as American imperialists never quitted their dream of having Cuba under their absolute sway again. That is why Castroist Cuba made in recent times an rapprochement towards Latin-American imperialist powers like Brazil and also towards other bourgeois nations like Venezuela (whose pro-capitalist clique also loves to use “revolutionary” cloaks in order to hide the fact that it has sold the country to Chinese imperialism) but foremost towards social-imperialist China. This makes sense, as China replaced Soviet Union as the world’s social-imperialist superpower. Indeed, rapprochement with these new emergent imperialist powers allowed Castroists to maintain their “socialist” masks, even because Chinese social-imperialists take great advantage of holding control over a country still using “red” cloaks, as this also provides Chinese social-imperialism with a more “progressive” and “popular” disguise in front of the eyes of those world workers who still believe Castroist Cuba is a socialist country and that, consequently, if Chinese social-fascists are supporting it, that’s because China is also a socialist country. Of course, as we have already explained in other articles, despite its fake “socialist” disguises, Chinese imperialism has the same objective of any other: profit maximization through ruthless exploitation, oppression and repression of world workers.

So, Chinese social-imperialists are tightening their claws over Cuba in their quest for profitable markets and for neo-colonial areas of influence and control with the open connivance and support of Castroist bourgeoisie. Accordingly with official sources:

“China and Cuba strengthened their economic and political ties on Sunday by signing a dozen cooperation agreements that will provide strong financial support to the Latin American country as it embarks on economic reforms. (...) The agreements also cover cooperation in digital television and telecommunications, banking supervision and financing for projects, as well as an oil refinery expansion project and a liquefied natural gas project. (...) Cuba is China's biggest trade partner in the Caribbean region (...). Over the past decade, bilateral trade increased from $440 million in 2001 to $1.83 billion in 2010.”
(http://www.chinadaily.com.cn/cndy/2011-06/07/content_12646298.htm, China Daily, China, Cuba sign host of cooperation deals, June 2011, edition in English)

Of course, needless to say that Chinese social-fascist “help” to Cuba is dependent on Castroist enforcement of those “economic reforms” which are able to transform Cuban economy into an appendix of Chinese imperialism, just like Soviet revisionists had done. Indeed, we had already pointed out the dominance of a vicious cycle in Cuban economy in which dependence on foreign imperialism only attracts more dependence on foreign imperialism. And as Castroist Cuba had always a capitalist and pro-imperialist / pro-social-imperialist economy, it is subjected to the interests of the finance bourgeoisie who always and invariably control phony “free markets” and whose gluttony for maximum profits causes crisis which reveal capitalism’s unsolvable contradictions:
“The global financial crisis intensified the need for reform in Cuba, transmitting its impact through the island’s sensitivity to foreign credit, export earnings, remittances, and tourism. The evaporation of hard currency, coupled with spikes in food and oil prices in 2008 and 2011, provoked Cuba to deepen reforms first implemented during the post-Soviet crisis of the mid 1990s. (…) China has become the island’s (...) trading partner (...), with annual bilateral trade reaching $1.83 billion in 2010 (up from just $314 million in 2000).” (http://theconversation.edu.au/with-its-eyes-on-chinas-growth-model-cuba-begins-its-slow-march-towards-capitalism-6244, With its eyes on China’s growth model, Cuba begins its slow march towards capitalism, April 2012, edition in English)

So, as can be observed, not even Western bourgeois ideologues are misled about Castroist insistence about using fake “socialist” masks. Of course that contrary to what the title “With its eyes on China’s growth model, Cuba begins its slow march towards capitalism” insinuates, Castroist Cuba never followed another path besides that of capitalism (the title is a result of the attempts of Western capitalist-imperialist ideologues to present state capitalism as being “socialism” or even “communism” with the goal of deviating world workers from genuine socialism: on one side, by inculcating in the workers of state capitalist countries the false idea that they are living in a “socialist society”, they make those workers give up the struggle for true socialism because allegedly it has already been accomplished; and on the other side, by presenting state capitalist tyrannies as being examples of “socialism” and even “communism”, they discredit authentic socialism and communism in front of world workers and proletarians thus keeping them away from MLSH and maintaining capitalist-imperialist-revisionist order alive. As can be concluded, these two purposes are closely linked between them and complement each other).

Under Chinese imperialist control, Castroist bourgeoisie is confirming its role as a typical pro-imperialist compradore exploitative class and is increasingly opening its doors to Chinese imperialist penetration. Some claim that it is Raul Castro (Fidel’s brother that assumed presidency of revisionist Cuba by mid 2000’s, when Fidel got sick) that is promoting this path, and that he is some kind of Cuban Deng Xiaoping. There are certain Castroists who insist in presenting Fidel’s times as being an epoch of “genuine socialism” in opposition to Raul’s times which would be “revisionist”. This reasoning is equivalent to that of “orthodox” Maoists who also claim that fascist Deng Xiaoping allegedly “betrayed Mao’s truly socialist path”. But this is not true. There is no substantial difference between Fidel and Raul Castro just like there is no substantial difference between Mao and Deng Xiaoping. Deng Xiaoping only continued Mao imperialist bourgeois-capitalist-revisionist course, just like Raul Castro only continued Fidel’s pro-imperialist bourgeois-capitalist-revisionist course. And as we have been observing throughout this article, anti-socialist and pro-capitalist-imperialist policies have been always followed by Cuban social-fascists and Cuba’s transformation into a pro-Chinese bourgeois-compradore country started when Fidel Castro still personally headed Cuban government. Indeed, the policies of Raul Castro only serve to confirm the openly capitalist path which had been initiated many years ago with Fidel. In recent times, Cuban social-fascist bourgeoisie has persisted in its path of implementing classic capitalism. In his official speeches, Raul Castro explicitly talks about “reducing the role of the state in the economy and encourage private enterprise” and it was determined that the salaries of the members of Castroist bourgeoisie that rule capitalist “state enterprises” will be increased without any limits. At the same time, accordingly with
newspapers “Havana Journal” and “MSNBC”, Castroist bourgeoisie is now totally free to stay in sumptuous hotels and to have cell phones and all kinds and varieties of luxury products built, fabricated and sold by foreign imperialist multinationals, for instance. Moreover, it can also own explicit private property without restrictions (until now, it had always instead in using state capitalist masks to hide that private property and its accumulation were never abolished in Cuba). Contrary to what happened in the past, when it still tried to maintain a certain “revolutionary”, “red” and even “socialist” appearance, Cuban social-fascists have now openly embraced the most wicked forms of bourgeois-capitalist degenerated way of life. Furthermore, Castroists are putting Cuban workers at total disposal of the imperialist companies that have now free reign over the island in order to facilitate and intensify the exploitation of Cuban labourers. According to the site \[\text{http://old.news.yahoo.com/s/nm/20111226/wl_nm/us_cuba_reform}\], Cuban revisionists determined that until 2016, over 40% of the country’s workforce must be in the “non-state” sector (and this percentage is wanted by them to increase even infinitely more after that year). These workers are described by Castroists as being “small businessman working for themselves”, but the truth is that they invariably fall into the enslaving claws of capitalist-imperialist bourgeois corporations. This is also an obvious sign of a clear Castroist ideology to gradually eliminate state capitalist sector and to replace it by a classic capitalist sector.

And, as we have already seen, all this is in agreement with the goals of Chinese social-imperialists. All these measures are result of Chinese neo-colonization of Cuba and have the aim of promoting and fostering the penetration of Chinese imperialist-capitalist multinationals and credits in Cuba, thus maximizing the profits of Chinese imperialist social-fascists bourgeoisie.

But let’s return to revisionist Cuba’s new subservience towards Chinese social-imperialism. In fact, Castroist Cuba became a veritable Chinese neo-colony. Cuba’s invasion by Chinese goods is nowadays a reality, and Castroist desperate need for Chinese manufactured and heavy industry’s products is a revealing symptom of Cuba’s economy neo-colonial nature. Relatively to the transporting and refrigerator sectors, Cuban dependence on Chinese imperialism is almost total. Accordingly with the Castroist publications “Havana journal” and “Granma Internacional” of June, 2006, Cuba had purchased 100 locomotives from China for US$130 million and had signed a contract for buying 1,000 Chinese buses for urban and inter-provincial transportation. Moreover, Castroist regime also bought over 30,000 Chinese refrigerators.

However, the sectors of Cuban economy which are most attractive to Chinese imperialists in their predatory quest for profits are undoubtedly those of mining (copper, nickel, cobalt, etc.) and oil. Only in 2004, 16 “agreements” relatively to these economic sectors were signed between the bourgeois-capitalist-revisionist social-fascist cliques of both countries. Accordingly with bourgeois sources such as “Reuters” and “China Chemical Report”, nickel processing facility of Las Camariocas (whose construction had been left unfinished by Soviet imperialists) was rebuilt by Chinese social-fascists and social-imperialists, who provided a credit of US$500 million in its completion and operation in the context of an “agreement” between both countries’ state monopolist capitalist enterprises China International Trust / Investment Corp and Cubaniquel. Furthermore, China Development Bank and the Chinese Export and Credit Insurance Corporation ensured financing and guarantees.
Relatively to the oil sector, SINOPEC, the Chinese state capitalist monopolist company signed an agreement with state-owned capitalist company CUPET (Cuba Petroleum) to develop and exploit oil resources in Cuba. Of course, needless to say that if Chinese imperialists are investing US$ 500 million today, that is because they surely know that they will profit US$ 500 trillion or more in the future. And in 2005, PetroChina Great Wall Drilling Co., Ltd. and Petroleum Company of Cuba also signed two drilling service contracts with a value of over US$ 24 million thanks to which Chinese imperialist company Great Wall Drilling has been enjoying a monopoly on providing drilling rigs for oil exploration on Cuba's coast.

Chinese imperialist financing is already promoting both the search for new mining and energy sources and the construction of infrastructures (roads, railways, oil pipers, gas pipers, harbors, etc.) with the aim of facilitating Chinese social-fascists’ and social-imperialists’ profit maximization.

Moreover, in 2005, the “Havana journal” announced that the two countries signed an agreement to develop biotech joint ventures. Thus, Chinese social-fascista and social-imperialists are already taking advantage of Cuban know how, technology and processes in the biotechnological field.

And besides all this, Chinese imperialists are also using Cuba’s geographical proximity with the USA in order to install military bases and military personnel in the island with the purpose of turning it into a spy base against their main rival for world’s dominance: American imperialism. Of course, Castroists promptly embraced these plans from the Chinese social-imperialists, even because in this manner Cuban social-fascists can enjoy from a protection against American imperialist bourgeoisie which is equivalent to that formerly assisted to them by Soviet social-fascists and social-imperialists with the purpose of having Cuba’s resources, means of production and workforce totally under their control in order to maximize their profits (exactly like Chinese imperialists and social-fascists do nowadays). This situation has obviously turned American imperialists furious; after Soviet empire had disappeared, they thought time had come to finally topple Castroists and re-occupy Cuba. Therefore, it is easy to imagine their despair when they realized that Chinese imperialists were taking the place formerly belonging to the Soviets, what means that American imperialist bourgeoisie are again in a position in which they cannot launch an open military attack against Castroist Cuba without facing the anger of an imperialist rival which, by the way, possesses an economic-military power superior to their own. Chinese newspaper “China reform monitor” admits that “China has installed electronic spy bases in Cuba and that Chinese personnel have been operating two intelligence signal stations in Cuba since early 1999.”

Castroists are doing their utmost to conquer the sympathy of imperialist China, as they perceived that it is a mere question of time before it becomes the world absolute dominant imperialist superpower. In recent times, many representatives of Chinese revisionist-imperialist dictatorship have visited Cuba. According to Irish revisionist journalist Toni Solo, on 30th May, 2013, colonel Guo Jinlong, General-Secretary of the “Communist” Party of China, visited the island allegedly in order to “fortify relations between both countries and their respective ruling parties” (retired from: http://tortillaconsal.com/tortilla/es/node/12982, translated from Portuguese language), that is, to reinforce even more the absolute and exclusive domination of Chinese imperialism over social-fascist revisionist Cuba. In 2004, Chinese social-fascist Hu
Jintao visited Cuba and was received by Castro. Jintao shamelessly praised “the achievements of Cuban government, party and people in socialist construction” and even dared to state that “both the CPC and the CPC remain faithful to socialist and communist orientation in accord with their respective nations’ conditions”. In return, Castroist official newspaper “Granma Internacional” goes lower and lower by publishing an article saying such falsities as that “Chinese experience shows that there are alternatives”, that “China’s staggering economic development was accomplished without capitalism, through a banking system under state control, a strong leadership and an harmonious social development”! Castro also disgustingly stated that “Hu is a genuine communist”. With these kind of affirmations, Jintao and Castro want to deceive world proletariat and world workers by hiding the anti-communist and bourgeois-capitalist character of both Cuban revisionist social-fascism and of Chinese imperialism, thus facilitating the depicting and presentation of this last one as a “progressive” and even “socialist and communist” force whose purpose is to “liberate world peoples’ from the yoke of US imperialism”. It is a deep insult to call fascist Jintao a “genuine communist”, when the truth is that he is the representative of the most reactionary, anti-socialist, pro-capitalist and pro-imperialist clique in the world: the bourgeois-capitalist bourgeoisie character of both Cuban revisionist social-fascism and of Chinese imperialism.

Cuban revisionists’ “friendship” with Chinese imperialists also shows how Castroist bourgeoisie does not hesitate in changing opinions in accord with their class interests. During the decades of subservience towards Soviet revisionists, Castroists used to criticize China in order to please their Soviet bosses, whose leadership of world social-fascist and social-imperialist movement was being menaced by Chinese revisionists. But nowadays, as Soviet empire has vanished and Castroists need another superpower to protect them and to keep their neo-colonial economy alive, they don’t think twice before putting Cuba under another social-imperialist sway – that of Chinese imperialists. This is also very interesting because Castroist bourgeoisie often accuses pro-American Cuban bourgeois exiled in Miami of being “pro-imperialist”. But the truth is that there are no substantial differences between them: while the last one serves American imperialism, the first one served Soviet imperialism and now serves Chinese imperialism. Castroists often try to depict Chinese social-imperialist dominion over Cuba as being “progressive” because Chinese social-fascists and social-imperialists occasionally contribute to the construction of schools, to the formation of technical personnel and invite the sons and daughters of Castroist bourgeoisie to go study on China. But far from denying Chinese revisionism’s imperialist character, this only proves it. Following the example of Soviet social-imperialists, also Chinese imperialists may encourage the formation of foreign loyal cadres and servants (which can help them taking maximum profits from neo-colonies) and provide certain countries with some credits for the construction of a few infrastructures. But there is nothing “progressive” and much less “socialist” about this. On the contrary, this constitutes a mean of incentive the development of commercial relations with those nations and of direct investment in order to open the path towards complete neo-colonialist dominion over them. Long time ago, comrade Lenin had already noted that the exportation of capitals is a mean to encourage the exportation of commodities and merchandises. Nowadays, the exportation of Chinese imperialist capitals mainly aims at promoting commercial relations with China as a prologue to imperialist absolute and exclusive rule by Chinese social-fascist, revisionist, state monopolist capitalist imperialist bourgeoisie with the
aim of expanding its bourgeois-capitalist, neo-colonialist, social-imperialist, social-fascist, wage slavagist, exploitative, oppressive and anti-communist sphere of influence (a situation which is already in effect at this moment).

Indeed, Chinese social-fascist penetration in Cuba has aggravated the deficit of Cuban commercial balance even more, with Chinese exports to Cuba far surpassing Cuban exports to China. For example, bourgeois newspaper “Financial Times” informed that:

“Bilateral trade between China and Cuba in 2005 totaled US$777 million, of which US$560 million were Chinese exports to Cuba.” (Financial Times, China helps Cuba to move up a gear, March 2006, edition in English)

As we had already stated, this constitutes one more proof of Castroist Cuba’s anti-socialist and anti-communist nature. Neither in comrade Enver’s Albania, neither in comrade Lenin and Stalin’s Soviet Union ever existed any kind of deficit in the commercial balance or of external debt. The emergence of these phenomenons would mean that socialist productive reports would have been eliminated and that economy had become under the control of an exploitative minority in search for maximum profits – that is, it had been transformed into a capitalist economy. Indeed, both those socialist countries strived for gradually extinguishing their external commerce with capitalist-imperialist-revisionist world, as the purpose of any country constructing authentic socialism and communism relatively to foreign commerce is to totally abolish any necessity of commercializing with non-socialist and non-communist nations.

But all this is on the antipodes of what occurred in social-fascist and pro-capitalist Cuba. In 2000, Cuban economy was still not able to fulfill more than just 85% of its 1990 productive capacity. During the period 1989-1992, Cuban economy suffered a decline of more than 50%. Cuba was only capable of preventing bankruptcy since 1991 thanks to the already mentioned tourism sector, which has surpassed sugar production as the main provider of assets to Cuban economy. In 2005, around 2,5 million of Canadian and European tourists visited Cuba and left there more than US$ 2 billion of revenues. This together with the money sent home by many Cuban migrants living and working abroad provided around 65% of Cuban payments’ balance – 2/3 of Cuban economy (the enormous weight of migrant’s money on Cuban capitalist economy is indeed the main reason behind Castroist recent decision on allowing all Cubans to freely enter and leave the country – thus promoting the penetration of many more bourgeois elements influenced by Western imperialism). Therefore, we conclude that Cuban economy is based upon non-productive and parasitic sectors. Indeed, no country which aims at constructing socialism can even think about basing its economic development on things like tourism, services and on the money sent by migrants! Indeed, during socialist construction, service and administrative sectors must have the minimum weight possible within economy, because they are parasitic sectors which don’t produce anything of their own. Both in Socialist Albania and in Bolshevist Soviet Union, the weight of non-productive sectors within economy was reduced as time passed in accord with the principles of Marxism-Leninism. We repeat once more: socialism can only be successfully achieved through basing economic development on a socialized and diversified heavy industry of means of production always supported by a socialized and mechanized agriculture – with all means of production and all economic fields being under the total and exclusive control of the proletarian dictatorship headed by an
authentic Marxist-Leninist-Stalinist-Hoxhaist party. As Albanian Marxists-Leninists accurately remarked:

“Socialism’s material and technical foundations are closely linked to the creation of a powerful mechanic base which will start by producing all exchanging pieces which are necessary to repair the machines utilized in industry, in agriculture, on transportation, on construction, etc. Later, it will begin to massively produce machines, instruments and equipments which are useful to satisfy the needs of our popular economy. (…) Thanks to the heroic application of the revolutionary program of the Party of Labor of Albania relatively to socialist industrialization, it was created in our country both a diversified heavy industry and a diversified light industry which rely on raw materials provided by our own nation and that are not dependent on foreign countries anymore.” (Documents of the PLA, Réponses aux questions sur l’Albanie, Tirana, 1969, translated from version in French language)

In 1993, Castroists leaders extended the comprehensiveness of their previous law allowing the existence of “free economic zones” in Cuba through permitting foreign imperialist investments in virtually all economic sectors. This new law also widened the possibilities offered by the previous Castroist law on “free economic zones” (which we had already analyzed in this article) relatively to the possibility of setting up joint enterprises, of grating endless concessions, of providing guarantees against nationalizations, of ensuring repatriation of all profits, etc. All this with the goal of attract foreign imperialist penetration. As we have been concluding throughout this text, Castroist Cuba’s commercial dependence always and invariably led to the domination of foreign imperialism over social-fascist Cuba’s political, social, economic and ideological order. This is the truth about the so-called “Cuban socialism”.

In fact, Castroist Cuba’s still remaining “socialistic” masks are mainly visible in official phraseology, because in what respects to economic structure, it has been further abandoning state capitalism and is becoming an archetypal dependent country of bourgeois-compradore type in which classic capitalism is applied. Consequently, state capitalist sector is being severely reduced in Castroist Cuba. For example, accordingly with official numbers, in 1989 state capitalism employed over 94% of Cuban workforce while in 1994 it not even employed 70% of workforce. And today, as we have already revealed, this percentage is even much more reduced. In 2005, the amount of imperialist capitals in Cuba reached US$ 6 billion. Besides predominant Chinese imperialist invasion, other capitalist powers such as Venezuela, Spain, Canada, Italy and France are also strongly investing in Castroist capitalist system. This kind of imperialist penetration is mainly made through joint enterprises in fields like energy, mining, etc. In spite of this, Cuban economy remains as monocultural, neo-colonial and backward as ever, because investments are direct property of foreign imperialists and all profits taken by them through exploitation of Cuban resources, means of production and workforce are automatically and entirely repatriated to imperialists’ respective countries. Supporters of Cuban revisionism around the world treacherously qualify these bourgeois-capitalist-revisionist measures as being “a more efficient socialism”, but in truth they are in total accord with exploitative class character of Castroist social-fascism. For example, the ultra-opportunist “Communist” Party of Australia published recently an article in which was affirmed relatively to this issue that:
“(…) there is a need to “make a more efficient socialism”. A high level of socialism produces paternalism (…). Cuba has to continue its challenge to find the way between social justice and efficiency (…) increasing the non-state sector.”


So, accordingly with Australian and Cuban revisionists, “socialism produces paternalism”. Unfortunately for them, only capitalist and revisionist regimes like the ones they support and defend produce paternalism. True socialism based on the teachings of Marx, Engels, Lenin, Stalin and Enver Hoxha never produces any kind of paternalism. On the contrary, under it workers are entirely free in all revolutionary and communist senses. And what about so-called “social justice” in Castroist Cuba? This false impression that Cuban social-fascism would be a somewhat more “socially fair society” is nothing more than phoney propaganda fabricated by Castroist revisionists with the aim of misleading world workers and proletarians keeping them away from authentically revolutionary Marxism-Leninism-Stalinism-Hoxhaism. Later on this article, we will further develop this subject.

Another problem affecting Castroist Cuba and which is typical from neo-colonial dependent nations is the existence of a black market of gigantic proportions. This issue comes from the 1960’s and is a cause of growing inequalities within Castroist society, with commercial intermediaries, service providers, tourism’s businessman, etc. fabulously enriching themselves while impoverished Cuban workers endure the harsh effects of Castroist pro-capitalist, pro-imperialist and anti-socialist policies [bourgeois compradore Cuba is also a very illustrative example of how corruption and nepotism are inevitably inherent to capitalist-revisionist system. In social-fascist Cuba, Fidel Castro’s position was transferred to the hands of his brother Raul and many of the most important positions (in the army, in the administration, etc.) are occupied by members of the Castro family clan. Cuban social-fascist capitalist-revisionist and pro-imperialist bourgeoisie keeps them in such positions as a reward for the subservience and inestimable services that Castro family always performed and continues to perform in benefit of Cuban social-fascist capitalist-revisionist and pro-imperialist exploitative classes, namely in what respects to repress Cuban working masses and to keep them subjected to revisionist rule so that social-fascist bourgeoisie can maximize profits to itself, but foremost to its imperialist and social-imperialist bosses that keep Cuban social-fascist capitalist exploiters and oppressors in power]. Indeed, in 2004, average life conditions of 1989 had still not been reached, and social inequalities are experiencing an exponential increase due to the emergence of more bourgeois elements linked to the penetration of imperialist capitals and to international commerce and tourism (prostitution is also a phenomenon widely spread in Cuba due to increasing poverty and destitution which are inherent to the capitalist, exploitative and wage slavagist character of Castroist repressive, social-fascist pro-imperialist bourgeoisie-revisionist society). There is an increasing abyss between Cuban workers employed in the still existing state capitalist sector, whose life conditions are miserable, and the members of Castroist bourgeoisie who exploit them and who enrich themselves through serving the interests of imperialist penetration and of capitalist-bourgeois multinationals operating in Cuba. The fact that social-fascist Cuba’s external debt towards capitalist-imperialist world finance bourgeois class is nowadays of over US$ 27 billions (including debt towards Russia inherited from former Soviet social-imperialist neo-
colonialist absolute control and dominance over Cuba) is also one of the main factors determining the unprecedented growth of poverty among Cuban working masses.

Of course, this has a very positive side, because it allows Cuban workers to see Castroist bourgeois dictatorship as it truly is, because it permits them to acquire a socialist conscience and to be aware of the unsolvable and deepening contradictions that are inherent to capitalist-imperialist-revisionist order.

Concluding, since the early 90’s, Castroist Cuba has been transformed from a bourgeois-compradore country of state capitalist type into a bourgeois-compradore country of classic type due to the increasing deficit of its commercial balance and to the exponential intensification of direct imperialist penetration. In this manner, Cuban capitalist economy is becoming direct property of foreign imperialism and of world finance bourgeois class.

In face of this, we, Stalinists-Hoxhaists, must make world proletarians conscient of the fact that revisionists’ claims about the struggle for “strengthening” and for “protecting” false “Cuban socialism” is nothing more than a masquerade aimed at deceiving world workers in general and Cuban workers in particular in order to present as “socialism” what in truth is social-fascism and to present as an example of “anti-imperialist revolutionary independence” what in truth is an example of the most disgusting bourgeois-compradore pro-imperialist colonial subservience.

5.2 – The myth of Castroist “social system”

Another “argument” used by Cuban revisionists to “prove” that supposedly “socialism is being built in Cuba” is relative to the bourgeois-reformist “welfare state” that exists in Castroist Cuba. Castroist social-fascist “social system” has been praised by revisionists of all colors as an example of “socialism”. Even American social-capitalist Michael Moore dedicated his documentary “Sicko” to eulogize Castroist healthcare system. Of course, compared to American capitalist-monopolist owned, social-Darwinist, Nazi-type healthcare system (which remains untouched despite Obama’s fake claims of “reforms”), Cuban bourgeois-reformist healthcare system may appear as “socialist”, but this is just mere facade.

In first place, we have to say that this “welfare state” and these “social rights” have been limited recently in accord with Castroist exploitative, oppressive, wage slavagist, social-fascist, pro-imperialist, capitalist-revisionist and anti-communist policies which promote direct property by foreign imperialists over Cuba’s productive sector and resources; and which encourage the formation of a gigantic external debt towards world finance bourgeois class that endangers Cuba’s economic sustainability and inevitably condemns this country to bankruptcy. For example, bourgeois-capitalist BBC news reported that in social-fascist Cuba “mass subsidies of basic goods will be removed and social spending will be “rationalised” (that is, they will be cut and even eliminated). And Luis Sexto, a Cuban social-fascist leader, affirmed that “nobody will wait for the generous hand of the state for an increase in salary or pension, which may have to be postponed … If you need it, or if you want to live more comfortably, you can work more” (citation took from the
Moreover, since the 80’s, Castroist regime has officialized unemployment in Cuba through implementing a “salary reform” allowing enterprises to adopt “technical unemployment” by putting workers in a state of “temporary availability”. These workers received an indemnization correspondent to 70% of their salary, which was in fact a true subsidy of unemployment equivalent to that which also exists in certain capitalist-imperialist nations. In fact, unemployment in Castroist Cuba has recently reached catastrophic proportions, with large numbers of workers having been fired from both the state capitalist enterprises and from the imperialist bourgeois corporations operating in the country in order to “adapt to the new economic conditions” and to “turn the system more competitive”. Those workers are now unemployed and condemned to a miserable life. It is obvious that this is one more sign of the capitalist character of the Castroist regime, this means that Castroist-Guevarist Cuba is beginning to explicitly embrace classic capitalism after many decades of “socialist” disguise. And after all, the final purpose of all kinds of revisionism is to open the path to the full restoration of capitalism. There is nothing surprising about that. Nonetheless, the bourgeois-reactionary ideologues are deceitfully taking advantage of this in order to say to the world workers: “You are always complaining about the fact that there is a lot of unemployment under capitalism, but the truth is that there is also unemployment under socialism. Just take a look at Socialist Cuba, where the communist regime is firing / dismissing and allowing the dismissal of immense numbers of workers. Therefore, you should not waste your time struggling in favor of impossible utopias because you will have exactly the same problems under socialism that you have under capitalism.” The truth is that the existence of unemployment in Castroist Cuba is one more proof of the anti-socialist character of Cuban social-fascism. Unemployment is a mean used by capitalists in bourgeois-capitalist regimes (like Castroist Cuba) to keep an army of downtrodden and hungry workers ready to sell their workforce at any price and to accept miserable slavagist working and living conditions in exchange for an opportunity to be exploited by bourgeoisie. From a capitalist point of view, the existence of unemployed is very useful because it serves as a mean of exercising pressure over the salaries of overall workers in order to decrease them. After all, if there are desperate unemployed workers eager to work for less, all other workers will be automatically obliged to accept working for the same slavagist salary – if they refuse, they will be immediately fired and will find themselves unemployed. In this manner, within bourgeois class societies, unemployment is inevitable (whether in open or in hidden forms). In these oppressive societies, capitalists oblige workers to accept laboring for less and less, thus maximizing their greedy profits. The only manner to definitively abolish unemployment is through total destruction of capitalist-imperialist-revisionist system and of everything related with it. In countries where genuine socialism is being
constructed, unemployment can never exist, because imperialist-bourgeois-capitalist-revisionist exploiters are no longer in power. Such was the case of Bolshevist Soviet Union and of Socialist Albania, where there was no unemployment.

Indeed, even in historical terms, Castroist “social system” is very far from perfection. For example, Cuban revisionists were never able to solve the problem of lack of habitation in their country. Both before Cuban 1959 anti-communist pseudo-revolution and after it, great numbers of Cuban workers do not have a permanent house where to live decently. Many of them live with their families in barracks, in temporary buildings, in tiny houses that lack all kinds of sanitary and space conditions or even in the streets [according to some sources, Afro-Cuban laborers are the most affected by poverty, and they continue to suffer racist discrimination in access to jobs, positions within social-fascist government and administration (even because Afro-Cuban members of Castroist capitalist-revisionist bourgeoisie are virtually inexistent), adequate houses and even to Castroist “social benefits” (“free” healthcare, “free” education/alphabeticization, “free” access to bourgeois-capitalist-revisionist, social-fascist, pro-imperialist and anti-communist “culture”, etc). This is far from being astonishing. After all, racism is an instrument of profit maximization used by oppressive and exploitative classes to promote disunion among workers, to direct their grievances towards convenient scapegoats and to make them forget that all their sufferings are caused by the brutal wage slavagist order to which they are subjected, thus keeping them away from genuine communist ideology and aims. Consequently, racism is something inherent to capitalist-revisionist system and can only be totally and definitely removed when capitalism and revisionism are also totally and definitely eliminated. As this never happened in Cuba, it is inevitable that racism continues to exist in this country]. Indeed, after Castroist bourgeoisie seized power, the habitation problem was even aggravated. Between 1959 and 1975, only 210,000 habitations were built in Cuba. This is clearly insufficient, as Cuba had a population of about 6.8 million inhabitants in 1959 and of about 10 million inhabitants in 1978. Cuban social-fascists themselves acknowledge that lack of housing is one of the country’s main challenges. According to official estimates, the shortage reached some 500,000 homes as of the middle of the 1990’s.

Thus, Castroist “social system” is not the paradise that many dream about. And this also shows Castroist despise towards Cuban proletarians’ and workers’ well-being. Castroists only want to deceive Cuban workers about their social-fascist nature through giving those workers some “social alms” that do not interfere with profit accumulation of Castroist bourgeoisie and of its imperialist and social-imperialist masters. From the moment investments in “social system” reach a value that interferes with this referred accumulation, Castroists couldn’t care less with Cuban working classes’ welfare. This is what certainly occurs with investments in habitation. But we affirm that even if Castroists were willingly to try to solve this problem, they would never accomplish it due to the simple reason that habitation problems can only be definitely and completely solved under socialism. In fact, there is not a single capitalist, imperialist or revisionist country that ever managed to solve habitation problem. In capitalist-imperialist-revisionist world, there will always be homeless people. As earlier as late XIX century, comrade Engels – the 2nd Classic of Marxism-Leninism – had already concluded this. But as Castroist Cuba was never socialist, habitation problems continue to be unsolved there and this situation will not change until the country is finally engaged in genuine socialist construction. Moreover, even accordingly with the parameters of revisionist
states, Castroist Cuba’s “social system” is nothing outstanding. Indeed, it lags far behind the “social systems” that existed in other social-fascist states. For example, revisionist social-fascist East Germany had a “social system” that was considerably superior to that of Castroist Cuba – and therefore, also much more able to mislead working masses, of course.

However, it is truth that during its existence and also nowadays, Castroist Cuba continues to display features of a bourgeois-reformist “welfare state” that is much propagated by defenders of Cuban revisionism all over the world. In fact, we understand that perhaps Cuba can appear as an “example” to many workers of neo-colonial nations due to the existence of a relatively accessible healthcare, alphabetization, a somewhat developed “social security system”, access to bourgeois-capitalist-revisionist, social-fascist, pro-imperialist and anti-communist “culture”, etc. But this does not excuse the treacherous demagogy of Castroist leaders when they use these factors as “proofs” that in Cuba “socialism is being constructed”. Indeed, not only Cuban revisionists, but also many other revisionists around the world use this same “argument”. For example, when praising Castroist Cuba’s “social-system”, British Maoists claim that:

“(…) every Cuban has the right to universal free education and access to a healthcare system (…)” [http://www.cpgb-ml.org/index.php?secName=proletarian&subName=display&art=456, Documents of the Communist Party of Great Britain (Marxist-Leninist), Proletarian issue nº 27, December 2008, edition in English]

“A poor country like Cuba is only able to achieve all this because of its socialist system.” [http://www.cpgbml.org/index.php?secName=proletarian&subName=display&art=251, Documents of the Communist Party of Great Britain (Marxist-Leninist), Proletarian issue nº 16, February 2007, edition in English]

And indeed, at first sight, Cuban “social system” apparently seems to have achieved some good results in healthcare and alphabetization, for example. But if we analyze it attentively, we will conclude that, far from being “free”, Castroist “social system” is in fact paid by workers’ extremely heavy taxes and “contributions” (just like also happens in many capitalist-imperialist-revisionist developed countries in Europe, North America and elsewhere), thus allowing capitalists to maximize their profits while making workers believe that capitalist state was replaced by a “democratic” and “popular” state worried about workers “welfare”. Therefore, we can say that in countries of bourgeois-reformist “welfare state” (thus also in social-fascist Cuba), workers pay large amounts of their salaries in order to be deceived and alienated by the bourgeois-capitalist state with the help of its revisionist lackeys (it is not be chance that in comrade Enver’s Albania taxes were abolished as soon as it was possible. Tax system is an inherent part of exploitative capitalist-imperialist-revisionist order, and it must be removed during socialist construction). In truth, through implementing “welfare state”, capitalists are only worried about preventing socialist revolution by extinguishing communist conscience among the proletariat and workers through making them believe that Marxist-Leninist-Stalinist-Hoxhaist theory about the exploitative and bourgeois class character of capitalist-bourgeois state is not applicable, and therefore there is no need to overthrow it neither to install a proletarian dictatorship towards socialism and
By implementing a tax system, capitalist-imperialist bourgeoisie display their cleverness: while keeping workers away from genuinely revolutionary and communist ideology (thus eternally perpetuating capitalist-imperialist-revisionist world predatory order), they can continue to accumulate and maximize their greedy bloody profits without being bothered. While the state is not a state of proletarian dictatorship acting in accord with the principles Marxism-Leninism-Stalinism-Hoxhaism, it will always be an oppressive, exploitative, tyrannical and predatory state. This is the truth which also entirely applies to Castroist Cuba, because capitalist productive relations were never abolished there and the state always kept its bourgeois character. Indeed, as we explained in our DWM III, the final utopian purpose of revisionist currents like Castroism is to construct a supposedly “equilibrated” and “perfect” capitalism under which there would be no class struggle neither insolvable class antagonisms and contradictions because its “socialistic” mask would be so well done that workers would firmly believe that they were “advancing towards communism”. Wage slavery and exploitative capitalist relations of production are hidden behind an allegedly “state-controlled economy” and a political system supposedly dominated by the “communist party”. Workers and proletarians no longer struggle against capitalism for the simple reason that apparently capitalism has already been abolished! The “communistic” outlook and phraseology of this kind of system reaches the point of inculcating in the proletarians and workers the false conviction that they are already living in a “socialist society”. This is undoubtedly the ultimate revisionist dream. Indeed, the creation of such an impossible capitalist society is the final objective not only of Castroism-Guevarism, but also of many other revisionist currents. Of course, one of the essential characteristics that this “capitalism with a socialist face” must have in order to deceive the workers is a wide range of so-called “social and human services” like “free” health care, “free” education system. These “social and human services” are to be presented by the revisionist bourgeoisie as “undeniable proofs of socialism”. As if socialism is nothing more than alphabetization, health care, etc. as if socialism is reduced to some ridiculous alms given by the social-fascist-revisionist bourgeoisie to the workers it oppresses and exploits (which, let’s repeat, are not even truly free because the oppressive tax system continues to exist in this kind of capitalist-revisionist system, and therefore those “free” services are actually paid by the workers themselves)!

Accordingly with revisionists, “socialism” is limited to things like widespread healthcare, alphabetization, etc. If we adopt these same criteria, then we could also qualify Castroist Cuba as a country of socialist ideologies. Defenders of Cuban revisionism claim that before 1959 pseudo-revolution, great part of Cuban population was analphabet and lacked access to healthcare but that after Castroists seized power, Cuban workers’ life conditions improved. As we have been stating, this is not exactly truth, because Castroist “social system” functions at the expenses of Cuban workers’ tears, sweat and blood and it has a lot of shortcomings. Contrary to what Cuban revisionists claim, there is no reason to get euphoric over a detestable bourgeois-reformist-capitalist wage slavagist revisionist and oppressive “social system” which only exists to prevent toilers from making the socialist revolution. Castroist-Guevarist “welfare state” has the same fundaments, origins and purposes of the famous Scandinavian “welfare state” (indeed, Cuban revisionist regime is often described as being another version of the Scandinavian “welfare state”. And in truth, if bourgeois-capitalist classes from Sweden or Denmark used some fake “red Marxist-Leninist” slogans, if they adopted state capitalism and if they hide themselves behind the façade of a phony “communist party”, the resulting exploitative anti-socialist political-socio-
economic-ideological order would be very similar to that of social-fascist Castroist Cuba) or even of the “social rights” defended by European social-democracy. Indeed, even ultra-reactionary pro-fascist “Christian Democracy” has everything in common with Castroism because all these pro-capitalist, pro-imperialist and anti-communist currents want to implement a “social market system” that maintains and perpetuates bourgeois world system while finding manners to prevent proletarians and workers from adhering to communist ideology through depicting and presenting capitalism as a “democratic”, “popular”, “progressive” system. This is the reason behind revisionist screams about the alleged “humanitarian character” of Castroist bourgeois regime. And of course, Castroist leaders themselves do their utmost to promote this false picture – we cannot forget that before 1959 bourgeois pseudo-revolution, they used to affirm that “our movement does not belong to communism, but to humanism”. Indeed, this was indeed an anarchist slogan adopted by Castroists, in what is an illustrative example of how Castroism and anarchism are closely linked. Cuban anarchists themselves admit all this and explain that:

“This humanist slogan had the purpose of promoting our idea of “freedom without terror”. “

Of course, when they mention “terror”, anarchists and Castroists are in fact referring to proletarian dictatorship, which they staunchly refuse. Indeed, their treacherous promises of “freedom without terror” have the aim of deviating workers from Marxism-Leninism-Stalinism-Hoxhaism through convincing them that it is possible to achieve true emancipation and liberation without having to implement proletarian dictatorship. At the same time, by depicting proletarian dictatorship simply as “terror”, anarchists and Castroists are also misrepresenting what proletarian dictatorship truly means, they are hiding its class character by presenting it as a period of indiscriminate repression. During proletarian dictatorship, political-socio-economic-military power will belong entirely to workers led by the proletariat organized in its communist party vanguard. As comrade Lenin affirmed:

“(…) this period (the dictatorship of the proletariat) inevitably is a period of an unprecedentedly violent class struggle in unprecedentedly acute forms, and, consequently, during this period the state must inevitably be a state that is democratic in a new way (for the proletariat and the propertyless in general) and dictatorial in a new way (against the bourgeoisie).”

Therefore, during proletarian dictatorship, not everybody will be repressed, terrorized and annihilated but only bourgeois-capitalist-imperialist-revisionist exploitative anti-communist elements and forces, but only those who are against socialism, communism and their construction.

Of course, it is obvious that Castroism never belonged to communism, it was always a bourgeois-capitalist ideology, even because what is not communist it is necessarily anti-communist, and what is anti-communist is necessarily pro-capitalist. And in what respects to “humanism”, Cuban workers and proletarians who are exploited by Castroists and who are forced to work as slaves for the imperialist multinational companies invading and occupying Cuba surely have a different view. After all,
Castroist “social system” cannot mislead workers forever. One day, it will be torn to pieces by the world proletariat.

In Soviet Union of comrades Lenin and Stalin and in comrade Enver’s Albania, socialism was never reduced to some phony alms neither to bourgeois-reformist “social rights”. In these countries, capitalist productive relations were indeed abolished, wage slavery and exploitation were removed and the means of production were in the hands of workers’ state headed by the proletariat and under the leadership of an authentic Marxist-Leninist party. But this does not at all means that Soviet and Albanian Marxists-Leninists despised workers’ well-being. On the contrary, during authentic socialist construction, working masses will enjoy unprecedented and unparalleled welfare. For example, in 1983, in Castroist Cuba there was a medical doctor for 576 inhabitants while in socialist Albania there was a medical doctor for 573 inhabitants! And we must take into account that Castroist Cuba was receiving enormous quantities of credits and “aids” provided by Soviet social-imperialists while comrade Enver’s Albania was solely relying on its own forces and resources! And contrary to what occurred with social-fascist Cuba, if Albanian Marxist-Leninists had not been removed from power by the revisionists the number of inhabitants per medical doctors would have surely been even much more reduced. In fact, while in Castroist Cuba inflation was never controlled (one more consequence of lack of a truly socialist planned economy), in comrade Enver’s Albania the prices of consumer goods never ceased from diminishing and salaries were steadily increasing, what represented a fantastic improvement of the living conditions of Albanian working people. Both in Russia and in Albania before socialist revolutions, working masses lived as in middle age, suffering from all kinds of diseases (malaria, tuberculosis, etc…) and from total lack of decent living conditions. But Soviet and Albanian workers knew an impressive increase in their well-being thanks to the implementation of proletarian dictatorship and to authentic socialist construction. It was only after revisionists seized power in both countries destroying Marxist-Leninist parties and restoring capitalism that workers’ living conditions seriously deteriorated again.

Just like Soviet and Albanian comrades, also we, Stalinists-Hoxhaists, know that it is totally false to depict “socialism” as being synonym of bourgeois-capitalist “social system” / “social rights” and of access to healthcare, to alphabetization, to bourgeois-capitalist-revisionist, social-fascist, pro-imperialist and anti-communist “culture”, etc. Socialism is infinitely more than that: socialism means the definitive abolition of capitalist exploitation, it means the destruction of the tyrannical class society under which workers are subjected to wage slavery and its replacement by a society which is in accord with the principle: “From each one according with his/her capacities, to each one according to his/her work”. But socialism also means the implementation of a new mentality; because socialism cannot be completed and cannot give place to communism without the total revolutionarization of social, moral, family relations, etc… Therefore, socialism is synonym of destruction of everything related with the old exploiting capitalist socio-economic-ideological order through the use of harsh revolutionary proletarian violence. As comrade Enver remarked:

“True, PLA’s general-line struggles for the country’s industrialization, the development of cooperative agriculture, the extension of education services (...). However, no matter how important these objectives are, they will never be an end in themselves, because they are just means to achieve a higher purpose: the
This principled Marxist-Leninist-Stalinist position of comrade Enver Hoxha is in complete contrast with the perverse reformist, pro-capitalist and anti-socialist theories defended by Cuban revisionists, who depict socialism as being synonym of a bourgeois “welfare state”!

Indeed, from all neo-colonial countries subjected to the rule of world imperialism, only in the most backward the workers suffer from widespread lack of conditions of access to healthcare, alphabetization, etc. Comrade Marx, the 1st Classic of Marxism-Leninism, remarked long ago that capitalism needs workers enjoying from high qualifications and from good health in order to maximize exploitation’s and wage slavery’s profitability. And as the “social system” that provides healthcare, alphabetization, access to bourgeois-capitalist-revisionist, social-fascist, pro-imperialist and anti-communist “culture”, etc. is exclusively paid by workers, capitalists can only take benefits from this. In general, modern bourgeois-bourgeois regimes abolish these kind of reformist-capitalist “social rights” and “welfare state” only when imperialism is already at its terminal stage, only when its economy is falling apart (as it is occurring nowadays after the outcome of world capitalist crisis) with the purpose of diminishing the cost of workforce through all means.

Just like happens with other social-fascist states, Cuban revisionists try to focus workers’ attention on Castroist degenerated “social system” with the objective of covering with silence the veritable political-socio-economic-ideological fundamentals that determine if a certain country is authentically constructing socialism or not. That is why they make long speeches and write gigantic books praising Castroist health, alphabetization and “social-security” system in order to prevent the world proletariat from making an efficient and accurate class analysis about material bases of Cuban social-fascist regime. They promote abstraction from concrete socio-economic reality that prevails in Cuba, where under “socialistic” disguises capitalist productive relations were kept untouched in agriculture as well as in industry and in other sectors which could never have a socialist nature because exploitative and oppressive productive relations were never eliminated in Castroist Cuba. Consequently, “market” economy (which is inevitably controlled by bourgeois-capitalist and pro-imperialist anti-communist dominant classes) was obviously never abolished in Cuba, contrary to what must occur during the construction of authentic socialism and communism. It is true that in the first phases of socialist edification, it can happen that some minor “markets” still persist. But that should not be something definitive. On the contrary, these minor “markets” which continue to exist after the proletarian socialist revolution will disappear gradually but firmly with the edification of socialist and communist society. And even in the first stages of socialist construction, the minor “markets” should never be allowed to constitute a form of exploitation and of bourgeois-capitalist restoration; they should be subjected to total control by the proletarian state which must always keep in mind that the final objective is the elimination of even those minor “markets”. In the late 40’s and early 50’s, Comrade Enver noted that Albania was the country in which the proletarian nationalizations were accomplished more quickly and in which the internal “market” was more reduced. Comrade Enver Hoxha frequently remarked that one of the causes of the success of socialist implementation in Albania was the fact that
in that country the internal “markets” were reduced to a minimum and that the PLA was struggling for their total eradication simultaneously with the deepening of socialist edification. But in revisionist social-fascist Cuba, the opposite happened. Castroist bourgeoisie never wanted to eliminate “markets”. On the contrary, it strengthened the country’s “markets” in order to exploit Cuban proletariat and working classes and to consolidate its oppressive wage slavagist class power.

If we qualify social-fascist Cuba as being a “socialist” country, then we will have to apply this same qualification to a lot of other openly bourgeois-capitalist states which sometimes also give a few “social alms” to workers to deviate them from true socialism and communism. Workers don’t need fake alms provided by the capitalists to perpetuate wage slavery, even because those alms are in fact paid by workers themselves (once more, capitalists-imperialists are giving what is not theirs to give). World workers headed by world proletariat cannot be deceived by Castroist, bourgeois-reformist and social-democratic conceptions which present socialism as being a mere “redistribution of social product” (which, as a matter of fact, never truly took place in revisionist Cuba, where Castroist bourgeoisie always lived splendidly serving its social-imperialist and imperialist bosses while destitute Cuban workers pay for Castroist “redistributive social system” with their own sweat, blood and labor). Just because in social-fascist countries (both past and present) like Cuba, North Korea, etc. and in certain capitalist-imperialist nations there are some “social rights”, this does not mean that socialism is being constructed in these countries. If this proves something, it is the rightness of comrade Marx’s assertion that within imperialist-capitalist class societies, salaries and “social benefits / alms” tend to increase with the development of productive forces because exploiters are able to ensure that if salaries increase, they will nonetheless increase at a rhythm which is much slower than the rhythm at which profits taken from workforce and labor’s productivity increase. Consequently, in these circumstances, the share of income that is given to working classes constantly diminishes in spite of the rising of salaries and of “social benefits / alms” - what means that exploitation increases exponentially. And this increase of exploitation provides an enlarged social base to revisionism, reformism and opportunism of all types.

Cuban revisionists try to inculcate in workers ideas which are typical from bourgeois political economy. Castroists want to make world proletarians incapable of seeing behind external and superficial facts. That’s why they don’t loose a single chance of proclaiming social-fascist Cuba as a “socialist bulwark” and Castro’s anti-communist theories as “Marxism-Leninism”. But just because a certain regime/system or a certain ideology qualifies itself as “socialist” and/or as “Marxist-Leninist”, that does not automatically mean that the regime/system and the ideology in question truly deserve those qualifications.

We, Stalinists-Hoxhaists, know very well that it is impossible to reach reliable conclusions about the veritable character of Castroist Cuba without analyzing the bourgeois class nature of Castroist compradore state or without reflecting about the development of capitalist exploitative productive relations in this country. Only analysis of such factors based on truly Marxist-Leninist-Stalinist-Hoxhaist principles can allow us to objectively understand the origins, fundamentals, characteristics and consequences of Cuban revisionism. Otherwise, we would be condemned to be subjected to bourgeois-reformist Castroist myths which try to present capitalism as socialism.
5.3 – Capitalist-revisionist Cuba: “romantic” social-fascism

In 2009, on the VI Congress of Cuban Social-Fascist Party, Raúl Castro affirmed that “there are no models to achieve socialism”. Also in this, Castroists are just equal to all other revisionists, who always love to fabricate innumerable “specific roads to socialism” allegedly in accord with “each country conditions”. Such was the case of the sadly famous “Yugoslav socialism” (which in truth was nothing more than capitalism of compradore type), of the “French road to socialism” put forward by French Revisionist Party in order to convince workers to abandon the path of the revolutionary armed overthrown of bourgeois imperialist-capitalist order, of Mao’s “socialism with Chinese characteristics” (whose truly aim was to permit the ascension of the Chinese national bourgeoisie to monopolist state capitalist positions to transform China into an imperialist superpower), and many others. Of course, there can be certain national particularities which will dictate some specificities of socialist construction. However, the 5 Classics of Marxism-Leninism always underlined that those specificities are always limited to minor and secondary aspects of socialist edification and can never be extended to its essential characteristics, because the accomplishment of genuine socialist and communist must follow a certain and invariable line in accordance with the principles of Marxism-Leninism-Stalinism-Hoxhaism, regardless of the place in which socialism and communism are being built.

Initially, Castroism also had the pretension of representing “the road to socialism under Latin American conditions”, but in face of the total failure of implementation and exportation of Castroist “model” (besides Cuba, not even a single country ever followed it), Cuban revisionists eventually abandoned this pretension and started to defend that “there are many ways to achieve socialism”. This theory from Castroists had already been used by Khrushchev. It allows Cuban social-fascists to present Castroist Cuba as being “socialist”, because accordingly with Castroists, to sell one’s own country to foreign imperialism while perpetuating exploitative production relations and keeping means of production on bourgeois-capitalist, imperialist and social-imperialist hands can also be “one of the many ways to accomplish socialism”. In the same manner, if there are no “models” to socialism, Castroists even dare to declare that Cuba has already achieved socialism, because if there no “models for socialism”, that is, if there can not be predefinitions of what socialism truly is, then everything can be considered as “socialist” in accord with Castroists’ wishes and interests. If to mislead Cuban and world workers and proletarians, Cuban revisionists decide to qualify as “socialist” a country of bourgeois-compradore type like Cuba, they feel totally free to do so, because to those who argue that Castroist Cuba is not socialist, they will contest that: “as there are no models neither predefinitions for socialism, also our regime can be considered as socialist”. In fact, as we have already stated, if we embrace this Castroist criteria, we can consider as “socialist” everything we want.

Of course that the essence of things won’t change, no matter how we insist in qualifying them. Cuban social-fascism will never be “socialism” just because Castroists insist in calling it as such to keep the proletarians away from the combat for authentic socialism. Capitalism is what it is and socialism also is what it is – we can exchange their names as much as we want. In the end, everything remains the same: capitalism remains an inherently and inevitably exploitative and oppressive system and socialism remains an
inherrently and inevitably anti-exploitative and anti-oppressive system. The repressive
caracter of enslaving capitalist productive relations in revisionist and social-fascist
Cuba won’t be changed only because Castroists affirm them to be “socialist”.

And the same occurs when Castroists affirm that theirs was an anti-imperialist
revolution, and that, consequently, it was also necessarily a socialist revolution. This
false idea that any anti-imperialist revolution is automatically a socialist revolution has
long been promoted by Cuban revisionists in order to present their own bourgeois
revolution as “socialist”:

“It was necessary to make an anti-imperialist and socialist revolution. But there is
only one revolution (…). This is the greatest dialectical truth of humanity
(…).”(Fidel Castro, Revolution Cubaine, translated from version in French language)

Every Stalinist-Hoxhaist knows that it is a grave mistake to confound anti-imperialist
revolution with socialist revolution. It is true that in the beginning, before Cuban
national bourgeoisie fell under the sway of Soviet social-imperialism, Castroist anti-
socialist revolution might had a somewhat anti-imperialist side, because it aimed at
limiting the dominance of American imperialism over Cuba in benefit of Cuban
national bourgeoisie who wanted to have more freedom to exploit and to take profits
from the island’s resources, means of production and workforce. But once more, we
repeat that a bourgeois anti-imperialist revolution can never be confounded with a
socialist revolution. In the context of a bourgeois anti-imperialist revolution, national
bourgeoisie whose class aims are opposed to those of foreign imperialism and of its
local lackeys can indeed play a progressive role under certain conditions. But a
bourgeois anti-imperialist revolution can only be transformed into a socialist revolution
if there is a strong Marxist-Leninist proletarian party to lead the working masses in the
struggle to defeat not only foreign imperialism and its local servants, but also national
“patriotic” bourgeoisie which only wants to get a bigger share of profits. The problem is
that since late 1920’s / early 1930’s there was never a genuine Marxist-Leninist party in
Cuba which could fulfill this essential task. Consequently, not only Cuban national
bourgeoisie was never annihilated, but it also was later turned into a pro-Soviet
bourgeoisie of the compradore type. Thus, it is obvious that Cuban bourgeois anti-
imperialist 1959 “revolution” (which was not even very “radical” when compared to
others, as we explained that Cuban national bourgeoisie had relatively modest aims
towards the totalitarian exploitative, oppressive, repressive, wage slavagist and neo-
colonialist dominance of American imperialism and its local servants) was never
transformed into a socialist revolution and Cuba eventually became a social-fascist
country and a neo-colony of imperialism and social-imperialism.

Furthermore, Castroists always did their utmost to promote an “idealized” and
“romanticized” appearance around them. As we had already stated in the beginning of
this article, Castroist revisionists always tried to present their social-fascist wage
slavagist regime and their capitalist pro-imperialist and neo-colonial political-socio-
economic-ideological system as being synonym of “decentralization and popular
power” in contrast with socialism of “Stalinist type” which would allegedly be
something “despotic” and “surpassed”. As can be concluded, Cuban revisionism does
not differ from all other revisionisms. In the end, revisionist currents and ideologies are
only different in name, because they are all essentially the same, they have all the same
cause (the pressures and attempts of the exploitative classes to destroy communist
movement and to perpetuate their class tyranny) and the same objectives (to prevent world workers from making the socialist revolution and from installing world proletarian dictatorship towards world socialism and world communism). Therefore, this also entirely applies to Cuban revisionism. Fidel Castro once affirmed that:

“In Cuba, socialism had to be the result of a non-institutionalized dialogue between the vanguard and the people (...) I know very well that all this is in total disagreement with the teachings of Karl Marx.”

We decided to include this quotation of Castro in this text because it is one of the very few post-1960 statements in which he assumes his anti-Marxism in an open and explicit manner. It is easy to perceive Castro’s anarchistic and anti-socialist ideas when he refers to the “non-institutionalized dialogue” to give the false idea that Cuban “socialism” has a truly “democratic” nature. If we follow and embrace Castro’s way of thinking, Castroist Cuba would not only be socialist, but it also would be the only truly socialist country that ever existed; as it would be an example of genuine “socialist democracy” with a “non-institutionalized” system where “people and its vanguard dialogue freely”. Indeed, Castroist refusal of so-called “institutionalization” is in total consonance and closely linked with its rejection of the proletarian dictatorship and of the necessity of having a Marxist-Leninist party leading the revolution. This Cuban “socialism” would be in opposition to the “Marxist-Leninist-Stalinist tyranny” and to its “centralized and surpassed order”. And to what “dialoging vanguard” is Castro referring to? Surely not to the Marxist-Leninist party that must lead any veritable socialist revolution, because nothing of this ever existed in Cuba. Therefore, he is referring to the vanguard of Cuban national bourgeoisie which later became a faithful lackey of Soviet and of Chinese social-imperialisms (and of all kinds of imperialisms). And what “dialogue with the people” is he mentioning? Taking into account the manner in which Castroist bourgeois-capitalist exploiters always treated Cuban workers and proletarians, we must assume that revisionist Castro considers as a “democratic dialogue” to mercilessly repress and slaughter proletarians and workers in defense of a social-fascist exploitative order that serves world imperialism and world social-imperialism.

In Castro’s words, we note a lot of arrogance and presumption when he affirms that “we never followed Marx’s teachings”, as if his own bourgeois-revisionist-capitalist and pro-imperialist ideas were much superior to those of comrade Marx. Indeed, it is not only comrade Marx’s teachings that Castro denies: throughout all his life, he always and invariably denied, rejected and struggled against the teachings of all 5 Classics of Marxism-Leninism as a whole.

As we had already said, there are many workers that refuse all other social-fascist states, but that still have:

“(…) a warm feeling for Cuba, which they see as having a truly revolutionary tradition and a more open society.” (Michael Parenti, Blackshirts and Reds, San Francisco, 1997, edition in English)
A truly revolutionary tradition? Castroist bourgeois-capitalist Cuba (established in 1959) was never truly revolutionary because it never genuinely embraced socialist and communist construction. The only manner to be an authentic revolutionary is by following the principles of true socialism and communism, because only this way we can make a definitive and total rupture with all aspects of wage slavagist system and capitalist-imperialist-revisionist oppression.

An “open” society? Yes, social-fascist Cuba is and was always completely “open”: open to the absolute control of world bourgeois class, open to neo-colonial exploitative subservience towards imperialism and social-imperialism, open to the supreme and unlimited rule of imperialist and social-imperialist corporations/multinationals in all aspects (political, economic, social, ideological, etc.), open to capitalist exploitation and oppression, open to enormous social inequalities, open to absolute predominance of monocultural and parasitic activities which only increase revisionist Cuba’s colossal debts towards world finance capitalists, open to bourgeois-capitalist-revisionist class tyranny which condemns Cuban proletariat and workers to a miserable existence, open to all kinds of bourgeois-capitalist degeneration, etc. World capitalists-imperialists love such “openness” by the Castroists. This is on the antipodes of the positions adopted by all authentic communists. Indeed, relatively to Albania’s situation, comrade Enver remarked that:

“The bourgeois and revisionist world think that we are an isolated country. This is the capitalist-revisionist view of things. The imperialists and revisionists consider that country which has closed its doors to the invasion of their decadent culture and degeneration through enslaving credits, tourists and spies, as isolated. From this point of view we really are, and intend to remain, an isolated country.” (Enver Hoxha, Report to the VII Congress of the PLA, 1976, edition in English)

What a tremendous contrast with Cuban social-fascists, who always did and do their utmost to keep their country closed to authentically communist ideology which is able to put workers on the path of veritable socialist and communist construction. And until now, the efforts of the Cuban revisionists have been relatively successful: since late 1920’s / early 1930’s, there was never an authentically proletarian Marxist-Leninist-Stalinist-Hoxhaist party in Cuba. But we are sure that this situation will change soon. Not even the most cunning lies of the Cuban revisionists will be able to eternally mislead world proletarians and workers in general and Cuban proletarians and workers in particular.

Workers must be elucidated about Castroist masquerades. But one of the greatest difficulties in unmasking Castroist social-fascism in front of the eyes of world workers and proletarians is due to the fact that Cuban revisionists managed to “romanticize” their class order with the objective of cunningly hiding its inherent bourgeois-capitalist, exploitative, oppressive, repressive, wage slavagist, pro-imperialist and anti-communist character and to give it a certain “adventurous” surrounding. It was with this purpose that they fabricated all sorts of myths and legends like those of a “tiny guerrilla group led by Castro and Guevara which was able to defeat a gigantic army directly supported by American imperialism”, of alleged false “Cuban socialism”, etc… In truth, the history of Cuban social-fascism as it is told by Castroists-Guevarists is nothing more than a colossal amount of lies. In its essence, Castroist Cuba is a social-fascist country like all the others, its regime is as reactionary, as anti-communist and as repressive as
those of North Korea, of Ceausescu’s Romania or of East Germany, for instance. In fact, it is specially dangerous and treacherous due to Cuban revisionists’ attempts to hide their capitalist enslaving nature and their subservience towards imperialism and social-imperialist behind “revolutionary”, “red” and even “Marxist-Leninist” disguises. By doing this, they still deceive many world workers, who continue to believe that Castroist Cuba is a country moving towards socialism when the truth is that Cuban social-fascist bourgeoisie always maintained the old exploitative class relationships and wage slavery while treacherously proclaiming that socialism is being constructed in Cuba. Defenders of Cuban revisionism around the world try to force workers to support Cuban social-fascism by presenting it as “socialism”, thus qualifying those genuine communists who oppose it as being “anti-socialists” and “reactionaries”. And Castroists worldwide use the same strategy relatively to proletarian internationalism, by presenting the defense of social-fascist and revisionist Cuba as being a condition sine qua non to be an authentic proletarian internationalist. For example, French revisionists affirm that:

“In our epoch, all revolutionaries have two homelands: theirs and socialist Cuba.”

But this is nothing more than an abject lie. We, Stalinists-Hoxhaists, know that true communists and true proletarian internationalists must struggle with all their forces for the total and definitive elimination of all kinds of revisionism and social-fascism in general, and for the total and definitive elimination of Cuban revisionism and social-fascism in particular.

It is up to us, Stalinists-Hoxhaists, to denounce all these lies and to expose Cuban revisionism as what it is: an anti-communist ideology serving the interests of world capitalists, imperialists and social-imperialists in keeping workers away from authentically revolutionary Marxism-Leninism-Stalinism-Hoxhaism, thus contributing to the maintenance of world bourgeois exploitative and oppressive system.

We, Stalinists-Hoxhaists, are not like the neo-revisionists, who pretend to “condemn Cuban revisionism” while happily accepting and eulogizing the other revisionist states. This is the case of the “Alliance”, an organization which publishes articles allegedly “denouncing” the anti-socialist nature of Castroist Cuba while implicitly defending North Korean social-fascism; indeed, they even reached the point of expelling the Comintern (SH) from the ISML precisely because they could not stand our principled position of total refusal of KimIlSungism, an anti-communist pro-capitalist bourgeois ideology which has enslaved North Korean workers for decades maintaining capitalist-imperialist exploitative class and productive relations in that country. Thanks to KimIlSungist bourgeois-capitalists, North Korea is a fascist monarchy whose existence is based on the forced painful division of an entire nation and whose oppressive classes rival with their South Korean counterparts in what respects to anti-communist class despotism and wage slavagist repression. As the world’s only genuinely proletarian, revolutionary and socialist organization, the Comintern (SH) could have never adopted a different position from the one which completely rejects and condemns KimIlSungist fascism (a thorough analysis of the origins, causes, consequences and development of Korean revisionism does not belong to the scope of this article; this issue deserves
indeed an entire article solely dedicated to it…). Of course, this was too much for the neo-revisionists of “Alliance”, who “forget” that to defend a revisionist state means in fact to defend all of them, as they are all essential equal among them. It is not possible to condemn Cuban revisionism without also condemning all other revisionist currents, ideologies and forces, including KimIlSungism, of course. In exchange, to defend one of them is to defend all, as neo-revisionists from “Alliance” do. As we said, all revisionist ideologies and states are substantially equal and share the same objectives. We will take the examples of Castroist Cuba and of KimIlSungist North Korea, as the neo-revisionists of “Alliance” criticize the first while supporting the second. Both Castroist bourgeoisie and KimIlSungist bourgeoisie resulted from their countries’ national bourgeoisies, whose struggle against American and Japanese imperialism was crowned by bourgeois “revolutions” which did not represent any kind of proletarian or workers’ victory, even because in none of these countries there was a veritable Marxist-Leninist party vanguard able to lead the toiling laboring masses towards socialism and communism under the headship of the proletariat. Indeed, just like occurred in Cuba, also North Korean bourgeoisie accepted neo-colonial exploitative subservience towards Soviet imperialism in return for continuing enjoying class privileges and in order to avoid overthrown by American and Japanese imperialisms. Since then and until nowadays, both Cuba and North Korea have been social-fascist tyrannies where proletarians and workers are fiercely exploited by bourgeois-capitalist-revisionist classes which have recently sold their countries to Chinese imperialism and which always tried to hide their anti-socialist / anti-communist nature and reactionary policies under “red” and even “Marxist-Leninist” masks. Both in Castroist Cuba and in KimIlSungist North Korea, masquerades of “communist and workers’ parties” have been put in scene together with an apparent and fake “centralized and nationalized economy” with the aim of making workers believe that “socialism and communism” are really being constructed and that, consequently, the necessity of anti-capitalist and communist struggle has already been totally surpassed. In truth, neither in Cuba neither in North Korea there are any authentic communist parties; both nations are being governed by bourgeois-capitalist-revisionist pro-imperialist parties from which democratic centralism and a truly Marxist-Leninist-Stalinist-Hoxhaist ideology are totally absent and which are absolutely controlled by social-fascist bourgeoisie which oppresses workers more and more. And the same occurs with these nations’ supposedly “socialized economy”. In Cuba and in North Korea, private property and accumulation were never abolished, they were kept alive and well behind “revolutionary” masks. In both these countries, revisionist bourgeois puppets control all means of production in benefit of the interests of their imperialist and social-imperialist masters. In both these nations (and in all social-fascist and revisionist states both past and present without exception), workers suffer from savage repression and unfortunately, most of them wrongly think that the evils they suffer are due to “socialism”, as majority of them do not know how to distinguish true socialism from the pro-imperialist, exploitative, reactionary, wage slavagist, bourgeois-capitalist, oppressive, repressive, revisionist, social-fascist, anti-socialist and anti-communist order under which they are living. Indeed, in Cuba, in North Korea and in all other revisionist states both past and present, when this is advantageous to them, social-fascist, wage slavagist, revisionist-capitalist bourgeoisie use the false pretext of “defending the socialist state” (which, in truth, never existed in these countries) to ruthlessly repress authentic communists. Consequently, all fascisms, social-fascisms and pro-capitalist orders and currents have as main goal to keep workers away from Marxism-Leninism-Stalinism-Hoxhaism, thus contributing to the eternal perpetuation of world bourgeois capitalist-imperialist-revisionist order
through maintaining exploitative wage slavery within their countries while selling these same countries to world imperialists and social-imperialists. Both Cuban and North Korea are neo-colonial countries of typical bourgeois-compradore type whose ruling cliques are subservient lackeys of world capitalists-imperialists. Both regimes have absolutely nothing to do with MLSH, neither with socialism and neither with communism. Relatively to social-fascist Cuba, neo-revisionists from “Alliance” affirm that:

“(…) the case of Cuba illustrates with convincing clarity an example of the harnessing of the potential or actual forces of the socialist revolution, the exploited and oppressed proletariat, poor peasantry and urban petty bourgeoisie, to the task of establishing not the socialist system under the democratic dictatorship of the proletariat, but a system of centralised state capitalism of a bureaucratic and comprador type under the dictatorship, albeit concealed by demagogic "left" phraseology, of the national bourgeoisie, and under the conditions of intensified class struggle and heightened inter-imperialist competition typical of the contemporary advanced stage the disintegration of the imperialist world system.”

(http://ml-review.ca/aml/MLOB/GuerrillaEliteFIN.htm, The Theory of the Guerrilla Elite, 1968, version in English)

But these same words are also entirely applicable to North Korean social-fascism! So, where are the abyssal differences that make neo-revisionists from “Alliance” denounce Cuban revisionism while defending North Korean revisionism? We don’t notice them. Of course, there are secondary differences between both these revisionist regimes, minor characteristics which are linked to historical and circumstantial reasons and which do not in any way alter that they are essentially equal and share all main socio-economic-political-ideological features and aims. That is why it is impossible to have a double standard relatively to social-fascist regimes: or we support all of them or we condemn and refuse all of them. There are no alternatives neither “third ways”. Of course, it is easy to understand why neo-revisionists from “Alliance” prefer North Korean social-fascisms’ “orthodox communist” disguises to Castroist openly liberal-anarchistic views, positions and policies. That’s because North Korean revisionism can be more able to convince workers about its supposed “socialist” nature, as it is insisting in state capitalism and in the legend of the “communist party” more than Cuban revisionists. But by openly defending North Korean social-fascist tyranny, neo-revisionists from “Alliance” are indeed also defending Cuban revisionism; as they are substantially equal, to defend one is automatically synonym of also supporting the other, even because what is not truly revolutionary is necessarily reactionary: between two bourgeois-capitalist, pro-imperialist, social-fascist, exploitative, revisionist, oppressive, repressive, wage slavagist, anti-socialist and anti-communist regimes, a position which defends one of them is automatically reactionary (even if that position pretends to “condemn” the other, it doesn’t change its reactionary character). Concluding, the neo-revisionists from “Alliance” are criticizing Cuban revisionism in words, but are defending it in deeds.

In fact, we note that in the documents where they allegedly “denounce Cuban revisionism”, those neo-revisionists do not mention comrade Enver’s irreplaceable teachings a single time (on the contrary, they eulogize the so-called “lessons from the revolutions in China and Vietnam”, which, by the way, have also the very same essence of Cuban 1959 anti-communist bourgeois-capitalist “revolution”: they were all military
putsches led by their respective countries’ national bourgeoisie trying to defeat the dominance of foreign imperialism and of the bourgeois factions linked with it in order to have access to a greater share of wage slavagist profits – in a few words: all of them were bourgeois-capitalist false “revolutions” that were inherently and inevitable anti-socialist and anti-communist; thus giving origin to social-fascist and social-imperialist exploitative tyrannies. Once more, we see how neo-revisionists from “Alliance” falsely affirm to “unmask” Cuban revisionism while explicitly supporting equivalent revisionisms). It is as if the 5th Classic of Marxism-Leninism had never existed. And we cannot forget that the neo-revisionists from “Alliance” are enemies of our principled Stalinist theory on social-fascism - this is the reason why we name them Neo-Trotskyites = Anti-Trotskyites in words, however Trotskyites in deeds; they pretend to “defend” comrade Stalin just like they pretend to “denounce” Cuban revisionism – they do it in words, but they do the exact opposite in deeds).

We, Stalinists-Hoxhaists know that it is not possible to unmask any kind of revisionism (be it Cuban or any other) without basing ourselves in the teachings of all the 5 Classics of Marxism-Leninism. To ignore one of them is just another form of despising and denying his respective teachings. We, Stalinist-Hoxhaists, consider that the teachings of the five Classics of Marxism-Leninism (Marx, Engels, Lenin, Stalin and Enver Hoxha) must be regarded and understood as a whole (despite the fact that each one of the five Classics gave his own special contribution to communist ideology in the context of a determined historical period, in the context of a determined stage of socialism). That is, the teachings of each Classic are bound to the teachings of all other Classics. The teachings of one of the Classics cannot be efficiently accomplished if we don’t strive to also accomplish the teachings of all other Classics. In fact, the legacy of one of the Classics cannot be adequately defended against anti-communist enemies without also simultaneously defending the legacy of all other Classics. Therefore, we Stalinist-Hoxhaists know that the negation of the teachings of one of the Classics of Marxism-Leninism means the denial of the teachings of all of them as a whole and in their entirety. And the negation of the teachings of the Classics of Marxism-Leninism means to shamelessly deny communist ideology in its entirety. And indeed, this is exactly what neo-revisionists from “Alliance” are: a bunch of anti-communists.

6 – Conclusion

“The Cuban revolution did not begin on the basis of Marxism-Leninism and was not carried out on the basis of the laws of the proletarian revolution of a Marxist-Leninist party. After the liberation of the country, Castro did not set out on the Marxist-Leninist course, either (…).”(Enver Hoxha, The Fist of the Marxist-Leninist Communists Must Also Smash Left Adventurism, the Offspring of Modern Revisionism (From a conversation with two leaders of the Communist Party (Marxist-Leninist) of Ecuador), 21st October of 1968, edition in English)

This statement from comrade Enver brilliantly synthesizes the origins and development of Castroist social-fascism in particular and of Cuban revisionism in general. Castroist Cuba was never, is not and will never be socialist and much less communist. With this article, we aim precisely at informing world proletarians and world workers about the
anti-socialist and reactionary nature of Cuban social-fascism. Cuban revisionism in general and Castroism-Guevarism in particular are totally and entirely exploitative, oppressive, wage slavagist, social-fascist, pro-imperialist, capitalist-revisionist and anti-communist. Our goal is to unmask Cuban revisionism on the basis of Stalinism-Hoxhaism and to destroy the “revolutionary” myth of Fidel Castro with the weapons of the teachings of the 5 Classics of Marxism-Leninism. We tried to analyze not only the major characteristics of Castroism-Guevarism but also the historical course followed by revisionist Cuba since before 1959 bourgeois pseudo-revolution until nowadays. Specially, we tried to unmask Castro's counterrevolutionary role in Africa because we think that this is very important for the African working class and for the creation of the African Sections of the Comintern (SH). We also want to use our text as a condemnation of neo-revisionist ICMPLO’s defense and embrace of Cuban social-fascism. To defend it means to defend capitalism and imperialism, means to defend eternal maintenance of exploitation and oppression against laborers.

Today, there is only remaining the possibility of openly supporting the world-revolutionary, anti-revisionist attitude of the Comintern (SH) or of openly supporting Cuban counterrevolutionary social-fascism. All attempts of reconciliation between both these contrary hostile positions will be unmasked as indirect support of the world-bourgeois line against the world-proletarian line in the context of the struggle between the ideological camp of the socialist world revolution and the ideological camp of the world's counterrevolution. We, Stalinists-Hoxhaists, are the only authentic foes of Castroist exploitative tyranny. All other false “anti-Castroists” (from defenders of classic capitalism to “left” revisionists) are in fact supporters and perpetuators of social-fascism in general, and of Cuban social-fascism in particular; because phenomena like social-fascism and social-imperialism are inherent to world wage slavagist bourgeois capitalist-imperialist system of profit maximization. Consequently, the only manner to prevent the inevitability of such things like social-fascism and social-imperialism is through total and definitive destruction of that same exploitative capitalist-imperialist global order. There is no alternative. Dreadful wage slavagist oppressive anti-communist regimes like that of Castroist Cuba will only be irrevocably annihilated when global capitalism-imperialism-revisionism is also torn into pieces. They will only be definitively eliminated when world socialist revolution triumphs and when world workers led by world proletariat establish global proletarian dictatorship towards world socialism and world communism – all this under the leadership of the Comintern (SH), the only truly faultless defender of the teachings of the 5 Classics of Marxism-Leninism. All other stands besides this one are in fact defending the existence and maintenance of Cuban social-fascist revisionist totalitarianism whose only purpose was, is and will always be to maximize the profits of Castroist bourgeoisie and mainly of its imperialist and social-imperialist masters.

In general, this article hopes to be an important help for the world proletariat and for the Stalinist-Hoxhaist World Movement in the context of the preparation of the socialist world revolution.

In particular, it aims to be a help for the Cuban working class and the Cuban socialist revolution to get rid of the social-fascist regime, it aims to be an ideological contribution for the struggle in favor of the Cuban dictatorship of the proletariat and for the creation of the Cuban Section of the Comintern (SH).
We hope that this article will attract all those inside and outside Cuba who struggle against Castroist tyranny from authentically Marxist-Leninist positions and who strive for the construction of true socialism in this country. Cuban workers, peasants and soldiers are tired of centuries of capitalist-imperialist-revisionist oppression. They want to accomplish that freedom which has always been denied to them by multiple exploiters. But the only manner through which Cuban proletariat can achieve this is by fully embracing Marxism-Leninism-Stalinism-Hoxhaism and by fighting for the world socialist revolution in order to establish world proletarian dictatorship towards world socialism and world communism.

And this because in the context of nowadays’ capitalist-imperialist globalization, the stage of socialism in a single country is surpassed (in Cuba and in all other nations). Today, we Stalinists-Hoxhaists know that only socialism and communism at a global scale can abolish the inevitability of capitalist-imperialist-revisionist restoration that permanently existed during the epoch of socialism in a single country and which determined the destruction of former Stalinist world camp and also of comrade Enver’s socialist Albania (and consequently, this is also the only way to abolish the inevitability of social-fascist, revisionist, anti-communist regimes and political-economic-social-ideological systems and formations like that of Castroist Cuba).

But to accomplish a stateless, classless and propertyless society at a global scale, it is necessary to destroy world capitalist-imperialist-revisionist order, it is necessary to abolish its exploitative relations of production based wage slavery and to annihilate all its ideological, cultural and spiritual influences. And this can only be fulfilled if world workers (thus also including Cuban toilers) are conducted by a world proletarian communist party faithful to the teachings of the 5 Classics of Marxism-Leninism: Marx, Engels, Lenin, Stalin and Enver Hoxha. Such party is the Comintern (Stalinist-Hoxhaist), which will lead world proletarians and world workers towards their complete and definitive liberation from all kinds of oppression, repression, alienation and exploitation.

World workers, peasants and soldiers - unite!

Don’t be deceived by the lies and myths of the Cuban revisionists!

Fight against Castroists, who are the lackeys of world imperialism and social-imperialism!

Revisionist Cuba is a social-fascist state which savagely represses and misleads working masses!

The purpose of Castroism-Guevarism is to perpetuate world bourgeois class!

Castroists help world capitalists-imperialists to maximize their bloody profits through exploitation of world workers in general and of Cuban workers in particular!
Death to all kinds of revisionism and fascism in general and to Cuban revisionism and social-fascism in particular!

Under the leadership of the Comintern (SH), world proletariat will tear Castroists and their perverse order into pieces!

For the foundation of the Cuban Section of the Comintern (SH)!

Long live world socialist revolution!

Long live world proletarian dictatorship!

Long live world socialism and world communism!

Long live Marxism-Leninism-Stalinism-Hoxhaism!

Long live the Comintern (SH)!

7 - Gallery of images

7.1 – Castroism-Guevarism: an utterly and inherently reactionary anti-communist ideology
Castro and Khrushchev: two staunch defenders of capitalism and imperialism. This nauseating image dispenses further commentaries.
Photo and comment taken from the book “Cuba: The Evaporation of a Myth”, published in 1976 by the Revolutionary Communist Party of the USA, edition in English. NOTE: the “RC” P of the USA is a neo-revisionist party which is in total opposition to the ideology and objectives of the Comintern (SH) – it has inclusively been criticized / unmasked in our DWM III. This photo and this comment are published here because they don’t contain information incompatible with our Stalinist-Hoxhaist principles and because they constitute useful material to this article.
Photo and comment taken from the book “Cuba: The Evaporation of a Myth”, published in 1976 by the Revolutionary Communist Party of the USA, edition in English. **NOTE:** the “RC” P of the USA is a neo-revisionist party which is in total opposition to the ideology and objectives of the Comintern (SH) – it has inclusively been criticized / unmasked in our DWM III. This photo and this comment are published here because they don’t contain information incompatible with our Stalinist-Hoxhaist principles and because they constitute useful material to this article.
Castro and Guevara were always ardent Krushchevists and promoters of Soviet social-imperialism: all of Castro’s and Guevara’s famous journeys in Latin America, Africa, Asia, Eastern Europe and elsewhere had the purpose of helping Moscow’s capitalists-imperialists to conquer new lucrative markets and to extend their social-fascist and neo-colonialist “sphere of influence”.
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Castro with Tito, the pioneer of modern revisionism: Cuban revisionists were always great admirers of Titoism, even because they all had one and only goal: to prevent world socialist revolution. Castro, Guevara and Tito strived for the annihilation of proletarian ideology and felt deep hate towards the existence of authentic communist parties of Marxist-Leninist-Stalinist type like the PLA which functioned in accord with the principles of democratic centralism and who truly led the proletariat as workers’ vanguard in socialist revolution.
Guevara salutes his ideological twin Tito. In their official meetings with other anti-communists, Castro, Guevara and the other Cuban social-fascists insisted in wearing their ridiculous guerrilla uniform (as Guevara is using in this photo). But revisionists like them do not miraculously transform into Marxist-Leninists just by using a hat with a red star.

Castro with the Vietnamese revisionists: both in Vietnam and in Cuba, social-fascist ruling classes try to present capitalist exploitative order and subservience towards imperialism and social-imperialism as being “socialism”. In this picture, Castro is holding a rifle and we can observe the false “muscled” and “revolutionary” appearance that Cuban revisionists always encouraged in order to deceive workers and to deviate them from Marxism-Leninism-Stalinism-Hoxhaism. In truth, Castroists are totally opposed to any kind of truly socialist armed violence and do their utmost to discredit it through their pro-guerrilla foquist bourgeois theories.
Che and Mao: two fierce enemies of Marxism-Leninism-Stalinism-Hoxhaism and of the world socialist revolution. This photo was taken in the early 60’s, in one of the last occasions when Cuban revisionists and Chinese revisionists were together before Soviet social-imperialists demanded that Castroists-Guevarists ceased all friendly contacts with the Chinese social-fascists and social-imperialists after these clearly emerged as the main rivals of Soviet revisionists for leadership of world social-fascism and world social-imperialism. Despite this, Cuban revisionists and Chinese revisionists are essentially equal: staunch defenders of capitalist-imperialist-revisionist exploitative totalitarianism and dangerous enemies of world socialism and of world communism. Among all Cuban revisionists, Che was perhaps the most sympathetic towards Maoist revisionist China, as its existence represented the triumph of Chinese national bourgeoisie over foreign imperialism and its local lackeys. Che wanted the same to have happened in Cuban and everywhere around the world, because he was a staunch defender of national bourgeois right to freely exploit each country without rivalry from foreign imperialisms (of course that this goal is condemned to fail, because while capitalism exists, imperialism is always inevitable and there will always be imperialist powers plundering the other nations against the interests of national bourgeoisie. And when world socialist revolution finally triumphs, national bourgeoisie will be eliminated as exploitative classes, thus also frustrating Guevara’s aims. As can be concluded, Che’s pro-national bourgeois purposes are destined to fail anyway).
Soviet ship in its way to Cuba. In return for maintenance in power and some class privileges, Cuban social-fascist bourgeoisie didn’t hesitated in transforming the island into a neo-colony of Soviet social-imperialists which produced only what was more profitable in accord with their predatory interests: sugar. Thanks to Castroism-Guevarism, Cuban economy never got rid of its typically dependent and colonial features inherited from former epochs of Spanish and American imperialist-colonialist domination over the island.
Fidel Castro and Ceausescu: two dreadful foes of authentic socialism and communism, two social-fascist leaders financed and supported by world bourgeois class with the purpose of discrediting Marxist-Leninist ideology in order to keep world proletarians and workers subjected to wage slavery and endless exploitation.
Fidel Castro with Spanish Franquist crowned bandit Juan Carlos II – just like Cuban revisionists, also Spanish fascists headed by Juan Carlos are arqui-reactionaries and sworn enemies of everything related with workers’ emancipation from wage slavagist oppression. Indeed, before being forced to adopt false “red socialist” masks, Castro brothers had always been openly sympathetic towards Spanish fascists like generals Primo de Rivera and Franco.
Guevara with North-Korean monarcho-fascist dictator Kim Il Sung. Behind Guevara’s “adventurous” and “romantic” outlook, there was an unscrupulous pro-capitalist and an implacable defender of the most perverse social-fascist regimes in this planet.
Anti-socialist Castro and monarcho-fascist Kim Il Sung: the founders of, respectively, Castroism and KimIlSungism. In the future, the world proletariat led by Comintern (SH) will give the deserved treatment to this kind of bourgeois-capitalist-revisionist pro-imperialist currents, ideologies / forces and also to all those who support them with the aim of perpetuating oppressive capitalist-imperialist world system.
Revisionist painting glorifying Castro’s meeting with capitalist-fascist-imperialist Brejnev. Until the fall of Soviet empire, revisionist and social-fascist Cuba was always one of the most faithful defenders of Soviet social-imperialism and social-fascism.
Photo and comment taken from the book “Cuba: The Evaporation of a Myth”, published in 1976 by the Revolutionary Communist Party of the USA, edition in English. NOTE: the “RC” P of the USA is a neo-revisionist party which is in total opposition to the ideology and objectives of the Comintern (SH) – it has inclusively been criticized / unmasked in our DWM III. This photo and this comment are published here because they don’t contain information incompatible with our Stalinist-Hoxhaist principles and because they constitute useful material to this article.
Fidel Castro, along with revisionist leaders Edward Gierek, Poland, and Erich Honecker, East Germany, applaud the Soviet Union’s Brezhnev during his speech to the 1975 Soviet party congress. The Soviets have found it useful to trot Castro around the world on various occasions, hoping to use his “revolutionary” image to cover the Soviet Union’s imperialist maneuvers. Castro received honors at the meeting, including “prolonged applause,” for his services in Angola.

Photo and comment taken from the book “Cuba: The Evaporation of a Myth”, published in 1976 by the Revolutionary Communist Party of the USA, edition in English. NOTE: the “RC” P of the USA is a neo-revisionist party which is in total opposition to the ideology and objectives of the Comintern (SH) – it has inclusively been criticized / unmasked in our DWM III. This photo and this comment are published here because they don’t contain information incompatible with our Stalinist-Hoxhaist principles and because they constitute useful material to this article.
Castro embraces Mengistu – Cuban revisionist mercenaries were widely used by Soviet social-imperialists in their wars in the Horn of Africa with the objective of maximizing profits through the maintenance of their Ethiopian lackeys in power, thus condemning Ethiopian workers to unspeakable exploitation, oppression, repression, famine and to all other evils inherent to bourgeois-capitalist, social-fascist and social-imperialist domination. Mengistu and Castro were natural allies in the bourgeois-capitalist-imperialist struggle against the world socialist revolution, against world proletarian dictatorship and against world socialism and world communism. Both of them are social-fascists that sold their respective nations to world imperialism and social-imperialism, both of them try to depict their wage slavagist rules as being “socialist” (discrediting MLSH in front of the eyes of world working masses) and try to hide their pro-capitalist, reactionary and anti-communist character behind fake “red” masks.
Photo and comment taken from the book “Cuba: The Evaporation of a Myth”, published in 1976 by the Revolutionary Communist Party of the USA, edition in English. NOTE: the “RC” P of the USA is a neo-revisionist party which is in total opposition to the ideology and objectives of the Comintern (SH) – it has inclusively been criticized / unmasked in our DWM III. This photo and this comment are published here because they don’t contain information incompatible with our Stalinist-Hoxhaist principles and because they constitute useful material to this article.
Fidel Castro greeting Honecker during an official visit to Havana: Cuban revisionists always admired East German social-fascists very much and never lost an opportunity to support the bourgeois-capitalist, oppressive, repressive and exploitative regime that mercilessly enslaved East German workers. During one of their frequent meetings with East-German anti-communist rulers, Castroist social-fascist bourgeoisie even decided to give the name of “Ernst Thälmann island” to one of the small tropical islands belonging to Cuba in the Caribbean sea – in what was a tremendous insult to comrade Thälmann, who spent his life combating all kinds of revisionism, capitalism and fascism, whether open or hidden behind “socialist” masks.
Castro and Hu Jintao (the representative of Chinese state monopolist capitalist-imperialist bourgeoisie): after its disappearance, the place of Soviet social-fascist and social-imperialism (that of Castroist Cuba’s neo-colonizer) was quickly occupied by Chinese social-fascists and social-imperialists.
Raul Castro and Chinese social-imperialists smile together: Castroist Cuba resolutely follows its path of subservience towards Chinese social-fascism and social-imperialism. But this will not last much longer. Under the leadership of the Comintern (SH), world workers and the world proletariat will finally see the truth behind the smiles of their class enemies. In the future, Cuban social-fascists, Chinese social-imperialists and all other exploiters will be swept away by world socialist revolution.
While Cuban workers live in poverty and destitution due to harsh salary cuts, severe lack of consumption goods, the recent ruthless “rationalizations” and elimination of the so-called “social benefits” (“free” healthcare, “free” education/alphabetization, “free” access to bourgeois-capitalist-revisionist, social-fascist, pro-imperialist and anti-communist “culture”, etc.) of bourgeois-capitalist-revisionist, social-fascist, pro-imperialist and anti-communist Castroist “social system” and also due to the merciless wage slavery to which they are subjected, Castro brothers and the rest of the Cuban revisionist bourgeoisie live opulently and lavishly serving their imperialist and social-imperialist bosses - which maximize their predatory greedy and bloody profits through exploitation and oppression of Cuban laboring masses (indeed, the value of Cuba’s capitalist “state enterprises” is calculated to be around US $ 600 million. This together with the incalculable surplus-value taken from Cuban resources, means of production and workforce gives us an idea of the colossal wealth stolen by Castroist capitalist, wage slavagist, social-fascist and anti-communist bourgeoisie and its imperialist masters to Cuban ultra-exploited and oppressed working classes. This image of the palace in which Castro brothers live is even more disgusting as we know that Cuba is one of the capitalist countries with more habitation problems, as we know that many Cuban proletarians and toilers are forced to live miserably in barracks, in tents and even in the streets. Shame on Cuban social-fascist regime and on all those who defend and support it, both directly and indirectly!
This is an image from the infamous prison “Combinado del Este” in Eastern Havana, with its mud-wall cells. In fact, there are more than 300 prisons in Cuba which are used by Cuban social-fascist bourgeoisie as repressive instruments to exercise its exploitative class dictatorship over Cuban proletariat and working classes. And this is not surprising. Since always, endless imprisonment has been one of the many means used by Cuban revisionist despotism to terrorize Cuban workers who dare to question the repressive and exploitative nature of Castro’s and Guevara’s regime. Already in the early 1960’s, Castro brothers and Guevara personally organized bloody sessions of torture and executions with the aim of forcing Cuban proletarians and labourers to accept their system of wage slavery and of bourgeois-capitalist-imperialist oppression and exploitation and to stop struggling for authentic socialism and communism. These kind of terrorist and fascist measures are inherent to the capitalist character of Cuban revisionist tyranny; they persist until nowadays and they will always exist until Cuban workers (together with the rest of world proletariat) accomplish world socialist revolution and world proletarian dictatorship under the leadership of the Comintern (SH). When this time comes, Cuban prisons built by revisionist wage slavagist totalitarianism will serve to incarcerate Castroist bourgeoisie and all its defenders. Today, ultra-exploited Cuban toilers are massacred and killed by Cuban bourgeois social-fascist ruling classes and by their exploitative imperialist and social-imperialist masters. Tomorrow, when Marxism-Leninism-Stalinism-Hoxhaism triumphs at a global scale, it will be the reverse to occur.
And what about the 5 Castroist agents who were captured in Miami by the FBI in 1998 and kept in prison since then by American imperialist bourgeoisie? Supporters of social-fascist Cuba love to qualify them as being “heroes defending socialism”. A gathering of 68 social-fascist parties from all over the world demanded:

“(…) the immediate release of the five Cuban young heroes who have been kidnapped for seven years in US prisons.”


And the Portuguese revisionists of the P “C” P are never tired of shamefully affirming that:


But the truth is that there is absolutely nothing of heroic and much less of socialist about them. They are merely a bunch of Castroist spies who were in the USA trying to discover the plans of American imperialist bourgeoisie to overthrow Castroist social-fascist bourgeoisie and to reconquer their former absolute control over Cuba. Far from being “socialist heroes”, they are only 5 lackeys of Cuban revisionism (and of its present Chinese social-imperialist bosses) which were imprisoned by an imperialist superpower whose dominant classes are rivals of the ones they serve to. Nothing more than this. What American imperialist bourgeoisie did was absolutely normal. They want to regain their former exclusive colonialist sway over Cuba, and consequently, it is logical that they do their utmost to prevent Castroist spies from knowing their plans. The social-fascist bourgeoisie which rules Cuba does exactly the same when it manages to incarcerate pro-American agents within Cuba. All this is usual in the context of the fight between Castroist capitalist-revisionist bourgeoisie (and its Chinese social-imperialist masters) and American imperialist bourgeoisie for absolute and exclusive dominion over Cuba. If we embrace Cuban revisionists’ way of thinking, then also pro-American agents jailed by Castroists should be considered as “socialist heroes” because there are no essential differences between them and the “Cuban 5”: all of them zealously serve bourgeois-capitalist-imperialist-revisionist anti-communist exploitative
classes that rule their respective countries with the aim of helping them knowing the plans and weaknesses of their rivals in order to accomplish profit maximization.

7.2 – The struggle of Cuban working masses against Cuban social-fascist bourgeoisie
The history of the period of Castroist social-fascist rule in Cuba is last not least also a history of the Cuban class struggle of the proletariat and the workers against the Cuban bourgeoisie on most difficult illegal conditions, and conditions of the absence of a genuine Marxist-Leninist Party. Therefore, the liberation movement of the proletariat at the head of the mass resistance movement (against the own bourgeoisie and against imperialism) and its progressive role in Cuban history could not go unmentioned in this article, even because we, Stalinist-Hoxhaists, must pay tribute to the progressive role of the working masses.

Cuban workers were always forced to leave their homeland in search for a better life in other countries due to capitalist-imperialist exploitation and oppression. However, since 1959 bourgeois anti-communist “revolution” and subsequent implementation of social-fascism in Cuba, this migration ideology has been accentuated. In this image, we see a group of Cuban labourers trying to escape revisionist and social-fascist oppression under awful conditions, having to face sea dangers relying only in an improvised boat made from a car.
Since Cuban 1959 pseudo-revolution, Cuban toilers tried to run away from social-fascist oppression and exploitation. Once outside Cuba, they organize frequent rallies and demonstrations against Castroist tyranny, like those shown in the images above (both photos are from the 1960’s and 1970’s). Here, we see them denouncing revisionist Cuba’s neo-colonial exploitative subservience towards Soviet social-imperialism. Unfortunately, many of those Cuban workers migrated to the USA, where American imperialists don’t hesitate in infiltrating and instrumentalizing their anti-Castroist combat in favour of their own greedy class interests. That’s why this kind of photos witnessing Cuban toiling masses’ struggle against revisionist tyranny are usually found in anti-communist sites dominated by American bourgeoisie. The purpose of American imperialists is to get Cuban labourers’ support for overthrowing Cuban social-fascist regime, thus re-establishing their former exclusive colonial yoke over Cuba. But Cuban workers inside and outside Cuba will not be misled by the treacherous manoeuvres of American imperialists. In the future, Cuban workers will faithfully follow Marxism-Leninism-Stalinism-Hoxhaism in their path as a valiant armed detachment of world proletariat towards the victory of world socialist revolution, of world proletarian dictatorship, of world socialism and world communism.
Until now, all images that we displayed were from Cuban labourers’ mass resistance against Cuban social-fascism outside Cuba. But this and the following photos are some of the extremely rare images of anti-Castroist workers’ protests inside Cuba. This photo depicts some of the members of the Escambray rebellion (1959-1965). Escambray is the name of a mountainous formation in Cuba which was used as headquarter by groups of Cuban peasants who were opposed to Castroist-Guevarist capitalist and anti-socialist “agrarian reform” which only managed to entirely concentrated land on the hands of Castroist bourgeoisie and to transform Cuban peasants into slaves ruthlessly exploited by the new ruling social-fascist classes serving the interests of Soviet social-imperialists. After 1959 bourgeois pseudo-revolution, these peasants quickly organized an armed resistance against Cuban capitalist-revisionist anti-communist tyranny, but their struggle was soon deviated, infiltrated and instrumentalized by American imperialist bourgeoisie (who wanted to reconquer absolute dominion over Cuba at all costs) and also by those sections of the Cuban national bourgeoisie which were dissatisfied with the fact that dominant bourgeois factions which control Castro had give up their former plans of “independent” course (that would allow them to freely exploit Cuba’s resources, means of production and workforce without having to see most profits going to the hands of foreign imperialists) in favor of neo-colonial exploitative subservience towards Soviet social-imperialism. This happened because those Cuban peasants lacked any kind of Marxist-Leninist formation and aims and their fight was never carried out under the iron leadership of a proletarian party of Leninist-Stalinist type (indeed, the presence of Cuban proletarians in the ranks of the Escambray
rebels was extremely reduced if not inexistent – thus turning leadership of the movement by the proletariat impossible. All these handicaps ultimately led to the defeat of the rebellion at the hands of reactionary Castroist army (financed and supported by Soviet imperialists) which didn’t hesitate in implacably slaughtering all peasants taking part in the revolt and in giving the Escambray rebellion the name of “War against the bandits” with the aim of discrediting it and of hiding the fact that there were workers (or peasants, in this case) who organized anti-social-fascist resistance in Cuba and who fought against Castroist-Guevarist bourgeois-capitalist-revisionist, pro-imperialist, exploitative, repressive, wage slavagist and anti-communist order from the very beginning. Therefore, we could never avoid mentioning the Escambray rebellion as an example of Cuban peasant working masses’ revolt against Castroist social-fascist oppression.

Photo taken from the site: www.therealcuba.com

These photos were taken and published against the will and without the consent of Castroist bourgeois-capitalist anti-communist authorities. As we can observe, social-fascist police savagely represses workers’ demonstration. In Cuba, workers are at the total mercy of revisionist totalitarianism. So-called “trade-unions” are mere puppets in the hands of Castroist bourgeoisie to oppress toiling masses even more. About this issue, comrade Enver one stated that:

“While infiltrating the existing trade-unions, the Marxist-Leninists never descend to the trade-unionist, reformist, anarcho-syndicalist, revisionist positions, which characterize the leadership of these trade-unions. They never become partners with the revisionists and the other bourgeois and opportunist parties in the leadership of trade-unions. Their aim is to expose the bourgeois character and reactionary role which the trade-unions, in general, have today in the capitalist and revisionist countries, to undermine these organizations in order to open the way to the setting up of genuine proletarian trade-unions.” (Enver Hoxha, Imperialism and the Revolution, Tirana, 1979, edition in English)
Therefore, in order to establish a genuine communist trade-union in the island, Cuban Stalinists-Hoxhaists must follow the principled glorious teachings of the 5 Classics of Marxism-Leninism. They should not be afraid of breaking social-fascist repressive “legal framework”:

“\textit{In their activity, the Marxist-Leninists are not worried about breaking and violating the bourgeois Constitution, laws, rules, norms and order with their revolutionary actions. They are fighting to undermine this order, to prepare the revolution. Therefore, the Marxist-Leninist party prepares itself and the masses to cope with the counterblows the bourgeoisie may strike in response to the revolutionary actions of the proletariat and the popular masses.”} (Enver Hoxha, \textit{Imperialism and the Revolution}, Tirana, 1979, edition in English)
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\textit{Photo taken from the site: www.therealcuba.com}

During the recent social-fascist repressive wave, many Cuban toilers were injured and even murdered, although there is no exact information about their numbers (Cuban revisionists always do their utmost to hide the existence of workers’ anti-Castroist resistance inside Cuba).
In this article, we had already mentioned the workers who stayed away from the working place as an example of passive resistance. Indeed, the use of absenteeism as a resistance weapon against capitalist-revisionist exploitation is so frequent among Cuban labouring classes that since 1964 Castroist Cuban exploitative, oppressive, wage slavagist, social-fascist, pro-imperialist, capitalist-revisionist and anti-communist bourgeoisie has created laws criminalizing all workers who supposedly “displayed signs of laziness, vagrancy, absenteeism, tardiness and foot-dragging” ([www.havanatimes.org](http://www.havanatimes.org), Samuel Farber, *Cuba Since the Revolution of 1959*, edition in English) and punishing these “crimes” with long prison terms as an attempt to force Cuban working masses to accept the savage wage slavagist exploitation with which Castroist bourgeoisie oppress Cuban laborers in order to maximize the profits of its imperialist and social-imperialist masters.

But class-struggle of the Cuban workers and peasants (including of the youth) against Castro’s social-fascist exploitation and oppression is not limited to passive resistance. In this photo, we can see Cuban working classes bravely fighting against social-fascist and anti-communist thugs. As can be observed, despite using bastions, Castroist muggers are having a lot of difficulties in dominating young unarmed Cuban toilers. In these conditions, revisionist bandits try to bloodily suppress labourers. But they will get the answer they deserve. When the Cuban Section of the Comintern (SH) seizes power in the country, Cuban revisionists will have to face the implacable communist anger of world working masses in general and of Cuban working masses in particular.
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