

III. Cuba declares war on advanced sector

by Gretchen Small

Cuba is one of the biggest strategic “prizes” held internationally by the oligarchist forces who are deployed to ensure that genocidal wars are implemented across the globe. This was made strikingly clear by the Second National Congress of the Cuban Communist Party, held Dec. 17-20 in Havana. North-South confrontation was adopted as formal strategy at the PCC Congress, the most important since the party’s founding congress five years ago. The underdeveloped countries have “unified into a single front,” Castro told the conference in his opening 12-hour speech, in order to confront the “contradiction between these countries and imperialism.”

The Reagan administration represents the ascendancy of the “most reactionary right” in the United States, according to Castro, and will have to face the “increasing combativeness of the masses” in the formerly colonial sector. Cuba will aid any national liberation struggle that “opposes the domination of Washington,” he promised.

Two leading allies of Cuba in this confrontationist strategy, outside the socialist sector, were cited by Castro: the Socialist International, and the radical “liberation theology” movement within the Catholic Church. Castro informed the congress that the PCC had “maintained frequent and fruitful contacts with the social-democratic parties” of Latin America and Europe in the recent period, and declared that “the Social Democratic participation . . . in Latin America [is] positive.”

Castro also underlined the growing importance of revolutionary Christian forces, and the PCC unanimously adopted a resolution at the end of the congress which formally stated that Cuba would seek “strategic alliance and joint action with progressive and revolutionary layers of the Church.”

The congress was attended by foreign delegations ranging from official representatives of the socialist bloc countries to representatives from national liberation movements and radical states from around the globe. Castro noted in his closing speech that “at times it was difficult to distinguish whether it was a Cuban congress or a congress of the world’s revolutionary forces!”

Cuba has served as a key base of operations for the creation of radical “national liberation” movements since the 1959 Cuban revolution. But the all-out war on the United States and the advanced sector as a whole that was adopted as Cuba’s official strategy at the Second

National Congress reflected a sharp shift in the factional situation within the Cuban government and its consolidation over the recent period. From the evidence provided by the congress, a deeply entrenched Dark Ages faction in Cuba linked to the KGB/confrontationist faction in the Soviet Union has gained ascendancy in the government’s foreign policy, and is gaining strength on the internal front as well.

As recently as Fidel Castro’s September 1979 speech to the United Nations, the Cuban president combined calls for Third World revolution with a saner orientation toward seeking economic cooperation between North and South as the only means to guarantee détente. Now virtually nothing remains of the détente strategy.

Cuba’s full adoption of the confrontationist game-plan is also a crucial policy entry-point into the rest of the socialist bloc. French Socialist Party members at the congress stressed that Castro’s positive reference to the Socialist International is doubly significant, in that it sharply differs from the historic animosity toward the Social Democracy in the rest of the East bloc.

A crucial role in swinging the Cuban government behind this Jacobin strategy has been played by networks under the control of British intelligence operating in the United States who have orchestrated an escalating confrontation with Cuba during the past year and a half in particular. Exemplary was the pamphlet on Cuba published by the influential Committee for a Democratic Majority (CDM), a hawkish policy-making group, many of whose members are now associated with the Reagan camp. Called “Coping with Cuba,” the pamphlet started with the assumption that the Castro government could be overthrown in the short to medium term if such actions were taken as funding of internal subversion, economic pressures, and even the re-imposition of a naval blockade around the island to stop Soviet oil shipments. The author of the report, Hugh Thomas, is British intelligence’s leading specialist on the Hispanic world and an adviser on Latin America to British Foreign Secretary Lord Carrington.

Carter administration plans to hold invasion and landing exercises last May at the U.S. military base at Guantanamo Bay as part of unprecedented Caribbean military exercises by the U.S. Marines—though cancelled at the last minute—made the CDM’s recommen-

datations more than credible to the increasingly besieged Cubans.

Equally significant in explaining the domination of the Cuban government by the current super-revolutionary "Third Worldist" mode was the Soviet invasion of Afghanistan. Top Cuban policy layers are known to have viewed this as signifying a Soviet decision to "trade off a pawn" with the United States—Afghanistan for Cuba—which led the Cubans to believe that they could not rely on firm allies either in the East or the West. Cuba's only strategy, in that case, was seen to be insurrectionary forces in the South.

Castro's speech to the congress is virtual clinical evidence of the fear reaction that now grips the centrist faction of the Cuban leadership, as his "let them drop 20 bombs on us" statement illustrates most graphically (see box). Discussion at the congress centered on mobilizing the population to withstand the severe hardships a blockade would entail, and the necessity of training every Cuban citizen in military skill to face an invasion.

That fear has in turn thrown the centrist faction in the Cuban government, which has tried to balance between the KGB-linked Jacobin faction on the one hand and the opposing industrially vectored faction on the other, into full support of the insurrectionary policy. Operating under an immoral, Maoist-style criterion of "the enemy of my enemy is my friend," the Cuban government is supporting and aiding everything that presents itself as "anti-American": the bestial Iranian revolution; Puerto Rican "pro-independence" terrorism in the United States; and genocidal wars of attrition in Central America.

The networks involved in this Dark Ages foreign policy are collaborating inside Cuba with cultural-relativist anthropology networks whose roots go back into pre-Castro Cuba and who are now centered around the cultural ministry. The promotion of Central Committee member Jesus Montane Oropesa into both the Secretariat of the Central Committee and the newly formed Alternate Politburo, is exemplary of the control gained by this Dark Ages faction.

Montane, a longtime close collaborator of current Culture Minister Armando Hart, was the representative of Cuba at a critical meeting of East bloc networks close to Soviet "radical" Boris Ponomarev held in East Berlin in October, on the topic, "The Joint Struggle of the Working Class Movement and National Liberation Movement against Imperialism for Social Progress."

Montane spoke there on armed struggle as the only route for national liberation. Montane's new post as general director of Foreign Relations and the Americas in the Secretariat places him in close collaboration with Manuel Pinero, the KGB-trained head of Cuban intelligence for the Americas, who has been identified as a critical man in Cuba's Latin American policy-making.

Fidel Castro looks to the Church radicals

The following are excerpts taken from the 12-hour speech that Cuban President Fidel Castro delivered on Dec. 17, 1980, to the opening session of the Second Congress of the Communist Party of Cuba.

On North-South confrontation

One benefit of the struggle for a new international world order is the unification of the underdeveloped countries into a single front. . . . This phenomenon can only be explained on the basis of a generalized contradiction between these countries and imperialism. . . . In the face of the strategy of the most reactionary circles of imperialism, the united action of the underdeveloped world, of the socialist countries, of the entire planet's progressive forces, and even of the most clear-sighted sectors in the developed capitalist powers, becomes essential in order to confront the serious crisis that today prostrates mankind. . . .

At the present time in world history, it is necessary to stop and consider whether mankind should choose—in resolving these ancient problems that are now recorded—the path of confrontation or whether it should prefer the path of cooperation. This was the central theme of the speech that Cuba presented to the 24th U.N. General Assembly in the name of the Movement of Nonaligned Countries. This choice has not yet been made, and there is still time to try—although it is a very difficult and perhaps romantic task—to coordinate the interests of the developed capitalist countries, of the socialist countries, and of the developing countries, in order to arrive at constructive propositions. . . .

On Cuba's strategic allies

The unity achieved by the revolutionary forces in some countries and the advances made in that direction in others, have constituted an important factor in the victories achieved and the advances made by the Latin American revolutionary movements of national and social liberation. . . .

Within the Latin American context, the active participation of Christian forces is more important every day. These forces . . . are actively joining the struggles for national liberation, democracy and the social transformations of our peoples. The fight of the revolutionary Christian elements, which sometimes include priests and other elements of the Catholic hierarchy, alongside the leftist forces, constitutes an appreciable ingredient

of the major historic changes currently taking place in our countries.

When we refer to the revival of the popular forces, there is another new element in the Latin American situation, which must be recorded: the social-democratic presence. . . . Now, however, Latin America has become one of the permanent arenas of social democracy. . . . Despite the well-known ideological differences that separate Marxist-Leninist revolutionaries from the social democrats, when we examine the immediate situation and refer to the current historic conditions, the social democratic participation and the social-democratization of former bourgeois and oligarchic parties of Latin America are positive. . . .

The Cuban Communist Party has maintained frequent and fruitful contacts, at times at the highest level, with socialist and social democratic parties and personalities from Latin America as well as from West Europe. . . . We will join also with all the patriotic governments and with the anti-imperialist movements that are combatting, in one way or another, the domination of Washington. . . .

On a showdown with the U.S.

The election of Reagan introduces into Cuban-U.S. relations an element of uncertainty, or more properly, of danger.

At the final session of the congress on Dec. 20, Castro again addressed the issue of Cuba's preparations for fighting a U.S. invasion:

We are constantly threatened by imperialist aggression. . . . They are threatening us with maintaining their economic blockade. Let them maintain it for 100 years if they want. . . . They are threatening us with naval and military blockades. Let them impose their blockade and they will see what the Cuban people are capable of withstanding.

If this gigantic mass has to disperse throughout the country and cultivate the land in order to live, if we have to cultivate it with oxen and plows and with hoes and pickaxes, we would cultivate it, but we would last. If they think that we are going to surrender because we lack electricity or buses or oil or whatever, they will see that they will never be able to subjugate us . . . even if we have to live like the Indians that Columbus found when he arrived here 500 years ago. . . .

If they dare invade our country, more Yankees will die here than died in the Second World War. . . .

If they wish to save themselves a lot of work and they wish to drop 20 atomic bombs on us, let them do so. Let them drop them. Once before we faced the risk of having them dropped on us. I do not recall that any citizen of this country lost sleep over it. . . .

We must prepare ourselves for the defense of the country. . . .

Soviet faction backs Latin insurrections

by Rachel Douglas

In the closing months of 1980, Soviet propaganda increased its support of the liberation theology of Jesuit revolutionaries to a loud roar. The internationally circulated Moscow weekly *New Times* hailed "Latin American priests . . . active in social and political life. The monthly *America Latina* devoted its entire October issue to liberation theology."

These are the outlets of a Soviet faction which is instrumental both in the immiseration of Central American nations and populations, and in the creation of military explosions in that region.

The same Soviet faction, which reaches to the highest levels of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and centrally involves the KGB security agency, orchestrates the Soviet networks collaborating with the Iranian mullahs' regime in plunging Iran into a new dark age.

The International Department of the Soviet Communist Party Central Committee, headed by Boris Ponomarev, is complicit in these operations. So are the foreign policy think tanks of the U.S.S.R. Academy of Sciences, led by the Institute of World Economy and International Relations (IMEMO), known for its links to British intelligence agencies.

Together with the overseas sections of the KGB, these institutions comprise a powerful subsector of the Soviet foreign policy-making establishment, which co-functions with those international socialist and Catholic networks that pursue policies of de-industrialization and destabilization. As such, they directly counteract a very different impulse that also contributes to Soviet foreign policy, namely the goal of avoiding war.

A clear, current instance of Soviet war-avoidance policy is the proposal made personally by President Leonid Brezhnev, during his December 1980 visit to India, for an international agreement on securing sea lanes through the Persian Gulf. Several nations of the Gulf region, nations which are otherwise targets of Soviet-linked destabilization, welcomed Brezhnev's initiative as a concrete opportunity for defusing the Middle East crisis.

At the just-ended Second Congress of the Cuban Communist Party, which cemented Cuba's allegiance to the destabilization strategems of the Socialist International and the Jesuit order, Moscow's contribution was on a stability track. The Soviet delegation was led not by the communist ideologues like Ponomarev, but by Polit-