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ABSTRACT

The improbable trajectories of Mexico and Cuba give rise to compelling questions: in what ways have the revolutionary governments of Mexico and Cuba been able to practice successful defiance of the United States hegemon of the twentieth century? And how has that defiance helped to define U.S. foreign policy in Latin America? This dissertation presents a detailed examination of the contexts surrounding both the Mexican and Cuban Revolutions and their struggle against imperialist-driven interventions by the United States in Latin America and the Caribbean. I argue that through strategic decisions, the Mexican and Cuban revolutionary governments were able to ward off U.S. intervention and create a process of independence that in turn became a trajectory for defiance in modern Latin America and the Caribbean through revolution, petroleum nationalization, and the establishment of a strong party system that harnessed the power of social movements through public buy-in to revolutionary principles.
The theoretical underpinnings of this Latin American Studies interdisciplinary dissertation incorporate Immanuel Wallerstein’s World Systems Theory, which provides a perspective on the development of imperialism and the rise of neoliberal free-market capitalism through an examination of the developmental processes of former dependent and colonial territories. Additionally, I use the approach developed by Theda Skocpol in Social Revolutions in the Modern World to inform the comparative historical method. I emphasize Skocpol’s theories of social revolution that stress the importance of geopolitical relations during twentieth century revolutions. I also incorporate Charles Tilly’s theory of social movements and Max Weber’s concept of charismatic authority. Bringing these diverse theoretical traditions into productive dialogue through my analysis, I develop the concept of “natural resource revolutions”: a concept that can illustrate the mechanisms that bring together organized groups to challenge local and international pressures and coercive historical relations that favor local and international elites. I also develop “charismatic revolutionary leadership” as a conceptual tool from which to view the national and global social forces shaping the success of social movements that aims to liberate national resources from imperial hegemony around the globe.

Through “charismatic revolutionary leadership,” Lázaro Cárdenas and Fidel Castro were successful because there were institutional dynamics inherent in revolution that facilitated the nationalist implementation of natural resource sovereignty. Specifically, they both came into power on the heels of the institutionalization of radical constitutions, strong social movements, and effective political party formation. And finally, the Mexican and Cuban Revolutions birthed constitutions that created the legal precedent for implementing national sovereignty as a new goal for their reconstituted political structures.
The contributions of this dissertation are significant because they link theories of world systems and social revolutions in the modern world to social movements and the dynamics of charismatic authority to what took place in Latin America during the 1930s and 1960s vis-à-vis the use of natural resource nationalization as a diplomatic weapon. It is my hope that these empirical and theoretical contributions can be used to explore the dynamics between the United States and other world powers throughout Latin America and the Caribbean and go on to inform research into other core and periphery country relationships.
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Chapter 1

Introduction – Background, Literature Review, and Chapter Outlines

Perhaps it is time, for that matter, for some talented historian or social critic to reacquaint the American people with the facts about revolution per se. To provide, as it were a poverty-guns-and-ideas version of the birds-and-the-bees story. A simple, blunt book on that subject that might have vastly more positive consequences for American Policy than all the explanations and analyses of communism and foreign aid that have been written since 1945.¹

The United States has long exerted self-interested influence over the countries of Latin America, resulting in stunted growth in terms of economic, political, and social development. United States interventions in Latin America and the Caribbean targeting sovereign nations such as Haiti, the Dominican Republic, Guatemala, Mexico, and Cuba (to name a few) have created an influential dynamic that exemplifies relations between what sociologist and historical social scientist Immanuel Wallerstein terms “core nations” and those of the “periphery.” Two nations with revolutionary twentieth century histories demonstrate interesting responses to the general pattern of U.S. core nation dominance and the resulting pressure on nations in the periphery, namely Mexico and Cuba. The improbable trajectories of Mexico and Cuba give rise to compelling questions: in what ways have the revolutionary governments of Mexico and Cuba been able to practice successful defiance of the hegemony the United States otherwise exercised during the twentieth century? And how has that defiance helped to define U.S. foreign policy in Latin America?

The objective of this dissertation is to explore the history behind the Mexican and Cuban Revolutions and how each revolutionary government pursued national sovereignty via the nationalization of natural resources, specifically petroleum, all while successfully fending off

government-backed U.S. companies competing for oil rights and the U.S. government’s efforts to exert political control. As a comparative historical and sociological analysis of the 1938 Mexican Petroleum Nationalization and the 1960 Cuban nationalization of petroleum refineries and later all natural resources and services, the subsequent establishment of sovereign governments in both nations. This dissertation presents a detailed examination of the contexts of both revolutionary struggles in an attempt to both broaden and deepen our understanding of the development of the geopolitical climate of the Western Hemisphere in the twenty-first century. I argue that both revolutions became successful as a result of their post-hostilities nationalization of petroleum. To map out this process, I trace the history of natural resource nationalization as the mechanism that supported the implementation of national sovereignty in Mexico and Cuba.

This dissertation incorporates a variety of methods and analytical strategies from the fields of History and Sociology, (such as comparative historical sociology) and uses a narrative approach to explore the development of a mentoring relationship between Lázaro Cárdenas (President of Mexico 1934-1940) and Fidel Castro (Cuban Leader 1959-2006) as seen through their correspondence and public speeches. In order to triangulate my data I use a variety of sources to conduct qualitative analysis. The primary data for this study include archival documents and other primary sources such as speeches, letters, political party documents, and official U.S. policy statements as well as secondary sources such as analysis of extant historical literature. By analyzing sources for themes, comparative historical analysis enables the study of the revolutionary trajectory of each country, with a particular focus on the charisma and populism utilized to sustain support for revolution. In this study I demonstrate how both leaders were able to mobilize popular support for nationalization while threatened by world powers. I detail how the Mexican and Cuban Revolutions confronted U.S. imperial hegemony and the rise
of global multinational corporations (MNCs) using nationalization of petroleum as geopolitical weapon to institutionalize the revolutions and ensure their national sovereignty.

By national sovereignty it is meant that in this dissertation I examine how Mexico and Cuba as former colonial countries became embedded in neocolonial regimes within the U.S. imperialist framework. National sovereignty in this sense is neither the restrictive definition of sovereignty of Grotius (international law or recognition) nor is it merely autonomy, though it has elements of both. It is about the nation state’s ability to challenge the rules of an imperialist order and exercise relative autonomy regarding decisions that impact relatively independent decision making on behalf of national populations that in this instance required revolution.

Through the Mexican Revolution, the destruction of the old Mexican state and military, the appropriation of land from the Catholic Church, and the increasing demands for petroleum to power the engines of industrial war machines, Mexico was able to establish a relative true sovereignty through what has become its most prized resource: petroleum. Through land reform, an essential aspect of the Revolution, there developed a natural resource revolutionary policy that changed ownership relations to favor the Mexican people. This in turn led to confrontations with U.S. corporations that had until then operated with little restraint on Mexican soil. The Mexican Revolution began addressing land ownership in a process that eventually led to nationalization, a lesson that would travel to other countries and future revolutions throughout Latin America. I argue that through strategic decisions, the Mexican revolutionary government was able to ward off U.S. intervention and create a process of independence that in turn became a trajectory for defiance in modern Latin America through revolution, petroleum nationalization, and the establishment of a strong party system that harnessed the power of social movements through public buy-in to revolutionary principles.
In a repeat of the Mexican example, the Cuban Revolution, while in an entirely different context, accomplished the same defiance of U.S. intervention by doing away with the old Cuban state and military. I argue that Cuba was able to succeed in creating a revolutionary army and government by not only appropriating lands of the Catholic Church, but also by severely curtailing the influence and practice of Catholicism. In comparison to the long Mexican revolutionary process, the Cuban Revolution seized power in short order, with guerilla fighting lasting only two years (1956 to 1958) and resulting in the establishment of another independent Latin American state in the face of the United States as a post-war superpower. Both of these revolutions changed the course of history, as the U.S. has been forced to contend with and adapt to newly emergent sovereign nations that are both relatively independent of the United States and in the region it has traditionally viewed as its sphere of influence. Understanding the competing forces and tensions in the Western hemisphere of the twentieth century is not possible without considering the Mexican and Cuban Revolutions. Paradoxically, as a result of a history of interventions, the United States has both helped to create and inherited a world where democracy is articulated and lived in complex ways according to U.S. standards requiring elections and abiding by its foreign policy. Both Revolutions occurred in the context of U.S. hemispheric dominance of imperialism and the transition to hegemony that provided a pathway to successful statehood through the nationalization of petroleum, thereby influencing U.S. foreign policy and Latin American development.²

This chapter is organized in to three sections. First, I provide a brief overview of the theories that inform my analysis. Second, I describe the process of petroleum nationalization and

the related literature as the key background dynamic for understanding U.S.-Latin American Relations and I end with a chapter outline for the dissertation.

I. Literature Review: Theoretical Considerations

In the following section I outline the various sociological theories, including theories of world systems, social revolutions, social movements, and charismatic authority, that I use to explore and describe neoliberal free-market capitalism and its influence as an important phenomenon developing in the twentieth century, in part as a result of the discovery and economic importance of petroleum as a commodity in Latin America. The confluence of these theories serves as a lens to examine revolutions by challenging the idea of globalization as a recent phenomenon (1960s) that is typically presented by scholars as unrelated to history and above the national sovereignty of countries. The results of my analysis can be compared to the leadership of Cárdenas and Castro in the 1930s and 1960s, both of which presented challenges to the global capitalist aspirations of United States hegemony.

a. Immanuel Wallerstein: The Thrust of Hegemony on Semiperipheral Countries and Antisystemic Movements

Applying Immanuel Wallerstein’s World Systems Analysis brings to light the comparative historical, sociological, and transnational solidarity that developed between Mexico and Cuba as semiperiphery nations within the sphere of U.S. hegemony. Revolution as a method of disruption challenges the global (macro) relations that are blind to local needs. World Systems theory provides a description of core, periphery, and semi-periphery countries and the developing relations surrounding natural resources.

Wallerstein defines a core state as the concentration of “high-profit, high-technology, and high-wage production” whereas peripheral countries are a result of “low-profit, low technology,
low-wage, and diversified production.” But these are not solid constructs, and between the two is situated the very important semiperiphery that both core and peripheral countries rely upon. Semiperipheral countries are similar to both core and peripheral states in that “they act as a peripheral zone for core countries and in part act as a core country for some peripheral zones.” They are in essence more flexible than either core or peripheral countries because they are able to take advantage of economic downturns due to their internal politics and social structures being distinct from those of core and peripheral states.

Accordingly, Wallerstein describes the semiperiphery as interesting to study because during times of world economic problems, semiperipheral states “usually expand control of their home market at the expense of core producers, and expand their access to neighboring peripheral markets, again at the expense of core producers.” Core states are relatively inflexible and subject to a political ideology that organizes nearly all actions towards maintenance of the control necessary to sustain capitalism.

As described in Wallerstein’s *The Politics of the World Economy*, peripheral countries push for nationalist revolution as core countries intensify their pressure on the extraction of resources from peripheral countries, inspiring nationalism by mobilized groups located in the periphery (Mexico and Cuba). Pressures on Mexico and Cuba as a result of interest in their natural resources (including human resources), as well as their close proximity to the United States squeezed populations living under difficult conditions imposed by both U.S. corporations and local elites. These difficult conditions and circumstances led to rebellion and the development of nationalist revolutionary movements in Mexico and Cuba.

---

4 Ibid.
5 Ibid., 99.
Revolution in the twentieth century and the rise of natural resource sovereignty influenced the development of Immanuel Wallerstein’s *World Systems Theory*. World Systems theory is a theoretical framework he conceived of as an elaboration of the comparative historical sociological approach, described as a protest against the ways in which the social sciences are structured and calls for one interdisciplinary social science that I call intellectual justice. Intellectual justice similar to environmental and social justice challenges concepts of justice but goes to step further and uses comparative history along with the knowledge of environmental and social issues to challenge hegemony as Cárdenas and Castro did through both revolutions. Through intellectual justice utilize Wallerstein’s World Systems concept to discern the tangled web of globalization and its impact on developing (semiperiphery) and former colonial (periphery) countries in the twentieth century. As such, the comparative history of the Americas serves as a background for revolutionary leaders such as Cárdenas and Castro and their understanding of the conditions and circumstances of the world in which they lived. Therefore, social revolution in the twentieth century led to the development of theories for the conditions and circumstances that led to social revolution.

According to Immanuel Wallerstein in *Capitalist World-Economy*, the semiperiphery is “needed to make a capitalist world-economy run smoothly,” and as a result there is great pressure on semiperiphery countries to provide labor and resources for core countries with immense wealth and development capacity. The U.S. is the dominant core country in the Western Hemisphere based on its historical development as a military and economic power caught up in the “thrust of hegemony” since 1945 not always acting in its best interests and at times wrongly interfering in the affairs of sovereign nations.

---

To fully articulate Immanuel Wallerstein’s *World Systems Analysis*, it is important to apply his methods to the Mexican and Cuban Revolutions, operating in the World System as semiperiphery nations. Moreover, the success of revolutions has a great deal to do with the eventual decline of capitalism as a result of its success in pressuring semiperiphery states. It is important to start from the premise put forth by Wallerstein that, “It is therefore the success of capitalism as a world-system (and not its difficulties) that will bring about its demise.”

He then goes on to make the claim that the success of capitalism is tied to the success of the U.S. reaching its zenith of hegemony in the period roughly from 1945-1967.

Revolutionary Mexico and Cuba, as semiperipheral countries, developed their “nationalism and militance, and in the pattern of their international diplomatic alliances” both countries implemented revolutionary change. This occurred as examples of the semiperiphery, as Mexico and Cuba are states that emerged from the “shifts in regime where the previous regime is insufficiently flexible to respond to the changed world political situation.” In both countries, a twentieth century filled with war and crisis brought about major technological and political changes that core countries were unable to address properly as a result of their need for raw materials and labor, allowing semiperipheral nations to become revolutionary based on hegemonic pressure from above. This was the result of the ability of the semiperiphery to take advantage of the changing dynamics with the advent of multinational corporations (MNCs) that created new relationships with core countries in the twentieth century.

The flexibility of semiperipheral countries during the tumultuous twentieth century is described by Wallerstein, “the semiperiphery includes a wide range of countries in terms of economic strength and political background. It includes the economically stronger countries of

---

10 Ibid.
Latin America: Brazil, Mexico, Argentina, Venezuela, possibly Chile and Cuba.””\textsuperscript{11} The growing strength of countries in Latin America, especially Mexico and Cuba, stems from what he describes as the “collective transnational syndicalism which inevitably pushes them ‘leftward,’ more in terms of international policy, but with perhaps some carryover in terms of internal redistribution.”"\textsuperscript{12} Essential to both revolutions were efforts to grapple with the massive disparities in wealth and social services occurring at two different periods during the twentieth century but addressing very similar conditions leading to internal redistribution. Factors internal to both countries led to international confrontations over agrarian and labor reform. Labor and land are the basis for my concept of natural resource revolutions in that I place the connection of people and their ancestral lands as both natural resources that through imperialism and hegemony come together in the form of the Mexican and Cuban Revolutions.

In this dissertation, I articulate the historical differences described by Wallerstein using the case of Mexico and Cuba and based on his claim that “the difference between socialist semi-peripheral and ‘non-socialist’ semi-peripheral countries is the absence in the former of an indigenous property-owning bourgeoisie and the exclusion of non-indigenous capitalist enterprises.””\textsuperscript{13} An important comparative view of the study, both the Mexican and Cuban Revolutions occurred as a result of similar but different circumstances, each related to agrarian and labor reform as contentious issues. In Mexico and Cuba, land ownership and capitalist enterprise followed different histories based on the level of U.S. intervention in that Mexico’s land ownership was dominated by the Catholic Church and the Mexican elite, whereas in Cuba, land was owned by U.S. interests. The Cuban experience in the early twentieth century saw large tracts of land shifting in ownership to U.S. interests as a result of economic downturns, whereas

\textsuperscript{11} Ibid., 100.
\textsuperscript{12} Ibid., 106.
\textsuperscript{13} Ibid., 112–113.
in Mexico the same dominance in property was not as complete owing to what Wallerstein has noted are differences in the concepts of indigenous and non-indigenous ownership of land.

The understanding of land ownership in Mexico and Cuba as well as other revolutionary countries (China and Russia) helps to understand the socialist and non-socialist development of revolution. Skocpol supports Wallerstein’s ownership perspective in that Mexico’s experience (non-socialist) and Cuba’s (socialist) shows an important difference, but as she describes below, highlights nationalist nature of revolutionary land tenure arrangements,

Immanuel Wallerstein has argued that the occurrence of national revolutions, which abolish capitalist private property in favor of state ownership and control of the means of production, has not altered the basic economic structure and dynamics of the world capitalist system. We agree with Wallerstein that state ownership is not socialism, and that no alternative world socialist economy has yet been created.14

Thus nationalism is a very important part of revolutionary success that is based on the need for agrarian and labor reform to institutionalize revolution. As both land and labor are resources and this a historical connection to the land by the people in the Americas, I use the term natural resource revolutions to include both people and land as natural resources. The next section provides a description of social revolution according to Skocpol with a descriptive connection to World Systems Theory.

b. Theda Skocpol: Neopatrimonial Dictatorships in the Modern World

To the previously described World Systems analysis at the macro-historical and world level, I incorporate Theda Skocpol’s state-centered work, Social Revolutions in the Modern World (Mexico, Cuba, and other countries) and specifically her engagement in a comparative historical study of the factors that lead to revolution under different structural conditions. According to Skocpol, the Mexican and Cuban Revolutions are no different from other

14 Theda Skocpol, Social Revolutions in the Modern World (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1994), 129.
successful revolutions (her previous subjects included the French, Chinese, and Russian Revolutions) as they all pertain to the same global capitalist system and follow a “coherent revolutionary pattern.” Moreover, as described by Skocpol and specific to Mexico and Cuba, both countries prior to revolution were ruled by neo-patrimonial dictatorships in the midst of powerful rivalries in the “capitalist world economy and the global geopolitical system.”

Skocpol defines a “coherent social-revolutionary pattern” as the “state-building efforts of revolutionary leadership and to the structures and activities of new state organizations within revolutionized societies.” This is reinforced through her description that “what is unique to social revolution is that basic changes in social structure and in political structure occur together in a mutually reinforcing fashion.” In both the Mexican and Cuban Revolutions, neither leader’s (Cárdenas and Castro) rise to power would have taken place had it not been for the process of revolution coinciding with political and social change. Furthermore, she describes that the type of state-building that Mexico and Cuba engaged in requires “morally confident leadership to create coercive organizations and mobilize popular support through militias, committees of surveillance, and the like.” Thus the special circumstances that created the conditions for Cárdenas and Castro to develop the morality Skocpol describes arose from their revolutionary experience.

I take Skocpol’s research further by combining both her work and that of Wallerstein to examine Mexico, Cuba, and both Cárdenas and Castro through their rise to power and interactions with the U.S. In the face of global crisis, providing additional support for Skocpol’s theories of revolution while establishing how socialist revolutions such as Cuba went further

---

15 Ibid., 287.
16 Theda Skocpol, States and Social Revolutions: A Comparative Analysis of France, Russia and China (Cambridge University Press, 1979). xi.
17 Ibid. 5.
18 Skocpol, Social Revolutions in the Modern World, 18.
than the Mexican Revolution (non-socialist) in their nationalization process. Each case provides a non-socialist (Mexico) and socialist (Cuba) revolutionary perspective, as Mexico’s was the first social revolution of the twentieth century and Cuba’s was the first socialist revolution in Latin America. And in each country social revolution combined with the historical and transnational connection between countries in Latin America provides an important opportunity to examine the continuities and differences as revolution evolved in the twentieth century.

Skocpol’s theory of Social Revolution regards a fundamental change to a society’s state and class structure, providing the ability to test the Mexican and Cuban Revolutions from a comparative perspective. Skocpol describes one of the most important aspects of revolutionary struggle as the use of nationalism to coalesce different groups of people behind action as a collective effort at revolution. She explains that “nationalism, in particular, has proven to be a more inclusive and powerful force for revolutionary mobilization than class struggle alone.”¹⁹ This builds on Wallerstein’s presentation of the importance of nationalism as a vehicle for a revolutionary movement to win power, and in support of that idea, Skocpol stresses that “revolutionaries have fared best where they – and not conservative or reformist leaderships – have been able to harness nationalist sentiments.”²⁰ In congruence with Wallerstein, who describes socialist and non-socialist movements, Skocpol’s description supports the idea that both Mexico and Cuba were fundamentally nationalist in their approach, a major difference being that one was socialist (Cuba) and the other non-socialist (Mexico). Skocpol helps delineate that, “ironically then, Marxist groups in the Third World have generally been most successful when they have de-emphasized class struggle and stressed the goal of national liberation instead – or at least when they have attempted to mobilize different types of people through the selective

¹⁹ Ibid., 262.
²⁰ Ibid.
use of both nationalist and class appeals.” Both Mexico and Cuba, especially during the post-revolutionary periods, were strongly nationalist for the purpose of harnessing the support of their populace in confronting the legacies of colonialism and neo-colonialism in what I call natural resource revolutions.

I focus my analysis; therefore, on positioning Cárdenas and Castro as nationalist revolutionary leaders who through the “selective use of both national and class appeals” (confronting U.S. imperialism in the Mexican case and U.S. hegemony in the Cuban) institutionalized the revolutions they led. This ability to use nationalism became useful after the Revolutions had seized power and were threatened by foreign interests, further assisting their ability to organize the masses to challenge U.S. imperial hegemony. The theoretical basis for this understanding builds on Theda Skocpol’s work “with special attention devoted to international contexts and to developments domestically and abroad that affect the breakdown of the state organizations of old regimes and the buildup of new, revolutionary state organizations.” The Mexican and Cuban Revolutions from their inception established national sovereignty and challenged imperialism through national policies that focused on agrarian and labor reform. What is different about the concepts of natural resource revolutions and charismatic revolutionary leadership is the revolutionary learning process (intellectual justice) that occurred in the twentieth century and where the bridging of nationalism and socialism evolved in both revolutions to create successful implementation of social revolution and nationalization.

Through her comparative historical approach, Skocpol also shows that, prior to World War II, the world was united against fascism and not polarized against socialism as it was during the Cold War. Part of this legacy is the history of U.S. support for dictatorships, and we have seen the
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destabilization of countries and the creation of the conditions for revolution based partly on a country’s proximity to the U.S. The proximity of the U.S., Cuba, and Mexico was later described by Mexican Dictator Porfirio Díaz, who lamented the plight of his country when he stated, “poor Mexico so far from God – so close to the United States.” Skocpol describes how support of corrupt and violent dictatorships exacerbated exploitive social conditions, and that prior to revolution, especially in Mexico and Cuba, there existed two types of “exclusionary and repressive authoritarian regimes,” known as “neo-patrimonial or sultanistic dictatorships,” which functioned solely on the basis of their connections to hegemonic and former colonizing countries. Examples of the previously described dictatorship were that of Porfirio Díaz (1876-1911) in Mexico and those in Cuba including Gerardo Machado (1925-1933) and Fulgencio Batista (1952-1958).

In agreement with Wallerstein, Skocpol describes how semiperipheral countries, prior to revolution, are associated with dominant core countries, which creates the potential for neo-patrimonial and sultanistic dictatorships vulnerable to being overthrown based on their strong attachment to their client states. In the case of Cuba and Mexico the dictatorships toppled by revolution were neo-patrimonial in that they were strongly identified with the United States and especially with multinational corporations (MNCs) owning large portions of land and natural resources.

Here Skocpol is helpful in understanding “that the task which revolutionized regimes in the modern world have performed best in the mobilization of citizen support across class lines for protracted international warfare.” Mexico was the first revolutionary nation in the twentieth century, and had to invent tactics and strategies in dealing with U.S. imperialism by relying on
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its own initiative. As an example, the nationalization process in Mexico (1917-1938) provided numerous interactions with the U.S., as petroleum became a vehicle for Mexican national sovereignty. Therefore, because Mexico held important reservoirs of petroleum at the time this provided a vehicle that made the Mexican Revolution a natural resource revolution.

Skocpol helps us to understand the influence of local revolutionary nationalism in the sense that her work provides the opportunity to further investigate the macro- and meso-level conditions the Mexican and Cuban Revolutions encountered. For my analysis in subsequent chapters I will engage in interpreting the country-specific conditions that led to successful revolution in both Mexico and Cuba. Below Skocpol provides the theoretical insight into the importance of nationalization and leadership by describing that,

> Revolutions are not consolidated until new or transformed state administrative and coercive organizations are securely established in the place of the old regime. Consequently, it makes sense that political leaderships – parties or bureaucratic/military cliques – that act to consolidate revolutionized state organizations should play a central role in revolutionary processes.29

The act of nationalizing petroleum transformed the state and consolidated the newly revolutionized state organizations that became the intersection of land and labor reform (natural resource revolutions), all part of the revolutionary process in Mexico and Cuba. In the next section I discuss social movement theory with a focus on natural resources and the mobilization of people in the consolidation of state power.

c. Charles Tilly and Revolutionary Outcomes

To understand the reasons for the success of revolution in Mexico and Cuba and how they are related to later rebellions, it is necessary to look at Charles Tilly’s work regarding social
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movements theory. One of the main concepts of his theory is that social movements take advantage of their ability to mobilize populations for the use of collective anger for political action. In the effort to organize populations during revolution, it is important to understand the state from Tilly’s perspective, as an agglomeration of avaricious institutions that work to increase their power. Therefore, it is difficult for revolutions to be successful in light of the fact that, as Tilly describes, revolution is

a transfer of power over a state through armed struggle in the course of which at least two distinct power blocs make incompatible claims to control the state, and some significant portion of the population subject to the state’s jurisdiction acquiesces in the claim of each bloc.\footnote{Charles Tilly, "Changing forms of revolution," in Revolution and Counter-Revolution. (Blackwell, 1991), 3.}

Thus, according to Tilly “few revolutionary situations have revolutionary outcomes.”\footnote{Michael S. Kimmel, Revolution: A Sociological Interpretation (Temple University Press, 1990), 207.}

Tilly argues that revolutions cannot be described through the psychology of people but by political reasons based on power structures and concepts of real justice, such as through state coercion, the conduct of war, the formation of coalitions, and how legitimate the state is in the eyes of the people. His approach stresses the importance of collective action and common goals, and, in line with Skocpol’s approach, through the mobilization and organization of resources controlling groups and governments. Thus, revolution is a form of politics by rational collective action and not a breakdown of the country. In this way Tilly addresses the historical role of capitalism and the state in development of revolution. From here, I provide a case study of the Mexican and Cuban Revolutions that applies Tilly’s theory combined with that of Skocpol’s theory of revolution to explore the mobilization of the Mexican and Cuban people.

Revolutions, like war and collective violence, are competitions for a combination of resources, influence, and hegemony that are controlled by the previous power block. Contrary to previous systemic breakdown approaches, Tilly looks at the processes of capitalism and state-
building as they are related to modernization and the rise of people who are not marginalized but who are “workers who belong to firmly established networks of long standing at the core of industrial society.” Therefore urbanization and industrialization create conditions for conflict when resources are taken away from established groups that remain organized. Therefore, in this dissertation, I describe what occurred in Mexico and Cuba as natural resource revolutions and using this concept I illustrate the mechanisms that bring together organized groups to challenge local and international pressures and coercive historical relations that favor local and international elites. In each case Cárdenas and Castro were each part of the dominant organized groups that understood the pressures involved in revolution.

Seen from this vantage point, revolution is the byproduct of the post World War I and II and Cold War world, driving many Marxists, anti-imperialist, and anti-colonial movements to challenge imperialism. As the Cuban Revolution seized power, so the 1960s saw the rise of movements in Africa and other parts of the world. As such it is important to study the impact of the Mexican and Cuban Revolutions in their regional and international contexts. Furthermore, the proximity of Cuba and Mexico to the United States makes both countries sensitive to the history of interventions, especially in Mexico during the nationalist Cárdenas period when history was explicitly used (intellectual justice) to support the aims of implementing the 1917 Constitution while at the same time establishing national sovereignty. The 1917 Mexican Constitution and the 1940 Cuban Constitution are important and revolutionary documents that legitimated the revolutionary policies of petroleum nationalization.

The twentieth century became the age of revolution as the actions of the state, according to Charles Tilly, are made up of institutions continuously seeking to expand their purview both domestically and internationally in an effort to vertically and horizontally control more land and
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social groups. As a result, the state is involved in four mutually reinforcing activities that include war-making, state-making, protection, and extraction. Extraction refers to the ability of the state to gain resources and money to carry out the first three activities. As a result, revolutions occur during times of state expansion “when the drive to build the state’s military power has expanded its agents’ claim from subjects and creditors, and to the costs imposed by war.”

The state is a protection racket, and Tilly makes the connection between state-building and organized crime as the state is greedy to the point of fiercely coveting its gains. Therefore, the expansion of capitalism creates new resources (petroleum) and opens up old resources (land and people) that the expanding state tries to control for state-building. Here Tilly makes the connection between the historical process of capitalism and state-building as “reinforcing historical processes” that remove benefits and rights from people, and combined this can lead to revolution in the modern world (Mexico, Cuba, et al.).

This coincides with Wallerstein’s concept of the “thrust of hegemony,” involving one power (U.S.) imposing its rule and wishes on the economic, cultural, political, military, and diplomatic arenas of the world. We also see the development of U.S. hegemony engaged in “interferences,” seen as domestic or international help in the accumulation of wealth. In addition to “responsibilities” that develop the ideologies to intervene on behalf of efforts to increase the “thrust of hegemony.” “Interferences” are not necessarily interventions but can also be considered support for different sectors of the economy enhanced by “responsibilities” that reinforce the hegemonic efforts of the U.S. in its quest for wealth accumulation. Here Tilly and Wallerstein’s work support each other in the sense that the U.S. is a protection racket that pushes and pulls for the purpose of control, but at the same time based on its success creates the conditions for revolution.

Tilly’s social movements theory coalesces with his ideas of capitalism, state-building, and their combined efforts at expansion through war, state-making, protection, and extraction, all leading to revolution. To Tilly “a revolution is a state of a whole society, not of each segment of society.”\(^{35}\) The result is that expansion of the state brings together different organized groups to form coalitions responding to the pressures of the state, and through the alliances bringing social groups together they destroy the state. In alignment with Wallerstein’s theories of the success of capitalism leading to its own demise, Tilly provides us with the ability to view how the overarching dominance of U.S. hegemony, as it expands and places pressure on countries such as Mexico and Cuba to become more capitalist, at the same time creates contradictions that weaken the state, creating revolutionary conditions. In agreement with Tilly, Skocpol describes the previous as “conflict between nation-states in the context of uneven development of world capitalism that is central to the genesis of revolutions.”\(^{36}\)

The conditions for revolution Tilly describes is the need for complimentary developments, including: 1) the mobilization of different groups, 2) large segments of the population willing to accept new claims on power, 3) the collapse of the state by its efforts to suppress revolution, 4) the rise of alternative coalitions to control part of the government, 5) the development of a single polity based on the winning coalition keeping and increasing control, and 6) the reorganization of routine government control throughout the country.\(^{37}\) These descriptions will be used in later chapters to support my historical narrative and interpretation of theory and history.

The Mexican and Cuban Revolutions can be considered successful based upon how Tilly and Skocpol describe the necessary conditions for revolution. Both countries follow a pattern of the dual occurrence of expanding capitalism and state building while also being pressured by the
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United States. This in turn leads to different organized social movements gaining access to resources for the development of nationalist revolutionary movements. These movements led to social revolution and later the nationalization of natural resources to solidify their overall revolutionary victories. In the next section I address the last theoretical contribution regarding the importance of charismatic authority as it relates to the rise of Cárdenas and Castro as charismatic revolutionary leaders.

d. Max Weber: Charismatic Revolutionaries

To study revolutionary leadership based upon the theoretical approaches of Wallerstein, Skocpol, and Tilly, I next incorporate Max Weber’s concept of charismatic authority to expand our understanding of revolutionary leadership in the Caribbean and Latin America. Building on Max Weber, I have also incorporated the analyses of Nelson Valdés, Arnaldo Córdova, and Anton Allahar (among others) to present the concept called “charismatic revolutionary leadership.” Both leaders (Cárdenas and Castro) are part of the revolutionary trajectory of the Cuban and Mexican people, and both helped to establish the place in world history now occupied by the people of each of these countries. Based on each man’s meteoric rise and efforts to establish a more socially just society, using revolution both leaders addressed the hopes of the people through implementation of the 1917 and 1940 Mexican and Cuban Constitutions respectively. The struggle of both revolutions involved hard-won measures reversing the lack of employment, healthcare, food, education, and access to natural resources found in Cuba and Mexico in the early twentieth century as a result of foreign capitalist expansion through resource extraction.

Following the use of Weber’s charismatic authority, Nelson Valdés refocuses Weber’s study on the Cuban public and their role in the development of Fidel Castro as a charismatic
leader. In his articles “The Revolutionary and Political content of Fidel Castro’s Charismatic Authority,”38 and “Cuba's Fidel Castro (1926) Charisma and Santería-Max Weber Revisited,”39 Valdés describes how he believes most academics interpret Max Weber’s theory improperly. They approach charismatic leadership by focusing their attention on the attributes of the leader and ignore the two-way street of native charismatic authority, which includes the relationship to the people. Building on Valdés’ arguments, I study the trajectory of the Mexican and Cuban people through both Cárdenas and Castro’s charismatic relationship with them through their common history and culture and the class origins of such leadership.40

According to Max Weber, there are three types of authority that function to give power to states and leaders. Legal Authority is based on legal institutions and the rules and laws that support such authority. Traditional Authority is that which is inherited from previous rulers and has in essence always existed, while Charismatic Authority (of main interest here) is earned by a charismatic leader based on the special powers, prophecy, or heroism of the leader. In the case of the Mexican and Cuban Revolutions, the rise of revolutionary leaders was the result of heroism in war and the charismatic appeal they earned by putting the benefit of the country above personal gain. Here also, Skocpol provides the class dimension, “in our view revolutionary leadership has never come from those who controlled the means of production. Hence, we find no instance of a class-conscious capitalist bourgeoisie playing the leading political role in a

Leaders such as Cárdenas and Castro developed organically as their societies became revolutionary each coming from the rural middle class as Castro’s father was a landowner who worked for the United Fruit Company and Cárdenas’ himself had to begin working at a young age after his father died.

Such leadership develops when “natural leaders – in times of psychic, physical, economic, ethical, religious, political distress – have been neither officeholders nor incumbents of an ‘occupation,’” in the case of the Mexican and Cuban Revolutions, years of struggle and hardship worked as a process of elimination with regards to leaders and regimes. Neither Cárdenas nor Castro were ‘incumbents,’ nor did they occupy posts as their predecessors had for many years. The regimes prior to the Cárdenas and Castro periods were broken based on their service to foreign interests that supported each man’s rise in power. Therefore, as described by the previously discussed theories and in agreement with Weber, “Charismatic rule is not managed according to general norms, either traditional or rational, but, in principle, according to concrete revelations and inspirations, and in this sense, charismatic authority is ‘irrational’.” That is, it develops as a result of the flexible nature of semiperipheral states and the rise of social revolution as a result of capitalist expansion. As a result, the ability of established leaders to work outside the prevailing power structure is weakened by the old regime’s sole purpose to survive, making revolutionary movements stronger. In the words of Weber, charismatic revolutionary leadership “is ‘revolutionary’ in the sense of not being bound to the existing
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order,” and, as seen in the case of Mexico and Cuba, is able to overcome adversity and challenge the continual weakening of dictatorships.\textsuperscript{44}

But the charismatic movements and their leaders are only as strong as they are able to inspire the belief of the people, and “the sources of these beliefs is the ‘proving’ of the charismatic quality through miracles, through victories and other successes, that is, through the welfare of the governed.”\textsuperscript{45} Pressure is on the leader and movement to be successful, reacting to openings caused by revolution to push for better conditions and the overall welfare of the people. With special gifts as a result of distress, natural leaders are unique, and this makes for a strong sense of responsibility as charisma becomes its own ‘determination’ and ‘restraint’ and the leader is bound by the ‘virtue’ of the task of revolution.\textsuperscript{46}

Charisma thus requires the rejection of remuneration and any ‘rational economic conduct,’ and “in its pure form, charisma is never a source of private gain for its holders in the sense of economic exploitation.”\textsuperscript{47} As such the revolutionary nature of charisma makes it flexible because it is not bound by any institution or ‘permanent structure’ as it is authentic in its efforts it remains true to its mission, the welfare of the people.\textsuperscript{48} Furthermore, the charismatic hero’s authority is not bound by laws or codes (as with public office) or bound by any traditional or legal authority, especially ‘patrimonial power.’\textsuperscript{49}

In contradiction to traditional and legal authority, “the genuinely charismatic ruler is responsible precisely to those who he rules,” not any foreign government or corporation, and

\textsuperscript{44} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{45} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{46} Ibid., 246.
\textsuperscript{47} Ibid., 247.
\textsuperscript{48} Ibid., 248.
\textsuperscript{49} Ibid., 249.
least of all to local elites (capitalist bourgeoisie).\textsuperscript{50} Furthermore, as it is irrational, charisma favors those groups that would not necessarily be supported in times of relative normality, as it arises from a ‘distress’ that in itself is an ‘enthusiasm’ that drives its course.\textsuperscript{51} Its firm conviction signifies that “charismatic domination means a rejection of all ties to any external order in favor of the exclusive glorification of the genuine mentality of the prophet or hero.”\textsuperscript{52} Nationalism, as described by Wallerstein and Skocpol, is part of the glorification that is harnessed by the charismatic leader to win mass support, and according to Weber, “the charismatic position (among natives) is thus acquired without regard to position in the sibs or domestic communities and without any rules whatsoever.”\textsuperscript{53} Weber describes the ‘charismatic position’ as strong in indigenous cultures in the Americas, especially North America, but also in Africa.\textsuperscript{54} Charismatic leadership is a historical part of Latin America and the Caribbean not by coincidence. I argue that it began with the Haitian Revolution (1791-1804) and the charismatic revolutionary leadership of Toussaint L’Ouverture who led a slave rebellion against French colonialism establishing the second independent country in the Americas, assisting South American independence while challenging European and U.S. imperialism. The Haitian Revolution set a standard for leadership that few have been able to live up to.

However, not just any one can be a charismatic leader or function without making use of discipline to appeal to the largest groups of people for the greatest benefit.\textsuperscript{55} Thus, the ability to appeal to large numbers of people does not necessarily mean an unhinged devotion to one leader.
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but a dedication to a common cause, no matter how appealing the charismatic leader may be.\textsuperscript{56} The strong sense of what Weber calls genuine charisma does stem from the heroism and message of the leader, this also transforms charismatic authority and gives it ‘routinization’ for the purpose of earning sovereign power through the successors of the ‘charismatic hero’.\textsuperscript{57} The charismatic leadership of Cárdenas and Castro institutionalized important measures (land and labor reform), and as we will see through the analysis of Mexico and Cuba, the legacies of both revolutions, established through conviction and discipline, have lasted beyond the tenure of each leader.

Taken together, this dissertation converges Wallerstein’s theory to situate Mexico and Cuba as semiperipheral nations and explains their flexibility in comparison to core or periphery states. It also draws on Skocpol’s analysis, providing an understanding of how the conditions in both countries related to the decline of core nation sponsored dictatorships that Wallerstein and Skocpol describe as weak and unable to change in the face of mounting pressure from revolutionary movements. It also uses Tilly’s analysis lending itself to understanding the mass mobilization of people as a result of the success of capitalism (Wallerstein also states this). This leads to the demise of a country’s power structure based on the changing dynamics that, through nationalism (Wallerstein, Skocpol, and Tilly), mobilize the collective anger of the masses into natural resource revolutions.

And finally it illustrates that as events progress; conditions create the rise of charismatic leaders who become connected through the ideals of heroism or other supernatural connections to the people. The bond between people and leader condition the circumstance that allow leaders to be flexible in their efforts, as they are not bound by laws or rules but rather by their stronger

\textsuperscript{56} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{57} Ibid., 262.
connections to the welfare of their supporters (class consciousness), thus rendering them immune to foreign control (hegemony). Using Weber’s *charismatic authority* allows me to link micro-level analysis to the macro- and meso-level concepts developed by Wallerstein, Skocpol, and Tilly. Through the combination of these four theories as a means to analyze the Mexican and Cuban nationalizations, I develop my theoretical contribution in the concepts of “natural resource revolutions,” where both Mexico then Cuba utilized petroleum nationalization as a geopolitical weapon to institutionalize national sovereignty, and “charismatic revolutionary leadership,” described as the evolutionary leadership that develops from revolution and decisive decision-making with impeccable timing, which also contributes to Wallerstein’s vision of a unified social science. In the next section, I provide a brief description of the Mexican and Cuba context of nationalization and foreign relations studies to look at the relationship between both countries in the twentieth century.

**II. The Problem of Petroleum Nationalization**

Anti-imperial struggles such as the nationalization of natural resources in Latin America and the Caribbean have a long history. Early in the twentieth century, the governments of Argentina, Brazil, and Mexico each attempted to nationalize petroleum; however their efforts were abortive at the time. These efforts failed because the influence the U.S. exerted on Latin America inspired policies authorizing a variety of methods to threaten those who would interfere with U.S. economic expansion. In some cases direct U.S. intervention was used to convince governments to be subservient to U.S. policies for their survival. Jorge I. Domínguez describes the transition from imperialism to hegemony in the Cuban case as “whereas under imperialism, the United States sought change Cuba, under hegemony, it sought to preserve the order. If under
imperialism the United States was concerned with the details of internal rule, under hegemony these details were important only if they threatened the structure of Cuba’s political system.”

The Mexican Revolution and the anti-imperialist ideology that developed during the revolutionary process challenged the imperial designs of Europe and the United States, and subsequently exerted a positive impact on future revolutions in Latin America. As a former President of Mexico, Lázaro Cárdenas developed an influential revolutionary solidarity with Fidel Castro between 1956-1970, which supported Cuba’s nationalization efforts and was in open opposition to United States hegemony in the region.

The relationship that developed between Cárdenas (President of Mexico from 1934-1940) and Fidel Castro (head of the Cuban government from 1959-2006) provided moral support for the Cuban Revolution and subsequent 1960 Cuba nationalization of petroleum refineries. In fact if it were not for Cárdenas using his influence to release Castro and the Cuban revolutionaries from prison in Mexico in 1956, there might not have been a Cuban Revolution at all. The historical encounter between these to revolutionaries is the narrative that drives this dissertation. For had it not been that Castro, with a keen understanding of history, had written a letter to Cárdenas they might have never met. It is both historical and symbolic that Cárdenas assisted Castro to cross the Rio Grande River into Texas to buy the Granma yacht. So that he could cross the Caribbean Sea as Simón Bolívar crossed the same sea over one hundred years earlier assisted by the Haitian revolutionary general Petió in order to liberate South America.

III. Literature Review: Petroleum Nationalization

The follow is a literature review that assesses the different approaches to the nationalization of natural resources. Christopher White’s *Creating a Third World: Mexico, Cuba,*

---

58 Dominguez, *To Make the World Safe for Revolutions: Cuba’s Foreign Policy,* 8–9.
and the United States during the Castro Era (2007) is one of the few historical studies to address the “relationship” between Lázaro Cárdenas and Fidel Castro, setting the premise for the book. His focus is on the Castro era from 1959 to the near present, primarily on the bi-lateral Cold War and post-Cold War relations between Cuba and Mexico. White’s study influenced the dissertation by expanding the scope of what I term the revolutionary solidarity between Cárdenas and Castro as connected to a greater revolutionary trajectory in Latin America and the Caribbean.

White examines the historically troubled U.S. - Latin American relations the Cuban Revolution exposed. At the end of his book he presents the threatened Cuban/Mexican relations through the 2000 - landmark victory of the Partido Acción Nacional (PAN) removing the Partido Revolucionario Institucional (PRI) after sixty years in power. Since then the PRI (2012) has returned to power, challenging the foundations of the Mexican Revolution and reversing the Cárdenas nationalization (2013), privatizing the state-owned Petróleos Mexicanos (PEMEX). A renewed struggle has returned to Mexico, and White’s study examines the basis for greater international solidarity between Cuba, Mexico, Latin America, and the world in confrontation with the Triad of U.S., European, and Japanese financial dominance.60

Other studies concentrate on the macro-historical relationship between Mexico, Cuba, and foreign policy, including Olga Pellicer de Brody’s México y la Revolución Cubana (1972),61 Ángel Gutiérrez’s Lázaro Cárdenas y Cuba (1989),62 and Werner Altmann’s México e Cuba: revolução, nacionalismo, política externa (2002, Brazilian Portuguese).63 Each focuses on the
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influence of Mexican Revolution on Cuba rather than examining the relationship between Cárdenas and Castro.

Focusing on international and historical connections to Latin America is Boris Goldenberg’s *The Cuban Revolution and Latin America* (1965) and Cole Blasier’s, *The Hovering Giant: US Responses to Revolutionary Change in Latin America 1910-1985* (1985). Each study focuses on one side of events such as Cuba alone or the U.S. in the confrontations that occurred in Latin America.

Addressing the macro-historical and natural resource relations in Latin America are Harvey O’Connor’s *World Crisis in Oil* (1962), Eric N. Baklanoff’s *Expropriation of US Investments in Cuba, Mexico and Chile* (1975), Philip George’s *Oil and Politics in Latin America* (1982), and Bernard Mommer’s *Global Oil and the Nation State* (2002). All are comparative studies of the complex relationships that natural resource nationalization played in these conflicts, providing insight from a variety of perspectives about natural resource sovereignty.

In *México y la Revolución Cubana* (1972) Olga Pellicer de Brody studies the growing influence of conservative forces in Mexico with the decline of the Mexican Revolution, claiming that the Cuban Revolution became a scapegoat against social justice while social conditions worsened in Mexico. Moreover, she addresses the political decline of Lázaro Cárdenas as a national force in the 1960s with the rise of stronger U.S.-Mexican relations over the rest of Latin
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America. Pellicer de Brody examines the growth of those relations as a challenge to the historical independence of Mexico and greater international solidarity with Latin America as the left lost political viability as a result the Cuban Revolution.

Ángel Gutiérrez’s *Lázaro Cárdenas y Cuba* (1989) examines the life and political development of Lázaro Cárdenas and his relationship with Cuba. The study provides a theoretical framework examining the influence of historical figures such as José Martí and the effect of his thought on Mexico. Furthermore, it alludes to the importance of the birth of Cárdenas in 1895, the year Martí died. Gutiérrez presents a historical connection between the Cuba and Mexico based on the rise of Cárdenas during the radical decade of the 1930s in both countries. Gutiérrez describes Cárdenas as a teacher and brother to the Cuban people, representing an old tradition of respect and love for Cárdenas based on his historical revolutionary example.

Werner Altman’s *México e Cuba: revolução, nacionalismo, política externa* (2002) analyzes the importance of nationalism as a social function that supports social movements, comparing the Mexican and Cuban Revolutions through the formation of their trajectories in the age of revolution and competition with growing U.S. hegemony. Furthermore, it makes the distinction that the Mexican Revolution was a defense of the republic against the regional hegemony of the U.S. versus the Cuban Revolution as challenging the worldwide hegemony of the U.S. Altman also addresses the economic and social conditions that led to both revolutions, including the local and international factors describing the Mexican Revolution as providing the need for the socialist direction of the Cuban Revolution.

Boris Goldenberg’s *The Cuban Revolution and Latin America* (1965) evaluates the massive influence the Cuban Revolution had on various social movements in Latin America and
the resulting U.S. reaction to growing revolutionary consciousness. In it he provides ample evidence to support his argument that the Cuban Revolution across Latin America had little impact on Latin American communist parties, parties that continued to be influenced by the Soviet Union. After the rise of Castro and the U.S. reaction, communist parties across the hemisphere grew significantly in size and influence. Moreover, he addresses the twentieth century demise of U.S. diplomatic relations with Latin America that contributed to the rise of major confrontations leading to “reform or revolution.”

Cole Blasier’s *The Hovering Giant: US Responses to Revolutionary Change in Latin America 1910-1985* (1985) is a comprehensive study examining the development of U.S. foreign policy in Latin America beginning with the Mexican Revolution and the changing world circumstances. He describes the changes in U.S. policy due to natural resource nationalization and revolution from the time of the Mexican Revolution to the Cuban Revolution.

Harvey O’Connor’s *World Crisis in Oil* (1962) is a classic book and one of the first comprehensive studies of the importance of oil in world relations. In it he describes Mexico as the “Torch bearer” with regards to the major revolutionary gains and influence, specifically in the area of natural resource nationalization. He also dedicates another full chapter to the Cuban Revolution and the greater influence of the coordinated efforts of Multinational Corporations and their influence on U.S. foreign policy.

Eric N. Baklanoff’s *Expropriation of US Investments in Cuba, Mexico and Chile* (1975) is one of the few studies that provide a concise analysis of the difference between the nationalization of natural resources and industries in three different countries. It focuses on the more important events and the legal and international ramifications of nationalization. Furthermore, it is an anticommunist tract that recommends the U.S. focus its efforts on domestic
investment and developing stronger ties to Latin America through investment and strengthening international legislation.

Philip George’s *Oil and Politics in Latin America: Nationalist Movements and State Companies* (1982) is an important study providing a focused history of the rise of Latin American nationalization with detailed information about the countries with major natural resources engaged in nationalization. George evaluates the nationalization process as a “world oil revolution” with Mexico as one of the most important countries providing a successful example of the possibility of nationalization also occurring in other countries.

Bernard Mommer’s *Global Oil and the Nation State* (2002) is a recent study of the “governance of oil.” Mommer presents case studies supporting nationalization through the comparison of British coal nationalization with the Mexican nationalization of oil. He argues that British nationalization provided stability for the British Empire. Mommer describes Mexico as an exceptional case that influenced “global decolonization,” which consuming countries could not stop as former colonies became independent and sovereign. The nationalization process has a major influence on world political relations leading to “one global economy,” and Mommer claims relations have changed to the point that we are entering the age where the poor through eminent domain have the right to resources the rich possess with a greater focus on collective sovereignty.70

Taken together these studies focus on relations between countries and the challenges of conflict and the growing power of the U.S. My dissertation adds to this literature by specifically bringing together studies of Cuban, Mexican, and U.S. relations during two major revolutions in the twentieth century that were successful through comparative analysis of primary and secondary sources. This is done by focusing on Mexico and Cuba as “natural resource
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revolutions” led by “charismatic revolutionary leadership,” as both are connected and supported by each other through their historical land and labor struggles. Furthermore, I build on Wallerstein’s concept of one revolution being non-socialist (Mexico) the other socialist (Cuba), how they learned from each other (intellectual justice), and the history of national liberation begun by the Haitian Revolution in Latin America and the Caribbean. I also bring together the development of natural resource sovereignty and revolutionary leadership in a comprehensive study of two important issues related to Mexican and Cuban national sovereignty and natural resource policy development. In the next section I present my theoretical contributions that illuminate the study of revolution in Latin American and the Caribbean.

IV. Theoretical Contribution: Natural Resource Revolutions and Charismatic Revolutionary Leadership

Revolution in the twentieth century led to the development of theories for understanding the conditions and circumstances that led to social revolution in Mexico and Cuba. The previous sections describing world systems, social revolutions, social movements, and charismatic authority, support the aim of the dissertation, which is to examine the importance of analyzing the Mexican and Cuban Revolutions but also to expand the results to an application useful to a unified social science (intellectual justice) approach that draws on different disciplines, including history, sociology, and Latin American and Caribbean studies. Using the term “unified social science” means that this study follows Wallerstein’s call for the use of interdisciplinary methods and theories to understand social movements and revolution through environmental, intellectual and social justice. The social science application can also be strengthened by my examination of the importance of natural resource policy development as a form of geopolitical diplomacy that insured the survival of both revolutions and fostered other countries to engage in land and labor reforms that led to other natural resource nationalizations.
The combination of the global nature of interactions (local, national, and international) in the world system and geopolitical forces pressured by local elites and powerful countries forced revolution in a number of countries in the twentieth century. The ability to develop social movements that harnessed the collective anger of large groups of people, along with the development out of these movements of charismatic leaders, established political parties connected to revolutionary governments committed to the establishment of national sovereignty. As a result, radical constitutions sought to change ownership arrangements leading to the nationalization of natural resources (land and labor).

As such Mexico, then Cuba through a long process developed into “natural resource revolutions” that nationalized petroleum in post-revolutionary Mexico and Cuba that also institutionalized land and labor reform. The origins of this stemmed from efforts to implement the historical land and labor struggles that in both countries revolution helped create. The conditions for the rise of leadership following a historical trajectory in Latin America and the Caribbean I call “charismatic revolutionary leadership,” defined as the historical moments or charismatic events that called for decisive action taken by both leaders and their decision-making teams.

V. Chapter outline:

This introductory chapter, titled Background, Literature Review, and Chapter Outline, provides the background and theoretical tools for the dissertation to establish that the Mexican and Cuban Revolutions and their special relationship have a critical place in the annals of Latin America and world history. I discuss the connection between natural resource sovereignty and the continuing struggles for the national liberation of Mexico and Cuba that challenged relations with the United States, leading to the rise of Cárdenas through the Mexican Revolution and
Castro through the Cuban. I also included a theoretical section organized into four major theoretical approaches. I described the theories that serve as the conceptual guideposts for the dissertation, namely theories of (1) world systems, (2) social revolutions, (3) social movements, and the concept of (4) charismatic authority. Using these conceptual tools, I extend the theoretical works of Immanuel Wallerstein, Theda Skocpol, Charles Tilly, and Max Weber, especially their sociological contributions regarding revolutions, by developing and defining two new concepts namely, “natural resource revolutions” and “charismatic revolutionary leadership.”

With these theories as a foundation, my analysis contributes to an understanding of natural resource nationalization as a mechanism for insuring the success of revolution and future economic, social, and political development.

Chapter two, titled Comparative Historical Research Methods, Data and Analytical Strategies, is a presentation of the methodological analysis I apply to selected primary sources. Using a comparative historical method, I approach the historical method through inductive qualitative analysis that begins with Mexico, then moves to Cuba and then examines the continuities and disparities of both nationalizations. The bulk of the primary material comes from the University of New Mexico Libraries Latin American Collection. The primary sources are from the published speeches, documents, and correspondence from the Cárdenas Presidency (1934-1940) and the Castro period (1953-2008) and the period of their revolutionary solidarity (1956-1970).

In chapter three, titled The United States and Hegemony: Imperialist Capitalism in Latin America, I provide a comparative chronological study of U.S. natural and human resource exploitation in the Caribbean and Latin America during the twentieth century. I elaborate upon Wallerstein and Skocpol’s concepts of intervention inspiring revolutionary nationalism by
assisting the mass mobilization for international warfare and revolutionary success. I trace the twentieth century history of intervention by the United States, highlighting the social movements that would develop into the Mexican and Cuban Revolutions. I argue that both Revolutions built on the historical ideas of Bolivarian and Martí inspired Pan-American unity through anti-imperial movements challenging growing U.S. hegemony in the twentieth century.

In chapter four, titled Natural Resource Revolutions: The Mexican and Cuban Revolutions: Land, Labor and Nationalization, I argue that twentieth century U.S. foreign policy maintained Theodore Roosevelt’s “Big Stick” policy (1901 - 1909) sophisticated by the earlier “Open Door” policy (1899-1931) promoting U.S. economic expansion worldwide. Based on the continuation of interventionism, the Mexican Revolution developed a sophisticated foreign policy allowing the government to negotiate respect for sovereignty in the face of interventionist efforts of the United States during and after the Revolution. Mexican foreign policy becomes an important influence in Latin America and the Caribbean, inspiring the Cuban Revolution that encountered an even more powerful United States during the Cold War. I argue that through their revolutionary experiences, shared histories, and radical national sovereignty focused foreign policy, Mexico and Cuba become the most influential countries in the Americas.

Chapter five, titled Charismatic Revolutionary Leadership and Party Formation: The Political Mobilizations of Lázaro Cárdenas and Fidel Castro, follows the evolution of party formation from a comparative perspective with attention to the development of popular approaches supporting the revolutionary trajectories and charismatic leadership as collective goals for the Mexican and Cuban Revolutions. I examine the development of party formation in post revolutionary Mexico and Cuba with attention to the Cárdenas and Castro periods, and I argue that the abilities of both Cárdenas and Castro and their political parties facilitated mass
mobilizations of people in support of their leadership during times of crisis. The international crisis that led to the nationalizations of natural resources and services both challenged the revolutions and the sovereignty of their countries and led to a strengthening of national sovereignty.

Chapter six, titled Post-Revolution, Nationalization, and Influence: Navigating a New Geopolitical Reality, is a comparative examination of the geopolitical context in which post-revolutionary Mexico and Cuba engaged with the U.S. and Europe. The focus on Mexico revolves around the Cárdenas period and the negotiations that developed as a result of the 1938 petroleum nationalization. The focus on Cuba stems from the resulting Cuban Revolution and subsequent 1960 petroleum refineries nationalization and later nearly all resources and services as defining events of the revolution. Mexico in the 1930s grappled with their antebellum status as one of the world’s leading sources of petroleum. Cuba in the 1960s encountered a deadly situation where the Cold War conflict created extremely difficult conditions both supportive of and nearly destructive to the Cuban Revolution. I argue that both countries encountered serious geopolitical challenges that in the Mexican case occurred prior to the world’s most destructive global war and in the Cuban case confronted the most powerful nation known to humanity. Mexico and Cuba in essence dealt with a world in crisis: as the U.S. became more powerful as a result of the demise of European colonialism and former dependent and colonial countries asserted their independence.

In chapter seven, titled Pathway to National Liberation, I summarize and conclude by contextualizing the twenty-first century rise of left of center governments throughout Latin America through the comparative analysis of the revolutionary trajectory and charismatic revolutionary leadership of the Mexican and Cuban Revolutions. Moreover, I explore the
growing experience of revolutionary democratization in Latin America, enhanced by natural resource nationalizations that has provided for greater social transformations for people and proven socioeconomic growth. It is a historical return to Simón Bolívar and José Martí’s call for a united Latin America as they encountered hegemony as it is expressed through U.S. power. Cárdenas and Castro, through their nationalizations, inspired other energy rich nations around the world to nationalize, heavily influencing current and future natural resource sovereignty movements in their negotiations with the core nations of the world. In the following chapter I describe the methods, data, and analytical approach I take in my comparative exploration of the Mexican and Cuban Revolutions.
Chapter 2: Comparative Historical Research Methods, Data, and Analytical Strategies

This chapter details the research design, analytical methods, and data I use in my analysis exploring the Mexican and Cuban pre-revolutionary, revolutionary, and post-revolutionary periods. These analyses allow me to map how the revolutions are related to power struggles with the United States and the exploitation of each country’s natural resources by foreign corporate interests. This is an interdisciplinary Latin American Studies dissertation that uses tools from history and sociology following a comparative historical method to analyze both similarities and differences of revolutions.

I. Scope of the Project

I further divide my study into historical events in the twentieth century as they relate to the Mexican and Cuban Revolutions and each country’s relationships with the United States and multinational corporations (MNCs). I selected the period from 1910 to 1970 in Mexico, years ranging from the beginning of the Revolution to the 1918 Carranza Doctrine related to foreign policy with the U.S. To the 1917 Mexican Constitution, which established agrarian reform and sovereign ownership of subsurface minerals and the death of Lázaro Cárdenas in 1970. For the Cuban Revolution I examine the time period from 1933 to 1965, including the 1933 Sergeant’s Rebellion led by Fulgencio Batista to his coup in 1952. This includes the first actions of the rebellion against dictatorship (1953) to the nationalization of properties in Cuba (1960) to the formation of the Cuban Community Party. The periods I focus on to explore the relationships between the U.S. and both Mexico and Cuba including the role of intervention as an influence on revolutionary mobilization. There are additional periods of importance that are pointed to; including the Haitian Revolution (1791-1804) led by Toussaint L’Ouverture, South American Independence (1811-1828) led by Simon Bolívar, and the Cuban Second Independence War (1895-1898) led by José Martí each charismatic revolutionary leaders who rose from those
challenges to French and Spanish colonialism to influence Latin American and Caribbean revolution.

II. Research Questions

In this dissertation I explore questions concerning the relationships between Mexico, Cuba, and the United States, and more generally, the dynamics of revolution and geopolitics around natural resource nationalization. First I ask: How were Mexico and Cuba able to withstand hegemonic power and intervention by the United States during each of their revolutionary and post-revolutionary periods? In what ways did events and legal policies adopted in each country influence the other? What were the historical and national-liberation-inspired dynamics of these different but connected revolutions that can be viewed as examples of revolutionary governments engaged in asymmetrical conflicts? My analysis answers these questions by engaging in comparative analysis using the methods described in the next section to examine both revolutions and petroleum nationalization processes.

III. Skocpol and the Comparative Historical Analysis Method

Comparative historical sociology starts from the premise that in order to study major world events, analysis must go beyond the traditional approach of creating a narrative of an event. In order to gain a fresh perspective on revolution, comparative analysis combines the tools of history and sociology to create a multi-dimensional picture of global social movements. An interdisciplinary approach to the complex and intertwined threads of Latin American history is necessary for this study to take into account the combination of events, persons, and places around which revolutionary action occurred within the context of global capitalism.

My historical analysis follows the method described by Theda Skocpol and Margaret Sommers in their 1980 article “The Uses of Comparative History in Macrosocial Inquiry” which
describes three methods for studying social change by examining historical trajectories. They describe the “three major logics” of comparative history I apply as: 1) parallel comparative history, using side by side analysis in the dissertation to examine the Mexican and Cuban Revolutions comparatively; 2) contrast-oriented comparative history, that examines differences in both revolutions; and 3) macro-analytic comparative history, which looks at the larger international and historical context of revolution. This approach demonstrates how various theoretical approaches work ‘on the ground’ to explain historical events from a sociological perspective.

For the purpose of the dissertation, I utilize a combination of three methods for comparative historical analysis in each chapter depending on the historical context, circumstances, and conditions. In this way I compare different cases side by side such as the Cuban and Mexican Revolutions, and as described by Skocpol, when “done well, the reader gains a much fuller understanding (than one would from a general theoretical discussion alone) of how key concepts and variables are operationalized and how the theory works ‘on the ground’ to explain actual historical development.”

The theories I rely upon are themselves based on comparative historical analysis. These analyses provide working examples of the specific theory in question and how they support an interpretation of historical events. I will examine the Mexican Revolution, comparing it to the Cuban Revolution and vice versa. By placing events next to each other I follow Skocpol’s approach that history is important in comparing revolutions regardless of when they occurred. By studying the conditions and circumstances that affected their success, events occurring at different times can yield valuable information about the functions of revolution generally. As I
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divide my study of twentieth century Mexico and Cuba into the pre-revolutionary, revolutionary, and post-revolutionary periods, the chapters begin with a discussion of the theories that apply to each period and the events related to U.S. foreign policy in Latin America, followed by the historical narrative, and ending with an interpretation based on both. The following is a discussion of the specific ways comparative historical analysis allows us to put events from each revolution side by side and deduce interpretations based on theory and the historical narrative.

Contrast-oriented analysis explores differences in the histories compared and provides the “holistic, rich descriptions and full, chronological case accounts” used to support my analysis of the complicated dynamics between core and semiperiphery countries. Each type of country, categorized using Wallerstein’s system, attempting to use their power and or influence to establish sovereignty (semiperiphery) or hegemony (core). Through this analysis, I seek to address the revolutionary trajectory exemplified by the historical encounters between Haiti, Venezuela, Mexico, and Cuba and the connections between Toussaint L’Ouverture, Simón Bolívar, José Marti, Lázaro Cárdenas, and Fidel Castro as leaders, with special emphasis on natural resource policy.73 The dissertation thus follows the histories of Mexico and Cuba and their connection to Latin American agrarian and labor reform as it evolved since pre-Colombian times to be codified as an important part of comparative historical analysis that combines the revolutionary history of the Caribbean and Latin America.

In studying both nations, regions, and the world, macro-social analysis is only one of three methods used to validate or invalidate “casual hypotheses about macro-phenomena.”74 My hypothesis is based on the conditions and circumstances of both countries as they engaged in revolution to resist foreign efforts at intervention, which engulfed the entirety of the populace.
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Along the way there developed charismatic leaders who learned through revolutionary experience how to mobilize people through liberation and nationalization in the face of threatening hegemony. There are patterns and continuities between countries in revolution and the outcomes of such struggles. Following the approach of macro-social analysis, Theda Skocpol’s *States and Social Revolutions* and *Social Revolutions in the Modern World* contain her brief discussion of two successful revolutions (Mexico and Cuba). In *Social Revolutions in the Modern World* Skocpol explains how both Mexico and Cuba were nationalist revolutions that were successful because they were led by moral leaders using nationalism and socialism to mobilize their populace. In *States and Social Revolutions* Skocpol compared three successful revolutions (Chinese, French, and Russian) following macro-social inquiry.75 According to Skocpol, successful revolution becomes the catalyst by which leaders are able to galvanize support for their movements. Skocpol also gives us the ability to use the three comparative historical methods to interpret (through primary sources) the role of what I call “charismatic revolutionary leadership” in mass mobilization.

Using Skocpol’s logics interchangeably throughout the dissertation, I use parallel, contrast-oriented, and macro-analytic methods throughout the dissertation based on the chapter and the area of focus to study the diversity of the Mexican and Cuban struggles for sovereignty through a) social movements, b) agrarian and labor reform (natural resource revolution), c) charismatic leadership, and d) from Tilly’s description of social movements as engaging in political party formation. Following a contrast-oriented comparative study of the chronologies of Cuba and Mexico demonstrates how socio-cultural experiences prove continuity historically, as both revolutions were based on traditional ownership relations that became international struggles.76

75 Skocpol, *States and Social Revolutions*, xi.
76 Theda Skocpol and Margaret Somers, "The Uses of Comparative History in Macrosocial Inquiry," 192.
The struggle begins with Spanish interventions (1492) disrupting indigenous land relations, as once communally held lands became property of the Crown. The struggle with Spanish colonialism continued past independence, and the Mexican and Cuban Revolutions, in their efforts to redistribute land, became engaged in international warfare as the U.S. tried to stop challenges to private property ownership through a growing hegemony in the world system.

IV. Analytical Strategy

In order to explore these questions within this historical context, I use comparative historical analysis, through a combination of Wallerstein and Skocpol’s theories, to apply sociological theories about historical events. The first theoretical perspective is from Immanuel Wallerstein’s *World Systems Analysis*, a method for evaluating how countries are defined as core, semiperiphery, and periphery in the world-system as a result of engaging in conflict and diplomacy with one another (as described throughout the dissertation). Next, I employ throughout the dissertation Theda Skocpol’s *Social Revolutions* theory to explore the rise of the Mexican and Cuban Revolutions and how each was able to survive challenges by powerful and dominant countries serving as examples of successful revolution. Additionally, I use Charles Tilly’s *Social Movements* theory in chapters 5 and 6 to examine the history and political culture of Mexico and Cuba that developed as a result of revolution and political organization of the masses. Lastly, also in chapter 5, I apply Max Weber’s *Tripartite Classification of Authority* to explore the development of authority in Mexico and Cuba during revolution and how the charismatic nature of both Cárdenas and Castro contributed to the successful implementation of revolutionary victories.

The result is a comparative historical approach that uses Wallerstein’s concept of core, semiperiphery, and periphery nations and Skocpol’s concept of ‘successful revolutions’ to
evaluate the barriers put in place by the United States in efforts to restrict Mexico and Cuba, their revolutions, and subsequent development. As the U.S. was acting in response to pressures to compete on the world stage, pressures that virtually predicted what actions it would take as a core nation caught in the thrust of hegemony. As such, using Wallerstein’s *World Systems Analysis*, I focus on Cuba and Mexico as semiperipheral countries and antisystemic movements that challenged historically subservient relations with the United States as it evolved as a hegemonic power. Furthermore, a combination of theoretical approaches facilitates an assessment of the growing effect of the “thrust of hegemony” of the United States, specifically during the twentieth century, by comparing the tactics used by the administrations of Franklin D. Roosevelt, Dwight D. Eisenhower, and John F. Kennedy to challenge the revolutionary efforts of both Mexico and Cuba.

Lastly, I offer a critical comment on the culmination of Simón Bolívar’s proposal for a greater Pan-American Union built on the mutual support and international solidarity for the national sovereignty of countries in Latin America and the Caribbean. Bolivar’s proposal connects historically with the theories used in the dissertation and specifically with *World Systems Analysis*, as Wallerstein describes that “Revolutionary movements can only succeed to the extent that they know how to maneuver in the dark forest of the present with concepts inevitably derived from the past.”

In his description of antisystemic movements and the development of national and social movements and their differences historically, Wallerstein theoretically supports Bolivar’s concept of solidarity. The dissertation incorporates Wallerstein’s theoretical approach in my claim that the Mexican and Cuban Revolutions were
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both national movements and social movements that developed and influenced dominant U.S. 
policies in the region and re-established relations worldwide.

V. Primary Sources

The following is a partial list of the sources chosen for their connection to both
Revolutions and their connection to U.S. foreign policy.\(^7^9\) I selected these sources because they 
provide information about both the relationship between Cárdenas and Castro and the decisions 
they made as heads of state dealing with reactions to those decisions by the U.S. government and 
other organizations. Sources include: Published Mexican and Cuban government 
correspondence, speeches, government policies, and memoirs from collected volumes both 
published and online via the internet with some original Spanish versions found in the Appendix 
section. For Mexico, sources such as the *Ideario Político de Lázaro Cárdenas*\(^8^0\) (a collection of 
primary documents organized by subject), *Epistolario de Lázaro Cárdenas* (a collection of his 
letters), and a collection of primary documents organized by subject, all in Spanish, that I 
translated for use in this project.\(^8^1\) Speeches and public pronouncements by both leaders are 
policy documents found at university and government websites. Sources on Cuba include 
government documents (1959-2008)\(^8^2\) also found on websites and in published form. Other 
documents to be studied are the correspondence of both leaders (1956-1970).\(^8^3\)

I have selected primary sources to aid in my comparison of the pre-revolutionary, 
revolutionary, and post-revolutionary periods (especially the impact of these periods on the

\(^7^9\) The sources are also chosen based on their accessibility and resources needed for travel and study.
\(^8^1\) Lázaro Cárdenas, *Epistolario de Lazaro Cardenas I*, 1. ed. en espanol, el hombre y sus obras (Mexico: Siglo Veintiuno Editores, 1974).
Cárdenas presidency) and the first six years of the Cuban Revolutionary government in power (1959-1965). The accessible pieces of correspondence (published in the Epistolario de Lázaro Cárdenas) between Cárdenas and Castro from 1956 to 1970 are important to my interpretation of their solidarity as leaders and each man’s comparative development as heads of state during times of crisis. I compare the twentieth century Mexican pre-revolutionary, revolutionary, and post-revolutionary periods to the Cuban revolutionary experience through accessible government documents found through university and government websites such as the Mexican website Memoria política de México84 and the Cuban website Documentos de la revolución Cubana: 1959, 1960, and 1961.85

In my interpretation of documents I utilize the previously described theoretical frameworks to examine the history of the Mexican and Cuban Revolutions. In historical order I begin with a study of the Mexican pre-revolutionary period, specifically documents pertaining to the Díaz dictatorship in the twentieth century, then the Mexican Revolution and the post-revolutionary Cárdenas (1934-1940) period. The Cuban Revolution is studied using the same approach, with each chapter ending with comparative interpretations regarding the similarities and differences between both revolutions.

The Castro documents include: published speeches, official Cuban government documents, and correspondence from the Cuban government website Discursos e intervenciones del Comandante en Jefe Fidel Castro Ruz, Presidente del Consejo de Estado de la República de Cuba,86 with a focus on those documents related to both the Mexican and Cuban pre-revolutionary, revolutionary, and post-revolutionary periods. The documents range from 1959 to

85 José Bell, Delia Luisa López García, and Tania Caram León, Documentos de la revolución Cubana 1961 (Ciencias Sociales, 2008).
86 Castro, “Discursos e Intervenciones.”
In addition, published collections of Castro’s speeches and documents are used extensively and include: *Latinamericanismo vs. Imperialismo*, *On Imperialist Globalization*, *Palabras a los intelectuales*, and *Venezuela y Chávez*.

VI. Limitations

The strength of the methods I employ rely on my use of the combination of theories from Wallerstein, Skocpol, Tilly, and Weber into a tool I apply to the revolutionary trajectories of Mexico and Cuba. The methodological strength stems from comparing two case studies to uncover features of social revolutions at the micro-, meso-, and global-levels. Although the Obama administration signaled a change in U.S.-Cuban relations in 2015 when he ordered a prisoner swap and announced negotiations regarding the troubled fifty year relations (even hinting at the possibility of setting up an embassy in Havana), historical limitations primarily stem from the difficult relations between Cuba and the United States that make it nearly impossible to gain access to Cuban government officials (especially Fidel Castro) or official government documents housed in Cuba. Therefore, the dissertation is limited to the use of available documents found online, including interviews given by Castro and his recorded speeches and public proclamations listed on the website *Discurcos e intervenciones del Comandante en Jefe Fidel Castro Ruz, Presidente del Consejo de Estado de la República de Cuba* (1959-2008). The broad scope of historical events I am interested in required the selection or rejection of documents based on their importance to both petroleum nationalizations and relation to Cádadas and Castro from a large amount of material for comparative analysis, so the documents presented are by no means an exhaustive inventory.
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VII. Conclusion

In this chapter I have detailed my research design and method of comparative historical analysis, how I use this theoretical approach, and the research methodology that enables me to test both my interpretation of the events I examine and the validity of each of the theoretical approaches I use to explore those events. I have also detailed the primary and secondary sources that inform my analysis. Furthermore, I have described the analytical strategy used to provide analysis of primary documents, the focus of which is related to the pre-revolutionary, revolutionary, and post-revolutionary periods in Mexico and Cuba and their development during the twentieth century.

In the following chapter, I examine the Mexican and Cuban Revolutions as both intra-governmental conflicts waged by rival parties and international conflicts between each revolutionary party and the United States in order to explore how each revolutionary government contended with and ultimately influenced the United States.
Chapter 3: The United States and the Thrust of Hegemony: Imperialist Capitalism in Latin America

Throughout the late nineteenth and early twentieth century, the United States developed and deployed various forms of interventions in neighboring countries. Immanuel Wallerstein describes the “thrust of hegemony” as “a pattern of the rise, temporary ascendency, and the fall of hegemonic powers,” using global military power for the “ultimate accumulation of capital.” Thus being caught in the thrust of hegemony has determined the actions of the U.S. as a core nation, as it was unwittingly robbed of complete agency regarding its actions. As the most recent hegemonic power, the U.S. sought control over its semiperiphery neighbors (Cuba and Mexico) as the interstate system created ongoing rivalries between the “great powers” in a way so unbalanced that one power (U.S.) became truly “primus inter pares.” The competitive approach of the world capitalist system created an emergent capitalist hegemon; the United States was largely able to impose its hegemonic influence in the economic, political, military, diplomatic, and even cultural arenas of other countries in a continuous effort to focus on efficient capital accumulation as determined by the overriding ideological transformation of the U.S. after World War II.

Unlike the historical empires of the past (such as the Roman) that maintained more or less complete control in their regions, in the modern world there has emerged hegemony based on the interconnected world of capitalism that Wallerstein describes as the world-system, which he believes began to develop sometime during the mid-fifteenth century. With the advent of globe-spanning naval capacity, the world became increasingly interconnected, and powerful European countries pressed their advantage through conquest of historically “isolated” and “untouched”
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regions. This contact facilitated the development of capitalism as the political and economic organizing factor of the emergent world-system as the early empires reaped the rewards of their increasing control of natural resources (labor and land) and markets around the world.

To capture these dynamics and extend his analysis into the twentieth century, Wallerstein developed his concepts of core, semiperiphery, and periphery nations, terms that capture the ever-evolving relationships between the nations in the world-system. The term core describes nations with a high level of technological manufacturing and a highly organized labor force such as the U.S., Europe, and Japan. Nations of the semiperiphery, such as Mexico, have lower levels of technology and manufacturing, are highly agrarian, and occupy the space between the core and the periphery. Their position makes them more flexible as a result of their earlier independence and institutionalization of governance that created the conditions for revolution than nations of the core or periphery, and therefore these nations are more able to react to economic fluctuations. By comparison, periphery nations are defined by a less diversified production system, low technology, low wages, and those which are historically dependent on former colonial territories that continue to have relations with European countries such as Haiti (France) and Cuba (Spain and the U.S.).

As a core nation, the United States of the nineteenth century won the ongoing war within its own borders against the Confederacy and the indigenous inhabitants (Manifest Destiny) within its declared borders, exerting economic and political control over its conquered territory. Countries of the semiperiphery (Mexico) and periphery (Cuba), based partially on the history of their interdependence were highly agrarian and had low levels of technological manufacturing. These material facts meant that countries of Latin America and the Caribbean were in a
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disadvantaged position in their relationships with the United States. As a modern imperial hegemon, the U.S. was able to establish and maintain conditions with nearby nations in the semiperiphery in ways that were advantageous to the U.S. economy while creating internal instability in countries of the semiperiphery.

Wallerstein terms the “Capitalist World-Economy” as a set of conditions characterized by power imbalances and economic exploitation. These conditions favored the development of U.S. hegemony through the twentieth century, as various government entities pursued economic and political goals using first military, then diplomatic, and finally corporate interventions and “state interferences” that evolved into the marriage of arms and business presented by President Dwight D. Eisenhower (in his farewell address of 1961) as the Military Industrial Complex (MIC).

Wallerstein also focuses on the concept of “interferences,” which can take place within the state or internationally, with the added caveat that hegemonic powers using them to control the “market” through political decisions to give advantage to a hegemon can take the form of a variety of actions that favor the accumulation of wealth. This can be done by a variety of methods that affect the “market” price of commodities through subsidies or illegal mechanisms to destabilize the economic situation of a given country or countries. As petroleum became a sought after resource in the twentieth century, there developed the “petrodollar” that became the world currency for oil set by the U.S.-dominated petroleum market. In order to establish greater independence, petroleum rich countries began using their resources as a method to develop their countries and economies. This was dealt with by the Multinational Corporations (MNCs) interests seeking to control natural resources with western government through the International Monetary Fund and the World Bank, requiring countries to exchange their sovereignty for better
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trading partner relationships in the capitalist world-system through loans to privatize their state-owned industries and resources.

In this chapter I explore how the entrance of the United States onto the world stage set in motion a series of actions driven by the competitive nature of the interstate system, the ever increasing demands of maintaining the edge of efficiency faced by core nations, and the vulnerability of new economic sectors developed through this new status, actions expressing the thrust of hegemony that in turn destabilized nations in the semiperiphery and opened the door for revolutions to occur. I argue that the destabilizing influence of U.S. interventions and interferences in countries of the semi-periphery created the conditions for twentieth century revolutionary movements, which in turn experienced a backlash from the U.S. government and MNCs interests, a response that shaped what then became the MIC of the United States. The MIC in effect transferred state power to the boardrooms of MNCs, where the drive to sustain economic developments resulting from interstate competition resulted in the unintended consequences of creating space for semiperipheral nations to overcome neocolonialism and in the case of Mexico and Cuba led to revolution. This is significant because the MIC is a convergent counterrevolutionary effort to challenge revolutionary movements in the periphery and semiperiphery as developing and former colonial countries sought independence.

How can we understand the relationships that developed between the United States and Mexico and Cuba against this backdrop? I argue, using the macro-analytic comparative approach, that as the countries in the semiperiphery destabilized and became problematic for the United States, a drive for modernization of the machinery of interference and intervention ensued, resulting in increasing pressure on the countries of the semiperiphery. As a powerful core nation, the United States framed Mexico and Cuba as nations that engaged in what the U.S.
termed as illegal nationalization policies. In turn, Mexico and Cuba, in the tradition of Latin American national sovereignty based on the Mexican Revolution, successfully resisted this framing by their hemispheric solidarity and relations, defying MNCs interests by launching the nationalization of their petroleum and later other natural resources and services.

I begin my consideration of U.S. foreign policy in the twentieth century by providing a narrative of the history of interventions, related actions that began with the Haitian Revolution (1791-1804), feared and criminalized for its audacity as second independent nation in the Western Hemisphere liberated by slaves, and the subsequent development of U.S. foreign policy that challenged countries seeking to establish their national sovereignty. I also discuss specific policies and ideologies such as the Monroe Doctrine, Manifest Destiny, Big Stick, Open Door, Roosevelt Corollary, The Good Neighbor Policy, and The Alliance for Progress, presenting and interpreting them comparatively with a focus on their impact on the Mexican and Cuban Revolutions.

In order to map out these dynamics I have organized this chapter into three thematic sections: 1) The intervention history of the U.S. via military, diplomatic, and other methods leading to the MIC; 2) The destabilization in the twentieth century as MNCs and the MIC coalesce, creating tensions for more rebellion; and, 3) The connection between the Haitian Revolution and the development of anti-imperialism in Latin America, specifically with Mexico and Cuba.

I. The Monroe Doctrine and Manifest Destiny go Global

The age of modern imperial hegemony developed as European countries began to colonize the world for the purpose of extracting natural resources and commanding labor forces. As countries developed due to technological advancements, the growth of empires led to the
organization of the world-system to support first European imperialism and then United States hegemony. In the 1800s, with the foreign policy known as the Monroe Doctrine, the U.S. began to exert military, diplomatic, and later corporate control of regions, specifically in Latin American countries. The Monroe Doctrine informed Europe that they were to stay out of the region, asserting the U.S. as the sole foreign policy leader of the Western Hemisphere.

The twentieth century rise of the U.S. as a growing world power (because of warfare and the development of the concept of Manifest Destiny in 1840) led to the invasion of Mexico in 1846. During this time, the U.S. established intervention as a policy to control Latin American affairs. With the Mexican-American War (1846-1848), the United States initiated the process of taking over lands and subduing independence or sovereignty movements in the western hemisphere and beyond (as in Cuba and the Philippines in 1898). In addition, the Fourteenth Amendment of the U.S. constitution (1868) was co-opted by various corporate interests and subsequent U.S. Supreme Court decisions (1886 and 1888), fostering the rise of corporate personhood. This exacerbated the unequal relations between corporations and the American people, as major financial interests grew to dominate politics in the United States, especially the control of U.S. foreign-owned properties. The Mexican and Cuban Revolutions became important historical confrontations with the U.S. and its developing hegemonic control over the Western Hemisphere.

As the U.S. began to implement a combined Monroe Doctrine/Manifest Destiny policy, it developed an imperial capitalist ideology. As a powerful nation in the Western Hemisphere, the U.S. exported its economic, political, and social ideals for the purpose of “civilizing” (democratizing the world for its corporate benefactors). Intervention through military, diplomatic, and corporate efforts followed a pattern throughout a twentieth century characterized
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by increasingly more subtle forms of intrusion (interferences). Called by a variety of titles early
in the twentieth century: Gunboat Diplomacy, the Open Door Policy, and the Roosevelt
Corollary, these interventions and later interferences remained a combination of efforts that, after
World War II, fell more and more under the influence of the multinational corporations (MNCs).
In 1960, President Dwight D. Eisenhower named the alliance the military-industrial complex
(MIC). It was the first time that anyone in an official capacity had openly acknowledged the
association of government, military, and the MNCs. The MIC was the culmination of the rise of
the MNCs and their ability to influence domestic and foreign policies that in the 1950s and 1960s
made the U.S. very powerful. As the MIC evolved, Wallerstein describes that “the long run cost
to the MNCs of interventionists actions on their behalf by core states in weaker states have risen
considerably, and relatively more than the costs of co-optative strategies.”
Eisenhower’s warning has been recognized as an important declaration, but one that has not entirely been
heeded, as intervention since 1960s has remained a policy used on behalf of protecting the
MNC’s properties and assets.

The “civilizing” project according to Wallerstein stems from European colonial ideologies
that saw itself as the center of the world, defining itself as the birth of civilization, and that
undeveloped lands were uncivilized and it was the “responsibility” of Europe and later the U.S.
to engage in the civilizing project of conquering the world and making it into the image of the
Western world. This strategy eventually morphed into the foreign policy mask of
“democratization” that worked to install pliable governments and leaders who would follow the
foreign policy recommendations of the U.S. State Department and later the MIC. In essence the
civilizing project continued, led by the U.S. using military interventionism creating the pressures
and conditions that led to national liberation anti-imperialist struggles.

II. Military Interventions and Anti-imperialist Struggles

In Latin America, Cuba was the last country to win independence, ending Spanish colonialism while influencing nationalist movements to establish sovereignty and control of resources. In the 1890s, the U.S. had secured its continental territory after defeating the Confederacy, Mexico, and the Native American tribes, setting the stage for efforts to control different regions of the world. In World Crisis in Oil Harvey O’Connor describes the West’s belief it could end Latin American nationalism through military force: “The rise of Latin American nationalism was disregarded as a temporary phenomenon which would go away if the Marines were kept handy.”

Lázaro Cárdenas also describes the same history through the Mexican Revolution and its relations with U.S. imperialism, detailing the ways in which various Mexican governments dealt with threats made by the petroleum MNCs and their U.S. government backers. The Mexican Revolution created institutions (1917 Constitution) for the establishment of national sovereignty, and in post-revolutionary Mexico implemented those laws by nationalizing petroleum.

The history of Mexican-U.S. relations provides a litany of transgressions against Mexican sovereignty. John Mason Hart’s work Empire and Revolution provides a record of U.S. efforts over a long period (1865-2000) describing the wholesale control of Mexico begun in earnest after the American Civil War (1861-1865). It is an expansionist history preceded by the destruction of the Southern Confederacy (a foreign and feudal society) and the complete subjugation of the Native American (“uncivilized”) populations, clearing the way for the defeat of Mexico (1848) and the seizure by the U.S. of half of its territory that included major labor and land resources.
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The history of Latin America is replete with examples of U.S. imperialism in action via military interventions in Cuba (1906-1909), Haiti (1914-1934), and Mexico (1913-1918). Interventions in the twentieth century were preceded by warnings from Simón Bolívar (1824) and José Martí (1895), whose anti-imperialist writings warn of the “colossus of the North.” Both men called for Latin American unity as a precursor to the national liberation (anti-systemic movements) that in the twentieth century resulted in revolution. Rebellion involved campesino-led armies with a history of people of mixed class and ethnic backgrounds that have long been engaged in the liberation of Latin America (1806-1828). The revolutionary armies of twentieth century Latin America are part of the historic trajectory of national liberation. As leader of the Cuban Revolution, Castro unites the collective history of national liberation to end imperialism:

In the fight for a liberated Latin America, in front of those obedient voices who usurped official representation, now surges, with an invincible potential, the genuine voice of the people…where rotos, cholos, gauchos, jíbaros, the heritage of [Emiliano] Zapata and [Augusto César] Sandino, aim the weapons of their liberty, a voice that resounds through their poets, novelists and students, from women and children and the disheveled elders. That collective voice.  

A collective Latin American nationalism originates from the anti-imperialism of the nineteenth century, as Bolívar and subsequent revolutionary leaders sought to liberate the Americas from colonial Europe (1828 Battle of Ayacucho). Twentieth century revolution is in the historical trajectory established by Toussaint L’Ouverture (Haiti 1804), Bolívar (South America 1828), and Martí (Cuba 1898), and these movements inaugurated what Wallerstein describes as the rise of anti-systemic movements challenging the capitalist world-system. By invoking Zapata and the Mexican Revolution, Castro brings together the collective Latin
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American and Caribbean challenge to end the imperial domination of the marginalized.\textsuperscript{105} In a speech in 1961, Castro stated, “in Latin America the poor from the countryside constitute a tremendous revolutionary force with potential.”\textsuperscript{106}

In the last country in Latin America to gain independence from Spain in 1898, Cuba’s poor were accustomed to U.S. domination in a historically significant switch from colonial Spanish to U.S. imperial rule.\textsuperscript{107} The U.S. even went so far as to demand that the Platt Amendment be included in the 1901 Cuban Constitution, because of its history of considering Cuba a part of the U.S. itself, codifying the right of the United States to intervene as it would internally. Moreover, the rise of U.S. dominance over Latin America became more pervasive than colonial rule because it established the notion that the United States was serving a benevolent interest in promoting “Washington style democracy.”\textsuperscript{108} According to Castro, U.S. interventionism placed a military, political, and corporate yoke on Cuba as,

That force was the imperialist penetration from the United States in our homeland; that force frustrated our complete independence; that force did not allow Calixto García and his brave soldiers into Santiago de Cuba (1898); that force impeded the liberation army to start a revolution….\textsuperscript{109}

Castro explains the “imperialist penetration” that began with Cuba’s efforts towards independence and self-determination. The repeated use of the word force describes the need for violence to stop Cuba’s efforts at national sovereignty.

The 1898 change in control of Cuba from Spain to the U.S. through neocolonial elite rule sent a clear message to Latin America and later to the Mexican revolutionaries looking back at 1898. A rebellion that began as a fight between one elite versus another, ultimately (and
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unintentionally) unleashed a class struggle and ten years of rebellion. In both countries, elites, be they rural or urban, were heavily influenced by U.S. foreign policy and the MNCs beginning in the 1870s with petroleum companies buying property in 1907. Cuba and Mexico share a similar history of diplomatic and military intervention by the United States, in Mexico, U.S. Ambassador Henry Lane Wilson was personally involved in the assassination of President Francisco Madero (1913) in a failed effort to impose greater U.S. control over Mexico. In the case of Cuba, the Platt Amendment was the constant reminder to Latin America of U.S. diplomacy. As 1913 was the year that launched the Mexican Revolution against U.S. intervention, twenty years later Cuba began another rebellion against U.S. dominance with the overthrow of the Machado dictatorship in 1933.

III. Diplomatic Interventions: from Henry Lane Wilson (State Department) to the Dulles Brothers (Military Industrial Complex)

The Platt Amendment of 1901 began the century of U.S. power in Latin America as a message to the region declaring the right to intervene in Cuban affairs through diplomatic and military action. The Amendment was later used to justify U.S. Marine Corps intervention in Cuba on four separate occasions (1898, 1906, 1912, and 1917). “Gunboat Diplomacy” began the century that twelve years later would see the violent end of the democratically elected Madero government in 1913 with the blessing of the U.S. Ambassador Henry Lane Wilson. The year 1917 signaled the success of two important social revolutions in Russia and Mexico, both invaded by the United States in 1917 and 1918. As the Bolshevik (communist) movement came to power in Russia, a coordinated effort by the U.S. and Europe, similar to previous invasions of Mexico (1846 and 1913), sought to topple the revolutionary government of Russia. As Russia
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endured several efforts to destabilize its revolution, Mexico’s efforts served as a reminder and a lesson exposing the U.S. strategy of challenging those antisystemic movements (Mexico, China, and Russia) that were in direct conflict with the capitalist world-system. Core countries of the world-system could not have countries asserting their national sovereignty through radical legislations (1917 Mexican Constitution) and eventually nationalizing their natural resources (Russia in 1919 and Mexico in 1938).

In 1917, the United States entered World War I ready to pursue the Open Door Policy that was “America’s version of the liberal policy of informal empire or free trade imperialism.” The nascent U.S. hegemon joined the European struggle for the control of natural resources as it consolidated its own territorial and hemispheric gains, establishing “that political and social democracy in the United States were largely limited to white Anglo-Saxons.” This settler colonial strategy signaled diplomatic interventionism, stating that people of color were not ready for democracy and self-government. It was an argument that “led rather rapidly to the conclusion that even at best democracy meant little more than the modification of colonialism in the direction of less harsh protectorates or open-door imperialism.” Contrary to its pronouncements about liberal democracy, the United States reinvigorated its interventionist inclinations, becoming involved in the internal affairs of numerous countries worldwide in the twentieth century.

Mexico’s enactment of the 1917 Constitution challenged arbitrary intervention. In response, the United States began an effort to curb Latin American national liberation rebellions.
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by limiting the enforcement of anti-imperialist national sovereignty through a variety of diplomatic, military, and corporate policies. At the same time, the United States became involved in World War I, in part to enhance U.S. imperial capitalist interests through the Open Door Policy expanded by the Wilson administration.\(^{119}\)

Domestic imperial expansion gained international dominance in the 1890s with the success of the frontier thesis (westward expansion) to eliminate other historical social systems that stood in the way of capitalism.\(^{120}\) As a result of changing world conditions in the twentieth century and the large influx of immigrants to the U.S., in 1921 and 1924 anti-immigration laws were introduced during an economic downturn that sought to protect the MNCs’ interests and consolidate U.S. power while thwarting international labor movements.\(^{121}\) The United States became a powerful nation in the 1920s through a focus on imperial expansion that was in contradiction to the revolutionary ideals it had espoused since the American Revolution.\(^{122}\) Wallerstein’s theory of the “thrust of hegemony” here helps describe the contradiction of efforts as democratization as world “responsibilities” go hand in hand with intervention and “interferences.” “Responsibilities” here take the form of diplomatic, military, political, ideological, and cultural stances that “conspires to reinforce the cooperative relationship of the entrepreneurial strata, the bureaucratic strata, and with some lag the work-class strata of hegemonic power.”\(^{123}\) All of this acts in the interstate system, “delegitimizing the efforts of other state machineries to act against the economic superiorities of the hegemonic power.”\(^{124}\)
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As the United States continued its aggressive and protectionist foreign policy, the 1917 Mexican Constitution caused a major reversal of policy, from a laissez-faire approach of the use of natural resources to a more egalitarian effort at wealth redistribution and an end to crony-capitalism favoring elite and foreign interests.\textsuperscript{125} Mexico, prior to the Revolution and under pressure by the U.S., gave nearly unfettered access to its material resources while maintaining a long dictatorship (Porfirio Díaz, 1876-1911) at the expense of the Mexican people.\textsuperscript{126} The dictatorship of Porfirio Díaz would be the first to fall in the twentieth century (1911), signaling the social revolutions to come. As Mexico’s non-socialist revolution was the first of the twentieth century, it was the last in the tradition of the French Revolution, transitioning from a feudal society to a capitalist one, as the rest of the major revolutions, including Cuba’s, were socialist.

\textbf{IV. Multinational Corporations Corner the Foreign Policy Market}

With the decline of European powers (1914-1945) through the ravages of two world wars, the U.S. mainland remained unscathed by its involvement in war that by comparison decimated millions and caused the massive destruction of property that empowered the MNCs, who increasingly influenced world foreign policy. Latin American relations became the exclusive domain of corporate lobbying efforts to influence U.S. domestic and foreign policies. The influence of the MNCs has certainly grown but at a price to core nations that has strengthened and increased antisystemic movements around the world. The MIC challenges Latin American countries to either abide by U.S. foreign policy or confront the overwhelming economic and
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political forces arrayed against them. As a result, such hegemonic pressure has served in part to support the growth of anti-systemic movements.\textsuperscript{127}

As the U.S. renewed its interventionist policy goals in part to attempt to control the world’s resources, less-developed (semiperiphery) countries such as Mexico and Cuba were subject to a history of colonial and later neo-colonial rule. The U.S. emerged after both World Wars as the unquestioned world hegemon, but its efforts at control were different from past hegemonies. They supplanted colonial Spain and by comparison developed a different approach. For example, Spain had spent nearly three hundred years in both Mexico and Cuba removing wealth and controlling local populations. The nineteenth and twentieth centuries saw the United States and Europe taking advantage of developing and newly independent countries and taking control of the world economic, political, and social development as core countries. However, social revolutions led peasants and workers to rebel against declining social conditions.\textsuperscript{128}

The Mexican Revolution was the first rebellion in 1910, to be followed by the Russian in 1917, and the Chinese in 1911 and 1946. In 1961, these revolutionary movements culminated in the Cuban Missile Crisis, taking the United States, the Soviet Union, and Cuba to the brink of nuclear war in one of the most dangerous confrontations in world history.\textsuperscript{129} According to Noam Chomsky and J. William Fulbright, the Cuban Revolution is important to Latin America because it represents what the 1964 State Department Policy Planning Council described as Castro’s “successful defiance.”\textsuperscript{130} Over fifty years later, the Cuban Revolution continues to be successful in nationalizing not only foreign-owned oil assets but also the material assets of nearly every all
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of the MNCs involved in Cuba in an effort to benefit of the Cuban people. Moreover, recent moves by the Obama administration (2015) admitted that U.S. policies towards Cuba including the trade embargo and collapse of the revolution failed, signaling possible changes to U.S.-Cuban relations after fifty years.

Through his December 1961 speech, Castro declared himself a Marxist-Leninist and the Cuban Revolution a socialist revolution. Such a declaration by a Latin American leader, especially one so near the United States, was considered far more dangerous than the Soviet Union across the sea. Such a regime threatened U.S. hegemony in Latin America. William Appleman Williams describes the challenge revolutionary Cuba posed to the United States that the Soviet Union did not:

It helps tremendously, for example, to account for the near panic manifested by otherwise perceptive, intelligent, and sober men when Castro sustained his power in Cuba. And in a broader sense, it offers considerable insight into the reasons why American leaders persistently interpreted political and social unrest throughout the world as a consequence of the Bolshevik [Russian] Revolution... American leaders were for many, many years more afraid of the implicit and indirect challenge of the revolution [Cuban] than they were of the actual power of the Soviet Union.

Russia was the second revolution of the twentieth century and the first communist revolution that seized a large portion of the world with immense natural resources. As a result of that momentous change, the interventions of the U.S. amounted to a foreign policy that placed its interests above international law. In the Mexican and Cuban experience, U.S. policy influenced both revolutions through its growing fear of world revolution. The only recourse for the United
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States was to intervene in Latin American affairs through a combination of tactics ("interferences" and "responsibilities").

The Mexican Revolution and the 1938 Petroleum Nationalization were seen as violations of international law by the petroleum MNCs backed by the U.S. military, challenging social revolution in Latin America. Moreover, the Cuban Revolution has been a thorn in the side of the U.S. because of its ability to implement its own decisions to secure its national sovereignty.135 I describe this as the criminalization of these efforts by powerful countries to use propaganda (among other methods) to declare illegal the seizure of foreign-owned assets what Wallerstein describes as world "responsibilities," by sovereign countries.136 As Mexico and Cuba, both sovereign nations, attempted to establish their economic independence for economic, political, and social development, the U.S. as a core country moved to protect ("interferences") its interests through different channels. I argue in this dissertation that criminalization of social revolutions takes on even greater meaning when seen in the light of the historical U.S. support for democracy ("world responsibilities").137 Mexico and Cuba are successful examples of challenging the democratization and development ideology the U.S. has used to justify its actions since World War II.

Twentieth century revolutionary movements (Mexico, China, Russia, and Cuba) experienced a backlash from the U.S. government and the MNCs interests of the MIC. Initiating efforts to destroy social revolution, Cárdenas and Castro as well as their governments were chastised for expropriating Anglo-American oil assets in the name of social and environmental

justice when the sovereignty of each country was at stake. Since the 1960s, Castro and the Cuban Revolution have been part of an international antisystemic movement and an example of successful defiance that also harkened to the history of anti-imperialist movements in Latin America and the Caribbean. Previous revolutionary independence movements sought a united Latin America (1824). These efforts evolved in the twentieth century as global anti-systemic movements challenging the capitalist world-system.

Over the course of the twentieth century, a world revolutionary trajectory, comprised of antisystemic movements, arose alongside U.S. corporate dominance. The world-system evolved from the colonial dominance of imperial countries such as Spain, France, and Britain to the rise of neoliberal globalization in the form of a consolidated capitalist world-system. After World War II, U.S. government institutions such as the military, the CIA, and State Department were pressed into serving corporate interests in a consolidation described as the MIC.138

The rise of the MIC in the years between 1938 and 1960 presents a different scenario, as the Soviet Union challenged U.S. military power. Harvey O’Connor explains the situation as one where “one of the first acts of the Bolshevik government had been to nationalize the oil industry” [1918],139 leaving Russia with some of the largest oil reserves in the world and placing the Soviet Union into the role of a threat to the MNCs. Through their coordinated efforts, both countries ushered in a Cold-War world, significantly altering relations from the time of Cárdenas’ nationalization to Castro’s nationalization.140

Pressure by the MIC (through the Cold War) brought together Russia and Cuba, solidifying their efforts around social justice and sovereign control of resources. As previously described,
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when the Soviet Union was first organized the U.S. and Europe immediately invaded it. The leaders of the Cuban Revolution knew that as they began to implement significant social changes, the U.S. would invade. A history of invasions (1918 and 1941) had proven to the Soviet Union that sovereign control was crucial to survival, a lesson Cuba shared after it was invaded in 1961. As Wallerstein explains, “the coming to power such movements (socialist and nationalist) by definition was antisystemic in effect as well as in intent, since it threatened the smooth functioning of the economic and political machinery of the world-system and encouraged by example and by deed other antisystemic movements.”¹⁴¹

By comparison, as the first revolution of the twentieth century, Mexico did not have the assistance of the Soviet Union when its nationalist anti-systemic revolution began. That and other revolutions provided the impetus for Cuba to take a more radical approach of nationalizing all its basic industries, including petroleum. Mexico, on the other hand, was alone in its nationalization process, helped only by the ensuing Second World War, as U.S. policies were modified based on competition with Germany and Japan (Axis powers) for Mexican oil.¹⁴²

William Appleman Williams describes the situation where

> Axis competition worried a significant number of men in policy-making positions after 1938, and that concern served to convince some of them that it was necessary to modify some of the existing practices of America’s overseas economic expansion in order to protect the expansion itself.¹⁴³

Mexico and other Latin America Countries dedicated to reform were able to remain steadfast to their efforts to keep the MNCs at bay. The result was the rise of the MIC to counter efforts by sovereign nations to establish their national sovereignty.¹⁴⁴
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The modifications during the 1930s of U.S. foreign policy during Franklin D. Roosevelt’s (FDR) administration promoted a “humanitarian idealism of American policy” in response to the legacy of military intervention. As Cárdenas expropriated petroleum in 1938, Secretary of State Cordell Hull’s call for the invasion of Mexico was stopped by the ambassador to Mexico, Josephus Daniels and FDR. After overriding Hull, the U.S. began using economic policies (interference), as the petroleum MNCs and the U.S. government banned loans and other support, restricting the growth of the Mexico’s state-owned oil industry.

The greatest fear on the part of U.S. policy makers was the “impact of Mexico’s action on petroleum rich countries like Venezuela, where Standard Oil had developed huge operations, or in Bolivia, encouraged in its nationalization battle.” The MNCs had gone a long way to establish their influence in the U.S. One of the earliest and most notable rebukes of the rise of MNCs came from decorated Marine Corps General Smedley Butler, who refuted the work he had been engaged in through his 1935 book, *War is a Racket*. As a famous soldier of fortune in 1933, Butler described how he was asked by major U.S. corporate interests to mount a coup to oust FDR. Butler, disappointed with his role as a “high classed muscle man for big business” exposed the plot against the FDR, who was at odds with most MNCs and their efforts to control U.S. politics. The same interests included many of the petroleum MNCs in Mexico, some that Butler had served throughout his career in Mexico, Cuba, and Haiti.
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V. Destabilizing the Semi-Periphery and Conditioning Revolution

This section provides a socio-historical interpretation of the need of the capitalist world-system to pursue continuous expansion in terms of economic, social, and political hegemony.151 Focused on twentieth century Latin America, it provides a description of the major social upheavals of that century and the antisystemic movements both social and national that developed in response to pressures both internally and externally to rapid technological advancement. By controlling access to natural resources and limiting access to land and labor rights, petroleum, and mining, the MNCs’ interests, along with U.S. foreign policy, influenced transnational, anti-systemic movements to challenge U.S. hegemony.152 Wallerstein provides a general description of the conditions that led to revolutions whereby,

Antisystemic forces – social movements opposed to the basic mode of operation of the world-system… that have sought power in the name of socialist and nationalist ideologies. The strengthening of capitalist forces and the development of the world-economy itself bred these antisystemic forces, whose own strength has increased significantly in the twentieth century.153

The culmination of the Mexican Revolution came after of years of growing consciousness regarding the growing levels of abject poverty and injustice experienced by many Mexican nationals. Decades of U.S. imperialism led to near domination of Mexico and Latin America. March 18, 1938 the day of Mexican Petroleum Nationalization, stands as an important date in the anti-imperialist history of natural resource sovereignty and antisystemic action. In the Latin American tradition of Bolivarian economic integration, Mexico’s stand for economic independence influenced nationalizations worldwide. Bolivarianism can be described as the hemispheric solidarity of countries avoiding war at all cost to ensure Latin America’s economic
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and social development as a challenge to U.S. and European control of the capitalist world-system.

The Mexican Revolution stemmed partially from the collective memory of the Mexican-American War (1846-1848) and later interventions and pressures (interferences) resulting in territories and resources seized by the United States and mining MNCs interests beginning in the 1870s.\textsuperscript{154} The 1938 Mexican Nationalization was a historical correction, a safeguard for Mexico’s national sovereignty on the eve of the World War II. Furthermore, two invasions, the 1913 Vera Cruz and 1916 Pershing Expeditions, during the Mexican Revolution had a significant impact on Mexican and U.S. relations. “Gunboat Diplomacy” led to the development of the Carranza Doctrine establishing Mexico and the Mexican Revolution as taking a leadership role in Latin America relations. Through the Carranza Doctrine, the establishment of economic and political sovereignty was a challenge to U.S. hegemony in the region.\textsuperscript{155}

In the words of Harvey O’Connor, Latin America saw Mexico as the “torch bearer” of revolutionary history, signaling the end of U.S. interventionist foreign policies through the Revolution institutionalized through the 1938 Petroleum Nationalization. Neither event went unnoticed, and although other countries in Latin America confronted the United States, Mexico and Cuba were at the forefront of national liberation. Both became historical examples of the rise of an integrated Latin America. Through the example set by the success of both revolutions, we now see an integrated Latin America in 2015 that has developed after years of struggle. The ability to describe the historical situation based on Cuba’s revolutionary struggle provided Castro the opportunity to reflect on the history of U.S. support for elite governments in Latin America and the special type of democracy promotion it has engaged in since World War II,
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Whoever analyzes the traditional conduct of the United States in this hemisphere can applaud, realistically that it promotes democracy, by supporting, maintaining and sustaining governments of landowners, oligarchs and ferocious tyrannies cruel and bloody to this day.\textsuperscript{156}

For Castro the pattern is a long one, first challenged by the Mexican Revolution and later when the Cuban Revolution seized power, ending years of U.S. supported dictatorship. It was one thing to seize power and end a dictatorship, such sacrifice might have been in vain had it not been that the Mexican Revolution implemented a legal basis (1917 Constitution) for land and labor reform that allowed petroleum nationalization to ensure the revolutionary success.

The 1917 Mexican Constitution, a radical document by the standards of the time, established the fundamental laws based on Mexican national sovereignty for implementing agrarian and labor reform. The Constitution challenged U.S. notions of private property and deemed Mexican territory as property of the Mexican people (property with a social function).\textsuperscript{157}

The year 1917 was an important year worldwide as the Mexican Constitution was developed and the Russian Revolution (after a number of years of development) triumphed as the U.S. entered the world stage through its involvement in World War I.

The entrance of the United States in World War I signaled the age of “Wilsonian idealism,” initiated the Cold War with the Soviet Union (Red Scare in the U.S.), and saw the U.S. invading both Mexico and Bolshevik Russia in 1918.\textsuperscript{158} While the Woodrow Wilson administration involved itself in international affairs, the European colonial powers were destroying each other. World War I signaled the beginning of the end of European colonialism and the rise of the United States and the Soviet Union as future world powers. It is also a time when Wilson begins suppressing U.S. social movements, initiating the racial criminalization
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(“interferences”) of minority groups, accusing them of being communist and part of a worldwide conspiracy against capitalism.\textsuperscript{159} William Appleman Williams, in \textit{The Tragedy of American Diplomacy}, concurs with Noam Chomsky’s assessment that U.S. imperialism began using human rights and democratization (world “responsibilities”) as benevolent efforts that after 1917 were used to support its expansionist foreign policy and justify intervention in the affairs of sovereign countries.\textsuperscript{160}

The interventionist “Open Door Policy” created the conditions for revolution, as nations experienced muted independence. Under the growing control of MNCs, U.S. foreign policy, a new imperialism, fueled by militarism and the need for petroleum, led to the domination of energy rich nations. Diplomat George Kennan in the 1950s stated that for “the protection of our raw materials,” he advised U.S. ambassadors in Latin America to carry on the Monroe Doctrine/Manifest Destiny interventionist policies into the twentieth century.\textsuperscript{161} It was a call for the United States to maintain the same foreign policy it had engaged in since the end of the nineteenth century, using intervention for economic expansion.

The Wilson administration began the effort to implement the combination of militaristic, diplomatic, and corporate organized policies later to become the MIC.\textsuperscript{162} MNCs such as Standard Oil (Exxon), Royal Dutch Shell, and Texaco used their wealth to support interventionist efforts by the U.S. and Europe to control energy rich nations. According to Wallerstein, the MNCs developed from core states as a new challenge in the twentieth century to antisystemic movements, both aiding their efforts and challenging them.\textsuperscript{163} As such, corporate overstretch through the MIC has weakened U.S. and European control of energy rich nations. In an effort to
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undermine revolution, the MNCs used core states to challenge the national sovereignty of Mexico and Latin America, thus empowering nationalism.\textsuperscript{164} The developing core state and MNCs effort is a continuation of a century of interventionist foreign policy successful in the short term, but in the twentieth and twenty-first centuries has proven to be a failure in Latin America.

According to Noam Chomsky, “legal humanitarianism,” used by world powers including the United States and the Soviet Union, takes advantage of international law to intervene in the affairs of sovereign countries, ostensibly to maintain peace and end bloodshed.\textsuperscript{165} In the United States, the MIC developed as a sophisticated policy maneuver to avoid world condemnation after years of overt military intervention. As a result of public pressure, the U.S. and Soviet superpowers were wed to legal “sovereign right to take military action” invoked during the twentieth century by the “Wilson Corollary to the Monroe Doctrine, [which] dictated that only American oil interests receive concessions within the reach of its power.”\textsuperscript{166} Mexico and Cuba were certainly within reach of U.S. power, and both were invaded by the United States on multiple occasions during the twentieth century. As a result, there developed a more sophisticated method for wealth accumulation through the use of “interferences” supported by the ideology of “world responsibilities” for the overall support of the “thrust of hegemony” the U.S. engaged in from roughly 1945 to 1967, according to Wallerstein.

VI. Historical Antecedents: Continuities and Disjunctures - The Haitian Revolution and the Development of Anti-Imperialism in Mexico and Cuba

The prevalence of imperialism, a system of exploiting countries, distant people, generates world wars that motivates our Latin American resistance becoming a fight for the integral liberation of our people, the more direct method of which we rely on for our sovereignty and the independence of our
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countries to ensure a contribution of the most efficient manner and with the help of other people to obtain a permanent peace for the entire world.\textsuperscript{167}  
Lázaro Cárdenas, 1962.

In this quote, Cárdenas synthesizes the anti-imperialist resistance expressed by the Mexican and Cuba Revolutions. In it he addresses an age-old question about the development of national liberation through revolution. Through this it is important to ask: who has the right to determine the proper political development of a country? By comparison, Anglo-American ideology has emphasized the greater western perspective of capitalist democracy (Adam Smith, Thomas Hobbes, and John Locke). As the self-proclaimed leadership of democracy ("world responsibilities"), the U.S. effort to legitimize its existence (Monroe Doctrine) became reason for perpetuating neo-colonial, race, gender, and settler-colonial projects (Open Door) in Latin America and the Caribbean. Neocolonialism is a term introduced by the former revolutionary and President of Ghana, Kwame Nkrumah to describe the enforcement of the Monroe Doctrine (imperialism) since the mid-1800s. Presented as progressive but carried out through violent conquest in the past, in the twentieth century neocolonialism established Western capitalist democracy (capitalist world-system) as the only economic, political, and social alternative for the world, once again an ideological "world responsibility."\textsuperscript{168}

In opposition to Western style democracy, the Mexican and Cuban Revolutions haphazardly melded nationalism to a commitment to environmental and social justice through national sovereignty and control of resources and services. Environmental and social justice are defined by the actions of people or states having the ability to realize their development potential based on equality, fraternity, and liberty and deciding to ensure their own national sovereignty. It


is a response to imperial capitalist expansion as a revolutionary historical theory (Karl Marx’s theory of revolution) beginning with the American Revolution and the concept of liberty, later influencing future revolutionary movements that led to the Haitian Revolution, beginning a critique of the American and French Revolutions and their inability to live up to the ideals they promoted. 169

By challenging the imperial project through environmental, intellectual, and social justice, subsequent revolutions rejected the lack of universal liberty, fraternity, and equality that the United States and France promised.170 But the inability of the American and French Revolutions to live up to their ideals influenced a strong ideology of national sovereignty through the equality they espoused, making possible the conditions that led to the Haitian Revolution.171

The Haitian Revolution became the historical moment defining the future of Latin American revolutionary movements challenging the lack of American and French revolutionary integrity. Haiti, as a slave led revolution, militarily defeated the British, French, and Spanish in their efforts to end national liberation.172 The Haitian Revolution, similar to the Mexican and Cuban Revolutions, challenged imperialism with a call for revolutionary social change in order to bring peace to the world. At the same time, Haiti’s revolution created the second independent nation in the Americas, not only challenging one but three European empires, defeating their greatest armies and proving to Latin America that national liberation was possible.173

The victory over the imperial armies of France, Britain, and Spain and the establishment of an independent Haiti set a precedent for the revolutionary trajectory of antisystemic national
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liberation movements. Toussaint L’Ouverture, a former slave, rose to power and overthrew the colonial French system, becoming the archetype for a charismatic revolutionary leader. L’Ouverture’s ability to organize a formidable revolutionary army from among Haiti’s former slave population, an army that ultimately defeated the seasoned fighters of Napoleon’s victorious European army, inspired generations of revolutionary leaders in Latin America.\footnote{James, \textit{The Black Jacobins}, 1989, 274.}

L’Ouverture rose from obscurity to organize the Haitian Revolution, as did Cárdenas and Castro. His experience as a slave primed him to follow the dictates of the French Revolution, especially the promises of equality to possess a rational-legal authority, to implement a similar revolution in Haiti. Through his military victories, he developed into a charismatic revolutionary leader and destroying French authority. In an interesting twist he remained loyal to France and the goals of the French Revolution, leading to his capture and death.

By making revolution possible for national liberation, Haiti also created the conditions for future challenges to the civilizing ideologies (“world responsibilities”) of the U.S. and Europe that developed into a hemispheric wide movement for national liberation.\footnote{Wallerstein, \textit{World-Systems Analysis}, 66.} In the twentieth century age of revolution (Mexican, Chinese, Russian, Vietnamese, Cuban, etc.), Castro describes the duty of revolutionaries in his 1962 speech; “the duty of all revolutionaries is to make revolution. It is now that in Latin America and the world that revolutions win, but it is not for revolutionaries to sit at the doors of their houses and just watch the cadaver of imperialism pass by.”\footnote{Castro, \textit{Latinoamericanismo vs. Imperialismo}, 85.} To Castro, victory did not signal the end of imperial or neocolonial control, it merely called for more action.

Haiti’s 1860s slave rebellion may have set the backdrop for the Cuban independence movement when the landowner turned revolutionary Manuel Céspedes freed his slaves and
declared rebellion against Spanish colonialism.\textsuperscript{177} Haiti, the second nation after the United States to win independence from colonialism, influenced nearby Cuba, as refugees fled the Haitian Revolution and spread word that Haiti had won its independence. By comparison, Cuba was the last country in the Americas to gain independence in 1898, after a long and bitter struggle, as the last Spanish speaking country in Latin America to eliminate slavery.\textsuperscript{178}

Furthermore, Cuba’s efforts at independence were dashed as the U.S. imposed the Platt Amendment onto its 1902 Constitution. As the American Revolution was the shot heard round the world, the Haitian Revolution was the clarion call for true revolutionary freedom reaching across the Windward Passage to Cuba.\textsuperscript{179} Although successful revolution bypassed Cuba in the 1800s, it traveled the hemisphere from Venezuela around Latin America to Mexico, influencing the movement for Cuban national liberation in 1959. As Haiti influenced Latin America and the Caribbean to challenge imperialism, Mexico in the twentieth century challenged U.S. neocolonial rule, evidenced by Mexico’s Díaz dictatorship catering to the will of U.S. foreign policy. The Mexican Revolution challenged U.S.-supported Mexican elites in the region, serving as a strong example for future revolutionary movements.

Castro, in the 1962 Second Declaration of Havana Speech, described the “duty of revolutionaries” in Latin America and the Caribbean “is to make revolution,” but insisting that revolutions are not exported but made by the people.\textsuperscript{180} Cuba serves as an example of a homegrown rebellion.\textsuperscript{181} C.L.R. James later echoed Castro’s call for revolutionaries not to sit idly by, describing the Cuban Revolution as the culmination of years of struggle for national identity,
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Whatever its ultimate fate, the Cuban Revolution marks the ultimate stage of a Caribbean quest for national identity. In a scattered series of disparate islands the process consists of a series of uncoordinated periods of drift, punctuated by spurts, leaps and catastrophes. But the inherent movement is clear and strong.\footnote{James, \textit{The Black Jacobins}, 1989, 391.}

Through efforts to implement social justice and national liberation, Cuba’s revolutions challenged slavery and neocolonialism. The Haitian trajectory of revolution C.L.R. James describes marked a new stage in the revolutionary trajectory in the Americas.

As a country free of slavery, Haiti directly assisted the liberation of South America by providing Simón Bolivar (the Liberator of South America) with money and equipment. As a result, Cuba became a Spanish colonial garrison as Haiti won its independence. Cuba became the epicenter of Spanish colonial rule, resulting in future U.S. neocolonial rule.\footnote{Thomas, \textit{Cuba: A History}, 59 and 234.} As such, the solidarity that developed between South American independence and Haiti influenced Bolivarian Pan-Americanism (transnational syndicalism), going on to influence other movements for national liberation to save and protect cultures and traditions.\footnote{Castro, \textit{Latinoamericanismo vs. Imperialismo}, 239.}

Historian Christopher Lasch’s work describes the rise of revolutionary movements based on the survival of traditional communities as providing the basis for understanding the historical trajectory of revolutionary movements. To comprehend the importance of the rebellion that occurred in the region, we must understand rural cultures as being as crucial to the development of revolutionary ideology as they are to antisystemic movements fighting for self-preservation.\footnote{Christopher Lasch, \textit{The World of Nations; Reflections on American History, Politics and Culture}, 1st ed. (New York: Knopf; [distributed by Random House], 1973). 107.}

Latin American and Caribbean revolutionary movements were born through their rural cultures (plantation slavery). The intersection of intellectual engagement (The Enlightenment)}
encountering action (American, French, and Haitian Revolutions) encouraged rebellion for the independence of Latin America and the Caribbean.\textsuperscript{186}

As the Haitian Revolution directly influenced independence in Latin America, slave liberation was an essential goal for Mexican independence, an issue that led to the Texas Revolution (1835-1836) and the Mexican-American War (1846-1848). It is important to note that Haiti (1804) and later Mexico (1821) were important independence movements that eventually ended slavery in Latin America and the Caribbean. Many newly freed ex-slaves and indigenous persons from throughout Latin America were swept up in the fervor of freedom from bondage as they fought for the independence of Latin America. To their dismay, they were used to defeat the Spanish, ending the rule of one landlord to begin neocolonial rule by creole elites who usurped independence movements with their own white male rule.\textsuperscript{187} The promise of freedom developed into new forms of bondage that tied people to the land through various schemes, from sharecropping to near slave-like conditions under the rise of imperial capitalism. In future sections of the dissertation, I will combine this rural history with Skocpol’s theory of revolutionary peasants and their connection to the Mexican and Cuban Revolutions. I will focus on the growing class divisions within both countries as the U.S. exerted it policies in the region and placed a stranglehold on the economic, social, and political development of the region.

Economic and political expansion paved a path for the development of an anti-imperialist ideology challenging U.S. power through revolution.\textsuperscript{188} In later interventions in the twentieth century, the memory of Haiti’s combined legacy of slave emancipation and national independence caused the United States to avoid commitments to universal justice. C.L.R. James
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illustrates the knowledge (intellectual justice) possessed by oppressed persons and their need to overcome colonialism before neocolonialism:

I have written in vain if I have not made it clear that of all formerly colonial coloured peoples, the West Indian masses are the most highly experienced in the ways of Western civilization and most receptive to its requirement in the twentieth century. To realize themselves they will have to break out of the shackles of the old colonial system.189

The Haitian Revolution was first in successfully “breaking the shackles” of European imperialism as it continued to espouse revolutionary change. Latin America and the Caribbean, as a result of rebellions, engaged in the monumental task of creating a separate approach (antisystemic) which began with the Haitian Revolution and continued with the Cuban and Mexican Revolutions. By comparison, the American Revolution and it self-proclaimed democratic capitalist example (“world responsibility”) is now seen as serving its own economic and political interests. Western civilization, as described by C.L.R. James, expanded into a new form of what William Appleman Williams termed “American administrative colonialism.”190 The United States took a bureaucratic approach to expanding economic markets with greater importance after the Mexican-American War, Civil War, and the defeat of Native America completed three pivotal events that served as precursors to interventions in the affairs of sovereign countries (Cuba, Haiti, and Mexico). Expansionism as a U.S. natural resource policy developed into a worldwide initiative of interventionism that can now be described as “American imperialism.”191 The Haitian, Mexican, and Cuban independence revolutions, in their own times, were opportunistically vilified for their strength of character as they ended slavery, just as
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twentieth century revolutionary countries were said to be communist if they were revolutionary and committed to environmental, intellectual, and social justice.

Whereas England once maligned the United States for its revolution, it became reified to future revolutions, representing an environmental, intellectual, and social justice cause influencing national liberation. However, its revolutionary influence ended with its entrance into World War I, fought between colonial European powers over their imperial conquests.192 As Haiti’s was the first revolution to challenge the French and U.S. civilizing projects (both countries refused to recognize Haiti’s independence), rebellions in the Americas after the Haitian Revolution challenged the U.S. as the “shining city on the hill,” as it was initially seen as the first successful revolution in the Western Hemisphere.193 Nevertheless, through twentieth century revolutions the U.S. has not been able to live up to the ideology “that all men are created equal.”194 Subsequent revolutions have been fought for the national liberation of people from dependency and colonialism.

U.S. notions of liberty at the expense of equality led to the development of “administrative bureaucratic imperialism” and the post-Cold War propaganda that history ended with the rise of U.S. superpower,195 an ideology reinforced by the collapse of the Soviet Union, described by Francis Fukuyama as the “end of history,” which began with the end of the American Revolution and ended with the U.S. as the world’s only superpower.196 Fukuyama’s “end of history” is part of the greater imperialist ideology synonymous with American exceptionalism, as the American Revolution and the rise of the U.S. made it the premiere democratic nation in world history.197
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Thus, the future arrived with the United States at the helm of world power, unable to explain or empathize with the conditions that created many twentieth century rebellions, armed rebellions which grew out of Enlightenment ideas as a result of the English, French, and U.S. Revolutions. Revolutionary efforts similar to Haiti’s were subsequently usurped by various oligarchies which rose to control the levers of power, emphasizing democracy while implementing a controlling bureaucratic state, a bureaucracy that in the United States was set up to maintain the development of imperial capitalism. For Latin American and the Caribbean, revolution has served as a weapon against the development of twentieth century U.S. expansion, as Mexico’s revolutionary foreign policy continued the legacy of national sovereignty begun by Haiti’s national liberation.

VII. Conclusion

In this chapter I began with the question of the revolutionary trajectory of Haiti, Mexico, and Cuba influencing recent South American leaders such as Húgo Chávez, Evo Morales, Rafael Correa, José (Pepe) Mújica, Cristina Fernández de Kirchner, Luis Inácio Lula da Silva and Dilma Rousseff. I argue that these leaders are engaged in a struggle similar to that encountered by Mexican and Cuban revolutionary leaders of the twentieth century confronting U.S. hegemony. This is important because all of these contemporary leaders are seen as enemies of the United States (in a repeat of the U.S. response to the Mexican and Cuban Revolutions), but they can also be seen as leaders of antisystemic national liberation movements that challenge the late twentieth and early twenty-first century interventionist policies of the United States. In the next chapter I present the concept of “natural resource revolutions” and apply it to the Mexican and Cuban Revolutions and the importance of their historical trajectory in influencing natural resource policies in Latin America.

Chapter 4: Natural Resource Revolutions: The Mexican and Cuban Revolutions - Land, Labor and Nationalization

Undoubtedly there has been popular support for particular oil expropriations. Very often, this amounts to little more than support for a popular government, which has carried out extensive policies of redistribution in sectors other than oil. When a popular president, for example Castro or Cárdenas, nationalizes the oil industry and announces that he is threatened by the ‘imperialist’, there is a genuine popular response, particularly when the threat from outside appears to be real.\(^{199}\) George Philip, 1982.

According to Theda Skocpol, “the task which revolutionized regimes in the modern world have performed best is the mobilization of citizen support across class lines for protracted international warfare.”\(^{200}\) Mexico was the first of the “contemporary social revolutions as promoting ideologically reconstructed and rearticulated national identities involving the sudden incorporation of formerly excluded popular groups into state-directed projects.”\(^{201}\) Since the Mexican Revolution, most if not all revolutions have been socialist in nature, but more importantly, those that have been successful have been nationalist.

How did the Mexican Revolution, as the first revolution of the twentieth century set a trend for successful nationalist rebellions that reshaped land and labor reform and influenced environmental, intellectual, and social justice relations? Using the parallel comparative historical analysis approach, I argue that the Mexican experience guided the Cuban and other revolutions to take on a socialist approach. This is important because Mexico’s revolution contributed to antisystemic and social revolution theories in Cuba as well as other Latin American countries that, similar to Haiti, saw Mexico as a non-socialist revolution successfully challenging U.S. and European hegemony.
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This chapter is organized into four main sections. First, I discuss how Mexico was one of the first revolutionary countries in the twentieth century to engage in international warfare with the United States, leading to the rise of revolutionary movements able to tap into nationalism across class and political differences for rebellion. Second, I address the role of campesinos (people from the fields) in radicalizing the Mexican Revolution that institutionalized land as a social function. Third, I identify continuities and differences regarding the historical relationship between Mexico and Cuba and their revolutionary trajectory in the twentieth century. And finally, I weave together strands from Wallerstein’s and Skocpol’s theories to argue that the Cuban Revolution went a step further, by moving to a socialist and nationalist revolution.

I. **Mexico’s Non-socialist Revolution: Natural Resource Radicalism and Nationalism**

From beginning to its end, the Mexican Revolution was not a communist or socialist revolution as was the case with Russia, China, and Cuba. The Revolution evolved from an elite struggle to a complicated social conflict confronting years of corruption and inequality that were the result of the evolving capitalist world-system. As the accumulation of wealth in the twentieth century was concentrated in the hands of core countries, efforts were organized to ensure continued control of semiperiphery and periphery nations, as colonialism became neo-colonialism. Mexico’s revolution also signaled the worldwide scramble for control of petroleum resources, as Mexico had some of the most accessible reserves in the world. At about the same time across the globe, Russia (rich in natural resources) was undergoing a revolutionary process as part of a worldwide antisystemic movement that immediately dealt with attempts to criminalize its efforts to alleviate poverty, disrupting the capitalist world-system. Above all, whether a revolution was nationalist or socialist, the Chinese, Cuban, Mexican, and Russian
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Revolutions were successful, according to Wallerstein and Skocpol, because they were nationalist movements seeking the liberation of their territories and people from local elites and foreign domination.\textsuperscript{204} As described by Skocpol,

Nationalism in particular has proven to be more inclusive and powerful force for revolutionary mobilization than class struggle alone. Revolutionaries have fared best where they – and not conservative or reformist leadership – have been able to harness nationalist sentiments…collective goods provided by revolutionaries may also include public education, health services, law and order, and economic reforms such as tax and interest reductions, the elimination of corvée labor and land reform.\textsuperscript{205}

Skocpol discusses the importance of providing resources and services necessary for the development of a country, and in the case of Mexico and Cuba, basic needs were important nationalist causes for revolution as they had been historically.

The struggle for Latin American nationalism was disregarded by U.S. foreign policy makers as temporary in that it did not support the imperial nationalism of the U.S. and could be easily crushed.\textsuperscript{206} Nationalism in Mexico followed the recommendations of Simón Bolívar and José Marti, who developed a hemispheric solidarity built not on competition but rather on trying to survive while confronting U.S. imperialism. It was a social and economic nationalism surviving the legacy of dependency and colonial rule in an effort to overcome hegemony.

The Mexican Revolution became a “state-directed project” that over a period of twenty-eight years engaged in developing policies for a social-revolutionary regime, and as Skocpol notes, excelled at channeling enhanced popular participation into protracted international warfare. Because of the ways revolutionary leaders mobilize popular support in the course of the struggle for state power, the emerging regimes can tackle mobilization for war better than any task, including the promotion of national economic development. The full realization of this revolutionary potential for building strong states depends on
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threatening but not overwhelming geopolitical circumstances.\textsuperscript{207}

The Mexican petroleum nationalization was the culmination of a long process that utilized the geopolitical circumstances of the twentieth century to mobilize Mexican citizens for the glory of Mexico. It is in the tradition of Pan-Americanism, a hemispheric lesson to future rebellions.

Castro provides his knowledge of the importance of the Mexican case,

\begin{quote}
We also view the Mexican Revolution, which ended the decades of tyranny by Porfirio Díaz and forged the first great social revolution in our hemisphere. And the first great agrarian reform it opened a time of fighting, both heroic and bloody, specifically to save the Revolution. I remember from the time we were students it was discussed with every reason that the [1917] Constitution resulting from the Mexican Revolution was one of the most advanced and progressive in the world. The Mexican Revolution consists of a deep and profound inspiration for the revolutionary movements of Latin America.\textsuperscript{208}

Fidel Castro, 1980.
\end{quote}

According to Castro, the Mexican Revolution significantly influenced natural resource policies around the world through the 1917 Constitution. Mexico led Latin America as a revolutionary society through the development of the 1918 Carranza Doctrine, the 1917 Constitution, and the 1938 Petroleum Nationalization. It was a twenty-eight year period of mobilization engaging nearly every sector of the Mexican population. The struggle in Mexico developed as a radical approach begun by mine workers confronting low wages and harsh working conditions that resulted in loss of life and dismemberment in the mines of Northern Mexico. The Cananea strike of 1906 was one of the first confrontations between Mexican workers and multinational corporations (MNCs) influencing the direction of the Mexican Revolution as an antisystemic social rebellion.\textsuperscript{209}
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The Cananea Strike was a precursor to future struggles that would ultimately culminate with the Union of Mexican Petroleum Workers, that in 1937 won better wages and work conditions through the Mexican Supreme Court. The Revolution, in challenging national and international intervention and “interference,” created a legal precedent that between 1906 and 1937 was won only through revolution. By seizing power and controlling the state, the Revolution was able to significantly challenge the power of the MNCs, using legislation derived from the 1917 Constitution. It led to “protracted international warfare” that during the Revolution saw several interventions that only served to further mobilize Mexico by strengthening their nationalist cause. Skocpol describes the impact of the Revolution and what U.S. efforts did to radicalize it,

If the United States had been able and willing to launch sustained antirevolutionary interventions, the Revolution could not have continued after the defeats of Francisco Madero and General Victoriano Huerta made it potentially socially radical. Some scattered U.S. interventions were launched, but they were so minor that their only consequence was to provoke Mexican resentment.

The Mexican Revolution signaled the future in Latin America, as peasant and worker led armies emerged to confront years of frustrated efforts towards social justice. It signaled the rise of charismatic campesino leaders such as Francisco Villa and Emiliano Zapata, both precursors to Cárdenas, who inspired the Mexican Revolution that since independence had fought against injustice. They led efforts to usher in some of the most radical social movements in Latin America (Zapatistas, Villistas, Carranzistas, and Obregónistas) and developed an environmental, intellectual, and social justice ideology that grew in strength as each faction combined to defeat
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the old state at the same time confronting the United States. All of this for Cárdenas was an educational experience as a young revolutionary witnessing the ten-year Revolution he eventually led as president of Mexico. Years later Cárdenas invoked the importance of all the great leaders of the Revolution with special consideration to Villa and Zapata who paid the ultimate price for their defiance. Here Skocpol describes the importance of peasant-led (campesino) involvement in Mexico,

in most instances, both peasants [campesinos] and city dwellers were mobilized for guerrilla warfare by nationalist revolutionary elites [Mexico and Cuba]; only in the Mexican and Bolivian revolutions were peasant communities able to rebel on their own [Villa and Zapata] as did the French and Russian peasant communities.

Mexican campesinos were able to organize into guerrilla armies after the elite 1910 Revolution was crushed by its own class interests. The ensuing power vacuum gave rise to the social revolution that was heavily influenced by the Villista and Zapatista armies of national liberation.

Cárdenas followed the path of Villa and Zapata and was faithful to the legacy of environmental, intellectual, and social justice in the form of agrarian and labor reform with just natural resource policies. Cárdenas was an example of a leader in the revolution that emerged from the muddled class lines of the struggle. At the age of fifteen Cárdenas joined the revolution, becoming a general at 25 and governor at 29, earning the privilege of leading Mexico through its struggle for land and labor rights that led to petroleum nationalization on the eve of World War II. Arnaldo Córdova provides us an understanding of Cárdenas’s special place in Mexican history,

General Lázaro Cárdenas… in 1929 was already one most important players in Mexican politics, without a doubt counted as one of the principal leaders
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of the Revolution, along with Calles and General Joaquiún Amaro, Cárdenas moreover, was the revolutions greatest leader ensuring the rescue of and making sure the ideological and political success of the Revolution.215

His ability to consolidate the gains of the revolution mobilized the Mexican masses through seasoned revolutionary leadership for the economic independence of Mexico. Fidel Castro describes the monumental task Cárdenas faced as he used his stature to engage Mexican citizens in confronting the enormous geopolitical warfare Mexico became embroiled in,

It was Mexico who was the first country to actually produce oil under difficult conditions when the world power structure was undefined, when what we consider a weak country confronted the great imperialist countries by nationalizing petroleum. And we can remember how irritated was the reaction of the imperialists and the hard won Mexican victory with its valiant and dedicated action, which immortalized the name of Lázaro Cárdenas.216

Cárdenas became the example of a new type of leadership in Latin America, one that developed a sophisticated approach to understanding the challenges of a developing state. And with limited resources and political and economic strength, the Mexican Revolution created policies and strategies for addressing challenges to its national sovereignty, specifically from the MNCs.

II. Settler Colonialism, Neocolonialism and broad-based revolutionary coalition building in Mexico and Cuba

After 1898, the U.S. filled the dominant role in Latin America as a result of defeating the Spanish Empire in its last stronghold of Cuba. Through the defeat of Spain, the United States took control of the “liberation” process in ways that Martí warned of, undermining Cuban national sovereignty and imposing a U.S. “democratic” neocolonial system: a limited independence as a result of the addition of the Platt Amendment (“interference”) to the Cuban Constitution as a measure to intervene in Cuban affairs as it saw fit. This resulted in the rise of

caudillos, or strong men (dictators) supported by the United States to ensure the safety of foreign investments.

Cuba’s transition from colonialism to neocolonialism was a vivid example to the Mexican Revolution of what could happen to states engaged in national liberation.\textsuperscript{217} The imposition of the Platt Amendment signaled to many countries in Latin America that they were next in line for subjugation.\textsuperscript{218} The Cuban experience was not lost to revolutionary Mexico where leaders who saw the Cuban experience as a reason to avoid U.S. intervention as a form of Cuban styled neocolonialism.

Mexico prior to the revolution was engaged in a similar situation under the U.S. supported neo-patrimonial dictatorship of Porfirio Díaz, who over a thirty-four year period had grown to serve elite and foreign interests well. Skocpol describes how neo-patrimonial dictatorships focus on maintaining power, and so Díaz ultimately contributed to the revolution when he reneged on his promise not to take part in the 1910 election. This became international news when, in an interview with James Creelman of the New York Times in 1908, Díaz made it known that he would not run for reelection in 1910.\textsuperscript{219} The failure to follow through with his promise caused a variety of groups, including the powerful hacendados (landed gentry) of northern Mexico, to challenge the urban elites (científicos) that Díaz represented.

The hacendados clashed with the urban elites over the lack of democracy, or at least one that provided an end to the dictatorship and a transfer of elite control to the first leader of the Revolution, Francisco Madero (hacendado).\textsuperscript{220} Madero, a landowner educated in the United
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States, won U.S. government recognition with the defeat of Díaz and the start of the Revolution. The confrontation between elites began a pattern of supporting neo-patrimonial dictatorships around Latin America, signaling confrontations with unintended consequences and leading to the rise of charismatic leaders of guerrilla campesino/peasant armies.

The clash between the Mexican científicos (urban) and the hacendados (rural) elites created a chaotic situation in Mexico that crossed class lines and unleashed the revolutionary potential of Mexico’s citizens. As the elites vied for control of Mexico, the campesino-led armies that supported Madero required him to make promises to include them in the new government. As a result, campesinos and workers were mobilized through agrarian and labor reform as incentives to fight for Mexico’s sovereignty and defeat the Díaz dictatorship. As the revolution evolved, charismatic leaders such as Francisco Villa in the north and Emiliano Zapata in the south began programs to confiscate foreign-owned properties and redistribute lands to peasants. They also developed plans, such as the Zapata Plan de Ayala, that challenged elite power and land tenure rights.221

Initially in 1910 Zapata and Villa supported the hacendado leadership in rebellion against Díaz. Eventually the revolution exposed a lack of commitment by Francisco Madero (father of the Mexican Revolution) as he vacillated in keeping his promises for agrarian and labor reform.222 Madero, who represented the elite hacendados, was eventually betrayed by one of Porfirio Díaz’s generals, Victoriano Huerta, who seized upon Madero’s weakness and had him assassinated in 1913. Madero’s death led to the ensuing peasant-led rebellion, ushering in some of the most radical revolutionary policies the world had ever seen, now enshrined in the 1917 Mexican Constitution emphasizing agrarian and labor reform.

---
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Theda Skocpol provides a theoretical explanation that describes the history of peasant involvement in revolution. The 1913 crisis can be understood as a time when “defeats in war, and international military interventions are the most likely ways for existing state power to be disrupted opening the way for autonomous peasant revolts, or for appeals by organized revolutionaries to peasant support in the countryside.” The counterrevolutionary assassination of Madero had done just that, making the Mexican Revolution (after 1913) a campesino rebellion promoting agrarian reform leading to important legislation (1917 Constitution) in future international struggles (1938 Petroleum Nationalization).

The Mexican Constitution was originally written to deal with the legacy of losses sustained as a result of the Mexican-American War and the resulting growth of foreign-owned properties, especially in petroleum rich states such as Veracruz. As an effort to rectify the history of abuse under the Díaz dictatorship, the revolution took shape when campesinos in northern Mexico aligned with the hacendados to defeat their common enemy: the Apache Indians. The defeat of the Apaches and the end of the Díaz presidency created the conditions for the hacendados to challenge long held campesino land claims and begin to seize properties. Madero, a northern hacendado himself, used the campesinos to defeat Díaz and expected them to be obedient to his rule. Madero’s unwillingness to support campesino land claims kept the Zapatistas wary of elite hacendado rule. They refused to disarm, and as soon as President Madero was killed in 1913 they immediately rebelled against the Huerta led counterrevolution.

The 1913 radicalization of the Mexican Revolution became a cross class struggle that pitted campesino armies against the Mexican federal army under Huerta. The struggle evolved
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into what Christopher Lasch describes as “peasant movements turned social revolutionary movements that develop out of rural areas where “radical” elements challenged historical injustices.” They are radical, according to Lasch, because they are on the verge of annihilation and thus compelled to defend their way of life to the death. Rural communities are described as populations struggling to maintain their historical connection to the land. Furthermore, Skocpol describes that successful campesino/peasant rebellions have greater ‘tactical leverage’ to engage in rebellion [which] is normally possessed by smallholders or tenants who live in communal villages outside of direct landlord control, and by peasants (even poor ones) who live in geographically marginal areas relatively inaccessible to government authorities.

Mexico is an example of both Lasch’s description of campesinos under threat and what Skocpol describes as revolutionary peasants and the conditions both internationally and locally that make them successful. In both the north of Mexico and in the south where Villa and Zapata developed as leaders both movements can be accounted for in terms of Skocpol’s description. The other components to their success were the formation of a broad revolutionary coalition with middle and upper-class groups rebelling against the Huerta dictatorship with charismatic leaders (Zapata and Villa) who were able to use nationalism as a mobilizing force.

Francisco Villa’s División del Norte and Emiliano Zapata’s Ejército de Liberación del Sur both engaged in a fight for the survival of their communities, and both leaders were instrumental in developing a Mexican nationalist identity. Both leaders were also campesinos with a history of practicing “successful defiance” against the Diaz dictatorship by seizing lands and properties by handing them over to campesino communities.
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charismatic revolutionary leadership during the Mexican Revolution. They instilled a fierce sense of loyalty in their followers while harnessing the collective willingness of peasants to sacrifice their lives for national liberation. They were also instrumental through the Plan de Ayala and Villa’s decrees as governor of the state of Chihuahua in establishing land and labor reform as fundamental tenets to the 1917 Mexican Constitution. For Cárdenas the ground work was established by Carranza, Obrégon, Villa, and Zapata through the peasants armies that according to Skocpol,

not until after such delicate and dangerous political work has been completed can the revolutionaries expect to benefit greatly from widespread peasant support…It is hard to image the successful institutionalization of such social exchange between peasants and revolutionaries except in places and times unusually free of counterrevolutionary state repression.230

To restate, the long revolutionary decade in Mexico was the culmination of years of strife that centered not as the elites had envisioned on a power struggle between them, but on the age-old land tenure struggle that over-rode such limited historical understanding. Cuba’s history of neocolonial rule at the hands of the U.S. had influenced the first revolution of the twentieth century, and the events of both Cuban and Mexican history provided the revolutionary case study that led to the similar broad-based nature of the Cuban Revolution.

III. Property as a social function: 1917 Mexican Constitution

Distancing ourselves from those who see petroleum as their own interest of egotistical privilege, and sustaining that petroleum should be considered “a human patrimony” – including precisely all the energy sources - without this being a contradiction taking the decision to utilize them, in the development of one’s own country.231 Fidel Castro, 1979.
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In 1927, Cárdenas, a distinguished general of the Mexican Revolution, was assigned to protect the largest oil producing areas of the state of Veracruz.\textsuperscript{232} A sort of petroleum MNCs zone of exclusivity, the threat of U.S. military intervention kept it under revolutionary control. As a real threat to Latin American countries in the age of U.S. intervention during the 1920s and 1930s, it was said that, “the only reason there has not been a coup in the United States is because there is no U.S. Embassy in the United States,”\textsuperscript{233} bespeaking the immense power of the United States, especially in promoting U.S. interests ahead of Mexican and Cuban national sovereignty. The 1927 dispatch of General Cárdenas to the oil zone was a precautionary measure so that in the event of U.S. intervention, the Mexican Army could set fire to the oil fields as a way to counter invasion. Cárdenas did not set fire to the oil fields because President Plutarcho Elias Calles did not implement Article 27 of the 1917 Mexican Constitution, thereby failing to expropriate petroleum as was legislated.\textsuperscript{234} Nonetheless, through Cárdenas’ experience during the revolution and afterwards as a key figure in the Calles government, he gained an understanding of the importance of Mexican and U.S. relations.

The oil rich areas remained a thorn in the side of Mexican revolutionaries because until those resources were nationalized, the Mexican Revolution would not be fully implemented and Mexican sovereignty remained in the hands of the MNCs. Cárdenas’s experience in Veracruz served as a constant reminder of the weakness of Mexican national sovereignty, because as long as the MNCs dictated petroleum policy Mexico was at their mercy. In later years and under similar pressure Castro describing the threats by the MIC to the Cuban Revolution in 1985,
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They also wanted to exterminate the Mexican Revolution because it made the bourgeois revolution in the first part of the century effectively nationalizing the large landholdings bringing about a series of measures with social benefits. The country was not ready at that time for a socialist revolution, but Mexico was constantly harassed. Remember the measures taken by the government of Lázaro Cárdenas in nationalizing the foreign-owned petroleum companies who initiated a boycott and all types of measures against Mexico…Imperialism does not want any type of revolution and much less a socialist revolution.235

Castro addresses the historical role of the Mexican Revolution and the United States reaction to revolution in Latin America. Castro also presents Mexico as an example of the various incursions made by the United States to stop at all cost any social change. The anchor for such change was the 1917 Mexican Constitution, which worked to ensure the sovereignty of Mexico in the face of major international challenges. The twenty-eight year struggle to implement national sovereignty through petroleum nationalization in Mexico led to a hemispheric mobilization against invasion, coups, and other efforts (interferences and responsibilities) to challenge burgeoning revolutionary movements. Skocpol describes the importance of nationalism and whether it is leftist in nature or not,

Whether “communist” or not, I argue, revolutionary elites have been able to build the strongest states in those countries whose geopolitical circumstances allowed or required the emerging regimes to become engaged in protracted and labor-intensive international warfare.236

As neighboring countries with a history of international warfare, neither country was a stranger to strained relations. According to the makers of U.S. foreign policy, the mobilization of the Mexican people around agrarian and labor reform gave reason for criminalizing efforts at implementing national sovereignty through natural resource nationalization as socialism. Be it
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nationalist agrarian reform or labor rights for basic improvements in health and well-being, it was nonetheless a challenge to U.S. hegemony.\textsuperscript{237} As a precursor to Castro, Cárdenas used socialist education as a means of engaging the Mexican people in supporting Mexican national sovereignty. This, for all intents and purposes, was their right under international law; it was fundamentally nationalistic, and not the concern of the United States.

In the presence of MNCs resistance against the implementation of Mexican national sovereignty through nationalization, the Cárdenas government used socialist education as an effort to counter the measures of powerful British and U.S. interests from undermining gains won by the Mexican Revolution. A variety of efforts were implemented by Cárdenas to support the 1917 Mexican Constitution by organizing a cross-class coalition through education, party formation, and, most importantly, through the collection of public funds to pay for the 1938 Petroleum Nationalization. By involving the Mexican people in the social revolution of natural resource sovereignty, Cárdenas provided an example for the Cuban Revolution. Below, Castro describes the importance of education and national sovereignty:

A revolution is a process and socialism is not enacted by decree. Socialism is an economic and social regimen that is reached by process; it is not won by decree. By decree nationalization of the banks, by decree the large industries can be nationalized, by decree the adoption of a series of measures can be taken, but by decree a social-economic regimen is not completed. Amongst other things, the revolution is a process of educating a nation it is a process of developing a revolutionary consciousness.\textsuperscript{238}

The Mexican revolutionary experience during the rise of U.S. dominance is a study of a revolution establishing a social consciousness about the history of inequality and a holistic need to affect change, not just political but also economic and social programs that require mass
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education to strengthen the character of social revolution.239 Furthermore, socialist-nationalist movements worldwide have used agrarian and labor reform to enhance the greater historical mobilization of broad coalitions of people against counterrevolution. Cárdenas explicitly describes the importance of land as a social function when he states,

The concept of universal rights that actually addresses property considers it to be a social function and not with the prerogative of abusing or abandoning those necessary elements that are susceptible for satisfying the needs of the people in a society and based on their needs. Law number 75 promulgated on January 28th, 1932, which regulates the modalities of the right to property based on its serving a social function for the good of the collective life establishes the statutes for which property is determined must satisfy social needs, based on a lack of public utility guaranteeing its indemnity. The vigilance and application of this law cannot qualify by analyzing the conditions of legality in Mexico, as a radical government creating the legal modality of universal rights.240

The agrarian issue began with the Spanish colonial encomienda system that removed indigenous people as residents of land they had lived on for centuries. It placed them under the control of the Spanish crown, the sole owner of the land. This created an imbalance, destroying the historical social function of land and causing rebellions that forced establishment of the Repartamiento system, changing land use throughout the Americas. Through the Repartamiento, the Spanish crown allowed campesinos to borrow the land through mercedes de tierra (gifts of land) while still claiming ownership. After years of colonial rule, successful indigenous rebellions challenged the Spanish system of labor and land tenure.

The indigenous rebellions were successful because they were coalitions of social movements that combined to expel the Spanish from indigenous territory, leading to the development of the ejido. The ejido, or communally owned lands, remained a part of Mexican life until encroachment of policies through the Diaz dictatorship allowed for legalized land theft.
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and confiscation of lands deeded to indigenous and peasant communities by colonial Spain.

Based on the historical lack of humane treatment of workers and changing land rights, these two issues were codified into Articles 27 and 123 of the 1917 Mexican Constitution. In the modern world, the social function of land has ensured the existence of communities that were historically a threat to colonial Spain and have survived to stand in the way of the capitalist world-system. James C. Scott describes the age-old land issue as it confronts the world-system.

We are often likely to find the strongest resistance to capitalism and to an intrusive state among more isolated peasannies with entrenched precapitalist values. While the values that motivate such peasannies are thus hardly socialist in value in the strict, modern use of the word, their tenacity and the social organization from which they arise may provide a dynamic for radical change.241

After the Revolution established Mexican ownership of subsurface minerals, petroleum, a natural resource, was now owned by the people, historically deemed the revolutionary campesinos. It was now set up to serve a social function for Mexico. As a result of the historical land struggle, labor rights were also an important part of the fight that came together during the 1938 Petroleum Nationalization. Through the 1917 Constitution, workers earned the right to organize and demand labor rights. This and the land issue led petroleum workers in the 1930s to push for the rights they had won through revolution.

After 1917, agrarian reform and labor rights became the collective sovereignty of the Mexican people through natural resource revolution. The rise of the MNCs created a threat to the gains of the revolution and Mexico’s sovereignty. Moreover, in 1937, the Mexican Supreme Court supported the Mexican workers’ right for better wages and work conditions, legally supporting the 1917 Constitution in a decision against the MNCs that challenged their

arrangements with the Díaz regime. As a result of their intransigence, they challenged the ruling of the Supreme Court, placing immense pressure on President Cárdenas who decided to expropriate Mexico’s petroleum, returning properties the Mexican Constitution had deemed as state-owned in 1917.\textsuperscript{242}

In solidarity with the Mexican people and the Revolution, Cárdenas and his administration took a calculated risk, nationalizing what the U.S. government and the MNCs considered impossible. Friedrich Schuler, in \textit{Mexico Between Hitler and Roosevelt}, explains that after many years of revolution, Mexico, in the face of major challenges, developed a revolutionary cadre honed into a seasoned political and diplomatic corps.\textsuperscript{243} By organizing the mass mobilization of the Mexican people through popular nationalism, the Cárdenas administration seized upon the collective indignation of the Mexican people. Mexico’s Revolution, since the end of hostilities in 1920, set forth a radical constitution that influenced future revolutionary movements in Latin America.\textsuperscript{244} The Cuban Revolution later was but one of many benefactors of the Mexican struggle and subsequent rebellions for national sovereignty.

\textbf{IV. 1917 – 1940 Mexican and Cuban Constitutions: Revolutionary Evolution of Natural Resource Policy}

Both the Mexican (1917) and Cuban (1940) Constitutions established revolutionary frameworks for the actions of Cárdenas and Castro, as efforts to follow the ideas of Bolivar’s Latin American republic after the 1824 Pan-American Congress were dashed by age-old imperial “divide and conquer” Machiavellian tactics.\textsuperscript{245} In order to control resources, the transition from colonial to neo-colonial rule set up imperialism as a more adept power structure to control people and resources through economic, political, and social development, described by Castro as
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“Imperialist Globalization.” Colonial rule was made obsolete as slavery placed limits on the ability of Western nations to reap the profits wage labor provided. Wage labor controlled by a variety of mechanisms surpassed slavery by controlling all aspects of a person’s life.

Wage labor as a control over people’s lives developed as the capitalist economic system was implemented with the rise of MNCs in the twentieth century. Early revolutionary efforts to establish the rights of man led to the development of the parliamentary system in England and the United States. Through the U.S. Constitution, the 14th Amendment established equality as the basis for relations regarding economic, political, and social conditions. Capitalism in the United States developed with greater efforts at expanding international markets, especially as colonial powers lost control of territories and neocolonialism led by the United States engaged in the control of developing and former colonial countries.

The spread of capitalism ended colonial rule, leading to imperial wars such as the Spanish-American War and clearing the way for neocolonialism. Neocolonialism, first coined by Kwame Nkrumah (Revolutionary leader of Ghana) describes the intersection of economic, political, and social efforts to control dependent and former colonies, limiting their development and disregarding the revolutions of previous centuries in England, the U.S., and France, as rebellions against the British Empire erupted in its former colonies. According to William Appleman Williams, the United States mobilized its own imperial expansion, which violated its own constitutional promises (“world responsibilities”) of liberty, freedom, and equality.

Liberty, freedom, and equality were the basis for the 1917 Mexican and 1940 Cuban Constitutions. Below Castro describes in detail how the 1959 Cuban Revolution implemented the
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1940 Constitution, ignored during the Batista dictatorship even though he had supported its creation in the 1930s. Reminiscent of the Cárdenas experience, it took nationalization of petroleum to implement the 1917 Constitution as nationalization in 1960 fulfilled the promises of the 1940 Constitution:

We begin by ratifying here that the origins of the 1940 Constitution, the fundamental precepts of the Constitution of 1940, are those that will govern the Provisional Government and the future government of the republic, of which is giving a tariff to the entire citizenry… in consequence the Revolution has stated that all the fundamental precepts of the Constitution, all the civil rights, political and human, guaranteed by the Constitution of the Republic are guaranteed by the Revolution, because that is the standard of the Revolution and why the Revolution can be done within those beginnings. Fidel Castro 1959.250

Castro, a lawyer, after winning power in Cuba, invokes the 1940 Cuban Constitution as the document most important to the Cuban Revolution. In both cases the Mexican and Cuban constitutions institutionalized both revolutions, establishing the legal right to implement nationalization through the near complete application of both documents.

Both Constitutions took two decades after ratification to be implemented. In Mexico agrarian reform laws established the Mexican people as the collective owners of all natural resources, leading to petroleum nationalization and the redistribution of farmlands. Following a similar process, Cuban nationalization of petroleum refineries went beyond petroleum and land redistribution, expropriating almost all foreign-owned businesses.251 The Mexican and Cuban nationalizations set a precedent for other countries, establishing that revolutionary gains could be implemented by legislation.

Nationalist legislation challenged twentieth century imperial domination of natural resources, empowering local communities against the imposition of Anglo-American
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“administrative colonialism.”\textsuperscript{252} Implemented in England during the eighteenth century, the British Corn Laws ended traditional peasant land tenure arrangements, instituting private property relations over a history of communal land ownership that began with the rise of capitalism.\textsuperscript{253} Therefore, imperialist countries engaged in expansionist wars locally and internationally, setting the basis for the development of foreign policies resulting in the confrontation with the Mexican and Cuban Revolutions in the name of national security.\textsuperscript{254} Revolutionary Mexico was one of the first countries in the twentieth century criminalized by U.S. interventionist policy in the name of economic expansion, directly challenging expanding U.S. hegemony.\textsuperscript{255}

In open defiance to U.S. and European interventionist policies Mexico and Cuba challenged the MNCs as revolution codified laws ending neocolonial rule. Based on historical threats of economic warfare, Mexico, then Cuba, implemented new laws through their revolutionary constitutions and nationalizations as imperialist globalization was being developed by the MIC.\textsuperscript{256} Imperialist globalization developed partly through the petroleum MNCs as they organized into a worldwide monopoly through secret extra-territorial policies regardless of state sovereignty.\textsuperscript{257}

As one of the first efforts to control a country in Latin America, Cuba’s Platt Amendment provided the United States a neocolonial utopia based on the false sovereignty that, until 1933, provided immense wealth for numerous MNCs. Cuba under the Platt Amendment was the
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example to greater Latin America of the possibility of a hemispheric Platt Amendment. The Mexican Maximato (Calles dictatorship) and Cuban Batistiano (Batista dictatorship) both counterrevolutionary dictatorships, with an important difference, the Batistiano was dependent on the U.S. for official recognition and financial support to stop revolution; this was not the case in Mexico. The massive ownership of property and resources by the MNCs violated revolutionary constitutions, remaining a constant reminder of U.S. hegemony. By operating on an imperialist model, complete control ensured preference and dominance through the manipulation of dictators, ensuring their territories remained open to imperial capitalism.

Overlapping historically, Mexico, possessing huge supplies of petroleum versus Cuba’s limited natural resources, followed a similar path to revolution that focused on national liberation. These were revolutionary movements enhanced by Latin America’s collective history during which Cuba had remained under Spanish colonial rule until 1898 and Mexico had won its independence in 1821, a seventy-two year difference. Although both countries after independence suffered numerous invasions and “interferences” in their development as nations, both developed a revolutionary trajectory connecting colonialism and neocolonialism that led to nationalist left leaning movements in the twentieth century.

After years of struggle (1821-1913), Mexico developed its economic, political, and social independence through revolution. It took nearly sixty years of rebellion in Cuba (1898-1959) following a shorter road to independence and national liberation, as it was one of the last in the hemisphere to do so. National liberation was not possible for most of Latin America in the twentieth century, as the U.S.-supported MNCs applied extrajudicial interpretations of
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international law (‘world responsibilities’) and overrode national sovereignty as a result of
continued use of the Monroe Doctrine/Manifest Destiny ideology.\textsuperscript{262}

Below, Castro describes the challenges that Latin America faces in its efforts to undo the
‘vicious cycle’ of economic stagnation that reaps countless profits for foreign interests.

Well then, there cannot be any doubt about the sincerity of the proposed
revolutionary government to effectively satisfy, without lying or
mobilization towards industry, contributing to the industrialization of the
country that is the other pillar of the revolutionary program.
On the other hand the law is adjusted to the principles of the 1940
Constitution and we await that now – after great insistence in the precepts
of the Constitution – it is not forgotten that the Agrarian Reform Law, the
prescription of landowners, is a mandate from our 1940 Constitution….
A Revolution was necessary – a Revolution with its origins like this one, a
Revolution honorable like this one, a costly Revolution such as this one, a
bloody Revolution like this one – to defeat all the obstacles that opposed the
progress of our people and the application of the measures more necessary
to leave the vicious cycle and the economic bottleneck that our country has
fallen into. For Agrarian Reform to occur a Revolution like this one was
necessary. A constitutional measure that was not only consecrated in our
homeland, but also consecrated as an initial phase to promote development
in the countries of Latin America.\textsuperscript{263}

Revolutions, according to Wallerstein and Tilly, should not be viewed as destructive or
negative but rather as a signal that the country is improving its situation and creating
opportunities for its people by challenging internal and external structures that limit social
development. As such, revolutions are collective efforts of the entire society (as described by
Tilly) that awaken the masses and bring out the best in a society. Furthermore, Skocpol claims
that revolutions bureaucratize the state and centralize power through its nationalist and leftist
character to enhance not just individual rights but the collective success of the nation.

Revolutionary movements in the twentieth century (Mexico, Russia, China, Cuba, and
Nicaragua) faced continuous threats. Cárdenas, in the passage below describes the importance of
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defending revolution against internal and external threats, pointing out the most important aspects of the 1917 Mexican Constitution,

In our condition as citizens we defend the policies of auto-determination and no intervention, of respect for our inviolate territory, our sovereignty and independence. We reaffirm and defend the postulates of the Mexican Revolution sympathizing and in solidarity with the people fighting for their emancipation. Our attitude is to modestly contribute to strengthen institutions created by the sound protection of our Magna Carta [1917 Constitution] against those who have deviated, been traitors or who have never accepted the cultural, economic, and social reforms in Articles 3, 27, 128, 130, and other precepts promoted by our Constitution.²⁶⁴

Cárdenas and Castro understood that the defense of Mexican and Cuban sovereignty required knowledge (intellectual justice) that the precepts of their revolutions would never be understood by interests with no understanding of the “cultural, economic, and social reforms” that social revolution provided. In both cases nationalization was the catalyst that would work to institutionalize revolution.

V. 1938: National Liberation through Natural Resource Nationalization

Latin America is endowed with great natural resources; in its extensive territories it can produce all the raw materials for its needs; it has big oil reserves and other important mineral bodies, sources of waterpower and a population of two hundred million inhabitants. If we utilize these vast riches to the benefit of our own countries Latin America could transform poverty into prosperity. The capital goods necessary for development must be invested by Latin America itself. Only in this way will the economic emancipation of our nations be gained.²⁶⁵ Lázaro Cárdenas, 1961.

As a result of revolutionary struggle, the Mexican revolutionary government (until 1940) was a historical crucible leading to Mexican nationalization. More than a political or economic move, major actions through the Mexican Revolution ended with the Cárdenas Presidency (1934-1940). Cárdenas, as the last major revolutionary leader to serve as President of Mexico,
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had risen through the Mexican Revolution as part of the winning faction led by Obrégon. As revolutionary general, he served as governor of the state of Michoacán, and based upon his work with the key leaders of the Revolution, he was elected president of Mexico at the age of thirty-nine. His experience was the experience of Mexico, an ongoing struggle to survive during a dangerous age of revolution. Linda Hall describes Cárdenas as a Lazarus of Bethany figure, who rises from the dead to lead the resurrection of the goals of the Mexican Revolution through his 1938 Petroleum Nationalization:

General Lázaro Cárdenas, who had been reported killed but apparently had been a prisoner of the Delahuertistas, surfaced “safe and sound.” Fourteen years later Cárdenas, as president of Mexico, would nationalize the oil fields and bring to fruition all the oil companies’ worst fears about the Mexican government intentions.²⁶⁶

During their rise to international power, the petroleum MNCs secretly met in Scotland in 1928, a meeting that included representatives from the major companies (Anglo-Persian Oil Company (now BP); Gulf Oil, Standard Oil of California (SoCal), Texaco (now Chevron Texaco); Royal Dutch Shell; Standard Oil of New Jersey (Esso) and Standard Oil Company of New York (Socony) (now ExxonMobil) to create a worldwide monopoly for control of the developing oil industry, a reactionary industry that during the twentieth century age of revolutions used their influence through war as a weapon of control. Revolution was the counterbalance to imperial militarism, with nationalization as a peaceful diplomatic method of “successful defiance” for development. Oil nationalization became a form of national liberation, allowing Mexico and Cuba to ensure their national sovereignty and economic independence in the age of the expanding capitalist world-system. Both countries, through their relations with the

²⁶⁶ Hall, Linda B. Oil, Banks, & Politics, p. 171.
U.S., invented strategies for addressing major social inequalities through economic, political, and social development based on revolution.\textsuperscript{267}

It was no mere coincidence that the nationalization of petroleum in Mexico led to a major diplomatic crisis with the United States (as it did later in Cuba), diplomatic crises that helped mobilize both countries to move beyond the military imperialism threatening their countries and galvanizing support for revolution. In the twentieth century, revolution through antisystemic national liberation movements challenged the ahistorical models of resource control. Europe and the United States were accustomed to the control of resources with a five hundred year history of colonial conquests that ended with revolution in Latin America and the Caribbean. Revolution radicalized people under neo-colonial structures in the twentieth century that had rendered Mexico and Cuba subservient to the U.S. based on geography and natural resource control.\textsuperscript{268}

The neo-patrimonial dictatorships of Porfirio Díaz (Mexico), Antonio Machado, and Fulgencio Batista (Cuba) followed U.S. foreign policy, resulting in the corruption and graft that led to revolution. As nations liberated themselves from neo-colonialism, petroleum nationalization provided the basis for transnational syndicalism in opposition to fascist and imperialist twentieth century wars.\textsuperscript{269} The combination of dictatorships, revolutions, and world wars created the catalyst of unintended consequences leading to social revolution and natural resources nationalizations.

The liberation of Mexico through Revolution established national sovereignty as an important route to economic independence. The 1938 Mexican Petroleum Nationalization decree describes the refusal of the MNCs to accept the decision by the Mexican Supreme Court in support of workers’ rights. It was an important decision to implement Article 123 (labor rights)
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against pressure by the MNCs, causing Cárdenas to invoke Article 27 (land tenure). Cárdenas delivered the decree in a radio broadcast on the evening of Friday, March 18, 1938, detailing the legal and moral rational for nationalization in the interest of protecting the Mexican people.

The decree provides a basic plan for how nationalization would take place and what government ministries would be tasked with immediately enforcing nationalization and determining ten years as the period for compensation to the MNCs. The most important part of the decree describes how the MNCs could not provide any good reason for not implementing the Supreme Court’s decision other than a questionable loss of income. That, by comparison to the complete loss of properties, turned out to be a risky decision. The decision to nationalize was not just a spur of the moment reaction, it encapsulated years of struggle begun by the Revolution (1910), the 1917 Constitution, the 1918 Carranza Doctrine, the Bucarelli Accords (1923), and the 1936 Petroleum Expropriation Law, all of which led to the struggle for national sovereignty that in 1938 brought together Mexico, Cuba, and the United States.

VI. Natural Resource Revolutions Part II: The Cuban Revolution: From Platt to the Bay of Pigs

Revolution means to have a sense of history; it is changing everything that must be changed; it is full equality and freedom; it is being treated and treating others like human beings; it is achieving emancipation by ourselves and through our own efforts; it is challenging powerful dominant forces from within and without the social and national milieu; it is defending the values in which we believe at the cost of any sacrifice; it is modesty, selflessness, altruism, solidarity and heroism; it is fighting with courage, intelligence and realism; it is never lying or violating ethical principles; it is a profound conviction that there is no power in the world that can crush the power of truth and ideas. Revolution means unity; it is independence it is fighting for our dreams of justice for Cuba and for the world, which is the foundation of our patriotism, our socialism and our internationalism.

Fidel Castro, 2000. 270

---

The Cuban Revolution is an example of successful geopolitics in modern diplomatic warfare through nationalization as a form of diplomacy and development. In the twentieth century the Cuban Revolution and its leader Fidel Castro built upon the revolutionary experience of the past. In the quote above, Castro’s idealistic view of revolution coincides with that of Theda Skocpol, who explains that “the key to success in revolutionary state-building is the capacity of a morally confident leadership to create coercive organizations and mobilize popular support.”

By comparison to other revolutions (China, Mexico, and Russia), the Cuban Revolution has had a profound impact on the world for such a small nation with no great resources (petroleum). Cuba’s revolution signaled a different type of rebellion begun by Mexico. Based on their similar histories and relationship to the U.S., they influenced international relations and in the process defeated U.S. neo-patrimonial dictatorships.

Cuba confronted a superpower during the height of U.S. hegemony, described by Wallerstein as occurring in the early 1960s. The Cuban Revolution, like the Mexican Revolution before it, was an example of what the U.S. State Department has described as “successful defiance,” a phenomenon that, from Wallerstein’s perspective, signaled that:

hegemony only refers to situations in which the edge is so significant that allied powers are de facto client states and opposed major powers feel relatively frustrated and highly defensive vis-à-vis the hegemonic power. And yet while I want to restrict my definition to instances where the margin or power differential is really great, I do not mean to suggest that there is ever any moment when a hegemonic power is omnipotent and capable of doing anything it wants. Omnipotence does not exist within the interstate system.

By understanding the interstate system and the limits of hegemonic power, combined with the ability to use leftist nationalism through “morally confident leadership,” the Cuban Revolution
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built on previous antisystemic national liberation movements. As such, it is important to state once more that both Wallerstein and Skocpol agree on the importance of nationalism as an important factor for successful revolution. Moreover, nationalism, when used predominantly by left-leaning revolutions as antisystemic movements, has been a successful strategy to build cross-class coalitions to destroy the old state and begin anew.

The next section is divided into three parts addressing the 1) complete nationalization of Cuba’s natural resources and services, 2) Mexican and Cuban Nationalizations as methods for institutionalizing the Revolutions, and 3) the international solidarity that nationalization had on both countries.

**VII. 1960: Cuba’s Complete Nationalization**

The Cuban people, headed by incorruptible leaders, brought about the downfall not only of an anti-national government, but also of the foreign landholders, the telephone, electric, and oil companies, the big subsidized dailies, the mercenary armies and the native opponents. This explains why the impact of the Cuban Revolution had such repercussions in each and every one of the countries in which the same instruments function were broken in the largest of the Antilles. It shows in the same way why it is that a strictly internal affair like the Cuban Revolution became converted into an international problem. To any person of good faith and independent judgment, it is clear that the responsibility for the internationalization imposed on a matter that was strictly national in its origins, falls completely and beyond appeal of the big monopolistic cartels. Lázaro Cárdenas, 1961.  

In the quote above Cárdenas speaks of the internationalization of the Cuban Revolution by U.S. pressures as a core country. Unfortunately the U.S. had few options, and, as described by Skocpol and Wallerstein, Cuba and Mexico were forced to engage in international warfare in the interstate system in solidarity with other antisystemic movements. Furthermore, Cárdenas’ “moral leadership” as a leader of the Mexican Revolution was a great threat to the rest of the
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hemisphere. Openly supporting the Cuban Revolution, Cárdenas provides a message to the rest of the world: revolution is an act of transnational solidarity.

Thus, Mexico and Cuba are examples of nationalization efforts with successful outcomes as a result of their international solidarity. Building upon Mexico’s limited nationalization efforts, Cuba expropriated all foreign-owned businesses and later commerce on the island. The short learning curve of revolution in the twentieth century from Mexico to China, Russia to Cuba, is described by Skocpol,

Specifically, the Communist revolutions could be interpreted as attempts also to insulate national economies from a world economy that was becoming so mature as to begin to cut off all opportunities for indigenous entrepreneurial capitalist development, and to “require” instead that politics be put “in command” if the substance of national sovereignty were to be retained.²⁷⁵

In just such a predicament while threatened with invasion, Castro in his famous speech of August 6, 1960, described the “leap” forward in declaring the nationalization of numerous foreign-owned enterprises. Raúl Castro (Cuban revolutionary and brother of Fidel) briefly takes over the speech when Castro is overcome by emotion, addressing the Latin American Youth Conference in Cuba as the nationalization effort was underway. Reminiscent of the 1938 Petroleum Nationalization, Castro nationalizes major MNCs as result of the United States ending Cuba’s sugar quota in 1960. Castro, as Cárdenas did before him on several occasions, calls for defense of the revolution against economic and political aggression that impedes the development of Cuba’s people and her sovereignty:

Raúl Castro - And for that, we swear, our Cuban brethren, prepare for the largest gathering that our country has ever seen (applause)."Republic of Cuba, Executive Resolution." (Inasmuch as you can see that everything is explained).
"WHEREAS: The Law No. 851 of July 6, 1960, published in the Official Gazette of the Republic, July 7, authorized by resolve so that through resolutions, have together when they see

²⁷⁵ Skocpol, Social Revolutions in the Modern World, 47.
fit to defend the national interest, nationalization, by way of compulsory acquisition of property
or businesses owned by individuals or corporations, nationals of the United States "(applause and exclamations:" Cuba yes, Yankees no! and "Fidel, Fidel!")", "Fidel, sure, the Yankees, give it to
them hard!" "What is that, the Americans cannot with him). Bad news for Yankee imperialism (shouts), because he might lose his voice, but Fidel’s voice is
returning. Let's do a small little effort, we and him, Fidel talking softly, and you being silent for
five minutes only, while we will sing the national anthem, led by Juan Almeida (They intone the
notes of the National Anthem. Subsequently Fidel Castro is able to continue speaking). (Raúl
Castro stops speaking for Fidel)

**Fidel Castro** - "Whereas: On the grounds of the said Act, was considered the attitude of the
Government and the Legislature of the US of constant aggression, for political purposes, to the
fundamental interests of the Cuban economy, evidenced by the amendment agreed to by the
Congress of that country to the sugar Act, by which emergency powers granted to the President
of that nation to reduce the sugar market share of that country, Cuban sugar, as a weapon of
political action against Cuba.
"Whereas: The Executive Government of the United States of America, expressed using the
emergency powers, and the notorious attitude of economic and political aggression against our
country proceeded to reduce the market share of United States - Cuban sugars, with the
undeniable purpose of attacking Cuba, and its development and revolutionary process.
"Whereas: This is a reiteration of the continued conduct of the Government of the United States,
aimed at preventing the exercise by our people of their sovereignty and comprehensive
development, and thus go to the despicable interests of American monopolies, that have hindered
the growth of our economy, and the assertion of our political freedom.
"Whereas: Given these facts, they solve, aware of their high historical responsibilities, and in
legitimate defense of the national economy, are obliged to provide the necessary measures to
counter the damage caused by the attacks that have been waged against our nation.
"Whereas: In accordance with our constitution and laws, in the exercise of our sovereignty, and
as a domestic legislative measure, understanding that it is appropriate for the consummation of
aggressive measures referred to by every previous exercise the powers conferred they resolve by
the Law No. 851, of July 6, 1960, that is, proceed to condemnation, to the State, of assets and
businesses owned by domestic corporations of the United States of America, as a justified
decision, by the need for the nation to recover damages caused to its economy, and strengthening
the state's economic independence...
"Whereas: Oil companies (boos) continuously defrauded the economy of the nation, charging
monopoly prices, which meant for many years the substantial outlay of foreign exchange, and the
desire to perpetuate their privileges defying the laws of the nation, and hatched criminal plans to
boycott our country, forcing the revolutionary government to intervene.
"Whereas: It is the duty of the people of Latin America to tend towards the recovery of their
national wealth, taking away the domination by monopolies of foreign interests that impede our
progress, promote political interference and undermine the sovereignty of the underdeveloped
peoples of America.
"Whereas: The Cuban Revolution will not stop until the full and final liberation of the
motherland.
"Whereas: Cuba must be a bright and inspiring example for our brethren nations of the Americas
and all peoples of the underdeveloped world, in their struggle to escape the brutal claws of
imperialism....
As you know, according to the Act of July 6, 1960, in defense of the national economy and sovereignty of the country, such property shall be compensated.\textsuperscript{276}

In the above statement Castro asserts several times that Law No. 851, of July 6, 1960, a revolutionary decision by fiat (legally binding command) that was preceded and legitimized nationalization through the 1938 Minerals and Combustibles Law that required petroleum refineries to process oil owned by the Cuban state.\textsuperscript{277} Importantly, Castro’s speech was made before the Latin American Youth Congress, reminiscent of Simón Bolívar’s 1824 Pan-American Congress uniting Latin America. It also echoes Carranza’s Doctrine (1918) for the economic and political sovereignty of Latin America. Linda Hall provides a concise description of the Carranza Doctrine,

\begin{quote}
Developed in direct reaction to United States pressures, the doctrine included five major points that are pertinent to this discussion: (1) foreigners would not be permitted to operate within Latin American countries under better conditions than natives; (2) judicial equality would be maintained among all nations; (3) the Monroe Doctrine constituted Interference in the international affairs of Latin American countries; (4) a relationship of solidarity among Latin American nations would be set up on the basis of non-intervention; and (5) control over national resources and industrialization was essential to each nation in maintaining independence.\textsuperscript{278}
\end{quote}

Set forth early in the Mexican Revolution, the Doctrine realigned relations between Mexico and the U.S., allowing for future legislation supporting nationalization. It also served later as support for other Latin American countries pursuing national ends.

In \textit{Cuba: A History} Hugh Thomas states the seriousness of the threat: “Cuba must be prepared for months, even years, of hardship because of the policies undertaken by the United
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States, Cuba would not starve, but even necessities would be lacking.” More radical than the Mexican Revolution in its organization and program, the Cuban Revolution faced serious challenges as it nationalized the petroleum refineries eighteen months after seizing power, in comparison to Mexico’s twenty-eight years after the end of the Revolution. Seen as a serious threat to U.S. hegemony, Cuba was invaded after it nationalized during the infamous 1961 Bay of Pigs (Playa Gíron) operation and later threatened by the 1962 Cuban Missile Crisis. Under serious Cold War conditions, Cuba’s revolution was far-reaching and transformed the island, removing all foreign control of the economy. Consistent with the theories of world systems by Wallerstein and social revolutions by Skocpol, this was necessary to ensure the survival and success of the revolution. Moreover, the Caribbean had experienced what could happen to countries that had defied imperialists when the powerful British, French, and Spanish empires invaded the Haitian Revolution as it won independence.

With a historical awareness of the problems associated with half measures, including the problems associated with the Batista dictatorship, the lessons from Mexico’s Huerta Coup (1913), and the Maximato period (1928-1934), the Cuban Revolution set about immediately implementing social programs to mobilize the Cuban populace. Wallerstein argues that revolution creates opportunities for greater participation in social change, occurring during the 1960s through economic and social development. The success of Cuba and its struggle play an important role in numerous later revolutions and antisystemic movements.

The lessons of Martí, Bolívar, and Cárdenas served as a uniting force in the 1950s against U.S. backed coups against, Iran (1953) and Guatemala (1954), as the Central Intelligence Agency (CIA) instituted U.S. hegemony. Moreover, in a crushing blow, Cuba’s victory over the
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CIA-sponsored 1961 Bay of Pigs Invasion and the Dominican Republic (1965) were warnings of future invasions in Grenada (1984), Panama (1989), Afghanistan (2001), and Iraq (2003).

Based on the history of revolutionary solidarity that began with the Mexican and Cuban Revolutions, the Russian Revolution, as part of twentieth century antisystemic movements, became an ally to the Cuban Revolution, replacing Mexico (who would not defy the U.S.). The Soviet Union thus entered an agreement with Cuba, exchanging sugar for Russian oil. As a result of the refusal by the Shell and Texaco, petroleum refineries were nationalized by Cuba in order to process Russian oil.

As the MNCs challenged Mexican sovereignty in the 1930s, the development of the MIC began to “ignore, isolate, and overpower,” revolutionary movements.\(^{280}\) Cuba’s nationalization was a form of national liberation, as it revolutionized during “the most dangerous time” in world history, the 1961 Missile Crisis.\(^{281}\) Russia’s support for Cuban sovereignty was a collective effort to ensure the survival of its own revolution and in comparison to the Mexican Revolution was a radical move.

In the face of major threats, the Cuban Revolution maintained a greater commitment to national sovereignty and economic independence for the people of Cuba. This was possible because early in the revolutionary process, the 26\(^{th}\) of July Movement (Castro’s social movement) laid out its plan of action to seize power and implement revolution. The U.S.-backed Batista Dictatorship saw Castro’s group as a bunch of young radicals easy to defeat, but by the time they moved to stop the revolution Castro was already in Havana (1959). As described

\(^{280}\) Williams, *Empire as a Way of Life*, 118.
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previously by Wallerstein, as a core country, the United States during the Mexican Revolution was powerless to stop the social revolution also occurring Cuba.\textsuperscript{282}

Nationalization in Cuba went further than just confiscating properties; it served as a mobilizing force to prove the revolution was a reality. For the Cuban Revolution there was little room for error, the world was watching the second major revolution in Latin America during the twentieth century as it threatened U.S. hegemony in the region. Cárdenas described in his 1961 speech that Cuba learned well the lessons of the Mexican Revolution.

The petroleum nationalization in Cuba and Mexico became a reminder of Martí’s call for nationalism and independence in Latin America.\textsuperscript{283} The long historical process of revolution in Latin America had its origins in a critical approach originating with the development of the Marxist theory that, “revolution is the driving force of history.” I argue that Cárdenas and Castro engaged in Karl Marx’s maxim that “revolutions are the locomotives of history,” as they engaged in revolutionary struggle.\textsuperscript{284} Marx championed revolution and wrote of the historical lineage of revolutionary movements and their impact on one another similar to Mexico influencing Cuba, as both countries understood the serious implications of engaging in open defiance of the U.S.

In the following passage Castro details how revolutions are not idyllic; they must confront misery and problems through awareness of counterrevolution as a constant threat,

The problems of the revolutionary government are simply social order, economic order, educational order, cultural order; send out doctors to the countryside so families do not die for a lack of assistance; taking the roads, taking hospitals, taking the schools; right injustices, industrial development,
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place lands into cultivation; is simple, creating a new world for our nation, where we reign in the world. Our responsibility is that order...Because simply we have not received a tranquil lake, the country was not all wonderful, but the country was a world of privations and poverty.²⁸⁵

Social order to Castro is for the advancement populations historically underprivileged, giving them the ability to express their needs. The social function of land and the social order are part of social justice revolutions that brought about major social transformations in twentieth century Latin America.

VIII. Revolutionary Continuities: From the Mexican Revolution to Cuban Revolution

I do not exaggerate nor do I need to find reasons regarding the constant sympathy from the Cuban people, when we remember Mexico nationalized petroleum in an epoch in which such a measure was inconceivable, who maintained for the longest time the most direct conduct with the legitimate government of Spain, three years before fascism incited World War II, Mexico who gave asylum to thousands of Spanish refugees to all the democrats pursued in Latin America.²⁸⁶ Fidel Castro, 1998.

Castro describes how Mexico has been a place of refuge for numerous radicals and revolutionaries from all over the world,²⁸⁷ beginning with the expulsion of the Jews and Moors to the outer reaches of the Spanish Empire to the conquest of the Americas being challenged by indigenous rebellion. Revolutionary independence has involved groups of people from mixed-heritages who arrived in Mexico seeking liberation from an expanding colonial and neocolonial world. As part of a worldwide antisystemic movement, the Mexican Revolution occurred during the transition of natural resource use to petroleum as a prized source of energy. A scholar of revolutions, Eric Wolfe claims that “the trajectories of the ‘people without history’ and the various continents of the globe dovetail

²⁸⁷ Cárdenas, Cuauhtémoc. Sobre mis pasos (Santillana Mexico, 2012), 544 and 548.
and converge within the larger matrix created by European expansion and the capitalist mode of production” that saw petroleum as a new resource for creating hegemony.\textsuperscript{288}

In the twentieth century independent Latin American and Caribbean nations have been invaded and attacked on various fronts militarily, politically, and economically. A history of U.S. interventions can be understood through Franz Fanon’s description that, “The arrival of the colonist signified syncretically the death of indigenous society, cultural lethargy, and petrification of the individual.”\textsuperscript{289} Revolution was a way to energize countries for their greater good and establish a national identity through collective sovereignty. Cuba, one of the last Spanish colonies, was punished by Western imperialism for its efforts at independence through U.S. intervention in 1898, leading to the imposition of the 1901 Platt Amendment on its first constitution.

The Mexican Revolution as a national liberation movement saw the rise of Lázaro Cárdenas who, based on his experience, engaged in a larger revolutionary struggle against illiteracy, poverty, and underdevelopment\textsuperscript{290} as rebellion became a continuous effort at improving the conditions of the less fortunate peoples of the world through mutual solidarity. Wallerstein describes an “international syndicalism,” between antisystemic movements challenging growing U.S. hegemony.\textsuperscript{291} A more organized modern form of rebellion developed internationally that was reminiscent of earlier nineteenth century independence movements in the region.

The 1824 Bolivarian/Pan-American quest for collective Latin American Independence, combined with the internationalist ideology of mutual solidarity influenced by Marxism, served as the basis for future revolutionary movements in China, Russia, Cuba, and Mexico to name a few. The national liberation struggle in the Americas unified for a brief moment in South
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America, as Simón Bolívar and José de San Martín joined forces in 1828 to defeat the Spanish military. Bolívar called for a united Latin America that was eventually riven by divisions between the newly independent countries. More than a hundred years later the age of revolutionary national liberation in the twentieth century evolved into a struggle for control of natural resources as divisions of class, gender, and ethnic rivalries stymied the greater liberation of diverse groups of people who had fought for Latin American independence in the nineteenth century.²⁹²

In the twentieth century, Latin American solidarity began with revolution for national liberation exemplified by the relations between Cuba and Mexico. As recently as 2002, Castro recalls the difficult days when only Mexico stood in solidarity with Cuba in 1959:

> That is why we went to Mexico and why we left from Tuxpan on the Granma and how we disembarked in Cuba precisely on December 2nd [1956] almost forty-two years ago. No date more inappropriate for planting the poison of our supposed offenses that consists more than not of a negation of our history and ingratitude towards Mexico and its people. It is unimportant to speak about or remember for the thousandth time that Mexico was not the only country in Latin America that did not break off diplomatic relations with Cuba nor did it join the economic blockade against Cuba.²⁹³

Frantz Fanon provides an excellent description of the greater international influence of strong relations between Mexico and Cuba:

> The United States with its anti-Castro policy has inaugurated in the Western Hemisphere, a new chapter in the history of man’s laborious fight for freedom. Latin America composed of independent countries sitting at the United Nations with their own national currency should be a lesson for Africa since their liberation these former colonies live in terror and destitution under Western capitalism’s stranglehold.

> The liberation of Africa and the development of man’s consciousness have
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enabled the people of Latin America to break the spiral of dictatorship where one regime looked very much like the next. Castro takes power in Cuba and hands it to the people. The Yankees feel this heresy to be a national scourge and the United States organizes counter-revolutionary brigades, fabricates a provisional government, burns the sugar harvest and finally decides to place an implacable stranglehold on the Cuban people.294

In 1898, colonial Cuba became neo-colonial; however, with internal divisions between ethnic and class groups, U.S. hegemony divided the Cuban nation. As a result of that experience, Mexico’s social revolution developed against U.S. interventionist policies in Cuba and Latin America. By comparison, the Chinese and Russian Revolutions ended monarchicalies that stood in the way of capitalist development. Cuba and Mexico, as semiperipheral nations, were not allowed to develop and were forced to serve U.S. interests.295

Furthermore, the Mexican Revolution was a non-socialist nationalist struggle against a neo-patrimonial dictatorship, signaling a new type of revolution challenging imperial capitalism. In comparison to Mexico, Cuba’s Revolution, was the first socialist rebellion in Latin America. Both Revolutions began anew as did the French, Russian, and Chinese in creating states. Franz Fanon describes the need for the destruction of the old colonial model that signals the beginning of a new method of resource extraction and natural resource conservation through revolution,

The country finds itself under new management, but in actual fact everything has to be started over from scratch, everything has to be rethought. The colonial system, in fact was only interested in certain riches, certain natural resources, to be exact those that fueled its industries.296

The 1938 Mexican Petroleum Nationalization signals the end of colonial extraction of petroleum resources that, through neocolonialism, was symbolized by the neo-patrimonial Diaz dictatorship, a system of rule that in Mexico and Cuba saw the rise of the MNCs and their influence on Latin
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America. A world-system that in the words of Lenin had reached the stage of “imperialism, the highest form of capitalism,” in the world, as expansionism that took over where imperial colonialism had begun.297

In the process, Mexico developed a diplomatic corps that learned to use geopolitics as the world became dominated by fascism in the 1930s.298 As Nazism and Stalinism influenced the future merger of the state and the MNCs into the MIC in the U.S., fascism and totalitarianism in Europe became the extremes of colonialism and imperialism.299 Both extremes provided the world with reactionary examples in contrast to the revolutionary national liberation seen in Mexico, Russia, China, and Cuba.300 Both reactionary regimes, Nazi-Germany and Stalinist-Russia, met on the battlefield of World War II, beginning with the German invasion of the Soviet Union in 1941 in a fight over land and ideology.301

As a result of the massive carnage, World War II left an indelible mark on Latin America as the allies and the axis powers fought for control of the world’s natural resources. As European and Russian cities and industries were devastated, the United States became a superpower. Countering the success of the Soviet Union over fascism, the U.S. convinced its public that it had almost singlehandedly defeated the Axis powers. After the war, anti-communism became an important foreign policy effort in Latin America to counter the success of the left as a result of the Great Depression and World War II.302

With the defeat of Nazi-Germany and Imperial Japan (fascism), the U.S. and the Soviet
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Union represented competing ideologies. To some in Latin America, as a result of the Russian Revolution, the Soviet Union represented national liberation while the U.S. represented neocolonialism. For Mexico the conditions remained the same as the Cárdenas administration had led an international solidarity movement prior to the war. Influenced by Mexico, the 1930s saw Cuba engage in a revolutionary process that provided support and refuge for fledgling liberation movements. In the following quote Castro describes the outcome of the solidarity that developed as a result of Cárdenas leadership in Latin America:

I omit other undocumented examples of solidarity with our country. I present only three, when on the April 17, 1961 mercenary forces under the order of the United States invaded Giron [The Bay of Pigs Invasion], a glorious man who was then, is today, and always will be a symbol of a living legend who offered to fight with us: Lázaro Cárdenas. Mexico, along with Venezuela, and Cuba founded the Latin American Economic System [SELA], the first Latin American organization which we were able to be a part of, when Cuba was then excluded like Cinderella from every continental institution; Mexico made possible the presence of our country at the Ibero-American Conference in Guadalajara, that today has been converted completely, into an economically integrated force of our countries with relation to Europe.

Castro sums up the greater importance of Mexico’s nationalization process in strengthening economic relations in the region because of its powerful petroleum industry, one that saw the rise of neo-liberalism in the 1980s and the massive selling off of state resources across Latin America as a result of the “Washington Consensus.” The “Washington Consensus” is an economic plan developed for the purpose of promoting a “free market” that recommends the privatization of state-owned industries and the opening up of local markets to foreign investments. Privatization of state-owned natural resources becomes an important tenant of the “Consensus:”
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The economic relations and collaboration between Cuba and Mexico are developing and the proposition for many developing countries of which the greatest are economic relations and collaborations. We cannot leave without taking notice that the Mexican economy with a powerful petroleum industry and with other industrial roots, the nations lands, that is to say the nationalized industries have a fundamental importance. The collaboration between our countries is supported and since then with confidence, and that confidence is based on realities, forged during long periods of time, with other countries of our region we can with satisfaction develop our economic relations and collaboration as Mexico has.306

The Mexican Revolution continues to be an important moment in the history of the hemisphere, representing the poor and impoverished people in their struggle for national liberation.307 Monuments to the Mexican Revolution, the 1917 Constitution, and the 1938 Petroleum Nationalization remain important, as many Latin American countries now counter U.S. hegemony. Eighty years after the end of the Mexican Revolution and more than seventy years since the 1938 Petroleum Nationalization, social revolution continues to influence U.S.-Latin American relations. So far the MNCs have failed to destroy the overall goals of the Mexican and Cuban Revolutions that were challenged by U.S. hegemony. The origins of the Cuban Revolution in the 1930s led by Fulgencio Batista coincided with the Cárdenas period in Mexico, as Cuba ended its first neo-patrimonial dictatorship (Machado) in 1933. In the tradition of Mexico’s Díaz dictatorship, the end of Cuba’s Machado signaled the end of the Platt Amendment as Carranza in 1918 announced the end of U.S. influence in Latin America as a result of Cuba’s experience with the Platt Amendment.

VIII. Mexican and Cuban Nationalization as a method for authority/sovereignty

The phenomenon of imperialism is present and daily negatively influences life in Latin America. It worsens the social and national problems by

applying an extractive politics without limits to our natural resources without paying for our raw materials and charging us high prices for manufactured products with growing financial, industrial, and commercial penetration at the base of the most productive part of our economy and in various countries engaging in agricultural and ranching exploitation. The nearly absolute imperialist hegemony regarding communication and transportation services – including the press, radio and television conform to the conditions appropriate to the exploitation exerted on the Americas through the large mediums attracting and influencing areas such as education, culture, and art, encompassing the capacity of its penetration. Fidel Castro, 1964.  

In the above passage, Castro speaks about the dominance in nearly every aspect of Latin American society by imperial hegemony, especially in crucial sectors of “communication and transportation services.” Mexico and Cuba prior to revolution were controlled by the MNCs. Today, the world is dominated more than at any time in its history as neoliberalism has pushed privatization of formerly state-owned enterprises across Latin America in the 1980s. Mexico, over seventy-five years since the 1938 Petroleum Nationalization, now serves as one of the contradictory examples successfully challenging the MNCs prior to World War II, only recently succumbing to pressures to privatize petroleum in 2013. Cuba, by comparison and under greater threat, nationalized nearly all of its resources and services, remaining outside the crises that plague “capitalist countries,” the plague of being tied to the ubiquitous market and the instability it has shown with regards to the growing use of state revenues to invest in a variety of questionable investments.

As the MNCs pushes to control Mexico through the North American Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA, 1994) and the Mérida Initiative (military agreement, 2008), the inheritors of the Mexican Revolution confront the continued historical legacy of U.S. imperialism. Most notably, Mexico’s natural resources were under state control until recently (2013) when its
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government privatized its state-owned oil company (PEMEX) using questionable measures.\textsuperscript{309} In spite of the history of U.S. intervention and the impact that privatization has had on other Latin American countries, Mexico has been pressured by a sophisticated coordination between economic and political challenges. As the past forty years have proven, U.S. neoliberal policies of privatization, fiscal austerity, deregulation, and free trade are questionable and part of the reason why Mexico nationalized petroleum in the first place.

The Mexican case both supports and detracts from the debate for economic sovereignty, as it did not completely nationalize all of its resources and services. I argue that by not completely nationalizing as Cuba did, Mexico developed a stronger attachment to U.S. hegemony. Furthermore, the MNCs were the greatest threat to post-revolutionary Mexico, challenging the Revolution itself.\textsuperscript{310} The question to ask is, if it were not for Cárdenas commitment to the revolution by institutionalizing agrarian and labor reform where might Mexico be now?\textsuperscript{311}

Fundamentally, Cárdenas did not want to seize petroleum assets, Castro and his leadership team did not want to nationalize either, and both had no option in the matter, but when the MNCs ignored the ruling of the Mexican Supreme Court, Mexico’s national sovereignty was at stake. Below, Castro provides an understanding as to the importance of the Mexican Revolution and the “political consequences” of the 1938 Mexican Petroleum Nationalization:

Mexico had its revolution, a national liberation revolution, Mexico nationalized the North American oil wells and Mexico has maintained a policy of defending its national interests. Mexico is a country with a international political tradition and it should be stated with complete justice that has had political consequences.\textsuperscript{312}

\textsuperscript{309} Arnaldo Córdova, "La derecha y el petróleo," \textit{La Jornada Semanal}, 8 de abril de 2013, http://www.jornada.unam.mx/2013/08/04/opinion/008a1pol.
\textsuperscript{310} Castro, \textit{Latinoamericanismo vs. Imperialismo}, 101.
\textsuperscript{311} Meyer, \textit{Mexico y los estados unidos en el conflicto petrolero, 1917-1942}, 303.
\textsuperscript{312} Castro, \textit{Latinoamericanismo vs. Imperialismo}, 101.
Cárdenas faced two great challenges during his presidency; the first was challenging an entrenched revolutionary power structure (Maximato), and the second was a threat to his mandate involving Mexican sovereignty in the form of outright challenge to Mexican constitutional law. Furthermore, with a tradition of bribes and intimidation, the MNCs did not understand the importance of revolution. As Cárdenas and Castro lived history, both were present at many of the most important revolutionary and post-revolutionary events of their nations.

Reminiscent of the legacy of the Mexican-American War (1846-1848) and the difficult relations with the U.S., it did not take much to engage the entire country to mobilize against the MNCs. Petroleum Nationalization and agrarian reform becoming important affirmations of Mexican and Cuban national sovereignty. Here, Castro reflects on the importance of Cárdenas with respect to defense of Mexico as defense of Latin American sovereignty,

And Lázaro Cárdenas is a man with extraordinary prestige in his country and the Americas; Lázaro Cárdenas is leader of the campesinos and workers of the humble men and women of Mexico; moreover, Lázaro Cárdenas is a leader of the Mexican soldiers; Lázaro Cárdenas is a man with an incalculable prestige in our brother country Mexico that not only has prestige in his governments’ accomplishments, but the prestige of his personal disinterest and his respect for the institutions of his country.  

The development of a revolutionary ideology over the first six years of the Mexican Revolution through various plans (San Luis, Tlaltizapán, Ayala, Santa Rosa, Guadalupe, San Diego, Agua Pietra, and others) and the Carranza Doctrine all combined to arrive at the 1938 Petroleum Nationalization. The basic requests by the Zapatistas (land reform) became the most important issue of the revolution. Only through struggle were the hard fought for institutions
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able to lead Mexico to gain control of its national sovereignty. It took over twenty-one years of struggle to solidify Mexico’s national sovereignty (1917 – 1938), and it took another twenty-one years afterwards for Cuba to both win its revolutions and nationalize petroleum refining (1933-1959).

In the face of major military threats by the U.S. during the height of its military power during the Cold War, the Cuban Revolution erupts ninety miles from the Florida Coast. In a near repeat of history, Fidel Castro on numerous occasions harkened to the lessons of the Mexican Revolution, specifically General Cárdenas and his momentous nationalizations. Mexico first nationalized its railroads, then petroleum, and then disbursed lands to peasants while implementing socialist education reform. At the time, Mexico operated in a geopolitical world on the verge of world war.

Cuba by comparison had few natural resources and developed in the Cold War (anti-communism) period where guerrilla warfare was fought in the jungles and in the halls of the United Nations as Mexico engaged in a revolutionary struggle that included inventive methods of international diplomacy. For Cuba the learning curve was steep and very dangerous. As a result, Cuba nationalized nearly of its resources and services as it learned from the Mexican case, with geopolitical warfare pushing it to seize power and nationalize swiftly (within eighteen months of seizing power).

X. Conclusion

In this chapter I examined the first revolution of the twentieth century, Mexico, considered by Wallerstein as a non-socialist revolution leading to social revolution. Mexico and Cuba engage in natural resource revolutions as they challenged the rise of U.S. hegemony on the geopolitical stage, the basis of which were the simple demands of land and labor reform. As the Revolutions

originally begun as a fight between urban and rural elites after years of being subservient to the U.S. and dealing with invasions and interventions, the Mexican Revolution led to the 1918 Carranza Doctrine, establishing Mexican leadership in the Americas. As the Doctrine called for national sovereignty and the right for people to determine their destiny, a coalition of campesinos, workers, and elites in both countries destroyed the old state in the process, destroying the old laws and establishing land and labor rights through the 1917 Mexican and 1940 Cuba Constitutions. A threat to the MNCs dominance that had developed through agreements with the Díaz Dictatorship, U.S. interests pressured revolutionary governments to keep the special relations they enjoyed, delaying the institutionalization of revolution. The 1930s saw differences in the efforts of Mexico and Cuba, as a return to dictatorship led to the rise of populist governments and the consolidation of the Mexican state into a nationalist challenge to the corruption and graft that Cuba fought by toppling dictatorship, only to see it return. In 1930s Mexico, the Revolution culminated in laws to strengthen the 1917 Constitution establishing the ability for Cárdenas to nationalize in 1938. Nationalization of the majority petroleum properties was the greatest triumph of the Revolution and the end of a thirty-year period of strife. Cuba would have to wait another twenty one years before the Revolution would learn from the Mexican experience and nationalize not just petroleum refineries but all resources, businesses, and services as it became a socialist revolution dealing with different world and different property arrangements as the twentieth century saw greater neocolonial control of petroleum resources from the MNCs to the MIC.
Chapter 5: Charismatic Revolutionary Leadership and Party Formation: The political mobilizations of Lázaro Cárdenas and Fidel Castro

General Lázaro Cárdenas, a true moral beacon for his people, took an interest in our case (26th of July Movement), and that helped to shorten our prison time [in Mexico] and limited the worst consequences of the incident, although the measures of control and surveillance remained rigorous until our clandestine departure from Mexico. Nevertheless, the unexpected meeting with that leader marked the beginning of a friendship that lasted until the end of his life. As the years passed, he went on to occupy positions of great responsibility in his country. If it were not for him, there might not have been any reason for telling this story today.\textsuperscript{316} Fidel Castro, 2003.

Cárdenas and Castro embody Weber’s concept of charismatic authority and as described by Nelson Valdés in “The Revolutionary and Political Content of Fidel Castro’s Charismatic Authority” from the book Reinventing the Revolution: A Contemporary Cuba Reader.\textsuperscript{317} Weber describes how a leader is able to earn authority by what he describes as “genuine charisma,” through actions of “personal heroism or personal revelation,” creating the conditions for charismatic leadership.\textsuperscript{318} Charisma is defined by Max Weber as “resting on devotion to the specific and exceptional sanctity, heroism or exemplary character of an individual person, and of the normative patterns or order revealed or ordained by him (charismatic authority).”\textsuperscript{319} Building on Weber, Valdés defines charisma as being granted by the communities that charismatic leader is from, and he challenges individualistic theories that charisma is specific to the person. Therefore, how were Cárdenas and Castro able to harness and transform their countries from neopatrimonial dictatorships to mobilized socialist and nationalist movements using charismatic authority? How were the Revolutions institutionalized through the nationalization of natural resources and the formation of political parties?

\textsuperscript{317} Valdés, “The Revolutionary and Political Content of Fidel Castro’s Charismatic Authority.”
In this chapter I explore how Cárdenas and Castro represent a charismatic revolutionary leadership trajectory in Latin America and the Caribbean driven by the societal histories they come from. Both men follow a trajectory of charismatic revolutionary leadership and party formation that began with the rise of Toussaint L’Ouverture and the Haitian Revolution (1791-1804) for national liberation. Their leadership, much like that of L’Ouverture’s, was based on the duty of charismatic authority earned through the process of revolutionary struggle while leading countries during major world events and social revolutions. The rise to power of Cárdenas and Castro developed while encountering the U.S., the most powerful country in the Western hemisphere, an adversary that unintentionally enhanced their nationalist leadership approach through efforts to undermine revolution. I argue using the parallel comparative analysis approach in this chapter that both men earned charismatic revolutionary leadership through their combat experience, victory over national and international challenges, leadership of their nations, and through the nationalization of petroleum institutionalizing their revolutions.

This chapter is organized into three sections. First, I describe Weber’s concept of charisma through Valdés’ critique of individually focused interpretations of charismatic leadership by explaining the importance of the revolutionary experience in the development of charisma; second, I combine the theoretical approaches of Wallerstein (World Systems) and Skocpol (Comparative Historical Approach) to explain the importance of natural resources to social revolutions and their use by Cárdenas and Castro to establish national sovereignty and charismatic authority to galvanize their countries behind them; and third, I address the combination of events and factors that were transformed by Cárdenas and Castro using nationalization of petroleum to engage in what Skocpol describes as international warfare to
institutionalize revolution and develop mass political participation through political party formation.

I. Meteoric Rise to Power: Charismatic Revolutionary Leadership in Mexico and Cuba

Using Wallerstein’s concept of antisystemic movements, I argue that the Haitian Revolution is roughly the beginning of a history of social movements based on slave rebellion and independence that directly assisted South American independence. In addition to charismatic authority, Max Weber describes two other forms of authority, traditional and rational-legal, which are also important when assessing the charismatic revolutionary leadership of Cárdenas and Castro. Traditional authority, according to Weber, is the result of a long-established cultural pattern (seen in the indigenous peoples of Latin America and the Caribbean) that I argue is the root of the revolutionary trajectory of the Cuban and Mexican Revolutions that began with the Haitian Revolution, one of the first rebellions led by a charismatic leader for national liberation in the region. National liberation through independence challenges the “traditional” authority of European crowns and their ideologically driven mandate of civilizing the world, what Wallerstein has named “world responsibilities,” connecting religion and law for the expansion of empire and conquest of lands.

After years of colonial rule and foreign use of ancestral lands, Latin America sought independence through national liberation, and the result was a backlash from colonial and later neocolonial countries challenging their efforts at independence. Ideologies in Europe and the U.S. affirmed their “legal” right to “civilize” the world for the purposes of expanding the world capitalist-system. Rebellion in the twentieth century and independence in the nineteenth century are dissimilar in that one wins sovereign independence and the other fights for national sovereignty and liberation. The institutionalization of independence or national liberation results
in revolution, requiring the need for rational-legal authority to enact laws that institutionalize revolutionary gains for national sovereignty.

Cárdenas and Castro were part of a charismatic revolutionary leadership trajectory in Latin America and the Caribbean that was driven by societal features of their home countries. Affiliation is critical here, and Nelson Valdés challenges previous interpretations of Max Weber’s theory of charismatic authority that focus on the individual leader rather than the masses that support a charismatic leader. In the quote below, Valdés provides an interpretation that can be applied both to the conditions both leaders encountered after seizing power and that sustained them against internal and external pressures:

Charismatic leadership becomes a possibility in times of institutional crisis and breakdown. The unique circumstance which leads to the disappearance of political authority based on a codified legal-rational system or on traditional institutions opens the opportunity for the emergence of charismatic authority. When the old order cannot be preserved because its institutions do not function or do not exist while social and political forces external to the system increase their pressure, the charismatic moment appears. Such was the case on December 31, 1958, the eve of the [Cuban] revolutionary triumph.320

While the United States engaged in trying to preserve the world capitalist order, Cárdenas and Castro seized the moment to implement social revolution. In the case of Cárdenas, the charismatic moment appeared when he was confronted with challenges to Mexican sovereignty by the multinational corporations (MNCs) that refused to respect a ruling by the Mexican Supreme Court. That moment occurred on the night of March 17, 1938, when, on the “eve of the revolutionary triumph,” Cárdenas nationalized the petroleum industry - an action that became the pinnacle of the Mexican Revolution following 28 years of struggle for national sovereignty. It was a struggle that began with the 1917 Mexican Constitution, implemented only after Cárdenas seized power from Calles (1935), which subsequently reestablished a revolutionary government.

The charismatic moment for Castro and Cuba occurred on December 31, 1958 after seizing power, and then again on August 6, 1960 when Castro announced the nationalization of foreign owned assets twenty years after the 1938 Minerals and Combustibles Law and the 1940 Cuban Constitution gave legal precedent for such an act.321

The revolutionary triumph of December 31, 1958 was the culmination of 60 years of struggle. In his speech, The First Declaration of Havana (Sept. 2, 1960), Castro recalls Cuba’s efforts at independence that were stifled by the United States in 1898. He describes how the U.S. military did not allow Calixtro García (Independence General) to take power in Santiago de Cuba after defeating the Spanish in 1898.322 By contrast, on January 1, 1959, Castro, without the interference of the United States, defeated Batista and entered Havana triumphantly.323 The long road to both charismatic moments was caused by pressure from U.S. interventions, which had mobilized the people of both Mexico and Cuba to support establishing national sovereignty.

Through participation in revolutionary struggle and becoming heads of state, Cárdenas and Castro were able to prove their ability to lead through decisive action. As Valdés describes, by engaging the populace through active participation for increased social welfare. Their commitment to environmental and social justice reached beyond national boundaries and embraced a revolutionary trajectory that led them to develop a lasting alliance embodied by the relations between Cuba and Mexico. Their collective angst against the history of U.S. interventions challenging struggles for national liberation was witnessed by the protests and mobilizations in support of the 1938 Mexican Petroleum Nationalization and the 1960 Cuban petroleum refineries nationalization in both countries.

323 Castro, Latinoamericanismo vs. Imperialismo.
The authority of both leaders was enhanced by their charismatic revolutionary leadership that they developed as a result of an irrational response by the popular masses who endured years of social hardships.\textsuperscript{324} A collective righteous indignation, what Tilly describes as collective anger, develops in response to the corruption and foreign domination of national development that, in the case of Mexico and Cuba, ushered in revolutionary leaders committed to social change.\textsuperscript{325} Here it is important to consider the concept of duty that José Martí described as necessary for a charismatic leader,

\begin{quote}
A true man does not see the path where advantages lie, but rather where duty lies, and this is the only practical man, whose dream of today will be the law of tomorrow, because he who has looked back on the essential course of history and has seen flaming and bleeding peoples, seethe in the cauldron of the ages, knows that, without a single exception, the future lies on the side of duty.\textsuperscript{326}
\end{quote}

The collective duty of the Cuban and Mexican people was to engage in an effort to reinforce national sovereignty promoting economic independence. Through the use of history as an educational tool, the Cuban and Mexican revolutionary governments developed support for national sovereignty and social development. Cárdenas and Castro used history in their approach to the events taking place in their respective countries. Using comparative history themselves, their revolutionary engagement provides for a more nuanced and sophisticated revolution (intellectual justice) compared to the western “civilizing” project that saw no merit in other cultures.

The struggles of Mexico and Cuba are here presented as intellectually based, involving analysis and experience in decision-making processes. By invoking rigor, efforts at national sovereignty holistically served as examples of integrity to the masses, reinforcing revolutionary


\textsuperscript{325} Skocpol, \textit{Social Revolutions in the Modern World}, 268.

\textsuperscript{326} Brenner, \textit{The Cuba Reader}, 35.
commitment through institutionalizing the 1917 Mexican and 1940 Cuban Constitutions. New York Times Journalist Herbert L. Matthews views Castro as possessing a level of integrity special to Latin America and the Caribbean, establishing a new standard for excellence in principled leadership that “Anglo-Saxon historians” are unfamiliar with,

His [Castro] right to rule is his charismatic stature as a hero, and he can achieve that image as much by defying the laws of his country as by climbing a political ladder. A leader whose supreme virtue is to be like everybody else, only more so [an Eisenhower however, for example], would have little attraction in a country like Cuba. Anglo-Saxon historians are wasting their time when they judge Fidel Castro by their own standards of morality and virtue.\footnote{327}

The rigor of a historically intellectual approach to revolution stems from a dedication (duty) to serving the majority while pursuing a process of democratization through agrarian and labor reform.\footnote{328} Both leaders combined their knowledge of history and witnessing the struggles their people endured as a result of the foreign economic and political dominance that created massive unemployment and conditions of near starvation. The lack of control of resources and the limited access to farmland made agrarian and labor reform immediate issues. I argue (in keeping with Wallerstein’s approach of one unified social science) that applying rigorous intellectualism to revolution (intellectual justice) made for an equally radical approach to governing that had for hundreds of years been at the service of powerful foreign interests.

Without agrarian reform the Cuban and Mexican Revolutions would not be important or cause so much strain between the United States and Latin America. Thus, strained U.S.-Latin American relations became the primary influence behind nationalization. The rhetoric/discourse of both leaders reflects the ability to confront the major challenges of the times while simultaneously conveying a strong sense of conviction towards social justice. Christopher M.

\footnote{327}{The Cuba Reader: The Making of a Revolutionary Society, 1st ed. (New York: Grove Press, 1989), 155.}
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White describes the importance of the relationship between both leaders and the importance of agrarian reform,

The focus of agrarian reform in the Mexican and Cuban revolutions, even if the process played out differently in each country, turned Mexico and Cuba into two of the most notable revolutionary regimes in Latin American history, and from 1959-1964 the strong relationship between Castro and Cárdenas epitomized this Mexican-Cuban connection.329

The rigorously crafted correspondence, speeches, and government policies testify to their intellectual development as charismatic revolutionary leaders as part of their revolutionary trajectory.330

One of the most revolutionary aspects of Cárdenas and Castro’s dedication to maintaining their integrity in the face of outrageous efforts to discredit them is how they dealt with challenges to their positions of leadership and their relationship to their people. The film *638 Ways to Kill Fidel* presents the history of over fifty years of assassination attempts against the Cuban leader. Surviving to an advanced age, all attempts to kill Castro failed. His defiance of these attempts, remaining public in his leadership, demonstrated his strong sense of duty and further enhanced his charisma and historical importance to the Cuban people.331 The combination of facing the world’s greatest superpower and Castro’s mythical status has been used to mobilize the Cuban people with a special strength in the face of enormous obstacles. Anton Allahar supports this assertion, stating that:

Castro’s continuing legitimacy is based on the permanent reaffirmation of his authority via the mobilization of the population. His contact with the population is his very claim to power, and that claim, which he earned as a guerrilla fighter, has been heavily bolstered by his popular acceptance as one who is blessed by the Gods.332
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As revolutionaries, Cárdenas and Castro follow a long revolutionary charismatic tradition as outsiders. Cárdenas did face the danger of assassination by an outside foreign government as Castro did, but by nationalizing petroleum he ushered in a concerted United States effort to challenge any attempt to establish economic independence after 1938.\textsuperscript{333} Cárdenas’ experience was not lost on Castro, who based his political strategy on the groundbreaking approach of the Mexican Revolution. As a veteran of the Mexican Revolution, Cárdenas learned from the precarious history he had lived.

Through the charismatic revolutionary leadership of L’Ouverture, the Haitian Revolution became a historical commitment to social justice. As described by Max Weber: “in order to do justice to their mission, the holders of charisma, the master as well as his disciples and followers, must stand outside the ties of this world, outside of routine occupations, as well as outside the routine obligations of family life.”\textsuperscript{334}

Revolution taught both leaders that great risk is part of the experience. The struggles of Cuban, Haitian, and Mexican Revolutions were similar, as Toussaint L’Ouverture also used the history of slavery and colonialism to mobilize the masses to support his meteoric rise into charismatic revolutionary leadership. The great challenge the Haitian revolutionaries encountered combined slave liberation with national liberation, leading to “revolutionary triumph.”\textsuperscript{335} Just as the Haitian Revolution had little choice in the matter of pursuing the objective of national liberation, the Cuban and Mexican Revolutions also reached historic points of no return in their efforts to achieve national sovereignty in the age of U.S. hegemony. The revolutionary history of Mexico and Cuba is a continuation of Haiti’s victory.

\textsuperscript{333} Emily Waklid, "Revolutionary Resource Populism: President Cárdenas and the Creation of Environmental Policies," in Populism in 20th Century Mexico: The Presidencies of Lázaro Cárdenas and Luis Echeverría (University of Arizona Press, 2010), 74.
\textsuperscript{335} James, The Black Jacobins, 1989, 264.
Anton Allahar reinforces Cárdenas and Castro’s statements when he says, “the followers of charismatic leaders are persuaded by what they perceive as special qualities in the latter and are predisposed to carry out the commands of their leaders at tremendous cost to themselves, sometimes even risking life and limb.” The Mexican and Cuban Revolutions are replete with examples of the masses risking life and limb for the greater country. The mere audacity of mounting revolution in the first place openly espoused the convictions of following through with the nationalization of petroleum.

Through the experience of the Mexican Revolution, Cárdenas was inspired by the charisma of leaders such as Carranza, Obrégon, Villa, and Zapata, who each made the ultimate sacrifice with their own lives. The same holds true for Castro, who also lived through and witnessed the tumultuous 1930s and 1940s in Cuba. The actual experience of political struggle assisted in the development of charismatic leadership based on what Castro describes: “But life teaches that the impossible, or apparently impossible, is possible in the reality of life. It is possible above all when countries take on ideas, when the revolutionary ideas are converted into the ideas of the masses.” Castro’s view of revolutionary ideas being converted into ideas of the masses connects with Cárdenas’ actions and ideas in accordance with the tenets of the Mexican Revolution and both create the charismatic moment that connects leaders and people based on a shared sacrifice for a better future.

The ideology of self-sacrifice lends itself to the development of charisma in leaders. Anton Allahar incorporates Max Weber’s differentiation of pure and modern charisma with the pure form being, “charisma [that] can only be awakened and tested; it cannot be learned or taught.” It
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takes events such as revolutions to “awaken” leadership that is “tested” by time and events. Thus, Allahar says, charisma “can indeed be taught and learned” and that pure charisma is legitimated through “heroism and revelation.” Charisma is “particularly disdainful of economic pursuits or economic gain and prefers instead to be supported by voluntary gifts and communal largesse: charisma quite deliberately shuns the possession of money and pecuniary income.”339 In the history of the Americas, revolutionary trajectory taught Cárdenas and Castro, the importance of charismatic revolutionary leadership.

As material gain is counterproductive to the development of charisma, in many instances young idealistic students have been the backbone of revolutionary movements, as in the case of Castro, who became a militant as student. For both Cárdenas and Castro education was foremost in creating a generation of revolutionaries striving for intellectual justice. Their aim was an attempt to develop honest, forthright, and intense people unbowed by power or wealth.340 Many have been at the vanguard of the revolutionary movements that supported the development of charismatic revolutionary leadership. Who are these revolutionaries and where do they come from?

Christopher Lasch wrote that middle-aged men led revolutions, but history shows otherwise; many young people did lead most of the revolutionary efforts in the twentieth century.341 The case of Mexico shows that leaders would develop from different class backgrounds and generations. For instance, well-known Mexican revolutionaries such as Zapata and Villa were campesinos compared to Carranza, a hacendado, and Obregón, who came from the lower middle class. Revolutionary movements evolved to include a younger brand of rebel arising from the impoverished working class and campesino ranks that included Cárdenas,

Zapata, and Villa. These revolutionaries brought about a certain amount of charisma and attraction that continues to hold a strong allure today. Allahar emphasizes the case that “charismatic belief revolutionizes men from within and shapes material, and social conditions, according to its revolutionary will.” To sum up the definition of a charismatic revolutionary leader, Allahar states: “the genuinely charismatic leader is seen to possess some or all of the following attributes: immunity from harm, magical or divine protection, a capacity to overcome great danger, invincibility, and prescience.”

Both Cárdenas and Castro had what some would call a meteoric rise to revolutionary leadership due to the collapsing neo-patrimonial dictatorships. Can their charismatic approach be understood as a new direction with revolutions being led by people from a variety of backgrounds? Allahar weighs in, describing how “Since it is extraordinary, charismatic authority is sharply opposed to rational and particularly bureaucratic, authority, … charismatic authority is irrational in the sense of being foreign to all rules.” Therefore, Cárdenas from a working class background enters the Mexican Revolution at age 15 to become president of Mexico at age 39. By comparison Castro, the son of a landowner, seizes power in Cuba at 32. Both the Cuban and Mexican Revolutions provide examples of leaders from a variety of class backgrounds. The unpredictable nature of revolution supports the notion that charisma is “being foreign to all rules,” but it certainly requires a charismatic revolutionary leader with the prescience to understand their place in history.

Therefore, the revolutionary conditions in Mexico and Cuba lent themselves to the development of charismatic revolutionary leadership. Torcuata Di Tella writes that “typically underdeveloped countries in Latin America that lack middle sectors and which are dominated by
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a small upper class provide the most fertile ground for various types of populism.” Populism requires governments that support the masses to create the conditions where charisma can rise with “magico-religious ambiance.” Places such as Cuba and Mexico have a spiritual populism “where scientific and rational world views have not yet taken deep root.” By “magico-religious ambiance” it is meant that the charismatic leader possesses special gifts that connect them to the people and vice versa, it is a charismatic populism that engages the masses.

The quote by Torcuata Di Tella on populism resonates with Nelson Valdés’s reinterpretation of Weber’s concept of charismatic authority as the “magico-religious ambiance” Valdés describes Castro’s authority as coming from the struggle that earned him the support of the Cuban people. Both Cárdenas and Castro as such, are bound together by their connected history to the people of Cuba and Mexico and the people of the Americas.

Therefore, the uninhibited or fearless nature of countries like Cuba and Mexico possess rich indigenous and African histories that provided the conditions for social change and the development of “the revolution of rising expectations.” The nineteenth and twentieth century promises of equality, liberty, and fraternity, emerged in the numerous revolutionary and national independence movements. Revolution became the standard bearer for radical anti-imperialism as it defeated the English, French, and Spanish colonial powers in the U.S, Haiti and South America.

Part of the radical nature of the rise to power of Cárdenas and Castro is due to the chaos created by the end of colonialism in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries as the United States
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became hegemonic, pushing conditions towards revolution. Revolution challenged countries like England, the United States, and France that had created the conditions for revolution, A mix of rebelliousness born of slavery and colonialism, on the one hand, and of hope born of emancipation, on the other. The hope concerned the possibility of creating a more just and equal society, wherein the former downtrodden and dehumanized could come into their own as free men and women in charge of their own destinies. Thus, the stage was set for the appearance of charismatic-populist leaders.

Cárdenas and Castro represent a ‘charismatic-populist’ revolutionary trajectory exemplified by their dedication to providing the promises made by their revolutions in the way of agrarian and labor reform. Theirs became a process of elimination; their rise to power evolved as a result of a loss of legitimacy/authority by the neo-patrimonial dictatorships of Díaz, Calles, Machado, and Batista to the short-lived American and French Revolutions that historically did not live up to their own standards of equality.

Furthermore, twentieth century national liberation struggles sought to rectify a lack of integrity on the part of the Western “democratic tradition.” According to Wallerstein and Skocpol, the struggle for national liberation is foreign to core countries of the capitalist world-system as the developing (semiperiphery and periphery nations) world produced leaders of different experiences and connections to the masses. Social Revolution, as described by Skocpol, occurred in countries with the flexibility to solve the problems of underdevelopment and poverty. Countries dedicated to social change understood the need to engage in extended struggles to implement lasting social transformation.

The Mexican Revolution followed a longer course to social, political, and economic transformation as a result of its proximity to the United States and influence on the development
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of the country. Moreover, the Mexican-American War resulted in the U.S. seizing half of Mexico’s territory, something so damaging it is a fresh memory even today. The country then became the historical bellwether for future U.S. expansionist efforts influencing the development of the various foreign policy initiatives. All of this focused on imperial expansion that evolved into the MNCs control of natural resources for U.S. industrialization. The longer revolutionary trajectory of the Mexican Revolution also served as the basis for Cárdenas’ rise to power based on the continuous efforts to control Mexico’s development. U.S. hegemony over Latin America developed as “world responsibilities” saw Cardenas as one of the first heads of state to be criminalized for efforts to improve Mexico’s economic, political, and social development.353

Anton Allahar explains the criminalization of charismatic revolutionary leadership as it has developed to address serious issues: “the abuse of ‘charisma,’ which the media uses synonymously with physical attractiveness or even sexiness, so too ‘socialist’ has been employed indiscriminately to discredit any political leader or systems that oppose capitalist democracy.”354 As the Haitian Revolution was feared and criminalized for the audacity of freeing slaves and territory, the nationalization of petroleum by Cárdenas audaciously challenged the nascent Military Industrial Complex (MIC) as Haiti had challenged the transnational colonial institution of slavery. Mexico exposed the illegality of the MNCs as they grew to influence the rise of the MIC and U.S. hegemony in the post-war capitalist world-system.355

In the twentieth century, United States has even criminalized approaches to political leadership including charisma, populism, socialism, nationalization, nationalism, communism, and revolution.356 This gave rise to the development of ‘capitalist democracy’ in spite of men
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who fought for national liberation in the Mexican and Cuban Revolutions. Revolutions (Mexican, Chinese, Russian, Cuban, and Nicaraguan) were used for counterrevolutionary purposes, using the language of criminalization or anti-communism ("world responsibilities") and intervention to destroy national sovereignty.

As revolution spread throughout rural Mexico, peasant populations were historically marginalized and excluded from the political process by violence. Such marginalization led to the rise of revolutionaries throughout the Americas coming from rural areas as in the case of Mexico (Obregón, Villa, and Zapata) including Cárdenas and Castro. As a boy, Cárdenas was swept up into the frenzy of the revolution, rising through the ranks of Carranza’s revolutionary army. As a result of his ability to read, write, and lead, he joined Carranza’s army representing the interest of the hacendados. Cárdenas fought for the overall victor of the rebellion: Alvaro Obregón, a general of the Carranzista faction. Cárdenas developed into a charismatic revolutionary leader under the tutelage of Plutarcho Elías Calles, a general in Obregón’s army. Joining the revolutionary army Cárdenas became a young general nicknamed by Calles, “el chamaco” (the boy), that was emblematic of the youthful nature of the revolution and the revolution molding Cárdenas.

The seemingly random Cárdenas presidency in 1934 resulted from a loss of legitimacy in the Mexican revolutionary government of the Maximato, who handpicked presidential candidates to maintain his power. Calles, out of necessity, tried to maintain legitimacy by placing Cárdenas (known for his honesty) on the presidential ballot. Cárdenas, as the regime’s official candidate, was chosen for the great respect and integrity he had earned as governor of the state of Michoacán.357

Calles wrongly assumed that after Cárdenas became president he would be subservient to his behind-the-scenes rule. Though a friend of Calles, Cárdenas’ loyalties lay with the revolution and its commitment to social change. Therefore in 1935, as Cárdenas got wind of a planned coup, he expelled Calles from Mexico for the rest of his presidency.\textsuperscript{358} As a leader with military and political experience, Cárdenas understood the risks and the importance of his role in the Mexican Revolution. The risks he faced included the decision to expropriate petroleum, not just for Mexico’s development but also for definitive implementation of the 1917 Constitution. Had he not expropriated petroleum, redistributed land to the peasants, and supported labor rights the Mexican Revolution might not be as important to the revolutionary trajectory of Latin America and the Caribbean.

Cárdenas and Castro possessed unique qualities that through their revolutionary struggles earned them the charisma of the masses they led. In the passage below Anton Allahar provides a strong description of the type of leader that both men represent:

populist leaders are seen by their followers to have unique personal qualities and talents, and on that basis they are empowered to defend the interests of the masses and of the nation. Among the special qualities they possess, Michael Conniff lists the following: ‘great intellect, empathy for the downtrodden, charity, clairvoyance, strength of character, moral rectitude, stamina and combativeness, the power to build, or saintliness’.\textsuperscript{359}

In a preventive move and with foreknowledge (or prescience developed from a keen understanding of the risks involved in leading) of a coup d’état, removing the Maximato was one of two major charismatic moments that solidified Cárdenas’ role as President; the second was the 1938 Petroleum Nationalization. Cárdenas returned to the agrarian roots of the Mexican Revolution and challenged the power structure at work in Mexico by fulfilling the promises

\textsuperscript{358} Schuler, \textit{Mexico between Hitler and Roosevelt}, 42–43.
\textsuperscript{359} Allahar, \textit{Caribbean Charisma}, 19.
made through the 1917 Constitution. He used the constitution to set the terms for returning lands and resources to the Mexican people through his presidential six-year plan (Plan Sexenal).

Following a similar set of events, Castro engaged in the radicalization of the Cuban Revolution with a meteoric rise to power. During the early part of the twentieth century, Cuba underwent a major change after the revolution of 1895, resulting in colonial Cuba becoming a client state dependent on the United States. The Platt Amendment was forced upon the newly independent Cuba, undermining its sovereignty in the 1902 Cuban Constitution. Cuba thus endured a controlled form of “self-government” in the service of U.S. expansion after the defeat of the Spanish empire and the acquisition of other island nations (Philippines and Puerto Rico).

Nonetheless, Cuba’s revolutionary trajectory, similar to Mexico’s, completely altered the military and political structure of the country. Both followed what began with the triumph of the Haitian Revolution, in that Cuba and Mexico ended creole (white)-led neocolonial armies. Revolution was the process of a historical elimination of the remnants of the colonial and neocolonial legacies the old militaries represented, in keeping with Wallerstein and Tilly’s view of revolution as an improvement. Alan Knight, in *The Mexican Revolution* (Vol. 2), describes the impact on the Latin America regarding the “dissolution” of military and political institutions serving as a historical process of elimination:

> The process of military and political dissolution cannot be easily mapped. Historians of the Revolution want to trace its advance with an eye on the major cities. But their fall came at the end of a long sequence, beginning with the mountains and remote hamlets,
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then the villages and scattered mining camps, finally the provincial towns and state capitals. The major revolutionary armies of the north, it is true, advanced on Mexico City in 1914 in a roughly progressive, geographical fashion. But long before – and also while – this advance took place, there was a complementary revolutionary advance which cannot be mapped, save metaphorically. This took form, not of a tide sweeping across the country, but rather of an insidiously rising water level, which first inundated the rural areas, for some time lapped around the islands of Huertismo, and finally swamped these to cover the face of the earth like Noah’s flood.\textsuperscript{365}

Knight describes the historical swelling that followed other revolutions in history, and much like Mexico, Cuba’s revolutions (1933 and 1958) eliminated the old military and political structures inherited from the British, French, Spanish, and the United States.

In the case of Mexico, after independence the army supported dictatorship by maintaining a caudillo type of rule under Porfirio Díaz until 1911. In Cuba a similar development occurred with the 1933 Revolution toppling the Machado dictatorship. The years 1910 and 1933 are important rebellions in Mexico and Cuba. Subsequent counterrevolutionary coups by Huerta (Mexico) in 1913 and Batista (Cuba) in 1952 were U.S.-supported dictatorships.\textsuperscript{366} The result was a lesson not lost on Ernesto Ché Guevara, who learned from experience that “we cannot guarantee the Revolution before cleansing the Armed Forces. It is necessary to remove everyone who might be a danger. But it is necessary to do it rapidly, right now.”\textsuperscript{367} The rise of campesino armies in both countries ushered in populist leadership as the ancien régime were removed.

Importantly, initial revolutionary efforts (1910 and 1933) in both countries became counterrevolutionary, as repression and a lack of leadership created a vacuum for later rebellions. The Porfiriato/Huerta and Machado/Batistiano regimes resorted to barbaric means of control at any cost through assassination and torture. Mexico then Cuba subsequently fell into chaos with

\textsuperscript{365} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{366} Blasier, \textit{The Hovering Giant}, 33 and 34.
\textsuperscript{367} Ibid., 178.
the 1911 collapse of the Porfiriato, the 1913 Huerta Coup, and the 1928 Maximato, resulting in instability and the rise of charismatic leaders (Zapata, Villa, and Cárdenas). In Cuba, the neocolonial instability the Platt Amendment represented led to the Machado and Batista dictatorships, as Cuba had no decision over its sovereignty.

Confronting a lack of legitimacy in Mexico, Cárdenas overcame the Maximato while Castro overcame the Batistiano, both leaders reestablishing the revolutionary trajectory of both the Mexican and Cuban Revolutions. Castro provided the characteristics needed for a true revolutionary stating, “Revolutionary valor is needed, revolutionary morale is needed, revolutionary dignity is needed. To tell the people the truth, one must be revolutionary!”

Calles and Batista, once revolutionary leaders, proved their inability to be charismatic as the weakness and subservience of their dictatorships created the “charismatic moment” for Cárdenas and Castro their ‘moral leadership’ rose to organize the masses for international warfare. As firsts in history, Mexico and Cuba in the twentieth century were challenged by unique historical circumstances that resulted in successful revolution.

In 1933, Cuba engaged in rebellion against the Machado dictatorship. A first in history, the “Sergeant’s Revolt” brought about the rise of Fulgencio Batista. A sergeant with access to critical military information, Batista served the Cuban military general staff, putting him in the right place to organize the end of Creole (white) officer military control. As a result, he elevated a mixed race/class military leadership and connected with student movements and communists to end the Machado dictatorship in 1933.
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In a few short years, as Batista remained in control of the military, a chaotic political situation continually supported Batista’s rule. Batista’s Cuban military became counterrevolutionary, assassinating once supportive student leaders (Julio Antonio Mella and Antonio Guiteras) and beginning a period of violence and corruption supported by the U.S. Importantly, in Mexico the Maximato (1928-1935) became counterrevolutionary, as Batista and his coalition began Cuba’s 1933 revolution. Cuba underwent a brief period of revolution ending when Batista usurped power in 1952; Victoriano Huerta had done the same almost forty years earlier in Mexico, and both were part of the old Mexican and Cuban militaries.

The 1952 coup by Batista on the eve of national elections influenced Fidel Castro to organize the ill-fated attack on the Moncada Barracks (July 26, 1953), a failed attempt to spark mass rebellion against the Batista Dictatorship. A number of similarities between Cárdenas and Calles, Castro and Batista can be drawn. Both Calles and Batista had been part of revolutionary movements challenging the corrupt and violent structures of neo-colonial Cuba and Mexico, but the trappings and exercise of power seduced Calles and Batista. Cárdenas and Castro challenged the growing power of both Calles and Batista as their authority and legitimacy declined.

In both countries a transition occurred when corrupt revolutionary leaders ushered in the dramatic rise of young leaders with moral leadership. Their youthful dedication to duty was based on the depth of the actions and commitment exemplified by their later nationalizations and redistribution of lands. They knew, as described by Skocpol in her work on social revolutions, that to be successful they had to be nationalist and also provide tangible results for the success of
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their movements. Otherwise, they would become the examples of counterrevolution they had defeated. Moreover,

Sultanistic-neo-patrimonial regimes are centered in the personal manipulation of individual dictatorial rulers, who allow no stable group prerogatives in the polity—not even collective prerogatives for military officers or upper social and economic classes. Examples of successful revolutions against such personalist dictatorships include the 1911 Mexican Revolution against the regime of Porfirio Díaz, the 1959 Cuban Revolution against the regime of Fulgencio Batista, the 1979 Nicaraguan Revolution against the regime of Anastazio Somoza, the 1979 Iranian Revolution against the neo-patrimonial monarchy of the Pahlavi Shah. Sultanistic neo-patrimonial regimes are especially vulnerable to actual overthrow by revolutionary movements.376

According to the U.S. government and the MNCs, by comparison to the above-mentioned dictatorships, Cárdenas and Castro were extremists based on their charismatic revolutionary leadership and vilified as communist and criminal.377 Nationalization in Mexico became one of the reasons that began a coordinated MNCs/U.S. government effort later described by President Eisenhower in 1961 as the MIC, organized to undermine the sovereignty of developing countries in an effort to stem the tide of communism with the ultimate goal of promoting MNCs interests.378 Henceforth, as a result of the strong nationalist current in the Americas, there developed a divisive identity politics as a method to undermine critiques of capitalist democracy (capitalist world-system). Identity politics over the second half of the twentieth century developed into a tactic used by U.S. intelligence to divide national sovereignty movements by separating people based on ethnicity, class, and gender (divide and conquer). Such tactics resulted from the rise of the anti-communist Cold War period. Below, Anton Allahar illustrates the divisive nature of identity politics and their impact on antisystemic national liberation movements:

376 Skocpol, *Social Revolutions in the Modern World*, 268.
Movements based on racial, ethnic, sexual, and religious identities are at best reformist, in that they do not embody a critique of capitalism and liberal democracy; hence, they are not really perceived as problematic by so-called guardians of the public order. Consequently, such movements are not singled out by authorities for elimination. Class-based movements like socialism, however, are serious matters and the authorities are relentless in their efforts to discredit and destroy them.\(^\text{379}\)

The Mexican and Cuban Revolutions, especially during the Cárdenas and Castro periods, were committed to a strong anti-imperialism and challenged monopoly capitalism in an effort to unite the masses. As such, both revolutions represent a strong and well-organized coalition, challenging the growth of U.S. hegemony in the twentieth century. Furthermore, C.L.R. James specifically addresses the “race question” in relation to class issues reiterating the strong class-based challenges that Cuba and Mexico represent in history:

The race question is subsidiary to the class question in politics, and to think of imperialism in terms of race is disastrous. But to neglect the racial factor as merely incidental as an error only less grave than to make it fundamental.\(^\text{380}\)

The basis for social justice goes beyond the identity politics described above. To understand class and race, Wallerstein explains that,

Racism among the “semi-proletarian” sectors within the capitalist world-economy is far more destructive than anti-barbarism directed against those on the edges of redistributive world empires. Anti-barbarism expressed itself for the most part theoretically and in the form of open warfare. Once the warfare was terminated and the barbarians were incorporated in the empire, the survivors no longer suffered special opprobrium. Racism, however, expresses itself continuously throughout the operation of the capitalist system as a basic ideological component of its operation, justifying inequality.\(^\text{381}\)

Inequality is the basis of the capitalist world-system as it works to further the goal of constant accumulation of capital and provides no quarter for environmental and social justice.

\(^{379}\) Allahar, *Caribbean Charisma*, 20.


Contrary to the “world responsibilities” of the U.S. in its efforts to mask hegemony, Castro provides some insight regarding “the duty of the people … to be realistic, have no illusions and prepare to confront with strong resolve the policies announced by imperialism.” Identity politics as a tactic have been used by the MIC using modern technology to smash social movements. People or movements (barbarians) in history who steadfastly remain loyal to their convictions (intellectual justice) are a threat to the capitalist world-system. As such, the two men studied here, based their success on revolutionary action, providing dangerous examples that openly challenged the effectiveness of partisan identity politics. Castro describes the growing transnational solidarity among revolutionary countries:

The message from people to people, from revolutionaries to revolutionaries, the countries they have tried to divide criminally and who today are more united than ever before in the defense of their independence, their sovereignty and sacred rights. For a time only one country [Cuba] with only the energy from the strength of revolutionaries, from those revolutionaries not in power. For us now this greeting is worth a great deal, it fills us with strength and fills us with fervor, because it is the greeting of revolutionary movements now in power.

Attempts to criminalize revolutionary movements have only created greater solidarity among those working to defend their independence and sovereignty. Castro describes how, for a time, Cuba was alone in the struggle against efforts to undermine the sacred rights of nations.

II. Revolutionary Party Formation in Mexico and Cuba

The Revolution wants Mexico to govern by democracy: but it cannot be perfected while the people are not organized to carry this out. It is for that reason that we try to unite within the party all the
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sectors that are interested in the social program ready to transform our people, sectors that form the majority of citizens of the Republic.\footnote{Cárdenas, \textit{Ideario político}, 67. “La Revolución quiere que México se gobierne por la democracia; pero ésta no podrá perfeccionarse mientras el pueblo no esté organizado para ejercerla. Y es por ello por lo que se trata de reunir dentro del partido a todos los sectores que están interesados en el programa social que habrá de transformar a nuestro pueblo, sectores que forman la gran mayoría de los ciudadanos de la República.”} Lázaro Cárdenas, 1938.

For the first time Cuba had ‘an authentically revolutionary government [1933] backed and nourished by the great popular masses without the previous authorization of Washington and its agents in Cuba. This was a brief moment of national euphoria, and one, which was never forgotten.\footnote{Hugh Thomas.}

In the case of Mexico, some scholars argue that party formation underwent a long process beginning once hostilities had ended around 1920, and only after nine years of relative peace did the victors organize the Partido Nacional Revolucionario (PNR) in 1929 to support the Presidency of Plutarcho Elías Calles.\footnote{Córdova, \textit{La revolución en crisis}, 287. The Maximato was a clandestine or perfect dictatorship that was used to maintain the power of Plutarcho Elías Calles during the 1920s, ending in 1935 with his ouster from the country by Cárdenas. The Maximato and the development of the Partido Nacional Revolucionario were the inception of the Partido Revolucionario Institucional that remained in power for over sixty years.} From a party to support the Revolution the PNR became less populist with the Maximato in power, until the revolutionary rise of Cárdenas ended it, requiring a party, the Partido de la Revolución Mexicana (PRM), for the mass mobilization around national sovereignty.\footnote{Cárdenas, \textit{Ideario político}, 20–25.} Thus, as the Maximato was losing the support of the Mexican populace, Calles positioned Cárdenas as the presidential candidate to save his Maximato. Under the auspices of the PNR, Cárdenas transformed the party into the PRM in an effort to move the PNR to support the masses rather than the Maximato. Removing Calles began the mobilization of the masses to re-instill trust in the objectives of the Revolution that later involved supporting the 1938 Mexican Nationalization.\footnote{Ibid., 24–26.} Cárdenas in essence developed the PRM to engage the...
Mexican people’s support for the efforts of the Revolution and for a democratic transition away from the Maximato, focusing on land tenure and labor rights.

Keenly watching the results of this audacious effort was the rest of Latin America and most certainly Cuba. The establishment of what became the PRM developed in the 1940s into the Partido Revolucionario Institucional (PRI), going on to become the dominant party in Mexico for the next seventy-one years with great impact on party formation efforts throughout Latin America and especially Cuba.\(^{389}\) We can view the development of party formation under Cárdenas and Castro as both similar and different in that Cárdenas used the existing party organization from the PNR to develop the PRM, while Castro was not associated with any dominant party in Cuba but used existing movements and parties to develop the Cuban Communist Party.

Thus, Cárdenas and Castro’s charismatic leadership and their decisive decision making changed the social structure of their countries and facilitated the rise of party formation with radical revolutionary outcomes. Radical in that they both combined social movements formed around agrarian reform leading to party formation for the purpose of supporting petroleum nationalization and the realization of the goals of the Mexican and Cuban Revolutions.\(^{390}\) Mexico’s effort to institutionalize the revolution through the mass mobilization of the Mexican populace provided Latin America an important example of successful defiance against U.S. superpower.

Cuba learned the importance of building institutions, and Mexico provided a loose blueprint to do this by using nationalism and national development to engage people in the service of national sovereignty. Once again, Mexico, with relatively little experience, was

\(^{389}\) Castro, *Latinoamericanismo vs. Imperialismo*, 100.

influential, giving agency to Latin American nations undergoing revolutionary transitions. That allowed countries like Cuba, in serious crisis after the fall of Batista, to assume the right of choosing national sovereignty through nationalization.

By comparison, the first party of the Mexican Revolution, the PNR, foreshadowed party formation in Cuba, as it was one of the first revolutionary parties that developed in Latin America as a result of revolution. Arnaldo Córdova, describes the PNR as containing a secondary political ideology but primarily supported the revolutionary government of Calles. Later revolutionary parties learned from that mistake as Cárdenas and Castro developed parties to serve the interest of the people. As a result they rectified the gains made through the rebellions against the Díaz and Machado dictatorships and threatened by the Batista and Calles counterrevolutionary regimes. The success of Cárdenas and Castro developed great fervor amongst the masses for implementing revolutionary change and mass mobilization.

Cuban and Mexican relations in the 1960s saw the Cuban Revolution return Mexico’s support as the Cuban Revolution influenced Mexico. A reciprocal and historical process reminiscent of Haitian support for South American independence, the Cuban Revolution and its success reinvigorated the Latin American left, especially in Mexico with the rise of the Movimiento Liberación Nacional (MLN) under the leadership of Cárdenas.

### III. Mexican and Cuban Revolutionary Leadership in Times of Crisis

Do you remember now the general euphoria created by January 1, 1959? It was thought then, that the Cuban Revolution was subject to the limits of political change accustomed to our (Latin America) countries. Can you imagine the sentiment that prevailed in Mexico when the chief of the revolution Francisco I. Madero, signed the agreements at the city of Juarez in 1911? Who at that time was not in agreement that General Díaz should give up power? But when the protection of the promises made by the Plan of San Luis was not fulfilled, the leader of agrarian reform Emiliano
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Zapata unveiled the flag for the restitution of land. When the first revolutionary government authorized the formation and function of the union, when the exploitation of our petroleum increased, when the people had their own press and when finally there were signs of popular concern, much of the support for the Mexican Revolution had hailed its advent.\textsuperscript{393} Lázaro Cárdenas, 1961.

Cárdenas draws strong connections between the Cuban and Mexican Revolutions, comparing the arrival of Madero in Mexico City (1911) to the arrival of Castro in Havana (1959) and stating that the Cuban Revolution did not have to “invent” as it learned from the Mexican Revolution how to implement “agrarian reform” in an effort to overcome the horrible living conditions the urban and rural poor suffered from. The quote is important because Cárdenas is engaging in his own comparative historical analysis, providing his view of the revolutionary trajectory and the connection between leaders in the Americas.

Allahar later echoed Cárdenas when he states: “exceptional or extraordinary leaders tend to arise in times of deep social or national crisis.”\textsuperscript{394} Revolution as a perceived crisis challenged the overlords in faraway places and eclipsed their ability to keep control, following Wallerstein and Tilly’s view of revolution it was the pre-revolutionary crisis that created the revolutionary leaders. There is a balance, and the development of charismatic revolutionary leadership in Mexico and Cuba leading to the rise of reactionary policies that were used to undermine national sovereignty but worked only to enhance support for revolutionary governments.

\textsuperscript{393} Cárdenas, Carta a Marte R. Gomez, 19 Junio de 1961, in Ideario político. 287-288, “Recuerdas la euforia general que se produjo el 1o. de enero de 1959? Se pensaba entonces que la Revolucion Cubana quedaria circunscrita al marco de los cambios politicos habituales de nuestros paises. No piensas acaso en el ambiente que prevalecio en Mexico cuando el Jefe de la Revolucion, don Francisco I. Madero, firmo los convenios de Ciudad Juarez en 1911? Quienes no estuverion de acuerdo en que el General Diaz debia dejar de poder? Pero quando al amparo de las promesas del Plan de San Luis, el caudillo de agrarismo Emiliiano Zapata enarbole la bandera de la restitucion de las tierras; cuando el primer gobierno de la Revolucion autoriz solo la formacion e funcionamiento de los sindicatos; cuando se aumento el impuesto de explotacion de nuestro petroleo; cuando el pueblo tuvo su propia prensa; cuando, en fin, se advirtieron sintomas de hondas preocupaciones populares, se retiraron de la Revolucion Mexicana muchas de las simpatias que habian saludado su advenimiento.”

\textsuperscript{394} Allahar, Caribbean Charisma, 20–21.
Both Cuba and Mexico in crisis suffered from poor economic conditions prior to revolution, and, as Allahar describes, a “conservatism born of status quo colonial politics, social and racial apartheid, plus a general sense of anomie,” is a constant threat to social revolution. Allahar and Cárdenas complement each other’s views of the shared revolutionary history of Cuba and Mexico and the impact on charismatic revolutionary leadership. Leadership in Europe and the United States is almost non-existent as policies are about control and not about creating opportunities for economic, political, or social development.

Laclau explains that “in socialism, therefore, coincide the highest form of ‘populism’ and the resolution of the ultimate and most radical of class conflicts…there is no socialism without populism, and the highest form of populism can only be socialism.” Efforts to stop populist or socialist movements do not take into account national sovereignty and the right of people to determine their own form of government. Going beyond efforts to engage in limited democratization, or worse destabilizing countries for the purpose of imposing draconian economic measures through austerity, U.S. style interventionism fosters the rise of revolutionary leadership.

The development of leadership under crisis situations is unpredictable which makes it charismatic, as “perceived” traditional and legal authority has collapsed. This leads me to challenge the negative connotation that populism and socialism are inherently corrupt. As previously stated, populism and socialism are as linked to revolution as they are to charismatic leadership. It has become very difficult for charismatic leaders to develop in the era of the twenty-first century. Allahar states that, “technology of the modern media, along with the process of modernization, urbanization and secularization, which make the appearance of pure charismatic leaders extremely
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difficult, if not impossible.” Castro views it differently, “that which is considered impossible, apparently impossible, is possible in the reality of life.” Resisting efforts at criminalizing him as communist, which seems to be again in fashion based on efforts to undermine U.S. President Barack Obama, Castro has been supported by efforts to undermine him as hegemony has served to support revolution and now called being a communist is not so bad.

In the twenty-first century it is rather difficult for charismatic leaders to rise, but rise they do. In the face of major obstacles the current Latin American left of center movements have developed in a similar trajectory as Cárdenas and Castro. The combination of self-sacrifice, earned leadership, and the unpredictable nature of such leadership led to a criminalizing fear of charisma, nationalism, populism, and socialism. U.S. government sponsored counter-revolutionary efforts such as the Operation Condor in Latin America or the Counterintelligence Program (COINTELPRO) in the United States have been exposed as overt efforts to stop revolution, resulting in the murder of thousands in order stop the rise of charismatic revolutionary leaders. In light of the Mexican and Cuban Revolutions, Latin America presents a strong challenge to the United States and its allies as described above by Cárdenas. Every effort by U.S. hegemony to destroy the work of revolutionary movements only strengthens them, further undermining its place in the court of world opinion. In the words of Senator William J. Fulbright, “the American view of revolution is thus shaped by simple but so far insuperable dilemma: we are simultaneously hostile to
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communism and sympathetic to nationalism, and when the two become closely associated, we become agitated, frustrated, angry, precipitate, and inconsistent.” Senator Fulbright’s observation supports the views of both Cárdenas and Castro regarding the reactionary use of communism as a method to undermine national sovereignty by destroying efforts to engage in social revolution through charismatic leadership.

The ability of Cárdenas and Castro to face such strong and militarily powerful nations, to overcome fear and doubt, stems from the ability to deal with crisis calmly and as Lasch describes,

Rebellions on the other hand, can express deep social antagonisms and even class conflicts, but they do not become revolutionary so long as they confine themselves to attacks on feudal overlords, the police, or other agents or symbols of oppression. Revolution is a direct attack – not necessarily violent – on the state.

Based on Lasch’s statement it can be inferred that, by challenging the state (Skocpol’s argument) in the larger context, the Mexican and Cuban Revolutions under Cárdenas and Castro were a formidable challenge to U.S. imperialism (Wallerstein). Otherwise, there might not have been so much antagonism against their nationalizations. The greater challenge represented by the Cuban and Mexican Revolutions to the MIC is a serious crisis that creates more charismatic revolutionary leaders. We see this currently in Latin America with the rise of Hugo Chávez, Evo Morales, Rafael Correa, and José Múgica. Moreover, the kind of legacies exemplified by the Haitian, Chinese, and Russian Revolutions all challenged at one time the French, Spanish, English, and U.S., and continue to echo throughout history. Theda Skocpol, in Social Revolutions in the Modern World, describes how successful revolutions engaged in national

---

403 Fulbright, The Arrogance of Power, 77.
404 Lasch, The World of Nations; Reflections on American History, Politics and Culture. 104.
liberation of people by focusing on local issues. It is also the case that there exists an international connection historically between revolutions, especially national liberation.

As presented by C.L.R. James in the appendix of his book *The Black Jacobins*, “From Toussaint L’Ouverture to Fidel Castro” there is a peculiar revolutionary trajectory that develops from what James describes as “insignificant Haiti becoming independent.” Lasch goes on to echo that idea by describing how,

Revolutionary movements articulate new ideas of liberty and equality, but these ideas, it would seem, are rooted in traditional, preindustrial ways of life. Revolutions are directed at powerful states that have arisen from the ruins of seigneurilism but have not perfected the methods of repression and control available to the industrial state.

Europe, Japan, and the United States have perfected repression through their imperial designs on Africa, Asia, and Latin America. The nineteenth and twentieth centuries are replete with examples: the Japanese invasion of Korean and China, the European empires and their conquests of the Americas, Asia, and Africa and imperial interventionism across the world by U.S. forces. The Mexican and Cuban Revolutions thus developed in the twentieth century by comparison to former imperial nations that destroyed themselves through world war that led to the rise of U.S. as a superpower. In essence, we witness revolutionary independence movements developing alongside the most powerful nation in world history and the demise of European empires. Cuba in the 1960s rebels in the midst of the most tension-filled decade of the Cold War between Russia and the United States, leading to the 1962 Missile Crisis.

The Cuban Revolution encountered the Cold War with the challenge of dealing not just with the U.S. but also the Soviet Union. The Cold War impact on Latin America is an area of

---

405 Skocpol, *Social Revolutions in the Modern World*, 263.
analysis that is often overlooked but is certainly well described by Lasch, who presents the argument regarding the impact that the U.S.S.R. had on revolutionary social movements:

In the Third World revolutionary movements in the twentieth century have often allied themselves – incongruously from the point of view of orthodox Marxism – with movements of national independence and with the defense of natural cultures not only against Western imperialism but against the globalizing tendencies of socialism itself, as embodied in the foreign policy of the Soviet Union. ⁴⁰⁸

The two superpowers challenged each other, and caught in the middle was the rest of the world. But the Mexican example for the Cuban Revolution was an important lesson as Mexico’s struggle for sovereignty was advanced through petroleum nationalization. Under similar circumstances, Cuba engaged the United States during the Cold War as Mexico confronted the petroleum MNCs. In contrast to Cuba, nationalization in Mexico surprisingly had limited support from U.S. government as the petroleum MNCs had not been able to exert their influence on U.S. foreign policy, as was the case in 1960. The difference between Mexico and Cuba was the very dangerous circumstances that Cuba encountered, as global nuclear war was a real concern.

As the Cuban Revolution was threatened by the U.S. Castro began negotiations with the Russians to trade sugar for petroleum, which later led to military support as the survival of the revolution was at stake. It cannot be stressed enough the monumental decision Cuba made to ally itself with the Soviet Union at a time when the USSR had little interest in Latin America. A new Latin American diplomacy thus developed as a result of the Mexican and Cuban Revolutions as both countries confronted U.S. hegemony. Such crises, interestingly enough in Cuban and Mexican pre- and post-revolutionary cases, created the conditions for the rise of charismatic revolutionary leadership. As a result, the solidarity between the Mexican and Cuban Revolutions

---

⁴⁰⁸ Ibid. 192.
is a testament to the dedication that became an important part of international relations in Latin America.

IV. Institutionalized Nationalization: Partido de la Revolución Mexicana (PRM) and the Cuban Communist Party

We will not resolve the problems of Mexico and other countries with simple slogans and isolated actions, No. We must organize, the young people of Latin America must organize, the intellectuals must organize, that the workers respond to their promises and obligations, and that the peasants organize themselves.  

_Lázaro Cárdenas, 1961._

Revolutionary parties do not develop overnight, and in the quote above Cárdenas calls for action, similar to the bold action he took in the 1938 Petroleum Nationalization. His call, made during the most dangerous time of the post-Cuban Revolutionary period, urged all of Latin America to organize in solidarity with the Cuban Revolution. What became the Partido de la Revolución Mexicana (PRM) in 1938 and the Cuban Communist Party (PCC) in 1965 developed over a number of years with a revolutionary trajectory during the twentieth century.

In Cuba, Castro worked with the existing Communist Party of Cuba (PSP), developing a new party to bring together the Cuban people in the tradition of what Cárdenas developed through the PRM to serve the people’s interests with a renewed effort at national sovereignty.

William M. LeoGrande describes how Castro used history:

_The Cuban Revolution, however, was the first socialist revolution to succeed without a Leninist party in the vanguard of the revolutionary struggle. The victory over Batista’s dictatorship was won instead by a loose coalition of political groups, foremost among them Fidel Castro’s 26th of July Movement, (M-26-7). Shortly after the victory, the anti-Batista coalition began to disintegrate over the issue of what the future course of the revolution should be, and even the M-26-7 divided into warring factions._

---

409 Cárdenas, _Ideario político_, 70. “Y no vamos a resolver el problema de México y de los demás países con simples gritos o acciones aisladas, no. Debemos organizarnos, que se organice la juventud de toda Latinoamérica, que se organice los sectores intelectuales, los obreros que respondan a sus compromisos y obligaciones, que en cuanto al sector campesino éste se organiza solo.”

410 Brenner, _The Cuba Reader_, 156.
Under the historical conditions described above, Cárdenas and Castro shared a similar talent for understanding the dynamics of forging parties to be inclusive rather than exclusive.\(^411\)

By working with unions Cárdenas expanded the national workers movement transforming the Confederación General de Obreros y Campesinos de México (CGOCM) into greater support for the revolution, and re-organizing the once Maximato dominated labor movement to be more inclusive, the Confederación de Trabajadores de México (CTM) or (CGOCM/CTM).\(^412\) Castro was able to re-establish leftist control of the Confederación de Trabajadores de Cuba (CTC) after it was manipulated into serving the Batista regime and its former leader Eusebio Mujal.\(^413\)

The Cuban CTC, founded in 1939, was communist led (PSP) from 1939-1946. The Mexican CGOCM founded in 1933 later split with the Confederación Regional Obrera Mexicana (CROM) led by Luis Morones.\(^414\) It was a sign of the future political split between Cárdenas and his mentor Calles, because control of the unions and the PNR had developed to support the Maximato to remain in power limiting greater political participation. In the Mexican and Cuban cases, the political and labor split meant a shift to the left with greater independence and mass participation through the Mexican CGOCM/CTM. Arnaldo Córdova describes the importance of Mexican unions in the development of Cardenismo, “the existence of an independent syndicate movement was indispensible so that the mass politics of Cárdenas would have guaranteed applications to the Mexican reality.”\(^415\)

\(^{411}\) Cárdenas, Ideario político, 187.

\(^{412}\) Ibid., 191.

\(^{413}\) Brenner, The Cuba Reader, 48–49.

\(^{414}\) Córdova, La ideología de la revolución Mexicana: La formación del nuevo régimen (Problemas De Mexico), 331.

\(^{415}\) Córdova, La política de masas del cardenismo, 70. “La existencia de un movimiento sindical independiente era indenpsensible para que la política de las masas de Cárdenas tuviera garantias de aplicacion de la realidad Mexicana.”
The development of the Cuban CTC and the Mexican CGOCM/CTM challenged dictatorial tendencies used to support the Mexican Maximato dictatorship (1928-1934) and the Cuban Batista dictatorship (1952-1958), as each was directed as if by a caudillo (strong man) that answered to the Batista and Maximato autocratic rule. In both Cuba and Mexico, workers’ movements began with agrarian and labor reform at the forefront of their efforts supported by the 1917 Mexican and 1940 Cuban Constitutions. However, the Maximato derailed efforts at economic independence, national sovereignty, and social justice, as corruption kept the Mexican Revolution from fully being implemented. The tenets of the revolution became secondary to the personal politics and the use of unions to secure personal fortunes. The difference between the unions that supported the revolutions led to the development of the Mexican CGOCM/CTM in the 1930s and the Cuban CTC in the 1950s. Both unions were efforts to implement more democratic processes in the face of growing autocratic on man rule in each country. The result was that in Mexico the CGOCM/CTM and in Cuba the CTC became allied with Cárdenas and Castro and strengthened their governments.

The parallels between the trajectories of the Cuban and Mexican experiences during the twentieth century highlight the importance of the labor movement in the revolutionary development of both countries. It was later in the service of the Batista dictatorship and the Maximato that the post-revolutionary labor movements lost legitimacy and became the reason why new labor movements developed in both countries after the 1910 Mexican and 1933 Cuban revolutions. Mexico develops into a nation through the Mexican Revolution and the development of the 1917 Mexican Constitution. Cuba then becomes a nation after the 1933 Revolution and the end of the Platt Amendment in 1934. Both countries then experience the curtailment of fully

416 Cárdenas, Ideario político, 191.
417 Córdova, La ideología de la revolución Mexicana: la formación del nuevo régimen (Problemas De Mexico), 355.
implementing the goals of the 1917 Mexican and 1940 Cuban Constitutions through the counterrevolutionary Maximato and Batista dictatorships.

The revolutionary trajectory of both countries goes from internal agrarian and labor struggles to the larger political confrontations as the sons of revolutionary movements and their legacies seek to fully implement the social justice ideologies that helped both countries become nationalist in the twentieth century.\(^\text{418}\) Castro, echoing revolutionary Mexican president Venustiano Carranza’s (1917-1920) 1918 Carranza Doctrine as the heir to a revolutionary legacy, shares his view of the Latin American and Caribbean relationship with the United States, stressing the importance of history in creating an international solidarity movement:

It is now to declare that the Latin American people are not intimidated by anything or anyone; they reject indignantly the stick and reject the Imperialist carrot. End this myth! End the blackmail! End the repugnant intent to intimidate the patriots of Latin America, the children of Bolivar, of San Martín, of O’Higgins, of Sucre, of Hidalgo of Morelos, of Morazán, of Maceo and Martí [all revolutionary leaders of Latin American independence]!\(^\text{419}\)

Cárdenas and Castro are like Lazarus or in Cuban Santería, Babalu Aye, who rose from past national liberation movements, thought to be defeated, by external and internal forces.\(^\text{420}\) Both not only succeed to power, they gain stature through the development of agrarian and labor reform movements. Their rise to power stems from the internal confrontations between Cárdenas/Calles in 1930s Mexico and Castro/Batista in 1950s Cuba, each resulted in the expulsion of dictators that creates the opportunity to implement social revolution. The experiences of Cárdenas and Castro are not the same, but they are connected through the
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\(^\text{418}\) White, *Creating a Third World*, 57–64.


revolutionary history of Cuba that draws from the revolutionary history of Mexico. In the Cuban case, Batista, who, if he had not mounted the 1952 coup, perhaps today would be seen as a patriot for Cuban national liberation based on his support of the 1933 Revolution and the 1940 Constitution.\footnote{Thomas, \textit{Cuba: A History}, 450.}

In Mexico, Calles’s legacy as a revolutionary leader remains intact, although somewhat tarnished, by his growing conservatism in the 1930s where, as fate would have it, his own corruption, like that of Batista (1958), led to his downfall and expulsion from Mexico in 1935.\footnote{Cárdenas, \textit{Ideario político}, 24–25.} Their ousters have an interesting parallel of being once revolutionary figures that ended up in exile. History is full of such persons, and as Skocpol describes in \textit{Social Revolutions in the Modern World}, there is an interesting parallel between neo-patrimonial dictatorships being supported by foreign interests and their eventual fall from power as a result of limiting democratic participation. There are similar parallels between revolutionary movements creating greater democratic opportunities for entire societies. Cárdenas and Castro fit the pattern of creating, through their long experience in revolution, greater opportunities for democratic institutions to take hold in Mexico and Cuba. This, I argue, is based on their ability to institutionalize their revolutions as a result of petroleum nationalization.

Two years before the 1938 Mexican Petroleum Nationalization, Cárdenas declared the right of workers to unionize during a speech in Monterrey, Mexico:

\begin{quote}
The same right that the employer classes have to link their organizations in a national structure, assisting the workers to do the same and maintain relations with an international character, as in all countries and mainly those who achieve greater industrial development […]\end{quote}
But it’s not enough for the government to do its thing; it is also necessary for companies to refrain from intervening in the social activities related to their work. It is in this sense that you [workers] ask our cooperation.423

This signaled to workers across the country that the Mexican government supported them and had successfully institutionalized their revolutionary gains. According to Lorenzo Meyer in *Las raíces del nacionalismo petrolero en México*, “The famous presidential speech in Monterrey – gave notice to industrialists that the worker-patron struggle arrived at an unsupportable result, workers and the government were ready to take charge of their interests bringing a seriousness to the labor conflict”424 Not more than two years after his speech, the conflict between the CTM and the petroleum MNCs erupted over wages and labor conditions, thus setting the stage for the eventual challenge to Mexican sovereignty in 1938.

In the case of the oil MNCs versus the petroleum workers union (CTM), the Mexican Supreme Court decided to support the workers, supported by the leftist CTM with additional support by the CGOCM, as workers fought for better salaries and work conditions.425 The decision led to the 1938 Petroleum Nationalization by Cárdenas, a decision his government did not necessarily want to make as a result of the recent struggles with the Maximato dictatorship in 1935.426

By refusing to accept the decision of the Mexican Supreme Court, the MNCs set in motion a series of negotiations that did not bode well for them. A replay of that experience occurred
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423 Ibid., 187. “El mismo derecho que tienen las clases patronales para vincular sus organizaciones en un estructure nacional, es el que asiste a los trabajadores para hacer lo propio y aun mantener relaciones de carácter internacional, como ocurre an todos los paises y principalmente, los que alcanzan mayor desarrollo industrial [… ] Pero no basta con que el gobierno haga lo suyo; es necesario que las empresas tambien se abstengan de interven en las actividades sociales de su trabajadora. Y es en ese sentido en el que pido a ustedes su cooperacion.”

424 Meyer, Lorenzo, *Las raíces del nacionalismo petrolero en México* (Mexico, D.F: Oceano, 2009), 183. “El famoso discurso presidencial en Monterrey – que hacia saber a los industrialis que si la lucha obrero-patronal llegaba a resultares insoportable, los trabajadores o el gobierno estaban dispuestos a hacerse cargo de sus interes-dio un caracter mas serio al conflict.”


426 Ibid., 153.
twenty-one years later after the Cuban Revolution seized power and nationalized petroleum in 1960. The same oil MNCs severely underestimated the commitment of Cárdenas that led to the 1938 Petroleum Nationalization. A charismatic and transitional moment in history, the actions of Cárdenas led to the institutionalization of the Mexican Revolution. The U.S. government reacted in a manner that signaled a continued pattern of indecision, with the powerful MNCs influencing U.S. foreign policy. This resulted in open confrontations and interventions with numerous national liberation struggles for economic and political sovereignty in the world. After the 1938 Mexican Petroleum Nationalization, Bolivia in 1952 attempted nationalization, and then in 1953 Iran nationalized petroleum only to be toppled by the CIA. This led to a series of countries over the next thirty years creating state-owned energy companies (Saudi Arabia and Venezuela). Cuba would be the next great confrontation, nationalizing over 84% of domestic and foreign assets.

Not more than twenty-one years after the 1938 Mexican Petroleum Nationalization, the Cuban Revolution confronted U.S. superpower. Famously, Ernesto Ché Guevara, as minister of industries in 1960, was pushed to intervene and take over administration of the petroleum refineries leading to near complete nationalization afterwards. It began with the end of the historical Cuban/U.S. sugar quota, leading to the nationalization of the petroleum refineries of Texaco and Royal Dutch Shell after their refusal to process Cuban-owned Russian oil. A parallel nationalization process occurred with the petroleum MNCs challenging Mexican sovereignty in 1938. In the Cuban experience, the U.S. government challenged Cuba’s
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431 Baklanoff, Expropriation of U.S. Investments in Cuba, Mexico, and Chile, 117–118.
432 Ibid., 118.
sovereignty against petroleum MNCs in a reversal of fortunes. One of the great differences between Mexico and Cuba involved the geopolitical (anti-fascism) conditions the 1938 Petroleum Nationalization encountered versus the post-war Cuban nationalizations that changed dramatically as a result of the Cold War (anti-communism) and threat of nuclear war.\textsuperscript{433}

As the world stage was changing, post-nationalization (after 1938 Mexico and 1960 Cuba) helped the CTC (Cuba) and the CTM/CGOCM (Mexico), through the Mexican PRM and the Cuban PCC, to develop and institutionalize the nationalization of land and resources to organize agrarian and industrial workers as human capital in support of Cardenismo and Fidelismo. Through revolutionary victories, Cárdenas and Castro enhanced their charismatic revolutionary leadership. Their political struggle was successful as a result of their petroleum nationalization efforts institutionalizing the Mexican and Cuban Revolutions with the support of political parties (PRM and PCC) able to mobilize the masses through coordination with strong and unified labor movements.

V. Conclusion

This chapter addressed how charismatic revolutionary leadership was part and parcel an instrumental part of party formation and the revolutionary trajectory of the legacies of Cárdenas and Castro. The combined legacies of both men overlap and include Cárdenas’ influence on the revolutionary and national liberation of the 1950s and 1960s worldwide. The victory of Castro and the Cuban Revolution reinforced the impact of the Mexican Revolution and in a time of major strife during the 1960s. Both the Cuban and Mexican experiences created a backlash from Europe, Japan, and the United States as they controlled the petroleum market. But surviving the 1980s and 1990s, the legacy of overlapping influence of Castro through twenty-first century natural resource sovereignty (Bolivia, Ecuador, and Venezuela) carries on the trajectory of

\textsuperscript{433} Blasier, \textit{The Hovering Giant}, 226–227.
revolutionary national liberation. Theirs is a legacy that began with L’Ouverture in Haiti and matured in the tumultuous twentieth century, as charismatic revolutionary leadership carried on into the modern world. In the next chapter I examine how the Mexican and Cuban Revolutions created a new geopolitical reality through international warfare based on their nationalizations.
Chapter 6: Post-Revolution, Nationalization, and Influence: Navigating a New Geopolitical Reality

If there is one factor that explains more than any other the tight spot in which we find ourselves, this factor is our disposition to utilize the specter of communism as a cloak to cover the failure of our own leadership.Senator J. William Fulbright, 1966.

Throughout the twentieth century, U.S. foreign policy was well established regarding economic expansion, following what was laid out as the Open Door Policy (before it became the Good Neighbor Policy under the Franklin D. Roosevelt administration) and then the Alliance for Progress (the Kennedy (JFK) administration). The Roosevelt Corollary (1904) emerged as a result of Venezuelan Crisis (1902-1903) after the Open Door (1899) and Big Stick (1901) Policies of the administration of Theodore Roosevelt emerged at the turn of the twentieth century. These various policies were consolidated through imperialism and backed by the Monroe Doctrine/Manifest Destiny ideology promoting “capitalist democracy” worldwide. The Open Door, Big Stick, and Roosevelt Corollary overlapped into one, leading to major economic, social, and political problems for Latin America.

Prior to the Rooseveltian (1904) affirmation of the Monroe Doctrine (1823), the Haitian Revolution supported Simón Bolívar in his return to South America (1816), beginning a process of revolutionary thinking that was influenced by the support he had received. As a result of his success against the Spanish (1828), he achieved solidarity between different groups and developed a Pan-American Union (1824) concept of a united Latin America that would later influence many Latin American revolutionaries. One such revolutionary was the martyred father of Cuban Independence (1898), José Martí, who in turn influenced Mexican revolutionaries, as he and Bolívar were highly critical of growing U.S. power in the region. The Mexican Revolution drew

upon the messages of Bolivar and Marti and the lesson of Cuba’s mediated independence as a result of the 1901 Platt Amendment signaled to the rest of Latin America that the same foreign policy was applicable to everyone and seriously challenged the collective national sovereignty of Latin America and the Caribbean.

Through the lengthy process of implementing national sovereignty, Mexico and Cuba developed an overlapping international foreign policy built upon the struggles of the Mexican Revolution, as U.S. imperialism grew stronger in the twentieth century. Through the 1938 Mexican Petroleum Nationalization and the 1960 Cuban nationalization of petroleum refineries, both countries encountered U.S. attempts to further the overarching expansionist doctrine that the Good Neighbor policy (1933) tried to change and the Alliance for Progress (1961) attempted to hide as the Roosevelt Corollary (1904) persisted. The following questions provide the approach and answers sought through this chapter: How were Mexico and Cuba able to navigate the new geopolitical and economic terrain of the twentieth century? What advantages did Mexico possess in 1938? What conditions did Cuba’s revolutionary government encounter in 1959?

This chapter addresses the importance of Mexico’s pioneering efforts in navigating U.S. and Multinational Corporations (MNCs) attempts to control petroleum resources. I argue, using the contrast oriented and macro-analytic approaches, that the actions of revolutionary Mexico supported Cuba’s future encounters as it dealt with both the United States and the Soviet Union during the height of the Cold War. The chapter is organized into three sections. First, I analyze the important advantages that Mexico possessed prior to and during the 1938 Mexican Petroleum Nationalization on the eve of World War II. Next, I explore the conditions encountered by the 1960 Cuban Petroleum Nationalization during the Cold War. And finally, I provide a comparative analysis of the 1938 Mexican and 1960 Cuban nationalization of petroleum refineries and the
significance of the Good Neighbor Policy and the Alliance for Progress in each case. This enhances our understanding of the development of an international Latin American foreign policy a significant part of the revolutionary trajectory of Latin America and important because it has not been previously studied from this perspective and in comparison to the U.S. (for a comparative view of the Cuban and Mexican nationalizations please see Appendix A).

I. The Carranza Doctrine: Latin America for Latin Americans

As Roosevelt implemented his Corollary in accordance with Open Door/Big Stick policies emphasizing economic and military expansion, the Mexican Revolution developed a revolutionary foreign policy through the 1918 Carranza Doctrine and the 1917 Mexican Constitution. As the twentieth century wore on, Fulbright’s claim of a lack of leadership can also be used to describe the United States’ waning influence in Latin America, and as early as the Woodrow Wilson Administration (1913-1921), anti-communism became a form of criminalization to sway the U.S. public to fear revolutionary movements. These tactics were used to avoid dealing with larger, more complex issues regarding economic and social development in a post war world, as the United States followed the same policies it developed and consolidated in the early part of the twentieth century. Lorenzo Meyer sums up the situation in Mexico during the 1938 Petroleum Nationalization regarding U.S. policies:

The Mexican regime firmly supported Roosevelt’s international policy [Good Neighbor], Daniels said. It was indispensable to keep up Latin America’s confidence in the U.S. and not fall back into the old imperialist practices. The ambassador went on to tell his president that the State Department was reluctant to abandon the “Big Stick” in favor of the Good Neighbor Policy. His advice seems to have been heeded, but only up to a point, since there were forces pulling in the opposite direction that had to be taken into account.438

437 Meyer, Mexico and the United States in the Oil Controversy, 1917-1942, 187.
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Lázaro Cárdenas provides his interpretation of Latin American solidarity regarding the United States, quoting Venustiano Carranza who, in 1918, changed the direction of Mexican leadership in the Americas. Cárdenas makes the point of stating how Mexico and Latin America had moved on from the U.S. model of interventionism,

My attitude regarding Cuba [1959] is inspired as part of the greatest of interest for Mexico. Asking respect for self-determination of the brother country [Cuba] and demand no intervention in its domestic affairs is to maintain the most correct and intransient thesis of international politics. Signifying the conservation of the incalculable Mexican moral authority demanding always, equal treatment of our country. Here I cite part of the important and memorable doctrinal speech Presented by Mr. Carranza in Matamoros on November 29, 1915:

“It is time that Latin America know that we have won through internal struggle the re-establishment of justice and the rule of law, serving as an example for the people to defend their sovereignty, institutions and the liberty of our citizens. Our battle is the beginning of a universal fight that passes into an era of justice, in which the establishment of the principle of respect, great countries should have for weak countries”…

Throughout the world there are clear signs of the passage of fundamental changes. The old countries that until yesterday were colonies, not only want political liberty, but their social transformation.439

Cárdenas asks that the policy of intervention be stopped and that the Carranza Doctrine calls for the rule of law, asserting that countries have the right to self-determination (national sovereignty) based on mutual respect. But that was not the case. In the 1950s, the United States continued to intervene and overthrow democratically elected governments in Iran, Guatemala, and Bolivia.440 The contradiction between the United States as the standard bearer of democracy and equality while serving its own economic and political interests masked the inability of the United States to lead the hemisphere, as the 1918 Carranza Doctrine was challenging.441

439 Cárdenas, Ideario político, 291-292.
A lack of U.S. leadership resulted in the world economic crash of 1929 (a sign of the relative weakness of the U.S. military during the 1930s) and the United States followed a modified foreign policy effort under the FDR administration, seeking to reorganize its efforts away from interventionism.\textsuperscript{442} Introducing president FDR’s Good Neighbor Policy to Latin America became an initiative promoting a policy of respect, but it did not extend much beyond FDR’s presidency (1933-1945).\textsuperscript{443} The Good Neighbor Policy was a contradiction in history, influencing Mexico’s decision toward the 1938 Petroleum Nationalization. International circumstances challenged the notion of the United States as a “Good Neighbor” because of the history of imperialist interventions in Mexico.\textsuperscript{444}

A new policy was needed to soothe the frayed relations between the United States and Latin America, one based on the good intentions of the Good Neighbor Policy approach, but it was essential to maintain the overarching economic expansionist dictum that had been in existence for more than a hundred years. On the eve of World War II, the United States sought to maintain good relations with Latin America, courting Mexico for its natural resources.

In the 1930s, the U.S. State Department was divided from FDR and Ambassador to Mexico, Josephus Daniels, over the petroleum nationalization issue. Ambassador Daniels remained outside of the tensions between the petroleum MNCs and the Mexican government.\textsuperscript{445} Supposedly favoring oil nationalization above all, he had respect for Mexican sovereignty. Daniels’ intentions were more about keeping Mexican natural resources accessible to the United States, especially on the eve of World War II.\textsuperscript{446} Mexico utilized the support of Daniels and FDR

\textsuperscript{442} Franklin D. Roosevelt, "Address before the Pan American Union, April 12, 1933," (US Department of State, Publication, 1983), http://www.ibiblio.org/pha/7-2-188/188-01.html.  
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to its advantage keeping in mind the historic approach (Big Stick) taken by petroleum MNCs using the U.S. government to do their bidding. Cárdenas describes the situation:

The direct dominion of the soil, liberating it from the control of impinging elements in which the right of the nation was a dead letter and with the habit of creating obstacles for the vigilance of the fundamental laws is mediated by coordinated diplomatic actions and mercenary interventions.

His words exemplified the description of the fundamental laws (1917 Mexican Constitution) that meant nothing in the face of the U.S.’s ability to use force in the combination of an aggressive diplomacy ready to intervene in Mexico’s affairs. Whether it was Big Stick, Open Door, Good Neighbor, or the Alliance for Progress, there was a limited shift away from imperialism during the Good Neighbor Policy. Mexico was the prime example of years of invasions and interventions, highlighted by a famous quote attributed to Porfirio Díaz, “Poor Mexico, so far from God, so close to the United States.”

The 1930s Mexican experience was a precursor to U.S.-Soviet relations during the Cold War (1945-1989) that signaled the end of the Good Neighbor policy and the resurgence of anti-communism. Similar to the success of the 1938 Mexican Petroleum Nationalization, the Cuban Revolution forced the JFK administration to develop the propagandistic Alliance for Progress. The Alliance was an attempt to counter the gains made by the Cuban Revolution by winning the hearts and minds of Latin America. A limited foreign policy, the Alliance focused on U.S. interests above those of Latin America. In line with the Big Stick/Open Door trajectory. Lorenzo Meyer states that the “New Deal [Good Neighbor], in the final analysis, was to help American

---
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enterprise get reestablished in a world emerging from the Depression of 1929.” It was a stopgap measure to stem the tide in the 1930s of the growing influence of the Mexican and Russian Revolutions and their influence on the developing world as both nations possessed huge reserves of petroleum that each nationalized to establish their sovereignty.

Thus, it is important to understand the conditions that led to the development of the Good Neighbor Policy that later impacted the development of U.S. foreign policy toward Latin America through the Alliance for Progress. It essentially developed a politically correct clandestine imperialism. The Good Neighbor Policy was an effort to curb the historical legacy of U.S. interventions in Mexico and other parts of Latin America. While the Alliance for Progress was an anti-communist effort to stop the advance of the Cuban Revolution, Cuba became communism’s greatest unintentional success in the Western Hemisphere.

The Alliance offered limited loans to Latin America but maintained its interventionist policy during and after the JFK Administration. Cárdenas describes the ultimate goal of anti-communism as criminalizing the right of countries to establish “democracy, economic independence and national sovereignty,” all ideals the U.S. espouses but does not live up to:

The anti-communist politics of Latin America tries to present communism as the source of subversive movements inspired to fight for democracy, with the intention of economic independence, the total dedication to defend national sovereignty, because each of these three currents [democracy, economic independence and national sovereignty] are seen as affronts to the interests of finance capital.\footnote{Cárdenas, Ideario político, 95.}

Finance capital, or the capitalist world-system, includes more than just the petroleum MNCs. It also includes the growing United States and European government coordination through their banking industries in support of economic expansion through intervention. By the time of the

\footnote{Meyer, Mexico and the United States in the Oil Controversy, 1917-1942, 186.}
Cuban Revolution, finance capital included all of the groups (banking, corporations, and governments) that aligned to form the military-industrial complex (MIC).

Castro also reminds us of the historical message of José Martí who, in the 1890s, presciently described U.S. policy as guided by imperialism and warned of it, using Cuba as an example of the numerous attempts since the first days of the U.S. Republic to seize the island. As a warning from history, Castro quotes Martí to describe the importance of timing and the need to work in silence to reach the ultimate objective of national sovereignty. For Castro, as for Martí, Cuba represented the frontline of the battle for the rest of Latin America and the Caribbean:

When the special period [1991] began we said: ‘Now, our first internationalist duty is to defend this bulwark.’ We meant what Martí had described in the last words he wrote the day before his death, when he said that the main objective of his struggle had to go undeclared, in order to be accomplished. Martí, who was not only a true believer in his ideas but also a wholehearted follower of Bolivar’s, had set himself an objective. According to his words, it was to ‘timely prevent, with the independence of Cuba, United States expansion over the Antilles and fall with this additional might on our purpose.’ It was his political will and he expressed his life’s aspiration to prevent the fall of that first bulwark (Cuba) which the northern neighbors had so many times tried to occupy. That trench is still there, and we will continue to be there, with a people willing to fight to the death to prevent the fall of that frontline, the Americas. Fidel Castro 1999.

Martí’s position was that the Americas were a bulwark against U.S. expansion due to its proximity and revolutionary history, a view which influenced Cárdenas and Castro to take Latin American sovereignty a step further by thwarting U.S. interventionism. Cárdenas and Castro’s efforts resulted in the creation of an international solidarity movement using petroleum as a twentieth century global resource weapon.

In Latin America, Carranza’s Doctrine took a stand against U.S. intervention and named Mexico as the new leadership of the Americas, ushering in a new generation of

---

revolutionaries. Therefore, the actions of Cárdenas embodied radical revolutionary aspirations, seen through the revolutionary administrative decisions made by him and his predecessors. Influenced by Carranza and Cárdenas, the Cuban Revolution was aware of the historical precedent set by the Mexican Revolution. Revolutionaries such as Ernesto Ché Guevara took part in establishing Cuban foreign policy, as the Revolution required the efforts of its leaders to overcome the major challenge of confronting U.S. hegemony.

On August 6, 1960 Ernesto Ché Guevara, Minister of Industries, nationalized the petroleum refineries as the Cuban Revolution was threatened militarily and economically. The events leading to the nationalization of the petroleum MNCs in Cuba harkened back to the time when Cárdenas nationalized petroleum in 1938. Below, Castro recalls the action taken by the Mexican government that served as a lesson to his confrontation with the MIC.

> Without a doubt (referring to the Mexican case) the reality that that country [Mexico] endured over fifty years of problems and challenges, since the beginning of the revolution [1910] and as a result of this process the nationalization of petroleum; many of the problems we are undergoing today the Mexicans endured to be able to obtain replacement parts and equipment. And in reality the Mexican economy now is growing, it is an economy that has risen to levels higher than the rest of the countries in Latin America.

In 1964, as the Cuban Revolution had survived invasion, Castro stressed the importance of the 1938 Petroleum Nationalization and the social, political, and economic impact such a policy had on Latin America. More than twenty-one years after Mexico nationalized its oil (a twenty-eight year process), Cuba underwent a similar experience in 1960 (eighteen months after seizing

---

power). According to Harvey O’Connor “Mexico of 1938 was a constant warning. As for branding nationalization an unpardonable sin, the oil companies were on shaky ground. Despite nationalization in Bolivia, they had returned; Shell and Texaco had gone into that country despite the nationalization of Standard’s properties in 1938.”\textsuperscript{457} Thus, Mexico had set a precedent, proving that efforts to stop petroleum nationalization would not be entirely successful.

Under political pressure, the petroleum MNCs refused to work with the Cuban revolutionary government and were forced by Washington to refuse to refine Cuban-owned Russian oil, ending relations with the Cuban government. As Castro described in the quote above, Mexico underwent a similar process which led to an attempted embargo by the world oil cartel; Anglo-Persian Oil Company - now British Petroleum; Gulf Oil, Standard Oil of California, SoCal and Texaco - now Chevron, Royal Dutch Shell, and Standard Oil of New Jersey - Esso and Standard Oil Company of New York - Socony now ExxonMobil, representing the petroleum MNCs of the twentieth century.\textsuperscript{458}

Confronting the petroleum MNCs in the 1930s was an audacious act on the part of the Mexican government. Mexico’s economy was weak, and World War II was about to break out in Europe and Asia. There was great competition for the Mexican oil reserves as both the Axis (Germany, Italy, and Japan) and Allies (Britain, France, Russian and the U.S.) powers vied for access. Cárdenas initially did not want to nationalize, but after the petroleum MNCs threatened to undermine his government and the sovereignty of Mexico he was forced to act. After the 1938 Mexican Petroleum Nationalization, the petroleum MNCs then imposed a boycott of Mexican petroleum that for the most part failed due to Mexico’s focus on domestic consumption and the
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changing international economic and political conditions (anti-fascism) on the eve of World War II.  

Almost twenty-two years later in 1960, Cuba confronts the petroleum MNCs in league with the U.S. government now the MIC, as the Revolution seized foreign owned assets, foreign-owned lands, and equipment for oil exploration and refining. Meanwhile the U.S. government blocked millions of dollars from reaching Cuba through an economic blockade (embargo) that has lasted nearly fifty years. Cuba in 1960 faced a coordinated effort by the MIC where Mexico dealt with the nascent U.S. hegemon. Therefore, during the Cold War, Cuba confronted the United States at the height of its hegemony as it vied for control of the world’s resources. Castro here weighs in on what is meant by blockade, where Mexico dealt with the oil cartels Cuba confronted very different conditions,

We say ‘blockade’, but blockade does not mean much. I wish it were an economic blockade! What our country has been enduring for a long time is true economic warfare. Do you want evidence? You can go anywhere in the world, any factory owned by an American company, to buy a cap or a handkerchief to export to Cuba. Even if produced by nationals of the country in question with raw materials originating in the same country, the United States government thousands of miles away, bans the sale of such a cap or handkerchief. Is that blockade or economic warfare?

The quote above describes the serious challenge faced by the Cuban Revolution in the age of coordinated government and corporate “economic warfare,” or, as described by Skocpol, “international warfare.” As such Cárdenas and Castro in the 1960s began to analyze the circumstances of their experiences. Their view coincides with that of Wallerstein, who describes that “the strategy of antisystemic movements had been decided upon long before. It had in fact been conceived in the nineteenth century and confirmed by crucial decisions during the 1914-
1945 period. In the period from 1945 on, this strategy has paid off in enormous successes.**461 Furthermore, Wallerstein explains that “Revolutionary movements can only succeed to the extent that they know how to maneuver in the dark forest of the present with concepts inevitably derived from the past.”**462 Prior to the Monroe Doctrine and Roosevelt Corollary, the Haitian Revolution and its support of Latin American independence established not a policy but a precedent that Bolívar and Martí used to influence the Mexican and Cuban Revolutions reinforced by the Carranza Doctrine.

II. Mexico’s Comparative Advantage: 1938 Petroleum Nationalization

Mexicans were better skilled in international negotiation, more realistic in the evaluation of historical contexts, and more creative in situations of crisis than their European and U.S. counterparts.463

The massive loss of life and destruction of World War I left Europe in chaos and opened the way for the United States to become an important economic and political influence. A new world power at the end of World War I, the United States dominated Latin America as a reaction to the Mexican Revolution.464 At the center of the developing League of Nations, the U.S. Congress rebuffed Woodrow Wilson in his attempts to establish a stronger U.S. international presence and promote the Roosevelt Corollary economic expansion policies. But powerful groups believed that isolation from Europe was the best U.S. international policy and pushed for a greater focus on Latin America. The 1920s for the United States saw an increase of gunboat diplomacy in Latin America, as the end of World War I saw the invasions of Cuba, Haiti, and Nicaragua.465 In a historical déjà vu, the United States once again implemented the Monroe
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Doctrine/Manifest Destiny (1823/1845) policy to exclude Europe (Britain France, Germany Italy, Belgium and Spain) from Latin America for its own purpose of economic and natural resource expansion.

Thus, in the first three decades of the twentieth century, the U.S. followed a policy of intervening in Latin American affairs. Several interventions that stood out in the minds of Mexican revolutionaries were the occupation of Veracruz in 1913 and the Pershing Expedition in 1917.\textsuperscript{466} Mexican revolutionary president Venustiano Carranza was appalled at the lack of respect for Mexican sovereignty, and in 1918 he developed the Carranza Doctrine.

For Mexico, the Cuban experience with the U.S. served as a reminder of the Big Stick policy towards countries in the region. U.S. foreign policy regarded Latin America as its sphere of influence and a country’s sovereignty meant little as the Platt Amendment imposed on Cuba was applied to the entire Western hemisphere.\textsuperscript{467} Castro looks at the Platt Amendment and its implementation across the hemisphere from a historical perspective,

Those who know the history of this century, who also know the history until this hour, within the last few days. Think about the United States promotion of democracy, it is a fabulous thing. It is legendary when the United States has culminated on this continent numerous interventions. The United States intervened in countries with a twenty million dollar debt which, happened to Haiti, it happened to Santo Domingo, it happened to Nicaragua, it is unknown to the quantity of people, Cuba included, and here also, with a constitutional right, and what does the United States want to establish now for all of Latin America but a species of Platt Amendment with an institutionalized right to intervention.\textsuperscript{468}

The promotion of the right kind of pro-U.S. democracy that faithfully provides payment is the best policy to pursue in the age of a worldwide Platt Amendment. Therefore, an interventionist
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policy for the political purpose of controlling the economies and politics of countries attempting
to develop their own national policies backfired, leading to the Mexican and Cuban Revolutions.

According to Wallerstein, “the long-run economic cost to the MNCs of interventionists
actions in their behalf by core states in weaker states have risen considerably, and relatively
more than the costs of co-optative strategies, although these too have risen.”

Furthermore, it has “led to a zigzag pattern of the real foreign policies of core states in so far as they respond to
the pressures of the MNCs. The zigzag pattern itself has led to uncertainties, which have
stimulated testing mechanisms, which thereby have increased the costs of both the
interventionists and the co-optative strategies.”

Whether the Big Stick, Open Door, or the
Roosevelt Corollary, the policy was fundamentally interventionist, and in the twentieth century
this created the opposite effect, leading to both revolutions and world-wide antisystemic
movements.

According to Friedrich Schuler, Big Stick, the Platt Amendment, and policies of
intervention became a diplomatic advantage for Latin America,

If geography is destiny, then Cárdenas administration’s proximity
to the Roosevelt [FDR] administration was a blessing in disguise.
Mexico’s relationship with the pro-Mexico faction in the White
House proved critical for many policy inspirations, provided it with
the financial base to realize its radical politics, and repeatedly
assured its survival against domestic and foreign foes alike.
It was a good relationship.

Despite the development of a strong Latin American diplomatic corps that stemmed from the
Mexican Revolution, there developed a clear policy towards the United States. The twentieth
century experienced growing disparities between wealthy countries and those with horrible
social conditions that led to revolution. Mexico, as the first to rebel in the twentieth century, had
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a far-reaching impact on future U.S. and Latin American relations. Revolution became a way of life for many, and as the social struggle was the only thing many knew, it molded the young revolutionary movements in Mexico and Cuba during the twentieth century.

As a result, Cárdenas was thrust into the Mexican Revolution and quickly learned to use the battlefield as both a training ground and experience for his future in politics. Through struggle, Cárdenas and his colleagues developed a strong nationalist attitude towards the United States and taking stock of the legacy of U.S. imperialism and various wars, incursions, and political intrigues. If revolution taught anything it was an understanding that war leads to misery and exposure to invasion, thus nationalism was an effort to strengthen the country against such problems. The revolutionary experience led to “Mexico’s neutrality in the expanding European war (World War II). The nationalist politician, Cárdenas was determined that Mexico’s self-determination and territorial sovereignty must not become a victim of developments in Europe long before a credible Axis threat had ever been proven to exist.”

Europe and the United States might have forgotten the lessons of World War I, but after years of revolution and mayhem, Mexico could not forget its own struggle. Below, Cárdenas describes the future impact of the war as not one of unifying people but shrinking their participation in major world decisions, and how with each successive war in the twentieth century, the concentration of power lands in the hands of the few, destroying the solidarity of conscious governments,

If this war, unwanted by the people of the world, representing like no other, destruction and death, does not win the democratic transformation, solidarity of men, nations, races; if this destructive fight only serves to affirm the democratic debility, the inhibition of the greatest, the domination codified by some countries well armed to oppress and place asunder weak countries,
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the history of the world will detail in its pages, referring to our time, the most odious example the world has ever seen.474

Cardenas’s remarkable military and political career assisted him in creating an extensive network throughout the Mexican revolutionary army. During his presidency he was able to hedge off threats both internally and externally while standing by his principles and lending support to a variety of causes and movements.475 Based on a chaotic international political climate, the reactionary authoritarian nature of both the left and right (Nazism/Stalinism) in the 1930s provided opportunities for the United States to support at times, be neutral at other times, and oppose radical democratic governments like Mexico.476

Unfortunately, an anti-communist opposition to countries seeking national liberation influenced Senator J. William Fulbright to claim that the United States suffers from a lack of leadership, in Latin America and the world, as a result of its fear. Thus, anti-communist opposition resulted in disparities leading to revolutionary conditions resulting from discontent.477 Mexico’s revolutionary struggle therefore developed an international approach to world relations, making it the center of radical democratic movements. Mexico, a country reeling from years of violence and strife culminated in producing fighters, intellectuals, and statesmen.478

With Europe severely hobbled by both world wars, Mexico was beset by revolution and chaos, as a radical democratic country firmly aware of world conditions it struggled to institutionalize revolution by way of the 1917 Mexican Constitution.479 The failure of World War I and subsequent efforts to end war created the desperate conditions leading to World War II.
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War fueled an obsession for oil resources as militarily powerful nations made policies with the petroleum MNCs. At the same time energy rich nations, led by Mexico, implemented radical documents like the 1917 Mexican Constitution to counter the history of imperialism. Chaotic world conditions influenced the Mexican Revolution to create policies and doctrines that grew to serve the Mexican people and influence Latin America. Schuler describes the future implications of policy decisions by Mexico in the 1930s,

Mexican Minister of Foreign Relations Genaro Estrada proclaimed the so-called Estrada Doctrine. It granted diplomatic recognition to a government in principle regardless of whether it had come to power by the ballot or the bullet. No longer should the U.S. and conservative Latin American governments have the power to determine which revolutionary Latin American government was legitimate and which one was not. Between 1924 and 1930 the Inter-American Conference system had become a place for professional diplomats to articulate a distinctly Mexican regional diplomacy.\(^{480}\)

The future implications of the Estrada Doctrine, much like the Carranza Doctrine, assisted Mexico in being the only country in Latin America allowed to have relations with Cuba (of course, with the permission of the United States\(^{481}\)), even after the Office of American States (OAS), under the command of the United States, ejected Cuba from membership. Mexico was one of the first countries to recognize the Cuban revolutionary government and continued relations for over fifty years.\(^{482}\) The Carranza and Estrada doctrines had over many years provided Mexico a special place in Latin American relations with the United States.

Furthermore, as a result of World War I,

During the same period all Mexican administrations declined repeated invitations to join the worldwide forum of the League of Nations in Geneva. Mexican diplomats saw no use in joining an organization that could not protect their rights against the United States, since the League accepted the
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validity of the U.S. Monroe Doctrine and, consequently abstained from intervening in Latin American affairs.\textsuperscript{483}

Mexican revolutionary governments were aware they had to pursue policies alone without international support, especially from the League of Nations. Support from the United States in the form of isolationist policies had the express purpose of continuing to use the Monroe Doctrine/Manifest Destiny in the twentieth century to promote imperial capitalism.\textsuperscript{484} The ability to incorporate history into foreign policy influenced a hemispheric diplomatic revolutionary period where Mexico in the 1930s taught radical democratic movements (1933 and 1959 Cuba) to use perceived weakness and vulnerability as an advantage.

Castro elaborates on the massive effort after World War II to control petroleum resources and people. The rise of the superpower created an overestimation, influencing efforts for hemispheric revolutionary social movements:

We say that it is new this form of revolution in this continent and with that we do not negate the liberation efforts of other countries, to be more correct, we could also say that this is the second revolution in the Americas. It was the first against the yoke of colonial Spain and it is this one, the second to the last against the yoke of Yankee colonialism. But, could we have imagined revolution in the Americas’? No! The revolutions in the Americas are scripted, the revolutions in the Americas are prohibited; they were prohibited to be done or even as a right. The completion of material domination and implanted rights by the empire on this continent. Revolutions were not authorized in the Americas. The only revolutions authorized in the Americas were the revolutions “made in United States!” It is the coups d’états here [Latin America], were called “revolutions,” or the revolutionary movements, until they were allowed to exist by the North American government.\textsuperscript{485}

The United States as a dominant country confronted the Soviet Union. Both emerged from the Second World War as superpowers. Russia’s bittersweet victory was severely hobbled by the
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massive losses (estimated 20 million dead) it suffered during the war. With Europe in ruins, once colonial powers ended their control of vast territories, and a power vacuum allowed the United States to establish complete dominance over Latin America, dominance that overlooked the 1918 Carranza Doctrine and the Mexican Revolution for national sovereignty. Fledgling social movements in the Americas were threatened both internally and externally by the MIC. First Carranza and later Estrada through the Mexican Revolution and later the 1938 Petroleum Nationalization influenced major geopolitical changes that as a result of the tumultuous Cuban Revolution brought about a different hemispheric geopolitical reality that the U.S. to this day does not entirely recognize.

III. The Good Neighbor Policy (Mexico/Latin America) v. The Alliance for Progress (Cuba/Globalization)

Lázaro Cárdenas responded to Kennedy’s speech and through the so-called “Alliance for Progress,” Kennedy declared, quoting Juárez as saying that America should be the continent of democracy, but Kennedy had forgotten that Juárez had stated that “respect for foreign rights was peace” and that the United States had taken half of Mexico’s territory and of course Kennedy did not mention a single word about that questionable act.\(^{486}\)

_Fidel Castro, 1961._

The Good Neighbor policy differed from the Alliance for Progress in its efforts towards hemispheric respect rather than regime change. Cárdenas had the distinct honor of being engaged in addressing both foreign policy efforts involving both Mexico and Cuba. By addressing the new conflicts presented by the “bipolar world” and based on the policies of the Presidency of Cárdenas, the legacy of Mexico allied to Cuba continued, no matter how much U.S. pressure was used to break off relations.

The rest of Latin America and the Organization of American States (OAS) ended relations

with Cuba after pressure from the U.S. Moreover, Cárdenas, like Fidel lived a long life -
outliving many of the policies and politics of many “world leaders.” That longevity, plus the
patience and perseverance saw through the false claims of being neighbors and of dubious
alliances.

It can be inferred that JFK, in his speech about the Alliance for Progress, was ill-informed
in invoking the words of Benito Juárez, the former president and hero of Mexican independence
from French neo-colonialism who encountered similar circumstances as Castro by defeating U.S.
neocolonialism. Both Castro and Juárez developed a new mandate for Latin American policy.
Juárez developed policies that ranged from the U.S. defeat of Mexico and the loss of over half of
Mexico’s territory to the defeat of French neocolonialism. Castro’s Cuba confronted a bipolar
world leading to the United States becoming the lone superpower in the 1990s. The French of the
1860s were similar to the United States of the 1990s, both international powers with military
bases around the world. They promoted their own doctrines, be it the Monroe Doctrine or French
Imperialism, dividing the world into spheres of influence and developing policies to justify
incursions be they economic, military, or political.

In a rebuttal to the Alliance for Progress given at the 1961 Punta del Este Conference,
Ernesto Ché Guevara pointed out that the United States had promised Latin America billions in
support, but the U.S. Congress had approved only a fraction of that money. According to
Guevara, Eurasian socialist countries had already signed agreements giving support to Cuba that
totaled more than what the Alliance for Progress had presented to all of Latin America. With
loans that did not go beyond more that those approved by congress, the fate of the Alliance for
Progress, for all intents and purposes, died with JFK.
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The death of JFK and the end of the Alliance for Progress meant little to the historical knowledge that the Good Neighbor policy tried in vain to end. Purely a rhetorical exercise, it tried to modify the economic, political, and military incursions that challenged Latin American sovereignty. They attempted to end such disastrous policies when Mexico rebelled, causing confrontations leading to the 1938 Mexican Petroleum Nationalization and later the Cuban Revolution.

Throughout the twentieth century the oil MNCs continued to ignore the diplomatic recommendations of the Mexican Ministry of Foreign Relations and the advice of U.S. Ambassador to Mexico, Josephus Daniels. The Mexican Revolution through the Carranza Doctrine was a stark reminder of the new leadership in Latin America, a leadership that connected both Mexican and Cuban Revolutions, challenging the Alliance for Progress and its limited support, described by Guevara as “a confidence game.”

The “confidence game” in Latin America, whether it was the Good Neighbor policy or the Alliance for Progress, became more complex, described by Guevara as the rise of economic imperialism in the form of neoliberalism. Fidel describes the Alliance for Progress:

The New York Times affirmed in an editorial that the presentation of an important policy is to be declared at the Punta del Este Conference of sufficient importance not given to one of the objectives of the “Alliance for Progress” as it was conceived of originally, that is to say social reforms. The newspaper decries that the original agenda allowed for an extensive debate about commercial problems, finance, production and economic integration, but president John Kennedy never supported a second plan, substituted for the question of social justice, when the Alliance for Progress was launched in 1961. According to the newspaper “the important and vital idea of social justice was forgotten.”
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The Alliance for Progress and the Good Neighbor policy were measures to block real progress, and overall they supported U.S. expansion, while invasions and interventions became clandestine with the rise of the CIA in the late 1940s. Castro raised the issue of social justice because the New York Times saw the hypocrisy of a lack of social justice leading to greater problems. In his article “When No One Gives a Damn: The Politics of Simulopting,” Saul Landau describes the dual policy of negotiation of state sponsored assassination implemented under the guise of the Alliance for Progress, thereby avoiding social justice because efforts were mounted against the life of Castro while trying to negotiate with the Cuban Revolution.492

A Machiavellian approach by the JFK administration and efforts at assassination and negotiations brought about the development of MIC, while JFK, trying to implement his own the Good Neighbor policy ushered in the Alliance for Progress, described in Hal Brand’s book, Latin America’s Cold War,

The rhetoric of the Good Neighbor conduced to a striking improvement in the tone of U.S.-Latin American relations, a change reflected in the late 1940s in the formation of the Organization of American States (O.A.S.) and the Rio Pact, two institutions that essentially institutionalized American hegemony in the hemisphere. Concrete U.S. policies mixed with the overall tenor of Washington’s global diplomacy in encouraging democratization in Latin America. Beginning with the Atlantic Charter in 1941, themes of democracy and self-determination were central to Roosevelt’s statecraft. Just as Woodrow Wilson’s anticolonial rhetoric had sparked nationalist sentiment following World War I, this idea of a “New Deal for the world” had a pronounced ideological impact in Latin America.493

U.S. hegemony lay at the base of attempts to control revolutions in the twentieth century, as countries gained their freedom with the demise of European colonial rule. The United States as a “revolutionary” country itself was in reality, according to Senator J. William Fulbright, an
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“unrevolutionary America.” The revolutionary past of the U.S. became a surreptitious ploy of promoting so-called social justice, described by C.L.R. James as the gains of the American and French Revolutions were specifically for white males. U.S. notions of ‘social justice’ became a coercive foreign policy that promoted national independence as a form of U.S. controlled democracy, exemplified by Cuba’s Platt Amendment, leading to dictatorships increasing the likelihood of rebellion.

According to Stephen G. Rabe, in the book *Eisenhower and Latin America*, a continued policy of supporting dictatorship in Latin America created major social problems throughout region. From Porfirio Díaz to Fulgencio Batista, Eisenhower at the end of his two terms in office repudiated the support of dictatorships by supporting efforts at promoting U.S. capitalist-democracy. Roosevelt through the New Deal focused on promoting U.S. interests began the “simulopting” approach in the age of national liberation (antisystemic movements) at the height of U.S. hegemony.

As a result of changing presidencies and changing administrations, no coherent foreign policy on the part of the United States lasted other than interventionism. The very partisan politics that evolved out of the Cold War reached a crescendo in the late 1950s and early 1960s, leading to the age of aggressive policies leading to the invasions of Cuba, the Dominican Republic, and the greatest disaster of all, the defeat by the Vietnamese (1975) who, like Mexico and Haiti, had to win their liberation also from the French. In 1969, Cárdenas declared, “Vietnam defines the future.”

Vietnam is today what defines the world of the immediate future: the fight
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without quarter against war and imperialist oppression and the completion and strict national independence of the people who seek justice and peace.498

By invoking Juárez, JFK overlooked the defeat of the French at Dien Bien Phu in 1954 as the French were defeated by Mexico in 1869 and Haiti in 1804.499 The United States ignored its own history with Latin America and the Caribbean, whether it was the Mexican-American War of the 1840s, the Cuban defeat of the CIA at Playa Giron (Bay of Pigs Intervention) in 1961, or the defeat of the United States by Vietnam in 1975. History foretells the fate of such misadventures, Iraq of 2012 and Afghanistan of 2013. Supreme power brings blindness, and as Mexico served as a reminder to Latin America, Haiti, Cuba and Vietnam became symbols to the world. Fulbright aptly describes the folly of power,

Power has a way of undermining judgment, of planting delusions of grandeur in the minds of otherwise sensible people and otherwise sensible nations. As I have said earlier, the idea of being responsible for the world seems to have dazzled us, giving rise to what I call the arrogance of power, or what the French, perhaps more aptly, call “le vertige de puissance,” by which they mean a kind of dizziness or giddiness inspired by the possession of greater power.500

Great power at what expense, at the risk of defeats throughout the world since the defeat at the Bay of Pigs invasion, as the U.S. has become powerful but continues to lose the hearts and minds of the world.

IV. Mexican (1934-1940) and Cuban (1959-1965) foreign policy processes
The powerful empire decided on the destruction of the Cuban Revolution, the Cuban Revolution had to encounter, without a doubt, the powerful empire. Is there anyone naïve enough in the world who thinks that agrarian reform will take away land from the big imperialist companies without confronting imperialism? Is there anyone naïve in the world who thinks that we can nationalize public services without facing imperialism? Is there anyone naïve enough with the belief that we can aspire to have an
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independent economy and independent politics without being challenged by imperialism?  

*Fidel Castro, 1961.*

U.S. global imperialism, a constant source of tension with Cuba, Mexico, and the rest of Latin America, created the need for a strong diplomatic response. Following a historical process of diplomatic relations, both countries serve as guideposts for the rest Latin America, establishing methods for making policy in countries such as Argentina, Brazil, Bolivia, Ecuador, and Venezuela. Latin Americanism, as described by Hassan Dalband, is “Internationalism with support for oppressed nations and progressive movements have been the base for the foreign policy of Cuba.”

Similar to the challenges created by a lack of recognition for Mexican revolutionary governments, the Carranza and the Estrada Doctrines set up the foreign policy standard leading to the victory of the Cuban Revolution in 1959.

Latin American revolutions during the twentieth century were successful because of the focus on social justice through national liberation. The years of struggle Mexico and Cuba endured follow Castro’s principles of revolution: “Honor is not negotiable! Our homeland is not negotiable! Dignity is not negotiable! Independence, sovereignty, history and glory are not negotiable!” An overall effort to remain steadfast in the face of massive pressure signifies a winner take all approach by the U.S. as its privilege expected Mexico and Cuba to follow its lead.

Revolution in itself was a “non-negotiable” process given no choice but to confront U.S. foreign policy with the success of its hegemony. Each country confronted the development of economic policies, the Good Neighbor of the 1930s to the Alliance for Progress of the 1960s,
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each promoted MIC economics over Latin American national sovereignty. The unilateral
approach that Bolívar warned Latin America of led to his dream of a Latin American union of
nations seeking national liberation resulting in the Mexican and Cuban Revolutions.\textsuperscript{505}

In the age of world wars to end all wars, neo-colonialism as economic control found once
former colonial powers unwilling to relinquish their territories once conquered by force.\textsuperscript{506} In the
age of Western democracy there developed alternatives to socialism in the form of policies
(Good Neighbor/Alliance for Progress). As described by Hassan Dalband in his book \textit{Democracy
and Human Rights, in Cuba and the United States},

International democracy to start with and the Cuban state professes an anti-
imperialism and internationalism with fundamental respect for
independence, sovereignty and the self-determination of nations. Rejecting
direct or indirect intervention in the internal or external affairs of countries
by means of armed aggression, economic blockade, or any form of
economic or political coercion.\textsuperscript{507}

Every major continent has experienced revolution against imperial dominance, be it the
Czar of Russia, European imperialist slicing up China, or dictatorship in Mexico and Cuba.
Rewriting history and the rules of engagement, irregular war, known commonly as guerrilla
warfare, led to the liberation of countries throughout the twentieth century. Engaging in
international warfare in the twentieth and twenty first centuries led to calls for some sort of world
governing body to support the efforts of the U.S. and Western Europe – The North Atlantic
Treaty Organization (NATO).

First the League of Nations then the United Nations originated to avoid world war through
disarmament, the use negotiation and diplomacy, and work to improve global welfare, but it was
also used to maintain neocolonial exploitation. The U.N. went further in serving the interests of
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the winning powers of World War II to stem the threat of potential world war. A limited policy of nuclear deterrence divided the world into bipolar corners of “democracy” and “communism.”\textsuperscript{508} The bipolar approach (U.S. and Russian relations) ignored a changing world - major shifts were initiated by world war led to national liberation movements. Castro describes the situation the Cuban Revolution encountered,

The same Cuban Revolution that has done what it has done, triumphed, and not by calculation, but by a rare historical coincidence, fourteen years after WWII in a bipolar world. None of us [Cuban revolutionaries] knew a single soviet, nor did we receive a single soviet bullet to support the end of the fight for our revolution, nor was there any political support after our triumph, nor did anyone attempt support because we were leery of it. For us Latin Americans, we do not like the suggestion of ideas or other things.\textsuperscript{509}

Support for the Cuban revolutionaries developed as a result of WWII and specifically from refugees from the Spanish Civil War.\textsuperscript{510} The precursor to WWII and the battleground between Nazism and Stalinism, the Spanish Civil War and the evacuation of Spanish refugees to Latin America, lent intellectual and ideological training (intellectual justice) to the burgeoning Cuban revolutionary movement. Cuba’s initial support came about in the Marti tradition of “It has to be in silence and sort of indirectly since the achievement of certain goals demands concealment, for, if proclaimed for what we really are, obstacles so formidable would rise as to prevent their attainment.”\textsuperscript{511}

The attainment of the overall triumph of the Cuban Revolution and the “rare historical coincidence” while following Martí’s dictum, provided the opportunity for the Cuban Revolution during the Cold War to have time for organization. Castro utilized the importance of the bipolar world because “It gave us time to form a consciousness, gave us time to develop ideas, it gave us
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time to create a new political culture, It gave us time! Sufficient time to create a fortress that allowed us to later resist the very difficult times.\textsuperscript{512}

During the Cold War, Cuba engaged in revolution and gained the assistance of the Soviet Union, once an ally of the United States against fascism. In comparison, revolutionary countries in the age of fascism (prior to WWII) had few allies other than the support of the Latin American people challenging U.S. imperialism. Facing the indisputable power of the U.S. made the actions of Castro in the 1960s comparable to Cárdenas encountering the economic and political problems faced by Cárdenas in 1938, with one notable exception. The Cuban Revolution learned from the Mexican experience and the history of Latin America,\textsuperscript{513} following a diplomatic approach that conceded little. According to Castro “We learned to imitate Mexico, who maintains a deep rut of its high traditions giving a realistic example of Latin Americanism that cedes nothing to influence those who work to destroy the unity of our lands.”\textsuperscript{514} Through the experience and personal connection to Cárdenas, Castro was in a way mentored in the skill of international diplomacy that the Mexicans of the 1930s invented.


Until the death of Stalin in 1953, the USSR took a patronizing attitude to Latin America, regarding it as at worst fascist and, at best, an ally of the United States of America. Consequently, until the 1950s, U.S. hegemony in the area was not seriously challenged. Under Khrushchev, however, Soviet policy became far more open towards Latin America and in the late 1950s the U.S.S.R. became willing to offer an attractive inducement to the oil-short Latin American countries: relatively cheap Soviet crude.\textsuperscript{515}

\textsuperscript{512}Castro, \textit{Venezuela y Chávez}, 174. “Nos dio tiempo para formar una conciencia, nos dio tiempo para sembrar ideas, nos dio tiempo para crear una nueva cultura política, nos dio tiempo!, suficiente tiempo para crear la Fortaleza que nos permitio resistir despues los tiempos más increiblemente difíciles.”
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The inter-war years (1919-1939) as a result of the Russian Revolution, created an anti-communist climate with thorough “red-baiting” criminalizing revolutionary or worker movements as communist. The origins of anti-communist foreign policies created a climate of fear. The Russian Revolution, along with the Mexican Revolution, served as examples to post World War II national liberation movements. Revolutionary combat experience was not lost on national liberation movements challenging world powers.

The most important and lasting experience was the case of the newly formed Russian Revolutionary government (U.S.S.R.). After triumphing in 1917, it was invaded on several fronts by a number of forces, including the United States at Archangel in northern Russia. Similar to the Haitian Revolution, the Russians fended off multiple attempts at toppling the Bolshevik government that rose to power over a period of revolution beginning in 1905 and ending in 1920. As in the case of Russia, the Mexican experience threatened the capitalist world-system. In the antagonistic “unrevolutionary American” tradition, the Soviet Union developed a difficult relationship with the United States early on, as did Mexico repeating a history similar to the Haitian Revolution (1791-1804) in being attacked by a number of countries. Following a revolutionary trajectory, national liberation movements continued a historical confrontation with the United States and its European allies.

After winning the Russia Revolution and establishing the Soviet Union, the death of Vladimir Lenin (leader of the Russian Revolution) brought Joseph Stalin to power (1922-1953). The rise of Stalinism led to the expulsion of Leon Trotsky (Second Leader of the Russian Revolution) and his “permanent revolution theory” that predicted the struggle for national
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liberation against imperialism and foreshadowed revolutions in the twentieth century. Trotsky would strain relations between Stalin’s Russia and Mexico as a result of Cárdenas giving him refuge in 1936 as he would Castro twenty years later in 1956. Influenced by Trotsky, Castro built upon the permanent revolution theory by describing, “revolutions are not exported (critic of Stalinism and U.S. anti-communism), they are done by the people, what Cuba can give people, it has done, is to serve as an example.” A counterrevolutionary similar to Calles and Batista, Joseph Stalin took control of Russia, liquidating many of the revolutionaries who brought him to power. Stalinism became an anathema to the national liberation struggle won by the Russian Revolution.

Stalinism sought to avoid international conflict for the purpose of concentrating on the development of a totalitarian state. Stalinism suited the imperial powers, especially after Soviet communism was empowered by Germany to destabilize the allies during World War I as it also tried to instigate Mexico, through the 1917 Zimmerman Telegram, to enter the war on the side of Germany, promising lands lost to the U.S., but Mexico refused. The arrangement between the Bolsheviks and the German military high command created a form of détente diplomacy later done by England, France, and Nazi Germany in an effort to destroy the Soviet Union.

Under confusing political circumstances, an anti-communist reaction developed after World War I led by the MNCs. Afraid of labor movements organizing workers for greater social justice, the MNCs crushed workers unions. In the 1930s western powers began to fear the rise of fascism in Europe, but questionable alliances between the MNCs in support of both Nazism and
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Stalinism continued. Many well-known U.S. corporations openly engaged in doing business with Hitler’s Nazi movement and supporting Stalin’s authoritarian regime.523

With the threat of war in Europe, unchecked German military expansion created antagonism with England and France. Both countries had rejected overtures by the Soviet Union to organize against Nazi Germany. Russia saw itself isolated and joined the 1939 Hitler-Stalin Non-aggression Pact to buy time for the USSR to develop defenses against a future a Nazi invasion. Friedrich Schuler describes the confused state of world relations and how they helped Mexico’s nationalization,

The Cárdenas administration was the greatest beneficiary of the ideological confusion that resulted from the Hitler-Stalin pact. First, the Mexican state gained a reprieve from leftist-rightist domestic struggles. Second, its organization would not be altered neither by fascist nor by leftist political interests.524

As a result of the Non-aggression Pact, alliances between radical and reactionary movements on the right and the left shifted, and an easing of tensions between the United States and Mexico provided support for Mexico’s nationalization. These tensions had resulted from anti-communist sentiments during the Mexican Revolution involving the long oil nationalization process. During the 1930s, the Good Neighbor policy engaged Mexico for access to its petroleum resources in an effort to counter the boycott imposed by the petroleum MNCs. 525 Furthermore, the United States also developed relations with the Soviet Union in the 1930s (anti-fascism), and there became a much closer relationship after Nazi-Germany attacked Russia
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(1941) in violation of their 1939 Non-aggression Pact.\textsuperscript{526} Both the United States and the U.S.S.R. entered the war after being attacked in 1941 by Japan and Germany.

As the allies united against fascism, the United States and the Soviet Union formed a relationship that included the delivery of support equipment and weapons to Russia for the fight against European fascism. In comparison to the U.S., Russia faced the largest military invasion in world history, resulting in the largest loss of life by any country during World War II. The struggle during World War II as allies meant little to the United States and its Cold War anti-communist agenda after 1945.\textsuperscript{527} The resulting Cold War created major tensions worldwide as the nuclear age had dawned and military power decided international relations once again.

As a result, a Cold War foreign policy of the U.S. after WWII dominated the world, promoting a false history of the United States as the most important military factor in defeating fascism during the War.\textsuperscript{528} The ensuing Cold War and “Iron Curtain” ideology based on Stalin’s totalitarian rule caused animosity between the United States and Russia. A history of confusing political alliances between the European and United States reached a climax after World War II. The ensuing Cold War as described by Hassan Dalban established a:

Growing international prestige of the Cuban Revolution with special significance earned by Fidel Castro from people fighting for their independence and above all in Latin America their developed diplomatic relations, economies and cultural ties with so-called socialist countries, that arose as a result of Cold War pressures between the United States and the U.S.S.R.\textsuperscript{529}

The Hitler-Stalin Non-aggression Pact (1939) and World War II caused Cuba and Mexico to develop policies that built on the imperialism of Western nations as the U.S. grew in strength and
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Europe lost its colonies with the rise of the USSR and China as communist countries.\textsuperscript{530} The Cold War provided for similar prewar conditions, i.e. the Hitler-Stalin Pact, creating opportunities for Cuba and Mexico to pursue efforts at national liberation and economic independence. The Hitler-Stalin Pact is a case consistent with the theoretical approaches of Wallerstein and Skocpol, who agree that nationalism was important for the initial success of the Nazi’s in Germany and later important for the success of the Soviet Union in defeating the Germans.\textsuperscript{531} Furthermore, the world crisis that led to war in Europe allowed both Cuba and Mexico considerable leeway in the 1930s. Fundamentally, the world wars of the twentieth century ushered in a financial windfall for the MNCs, as they became the MIC. Cárdenas in 1956 gave a stern warning,

\begin{quote}

The threat of a new world war creates and accentuates negative conditions for the development of Latin America, because the Cold war deforms the economies of its countries and augments their dependency and pauperizes the people because of the unequal economics and finance that promotes the exploitation of workers. Furthermore, the disproportionate growth of funding for war produces the stoppage or curtailment of labor and the realization of national and collective interests. To sum it up, the continued threat of world war conditions the economic and military politics of nearly all Latin America for the bellicose necessities of the United States.\textsuperscript{532}
\end{quote}

Such international political openings (national liberations) grew out of former colonial countries post World War II transitions, caused by the mounting efforts at defeating colonialism as once colonial powers grew weak as a result of war. The Soviet Union, in an attempt to gain territory and power, bargained with Nazi-Germany through the Non-Aggression Pact, following a similar course of action during the Missile Crisis when the Russians bargained with the United States to remove its missiles from Cuba, challenging the Cuban Revolution’s right to national
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sovereignty. Prior to World War II and during the Missile Crisis (1962) Russia did not have clear intentions, as its opportunism led to the German invasion and the future demise of the Soviet Union.

In Mexico, Cárdenas learned from the relationship between Germany and Russia while engaging in international warfare with the United States and England. In 1938, the Anglo-American oil MNCs were supported by British diplomats in their attempt to stop the petroleum nationalization. Through FDR’s Good Neighbor policy, Ambassador Josephus Daniels worked at odds with the petroleum MNCs in an effort to maintain access to Mexico’s oil and good will prior to World War II. Cárdenas understood the complicated relations between the greater ideological war between fascism, imperialism, and Stalinism. Fascism, imperialism, and Stalinism became a form of unilateral positioning for personal interests as each were counterrevolutionary efforts to undermine revolution because they were fundamentally counterrevolutionary. As a sign of its independence on the world stage, Mexico continued to sell petroleum to Germany and Japan until it declared war against them in 1942.

Taking advantage of the antagonisms both internally and externally, the Cuban Revolution, in contrast to the Mexican Revolution, allied itself with the Soviet Union. Mexico in the 1930s was alone in its pursuit of radical nationalization as the world was in the grips of the Depression and the rise of fascism. Both Mexico and Cuba used diplomacy and the geopolitical tensions of their times to their advantage.

It is no mere coincidence that the Soviet Union and the United States were allied against fascism in the 1940s and then later pitted against each other. International tensions between imperial capitalism and communism created the conditions for Cuba and Mexico to skillfully pursue their own
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policies of economic, political, and social development based on their shared experiences. They also possessed the ability to avoid the pitfalls of imperialism, fascism, and Stalinism, as both leaders saw their success as the success for the greater benefit of their countries futures. The following statement by Castro supports the concept of sovereignty by describing the history of Cuba and the importance of self-governance,

Then began the new colonization of our homeland, the acquisition of the best agricultural lands for the North American companies; concessions of our natural resources, mines; concessions of public services for the exploitation of public services; commercial concessions, concessions of every kind, how united with constitutional law – constitutional force – to intervene in our country, they converted our homeland from a Spanish colony into a North American Colony…But there did not exist an independent republic, there was a colony, ruled by the United States embassy. We have no shame in proclaiming, because before that shame is the pride of being able to say, that today no embassy rules our homeland, that our people govern themselves.

The concept of national sovereignty in the developing world is different from that of the triad of Europe, North America, and Japan. Castro points out the difference between the history of colonization prior to the war and the neo-colonialism developing afterwards.

Mexico of the pre-war 1930s and Cuba of the Cold War 1950s and 60s are not as different as might be supposed. For Cuba, the learning curve was the serious threat of global nuclear war as it was the first socialist revolution in the Western Hemisphere in the age of superpower. For Mexico, post-revolutionary sacrifices for national sovereignty were crucial when dealing with the MNCs, as the first revolution of the twentieth century and throughout the nationalization process (1917-1938) countering efforts at controlling Mexico’s petroleum. To conclude this
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section it is important to quote Cárdenas, who spoke of the dangerous position Cuba was in the 1960s,

Cuba is not alone. The efforts to isolate her have failed. The decision of the Soviet Union to defend her if she is attacked openly by the United States, signifies direct military aggression, the United States itself, are a people who want peace just as all people of the world do, they are also in danger of suffering a destruction of incalculable proportions; and hopefully before being engulfed by such aggression, Cuba, Washington or New York could be converted into another Hiroshima.538

The real threat of global annihilation was the possible outcome of the international warfare that had evolved from the 1938 Mexican Petroleum Nationalization challenging the MNCs to the ousting of the MIC from Cuba through the 1960 nationalization of petroleum refineries. The stakes had grown more dangerous as the U.S. had grown more powerful but unaware of its vulnerable position.

VI. 1961: The Latin American Conference for Economic Emancipation, Sovereignty and Peace

With good reason the distinguished leader of the Mexican Revolution Lázaro Cárdenas has declared that if Kennedy wishes to make a visit to South America, he will encounter a reception similar to that of Mr. Nixon, that is to say that he will be greeted much the same as the previous vice president [Nixon]. The Latin American Conference for Economic Emancipation, Sovereignty and Peace held recently in Mexico, the attitude of the government of Mexico, with respect to Cuba and the support of a political figure like Lázaro Cárdenas, so loved and with Mexico’s prestige throughout the continent are motives more than sufficient to worry imperialism. They were at the point of profoundly damaging the Mexican national sentiment by placing one of those absurd senators who they so promote there in the North American Senate, nothing less than an investigation by the American Senate! About the conference recently held in Mexico. But it seems as if the tremendous prestige of a personality such as Lázaro Cárdenas intimidated them.539 Fidel Castro, 1961.

In the passage above Castro speaks of U.S. Senate hearings to investigate the development
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of the Movimiento de Liberación Nacional (MLN), which brought together activists from throughout Latin America to Mexico City in 1961.\textsuperscript{540} The conference’s purpose was to support the Cuban Revolution in its hour of being threatened by the 1961 Bay of Pigs (Playa Giron) invasion. To the Cubans, it was not just one crisis but one of many crises as described by Castro.\textsuperscript{541} What occurred was the end of half-measures such as the Good Neighbor Policy and the ill-fated Alliance for Progress and many years of tensions and efforts to assassinate and undermine Cuba’s revolution.

In solidarity with the Cuban Revolution, Cárdenas led the hemispheric effort to promote the MLN, creating opportunities for solidarity amongst people seeking to return their countries to national sovereignty. As a result, Mexico was the only country outside of Cuba to begin an MLN party that became the Partido de Revolución Democratica (PRD).

George Philips, in his book \textit{Oil and Politics in Latin America}, describes the impact on policy that some argue shifted Latin America politics to the right and resulted in the assassination of many activists,

\begin{quote}
The Cuban Revolution sharply changed the tone of relations between Washington and Latin America. In the years 1945-1960, Latin America had been largely ignored by Washington which, with no other overriding policy objectives, devoted its main interest to the protection U.S. property and the discouragement of state companies which might provide an alternative to foreign investment.\textsuperscript{542}
\end{quote}

Philips’ statement is supported below by the chaotic polices of the MIC, where before the Cuban Revolution, Latin America went from being “largely ignored” toward a neoliberal expansionist approach in the 1970s and 1980s.
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The administration of Dwight D. Eisenhower was particularly zealous in the fight against communism. But, in pursuing this conflict, the administration was also upholding customary U.S. policies. Throughout the twentieth century, the United States had practiced sphere-of-influence politics in the Western Hemisphere: it has tried to maintain peace and order, exclude foreign influences, expand U.S. trade and investment, and shape Latin America’s development. The anti-Communist crusade of the Eisenhower administration was rooted in this tradition.\footnote{Rabe, \textit{Eisenhower and Latin America}, 178.}

Furthermore, Cuauhtémoc Cárdenas, (son of Lázaro Cárdenas) in his book \textit{Sobre Mis Pasos}, describes Cuba and Mexico as successful revolutionary countries as a result of their ability to maintain their national sovereignty in the face of major social change. In each case, Mexico and Cuba, through revolution, destroyed their traditional militaries and replaced them with revolutionary armies.\footnote{Castro, \textit{Latinoamericanismo vs. Imperialismo}, 12.}

The Mexican Revolutionary Army that Cárdenas rose to prominence through was led by the great figures of that period; Carranza, Villa, Zapata, and Obregón, and he followed revolutionary tradition that educated him through combat and the post revolutionary institutionalization of agrarian reform and workers rights. He eventually led a revolutionary military, which included urban workers and rural peasants from a legacy of independence wars and national liberation struggles influenced by hemispheric revolutionaries.\footnote{Ibid., 194.} Cuba’s military followed a similar trajectory as it took a different route to the establishment of a revolutionary army in the 1950s.

As Fulgencio Batista weakened the U.S.-supported Cuban military by seizing power in 1952, he had earlier ended a segregated army through 1933 Cuban Revolution, removing the white officer corps and replacing it with a mixed leadership of former non-commissioned
officers.\textsuperscript{546} An officer corps that included Afro-Cubans, it was one of those officers who after the failed Moncada attack in 1953 captured Castro, saving his life.\textsuperscript{547}

In 1958 Castro and the 26\textsuperscript{th} of July Movement defeated the Cuban military, creating the Cuban Revolutionary Armed Forces, an army that included remnants of Batista’s military, including the officer who saved Castro’s life.\textsuperscript{548} That Cuban officer inspired Castro with the statement “you cannot kill ideas,” while saving his life. The officer understood the Castro led rebellion and the need to fulfill the goals set forth by the 1933 Cuban Revolution and the 1940 Constitution.\textsuperscript{549} Both Mexico and Cuba through the destruction of their old armies created opportunities for service by a larger and more diverse population loyal to revolution.

Through Cárdenas's quest to create a Latin American, national liberation movement (MLN), he intimidated the U.S. government, allowing casting a historical shadow over the Western Hemisphere. In the case of the Mexican military, the 1968 student massacre at the Plaza of the Three Cultures, Tlaltelolco, became an event that marred the relationship between the Mexican people and its government.\textsuperscript{550} Since that time the Mexican government has become a part of a U.S supported counterrevolutionary agenda to strip countries of their autonomy, reversing the gains of the Mexican Revolution.\textsuperscript{551}

The age of revolution in Cuba and Mexico was influenced by the U.S. military as a result of interventions becoming more militarized by world war. As global militarization to counter independence and national liberation movements it created the MIC. The ensuing Cold War
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forced many countries in Latin America to overcome U.S. hegemony. Through a history of countering national liberation movements and having the opposite impact, the United States has proven both Cárdenas and Castro correct in their views of the world.\textsuperscript{552}

The 1961 Latin American Conference for Economic Emancipation, Sovereignty and Peace changed relations between Latin America and the U.S. as a result of the influence of the Cuban Revolution and the need for hemispheric cooperation.\textsuperscript{553} The amount of effort and time invested in the effort to stop revolution evolved into a weak foreign policy not different from the Roosevelt Corollary.

\textbf{VII. Petroleum Nationalization as a Geopolitical Weapon}

Our territory, with valuable riches within it was the object of incursions by companies that were used to considering the Hispano-American countries as simple colonies of exploitation and consisting of economic forces superior to the sovereign power of the states.

Confronting this problem the revolutionary government applied the Magna Carta of 1917 [1917 Mexican Constitution] that was recuperated by the republic by inalienable form as dominion of the subsoil, liberating it from the tutelage of elements acting as if the rights of the nation were a dead letter and used to act as an obstacle for the vigilance of the fundamental laws that through coordinated actions are challenged through diplomacy or mercenary efforts to overthrow governments.\textsuperscript{554}

Lázaro Cárdenas, 1939.

Cárdenas accurately describes the pre-revolutionary dominance that the petroleum multinational corporations (MNCs) imposed on Mexico during the transition to implement Mexico’s revolutionarily won access and control of its own petroleum resources. Their challenge became enforcing the hard won struggle to ensure their sovereignty, a lingering initiative that
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provoked the ire of European and U.S. policymakers, who did not see their own attitudes out of step with international law that contradicted their own constitutions.

It is no mere coincidence that a confrontation development from the MNCs exploiting petroleum resources with little concern for local interests. Corporate and governmental incursions in the twentieth century began to hold undue influence on U.S. foreign policy beginning years before in the 1890s. As the MNCs were given special status (corporate personhood), governments were organized in service to the oil MNCs. As unrest began in the early twentieth century in Mexico’s mines, it reached a crescendo with the 1938 Mexican Petroleum Nationalization. Twenty-one years later, the MIC, the apex of corporate/governmental collusion solidified its control over U.S. foreign policy, so warned retiring President Eisenhower interestingly enough, two years after the triumph of the Cuban Revolution in 1959.  

The confrontations between the MNCs and sovereign states developed greater significance with the rise of Nazi Germany (fascism) and the Soviet Union (totalitarianism) who challenged the control of petroleum resources by Europe and the United States from the right (fascism) and the left (pseudo-socialism). In the twentieth century, Wallerstein describes how numerous movements were assisted by the rise of the MNCs, especially their growing influence on the foreign policy of governments (Germany, Russia, Mexico and Cuba). As World War II developed into a scramble for petroleum resources, Cuba and Mexico served a strategic role in the rise of the MIC. Each country played an important role in providing support for the allied war effort as a source of oil and production. The 1938 Mexican Petroleum Nationalization was perhaps the major international event challenging U.S. and Latin American relations up to that
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time. Mexico’s audacity in confronting the powerful MNCs expressed the strength of Mexican sovereignty that nationalization reinforced.

Post-war power struggles (World War I and II) for the control of petroleum resources created a huge demand for fuel, leading to the development of MIC. Mexico’s confrontation with the petroleum MNCs provided Castro with the historical connection between both revolutions and the misconception that only U.S. and European technicians could operate the Mexican oil industry effectively:

Fortunately for Mexico and its people the jubilation of the people for the rest of Latin America a country of immense natural resources. In recent years with its own support with its own technicians and technologies, Mexico has explored its territory geologically and discovered great sources of petroleum, with estimates that reach as far as 50 billion barrels and the potential could quadruple. I repeat with her own technicians and technologies realizing that feat, it does not need the multinationals to discover and explore its sources of petroleum and gas on the land and in the sea. The size of its richness with relation of Mexican hydrocarbons had to awaken the interests and ambitions of others.

Contrary to the notion that only the MNCs have the ability to successfully operate the petroleum industry, Castro describes in detail the greater importance of Mexico’s state-owned petroleum industry as one in solidarity with other developing countries. Itself revolutionary in opposition to global capitalist ideologies of innovation stemming from a profit motive, Mexico’s state-owned petroleum serves as a constant reminder of revolutionary economic independence.

As the MNCs increased their influence worldwide, resulting in policies designed to overcome national sovereignty movements. revolution in Cuba and Mexico during the twentieth century resulted from the spread of imperialist international economic expansion (globalization)
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pushing the margins of acceptable actions. By squeezing newly independent countries and trying to establish control over resources, U.S. foreign policy dominated developing countries, applying pressure through U.S. diplomacy.\(^{560}\) A confrontation developed with nationalist Mexico engaged in its own power struggle that culminated with the crisis leading to the rise of Cárdenas in 1934.

As petroleum-fueled industrialization made it the most sought after resource in the world, it became instrumental for imperial expansion, influencing the confrontation between the Axis (Germany and Japan) and Allied (Britain, France, United States, and U.S.S.R.) powers, leading to World War II. Mexico, with its oil reserves, was sought after by all nations at war.\(^{561}\)

Historically within the sphere of the United States, Mexico’s oil reserves played an important role in World War II. The late 1930s confrontation between Mexican oil workers and the oil MNCs developed as a result of lack of respect for Mexican national sovereignty.

Historically, petroleum workers confronted the legacy of the oil MNCs imposing harsh work conditions with few benefits for Mexican workers. The Mexican Revolution supported their struggle, as they had historically been forced to accept far less compensation than U.S. workers performing similar work.\(^{562}\) Cárdenas sums up the contradiction between supporting corporations versus workers and the responsibilities of the nation to overcome labor injustice:

> The same rights that the elite classes use to support their organizations through a national structure, it is he who supports the workers in making that structure their own while maintaining an international character which occurs in all countries and principally those that reach great industrial development […] But don’t count on your government doing the same it is important that companies also abstain from intervening in the organizing of their workers. With that understanding, I ask for your cooperation.\(^{563}\)

\(^{560}\) Fulbright, *The Arrogance of Power*, 84.
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Cárdenas distinguishes business from the social functions of the workers by defining the basic reason for the confrontation with the oil MNCs as the right to organize. At the heart of the issue was the intersection of history, as agrarian reform and workers’ rights joined with the right of national self-determination requiring the “cooperation of all sectors.” A throwback to the 1917 Mexican Constitution, the oil MNCs brought together the struggles involving land tenure and workers rights with national sovereignty as they defied the Mexican Supreme Court ruling.\textsuperscript{564}

Cárdenas understood the confluence of struggles and built upon them to strengthen the position of Mexico. By supporting workers’ rights while confronting petroleum concessions with the MNCs, he avoided a constitutional crisis, as the MNCs would not adhere to the 1937 Mexican Supreme Court decision supporting workers’ rights. By supporting agrarian and labor reform, the 1938 Mexican Petroleum Nationalization implemented Mexican national sovereignty. Cárdenas’ decision to expropriate became important for ensuring the gains of the revolution. The alternative might have been disastrous for the people of Mexico.

Unaware of their precarious situation, the MNCs, only interested in profits, were not at the time organized enough to have a more nuanced foreign policy apparatus.\textsuperscript{565} But the MNCs learned from that experience to crush revolutionary movements, leading to the rise of the MIC. As the MNCs became powerful they extended their control internationally. The historical lesson for future revolutionary movements from the Cuban and Mexican Revolutions was that imperial interests tend more often than not to overreach their strengths by making matters worse.\textsuperscript{566}

Twenty-one years after the 1938 Mexican Petroleum Nationalization, the MNCs dominated U.S. foreign policy, becoming the unwitting victims of their own power play. U.S. foreign policy
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as dictated by the MIC, became a reversal of fortunes by continuing a similar policy over the
twentieth century, serving Cuba and Latin America by conferring the ability to confront
interventionism with revolutionary solidarity now seen throughout Latin America.\textsuperscript{567}

Christopher M. White, in his book \textit{Creating a Third World}, describes the solidarity
between Cárdenas and Castro as the embodiment of struggles to remain sovereign under
immense U.S. pressure. The Soviet Union also played an important role in challenging the
sovereignty of nations, leading to the development of a “Third World” that became the Non-
aligned Movement founded in 1961 as an alternative to Cold War domination:

Instead, Cárdenas and Castro represented mutually reinforcing revolutionary icons in Mexico and Cuba that signified the beginning of the process I refer to as “creating a Third World.” That is, because the superpowers had globalized the struggles of the Third World, which before then had been considered regionally specific, it became imperative that Third World leaders participate on the stage of international relations. They built their platform on common ideals such as resistance, defiance to “imperialism,” and alleviating the suffering of the poor Latin American majority. Further, Castro and Cárdenas admired each other considerably, as is the case among leftist leaders even today in Latin America, and this enhanced the friendship for years to come.\textsuperscript{568}

A mutually reinforcing mentorship developed between both leaders that, during the tumultuous 1960s, influenced their struggles while inspiring countless other movements during the age of national liberation. A “luminous future” Cárdenas proclaimed has lasted over 50 years, and it is one that has extended to other parts of Latin America, creating a generation of charismatic leaders (e.g., Hugo Chávez/Venezuela, Rafael Correa/Ecuador, Evo Morales/Bolivia, José Pepe Mújica/Uruguay and Lula da Silva/Brazil) in the trajectory of Cárdenas and Castro.

Cárdenas describes the connection between petroleum nationalization, agrarian reform, and national sovereignty, tying the need for economic independence to the public interest:
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Petroleum expropriation and agrarian reform represent acts of affirming our sovereignty and the protection of our national interests based on the laws consecrated by our Magna Carta [1917 Mexican Constitution], that clearly situates what falls under the guise of our countries direct dominion of its natural resources and the right to impose on private property the modalities dictated by the public interest. Therefore, the governments of the revolution have inspired, as in the case of petroleum in our constitutional laws by recuperating for our patrimony the national industries vital to the economic development of our country through national sovereignty.569

Sovereignty and agrarian reform in the ideological tradition of the Mexican Revolution inspired Cárdenas to call for respecting the sacrifices of the revolution.570 A charismatic leader such as Cárdenas did not just happen; the inertia of years of struggle brought forth a person schooled from an early age by conflict and crisis. An able warrior, Cárdenas was a seasoned statesman ready to confront threats through international warfare as he advised the Cuban Revolution in its hour of greatest danger.571 Offering little challenge to U.S. hegemony in the 1930s, Mexico, then Cuba in the 1960s, used a combination of conditions and circumstances that provided petroleum as weapon to protect and enhance their national sovereignty and institutionalize revolution.

VII. Conclusion

This chapter began with the goal of seeking a more nuanced exploration of the evolution of foreign policy from the Mexican, Cuban, and Latin America perspective when confronting the overwhelming forces arrayed against their efforts at winning and enforcing national sovereignty. With clear goals to accomplish this, both Revolutions throughout the twentieth century had a significant impact on the organization and training that revolutionary struggle called for in the aftermath of major social transformations.
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Mexico of the 1930s encountered a pre-World War II situation of fascism and totalitarianism reaching their zenith in Eurasia. World War II became the event that led to the rise of the MIC and the subsequent development of more lethal methods of warfare. In comparison to the pre-war 1930s, the U.S. government became more fragile in its efforts to overturn successful social revolution in Latin America as it focused more attention on Europe and its intrigues. That fragility and the rise of the Soviet Union created a growing independence among the Latin American countries that had engaged in revolution.

Cuba, through revolution and the legacy of a Latin American geopolitical reality, learned from the Mexican Revolution that it was not alone but could use the historical transnationalism of Latin America and the Caribbean, using that solidarity to reach out to other revolutionary governments to survive its geographic proximity to the U.S. The contentious nature of twentieth century politics that Mexico had undergone prior to World War II and the dangerous nuclear age that Cuba encountered saw Latin America caught between the U.S. and the U.S.S.R.

The following chapter concludes the dissertation with a return to my larger arguments about natural resources revolutions, charismatic revolutionary leadership, and the new geopolitical reality that develops from the Mexican and Cuban Revolutions in the age of twentieth and twenty-first century national liberation movements.
Chapter 7: Summary and Conclusion: Pathways to National Liberation – Theoretical Significance and Contributions to Future Studies of Latin America and the Caribbean

There exists in Cuba, with relation to Mexico, a tradition of history and friendship without equal amongst Latin American countries. Our struggles have been intimately connected to the struggles and history of Mexico. When during our wars of independence, the Cuban patriots relied on the friendship of the Mexican people, with a place to live in our brother country. José Martí our national hero lived there for some time. In Mexico, he enriched his revolutionary vision and that of the Americas. Martí loved immensely and affectionately Mexico, a love that he carried to his grave...

In Mexico we organized, and from Mexico we departed [Granma Expedition]. But our strong sentiment of friendship and affection for Mexico is not based solely on past history; it is also based on present history.  

In this dissertation I argue that through strategic decisions, the Mexican and Cuban revolutionary governments were able to ward off U.S. intervention and create a process of independence that in turn became a trajectory for defiance in modern Latin America and the Caribbean through revolution, petroleum nationalization, and the establishment of a strong party system that harnessed the power of social movements through public buy-in to revolutionary principles. I began this dissertation by asking: in what ways have the revolutionary governments of Mexico and Cuba been able to practice successful defiance of the United States hegemon of the twentieth century? And: how has that defiance helped to define U.S. foreign policy in Latin America? Based on these questions I examined how Mexico and Cuba were able to withstand hegemonic power and intervention by the United States during each of their revolutionary and post-revolutionary periods, influencing each other along the way through historical and national-liberation-inspired dynamics that connected both revolutions, and how they each can be viewed as examples of governments caught up in asymmetrical conflicts with a powerful hegemon. I engaged in the history of revolutionary solidarity in Latin American and the Caribbean beginning
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with the Haitian Revolution and its liberation of land and people. Through that study, I offer two new concepts that are significant for the study of Latin America and the Caribbean: “natural resource revolutions” and “charismatic revolutionary leadership.”

This concluding chapter draws together the threads of the previous chapters charting U.S. hegemony, natural resource revolutions, charismatic revolutionary leadership, and navigating a new geopolitical reality - all influenced by both the Mexican and Cuban Revolutions. The goal of the dissertation is to determine the pathways to petroleum nationalization that Cuba and Mexico underwent by analyzing their historical process, their interaction with the United States, and the influence these events had on later petroleum nationalizations. The combination of each of the previous chapters provides a greater understanding of the geopolitical development of the Western Hemisphere in the twenty-first century and the rise of left of center governments throughout Latin America (Argentina, Brazil, Chile Bolivia, Ecuador, Paraguay, Uruguay, and Venezuela).573

This chapter is organized into three sections that highlight the significance of the concepts of “natural resource revolutions” and “charismatic revolutionary leadership” that I developed previously. First, I will address the importance of the concepts explored in this work as they relate to revolution in the Latin America and the Caribbean historically. I combine Wallerstein’s and Skocpol’s analyses to examine the rise of U.S. hegemony. Next, combining my concept of natural resources revolutions, I compare and contrast Mexico and Cuba regarding the history, motives, and legality (1917 and 1940 Constitutions) of petroleum nationalization. Then I discuss the importance of charismatic revolutionary leadership as it relates to the rise of Cárdenas and Castro in the age of growing U.S. hegemony. Then I address the importance that natural resource

revolutions and charismatic revolutionary leadership have had on the development of a new and historical geopolitical reality. And finally I discuss 1970, a year which saw the death of Cárdenas, the rise of the Organization of Petroleum Exporting Countries (OPEC), the celebration of the first Earth Day and subsequent regional natural resource organizations, and the development of revolutionary international environmentalism that stems from the influence of both Cárdenas and Castro.

I. Confronting Hegemony in the Twentieth Century: Historical Transnational Alliances in Latin America and Beyond

Whether “communist” or not, I argue, revolutionary elites have been able to build the strongest states in those countries whose geopolitical circumstances allowed or required the emerging regimes to become engaged in protracted and labor-intensive international warfare.574

To understand the political dynamic that Skocpol describes in the quote above, it is necessary to study Mexico and Cuba as semiperipheral countries in the world-system and understand that “both their internal politics and their social structure are distinctive, and it turns out that their ability to take advantage of the flexibilities offered by the downturns of economic activity is in general greater than that of either the core or the peripheral countries.”575 As semiperipheral states, Mexico and Cuba actually increased their bargaining power with core nations as a result of downturns in economic activity and the growth of industrialization that followed on the heels of warfare. The “protracted and labor-intensive” aspects of the international warfare that developed in post-revolutionary Mexico under Cárdenas and Castro’s Cuba were the determining features that made Mexico and Cuba natural resources revolutions led by charismatic revolutionary leaders who, through the struggles their predecessors, engaged in developed a new geopolitical reality whose origins were of a historical and intellectual nature.
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Mexican and Cuban possession of sought-after commodities and resources, creating the conditions whereby in “moments of world economic downturn, semiperipheral countries can usually expand control of their home market at the expense of core producers.” Furthermore, economic downturns such as the Great Depression of 1929 led semiperipheral nations (Mexico and Cuba) to “expand their access to neighboring peripheral markets, again at the expense of core producers [U.S.].” Therefore, during the twentieth century, the growing bargaining power of Mexico and Cuba increased the “degree of their ‘nationalism’ and militance in the pattern of their historical international diplomatic alliances.” This led to military, diplomatic, and multinational corporations (MNCs) efforts that “resulted in shifts in regime where the previous regime is insufficiently flexible to respond to the changed world political situation.”

As the old regimes were not flexible enough to adapt to changes in world politics, the twentieth century saw the development of more fluid relations between the core and semiperiphery. Economic downturns during the 1930s curtailed the ability of the core nations to intervene, resulting in changes in production and trade relations. The changing dynamics in the world-system after World War II caused the U.S. to increase its efforts at intervention and interference as it dealt with circumstances that, as described by Wallerstein, the U.S., Europe, and Japan did not fully understand. The semiperiphery is not a concrete definition of states and their power; what makes them flexible is their “wide range of economic strength and political backgrounds.”

Semiperipheral revolutionary countries can be divided into socialist and non-socialist governments that deal with crisis in the world economy in different ways. Based on
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Wallerstein’s claim that non-socialist states are defined as featuring an “external and internal bourgeoisie,” Mexico is a non-socialist semiperipheral nation. This is compared to Cuba, a socialist semiperipheral state, characterized by extensive foreign ownership in the twentieth century. Both countries were sites of monopoly (imperial) capitalism through the MNCs, which evolved in the case of the United States into the Military Industrial Complex (MIC). In post-independence (1898) Cuba, a large percentage of the land was owned by U.S. interests, in contrast to Mexico, where the Catholic Church was the majority landholder. These were the conditions that led to revolution, and the differences in their development and future outcomes related to Mexico not engaging fully in socialism and Cuba becoming the first socialist revolution in the Western Hemisphere.

It is important to stress that when using Wallerstein’s definitions of countries in the periphery being weak and unable to comprehend the circumstances and conditions of changing world dynamics, the MNCs were not necessarily threatened by semiperipheral nations, as they were not concerned by the history or conditions of semiperipheral countries or the world economy. However, in the case of the Mexican and Cuban Revolutions the development of the MIC meant that the United States, through a strong desire to protect corporate interest abroad, reacted with force, challenging rebellions without fully understanding the ongoing economic crisis in the world-system, an economic crisis that the flexibility of semiperipheral Cuba and Mexico were able to use to their advantage through petroleum and petroleum refining nationalization.

As core nations did not understand the world economic crisis in the twentieth century, their reactions only contributed to the conditions that led to revolution. As such, the MNCs became more powerful than the national bourgeoisie, and as they began to exert control over
semiperipheral nations, local power brokers had to focus more on controlling the state than on increasing their wealth. This allowed the MNCs to concentrate economic and political strength in the semiperiphery where they had a historic foothold (in Cuba and Mexico), especially after the defeat of the Spanish empire. This led to nationalist movements and the rise of ‘isolated idealists’ (Cárdenas and Castro) who became full-time revolutionaries leading nationalist rebellions. To stem the tide of revolutions, periodic economic downturns were part of the built-in program of the MNCs, pressuring developing countries as a way to take advantage of semiperiphery nations. Moreover, through monopoly capitalism, the MNCs established their hegemonic power in the world-system. Both the MNCs and nationalist rebellions resulted from the growing importance of petroleum and U.S. efforts to repress and control both internal and international movements for the accumulation of capital.

As the world-system is in flux and unpredictable, not all semiperipheral nations are successful in establishing sovereignty during economic downturns. The twentieth century saw the rise of the MNCs, and in response there developed a “collective transnational syndicalism, which inevitably pushes them [semiperiphery] ‘leftward,’ more in terms of international policy, but with perhaps some carryover in terms of internal redistribution.”581 As some semiperipheral countries joined a transnational class alliance they focused on development, but their internal conditions determined how far this leftward shift extended.

Cuba, as a socialist semiperipheral country, can be categorized using Wallerstein’s description as featuring the “absence in the former of an indigenous property-owning bourgeoisie and the exclusion of non-indigenous capitalist enterprises.”582 After independence and a related world economic downturn, Cuba was bought off by the MNCs and private interests, resulting in
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the country being nearly owned part and parcel by U.S. interests. There was a very small landowning bourgeoisie while foreign companies owned most of the businesses, a veritable monopoly that was later ended by revolution, the gains of which were institutionalized by petroleum nationalization. In Mexico the Cárdenas administration tried to implement socialism, but the difference in property relations between Cuba and Mexico and the size and diversity of the population made it difficult. As a result, the twentieth century saw the development of the “unity of the semiperipheral nations” as vigorous and continuously increasing their influence through “transnational syndicalism.”

According to Wallerstein, in the coming decades the semiperipheral states will be the battleground of two major transnational forces. One will be comprised of the MIC fighting for the survival of the essentials of the capitalist system: the possibility of continued surplus appropriations on a world scale. The other will be a transnational alignment of left of center (Brazil, Russia, India, China and South Africa –BRICS and their allies) forces who will be seeking to undermine the capitalist world economy, not by ‘developing’ singly, but by forcing relatively drastic redistributions of world surplus and cutting the long-term present and potential organizational links between the MNCs and certain strata internal to each semiperipheral country, including such strata in socialist semiperipheral states.583

The Mexican and Cuban Revolutions represent two examples of semiperipheral nations that became nationalist and revolutionary. One became socialist while the other did not, but, in the tradition of the Haitian Revolution and Latin American Independence, they both maintained a strong transnational solidarity and worked to develop their countries (1917 and 1940 Constitutions), taking advantage of economic downturns to establish their sovereignty within the sphere of U.S. hegemony. In this section, I have stressed the importance of the differences
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between the revolutionary evolution of both Mexico and Cuba, as non-socialist and socialist respectively, to explain the conditions in each country and the outcomes of their social revolutions. This was done purposefully to shed light on the importance of nationalism as a strong factor in the petroleum nationalization process and one that Wallerstein and Skocpol stress. I have added my own interpretation using their studies and highlight the importance of intervention and interferences in the interstate world-system. U.S. hegemony in the final analysis has had the unexpected impact of assisting both Revolutions studied here and also influencing the current changes in the world-system as more countries gain their national sovereignty through ‘transnational syndicalism.’

II. Mexican and Cuban Revolutions: Comparative Natural Resource Revolutions

…there are many things in common, much sympathy, and many affinities between Mexicans and Cubans, between the Mexican Revolution and the Cuba Revolution.

The first social revolution in this hemisphere was the Mexican…The first social revolution or the second social revolution, we call it the first socialist revolution in this hemisphere, the Cuban Revolution…

We were very interested in the Mexican Revolution; it interest us today and will interest us tomorrow, its experience, its development and its ideas. We cannot forget that the Mexican Revolution was always a source of inspiration for the Cuban revolutionaries and continues to be a source of very rich experiences.\footnote{Fidel Castro, "Discurso pronunciado en la comida ofrecida por la Delegación Cubana a la Delegación Mexicana en el Hotel Presidente, en la Isla Cozumel, Quintana Roo, Mexico, el 17 de mayo de 1979, “Año 20 de la Victoria,” s. f., http://www.cuba.cu/gobierno/discursos/1979/esp/c170579e.html.}

In the statement above Castro applies a Marxist analysis to the Cuban and Mexican Revolutions. As an organic intellectual, Castro presents the historical role of both revolutions during the twentieth century, a radical time that ushered in major social change as well as implementing socialism.\footnote{Kimmel, Revolution, 19.} According to Castro, Cuban history is Mexican history, and both are
world histories connected to the larger trajectory of revolution for national liberation that I argue began with the Haitian Revolution. Castro presents us with a comparison of both revolutions, describing them as having a common history that was inspired by the other. It is important to view them as both similar and yet different as each revolution had its own circumstances and conditions, but each also carried the historical banners of previous revolutionary movements.\(^{586}\)

It is important to note that, were not for the assistance of Lázaro Cárdenas in 1956, gaining political asylum for Castro and the Cuban revolutionaries and their release from prison, the Cuban Revolution might not have occurred. On numerous occasions Castro has paid tribute to Cárdenas for his assistance that followed in line with the ideology of the Mexican revolutionary view of Latin American unity. It is a unity that began with Haiti assisting Simon Bolívar to liberate South America that carried on to the actions of Cárdenas’ solidarity.

Karl Marx suggested that “revolutions are the locomotives of history,” and national self-determination through revolutionary movements push forth a destiny. Castro addresses the challenges that revolution has presented to Mexico as a common problem when the direction of humanity is altered for social change.

As the conquest of the new world occurred by the exploitation of natural resources both human and terrestrial, it is important to remember the role of the epoch of conquest and colonialism (1492-1898) in the process of overcoming the legacy of European rule. Castro describes the collective connection between national sovereignty and natural resource conflict:

Latin America engages us in a common preoccupation and a similar focus when we accept the urgency of preserving and maintaining our rich natural resources and overcome the legacy of colonialism, eliminating tyranny and neo-fascism also determined by history. We proclaim the necessity to install
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in our lands democratic societies that can select for themselves the direction of their future transformation.  

Ending colonial domination and creating social change through revolution in Cuba had a reinforcing influence on the effect of the revolutions of Cuba and Mexico on Latin America at large. Through major social transformation during the rise of Castro, Mexican revolutionaries, namely Cárdenas, were reinvigorated to organize the Movimiento de Liberación Nacional (MLN) as a hemispheric movement. The leftist elements of the Mexican Revolution, especially the Cardenistas, developed into the various leftist parties that now form the coalition behind the Partido de la Revolución Democrático (PRD), founded in part by the son of Cárdenas, Cuauhtémoc Cárdenas. National liberation movements in Latin America stemmed inadvertently from the aggression of the United States, as exemplified by the 1961 Bay of Pigs (Playa Girón) intervention. Subsequently, the Cuban revolutionary victory was declared by Castro as the first defeat for imperialism in the Americas.

For many in Latin America, the Bay of Pigs CIA-sponsored intervention was the watershed moment of the time, as according to Castro The Bay of Pigs Invasion galvanized the support of the Latin American left, who met in Mexico City in 1961 to establish the national liberation movement of Latin America with the intention to return to their countries of origin to initiate revolution. Such efforts only took hold in Mexico due to what I argue are the differences between Cuba, Mexico, and the rest of Latin America, as both revolutions ended the old armed
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forces of each country, opening the way to development of radical constitutions (1917 and 1940).  

The subsequent years of infighting between the Carranzistas and the Villistas and Zapatistas became the Mexican Revolutionary Army. The Cuban Revolution followed a similar path. The importance of the military in the Cuban and Mexican revolutionary experiences is different from what has happened in the rest Latin America. For Mexico and Cuba both neocolonial militaries were ended, but each also created revolutionary armies, armies built on combat experience similar to the camaraderie that Castro’s guerrillas developed through their experience in the mountains of Cuba. The National Liberation Movement (MLN) brought together social movements through revolutionary solidarity that developed between Cárdenas and Castro.

Furthermore, my analysis shows that national liberation movements took strong hold and continue to have an influence on Latin America and the Caribbean. I argue that the success of the Mexican and Cuban Revolutions has great importance because of the complete destruction of the old military order and subsequent radical constitutional governments that allowed for a new beginning in each country. Therefore, the Cuban Revolution signaled the end of the Cuban military, as it had become a neocolonial army heavily corrupted by the United States since Cuban independence in 1898. The beginning of the end of the Cuban military started as a result of the 1933 Revolution. An attempt that did not entirely cleanse the same corruption that toppled the Machado dictatorship that year but instead made it a multi-ethnic army, radically changing its leadership structure. Thus, by removing the vestiges of military colonialism from Mexico and Cuba, Cárdenas and Castro became part of the revolutionary trajectory that created armies known for their class, ethnic, and ideological diversity. Moreover, Castro describes the historical
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connection between the Cuban and Mexican revolutionary armies each as overturning the existing colonial and neocolonial order through a historical transnational alliance.\(^{594}\)

Through alliances in the twentieth century, the Cuban Revolution’s impact on the sovereignty of numerous countries in Latin America and Africa influenced a worldwide mobilization.\(^{595}\) After the Cuban Revolution was victorious in 1959, 1960 saw the liberation of seventeen countries in Africa, including Senegal, Mali, and the Congo. Keeping alive the spirit of national liberation through nationalization, the 1960s saw Argentina and Peru take their place amongst revolutionary Mexico and Cuba. The development of imperial policies as a result of the wave of national liberations drove the Military Industrial Complex (MIC) after the Second World War to exacerbate its counterrevolutionary efforts. In Mexico this has been done by quelling dissent and opposition to the Partido Revolucionario Institucional’s (PRI) “revolutionary” hold on power; Mexico in the 1960s and afterwards adjusted to U.S. foreign policy by serving the MIC. By the 1980s, Cuba was left to take the helm of national liberation, as Haiti did through its liberation of slaves and territory (1804) compared, to the U.S. and France. As a result, historically Cuba, Haiti, and Mexico remain countries known as the consummate renegades of the Americas.\(^{596}\)

The Cuban Revolution remains a source of inspiration for those practicing successful defiance, a status now shared by other countries (Argentina, Brazil, Bolivia, Ecuador, Uruguay, and Venezuela) through a hemispheric collective mobilization confronting twenty-first century imperialism through petroleum re-nationalization.\(^{597}\) The collective hemispheric mobilization begun with the Conference for National Liberation, Emancipation, Economic Independence and


Peace in 1961, organized to defend the Cuba Revolution, reiterated by Castro’s description of Cárdenas:

> These evident factors had an important determination, but also had a determined importance that of international solidarity. We remember with emotion the overture by General Lázaro Cárdenas asking to travel to our country [Cuba] to fight with us (1961).\(^{598}\)

Castro describes the international solidarity shown by the old revolutionary Cárdenas in support of Cuba’s national liberation. A trajectory for the survival of the Cuban Revolution in the tradition of the Haitian and Mexican Revolutions called for a worldwide commitment to revolutionary struggle.\(^{599}\)

To highlight transnational revolutionary solidarity, I have used Skocpol’s studies of the Cuban, Chinese, Mexican, and Russian Revolutions as examples of the experience of surviving incursions by the U.S. and other militaries waging international warfare.\(^{600}\)

The Cuban Revolution has survived and thrived on international warfare based on the threat of invasion and assassination. The resulting revolutionary trajectory led to a principled dedication to maintaining the social gains of the revolution and promises to the Cuban people. Especially in the age of the Cold War, when the U.S. and the U.S.S.R. each played surrogate roles promoting democracy as neocolonial countries searched fought for national liberation. In this circumstance Cuba played the role of engaging in the national liberation struggles of Africa through its role in Angola, Namibia, and South Africa, which the Soviet Union did not want to take part in.

By surviving as a socialist country into the twenty-first century, the Cuban Revolution views international solidarity as national liberation. The ideology of national liberation led Cárdenas to meet
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Castro for a second time on July 26, 1959 in Cuba to recognize the triumph of the revolution.\footnote{Cárdenas, Ideario político, 281.} Years later, Castro was rewarded for his efforts in 1988, receiving the highest civilian Mexican award, the Mexican Aztec Eagle Order from then President of Mexico, Miguel de la Madrid, who declared, “For Latin America, you represent the impassioned defense of our people’s freedom and right to self-determination.”\footnote{Sheldon B. Liss, Fidel!: Castro’s Political and Social Thought, Latin American Perspectives Series, no. 13 (Boulder: Westview Press, 1994), 82.} Later in the 1990s, Nelson Mandela praised Castro for his own liberation and the liberation of South Africa.

Below, Castro further describes the history of struggle through the actions of revolutionaries such as Cárdenas. He pays homage to the forgotten gains of the Mexican Revolution by future Mexican presidents connecting the Mexican revolutionary victory to victory in Cuba,

> We are more interested in the relations with the Mexican Revolution than those with the Mexican Republic… As if the Republic of Cuba could ignore or separate itself from the [Mexican] Revolution. There’s no separation possible much like that of Mexico and its history that can be separated from the Revolution. Or shall we say that many of the gains enjoyed today by Mexico can be attributed to the Revolution occurring.\footnote{Castro, “Entrevista concedida por Fidel Castro Ruz, Presidente de la República de Cuba a la prensa nacional y extranjera en la inauguración de la XI Feria Internacional del Libro de La Habana,” efectuada en la fortaleza de La Cabaña, el 7 de febrero del 2002.}

For Castro the solidarity between both revolutions cannot be separated from the past, present, or future of each country. Ahistorical approaches provide for a U.S.-centered understanding of social revolution. As such, Christopher Lasch describes how the U.S. suffers from nostalgia whereby it “remembers the past by burying it alive.”\footnote{Lasch, The True and Only Heaven, 118.} Latin America, because of its revolutionary past, has used U.S. “nostalgia” to succeed.

Castro also identified what may be his greatest crime: successful defiance of the United States, through his long life leading the Cuban Revolution and his connection to the truth - come
what may. As Antonio Gramsci famously wrote, arriving at the truth is a revolutionary act that requires “industrious enthusiasm”:

But the concrete and complete solution to the problems of socialist living can only arise from communist practice: collective discussion, which sympathetically alters men’s consciousness, unifies them and inspires them to industrious enthusiasm. To tell the truth, to arrive together at the truth, is a communist and revolutionary act.605

Castro continuously remembers the Cuban and Mexican Revolutions as having deep connections to the concept of a republic. A republic defined as the involvement of people in the affairs of state that, through national independence and revolution, expanded public participation as revolution in one country influences social change and revolution in other countries.

Castro elaborates further by connecting the hemispheric lesson of the revolutionary trajectory linking Haiti to Cuba to Mexico, echoed by C.L.R. James in his appendix of the Black Jacobins, the Haitians and Latin Americans inaugurated Latin American and Caribbean revolutions as liberation from colonialism influencing the anti-imperialist Latinamericanismo challenging globalized imperialism:

I have a very clear understanding of the significance of the Mexican Revolution it was the first social revolution in the last century. The first of all was that of Haiti, in the early part of the eighteenth century, a profound revolution; but Mexico’s was a social revolution where lands were returned to the people, dozens of hundreds of schools, universities and much more were built…

I have high regards for the Mexican Revolution as a historical event and as a social revolution that carried forward education, cultural development, economic development and other great advances that without the Mexican Revolution would not have been possible.606

Castro pays homage first to the Haitian Revolution (1791-1804) as the first in the Americas comparing it to the other first of the twentieth century Mexico’s social revolution (1910-1920).
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Castro’s view of Mexico is one of respect based on the history of wars, invasions, and thefts of territory as Mexico continues to thrive in the face of massive emigration and problems with the U.S.

James D. Cockcroft, in Mexico’s Revolution Then and Now, supports the preceding statements by Castro regarding the importance of history and revolutionary survival: that the legacy of the Mexican Revolution and its history of international solidarity have created a groundswell of energy expanding the struggle against imperialism:

Through the praxis of international mutual support and coordination of social struggles, there is a greater chance of winning substantial victories and simultaneously avoiding the marginalization of trans-border injustices like those affecting the migrants, or the victims of the drug wars, or divided families and children, or the rights of the original peoples, women, and other social minorities.607

Similar to the petroleum nationalization process, a method of survival through international solidarity, revolution is the method that continues the liberation of people and nations. Social revolution is liberation from the macro to the micro and evolves with the forces of oppression having to invent new models of control.608

Such revolutionary fervor extends to Cuba, which, after years of struggle, challenges the capitalist world-system. Castro describes how in Latin America and the Caribbean, Cuba is the least dependent on other countries for assistance and therefore one of the most independent:

For Cuba, you cannot separate it from the history of the Cuban Republic, which is the Socialist Republic of Cuba, the independent Republic of Cuba; no one can separate it from its history. And the republic is not a name, it is a revolutionary republic, and without debate the most independent in today’s world.609

Revolutionary Haiti provided the historical experience, as it was invaded on multiple fronts
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by imperial countries, and as Mexico suffered two U.S.-led invasions during the Mexican Revolution. The trend continues historically but with the difference that the Cuban Revolution gave U.S. imperialism its first defeat at the Playa Giron (Bay of Pigs) invasion.\textsuperscript{610}

The attacks on revolutionary movements as described by Castro led to the Bay of Pigs Invasion (Playa Giron) showing the failure of U.S. foreign policy.\textsuperscript{611} Another first of defeats, I argue, was suffered by the MNCs through the 1938 Mexican Petroleum Nationalization. It and the 1960 Cuban nationalization of petroleum refineries, that began with the 1917 and 1940 Constitutions cleared the way for the Bolivarian Revolution led by Húgo Chávez in Venezuela (1998-2013) and the 1999 Venezuelan Constitution. In the tradition of twentieth century revolutions, radicalism is legal from the standpoint of supporting national sovereignty through radical constitutions that provided the legal basis for petroleum nationalization that ultimately institutionalized both the Mexican and Cuban Revolutions.\textsuperscript{612}

III. Charismatic Revolutionary Leadership in the Age of Global Conflict

The charismatic revolutionary leadership of Cárdenas and Castro institutionalized revolution and implemented national sovereignty through the revolutionary trajectory of their nationalizations. Petroleum Nationalization provided for the economic and social development of both countries as they focused on education, health, industrialization, labor, and agrarian reform. The impact of petroleum nationalization, not just in Mexico and Cuba but also in other energy-rich nations, influenced national liberation movements in open defiance of imperialism. As it was not the historical U.S. imperialism of the Roosevelt Corollary, but a new form of imperialism that
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rose from the demise of the Soviet Union and morphed into neoliberal globalization, described by Castro as imperial globalization.\footnote{Harvey, \textit{The New Imperialism}. 2-3.}

As a result of international warfare, the world in the twentieth century was challenged by the efforts of revolutions built on radicalizing the populations of semiperipheral countries as the capitalist world-system grew. The twentieth century saw the fall of colonial rule but also the rise of U.S. imperial hegemony. The development of neoliberalism was reaction to national liberation as it tried to stop efforts at economic independence through “democracy promotion.” In the process, neoliberalism influenced the development of social movements, including the U.S. Civil Rights, Black Nationalism and Chicano movements to stop the militaristic foreign policy the Alliance for Progress tried to hide.\footnote{Blasier, \textit{The Hovering Giant}, 141.}

According to William Appleman Williams in \textit{The Tragedy of American Diplomacy}, U.S. interests pushed forth the Open Door - Rooseveltian policy of the early twentieth century, involving the MNCs to push for the MIC.\footnote{Williams, \textit{The Tragedy of American Diplomacy}, 290.} The MNCs grew to control the foreign policy apparatus of the U.S. government, and in recent years that of foreign governments, all for the purpose of capital accumulation. By using U.S.-styled democratization, policy shifts were needed to stem the tide of rebellion by overt “democratic” intervention through invasion.\footnote{Williams, \textit{Empire as a Way of Life}, 155.}

C.L.R. James describes in the \textit{Black Jacobins} that under such renewed interventionism, not much had changed since the Haitian Revolution:

He [L ’Ouverture] knew French, British, and Spanish imperialist for the insatiable gangsters that they were, that there is no oath too sacred for them to break, no crime, deception, treachery, cruelty destruction of human life and property which they would not commit against those who could not defend themselves.\footnote{James, \textit{The Black Jacobins}, 1989, 271.}
As revolutionary Mexico and Cuba were countries in precarious situations and vulnerable to invasion and economic pressure, Cárdenas and Castro’s trajectory connected to L’Ouverture’s historical message,

You are going to fight against men who have neither faith, law nor religion. They promise you liberty, they intend your servitude. Why have so many ships traversed the ocean, if not to throw you again into chains? They disdain to recognize in you submissive children, and if you are not their slaves you are rebels.618

Rebels as criminals were the labels given to Mexican and Cuba revolutionaries as L’Ouverture’s men were labeled submissive children in a way similar to the methods charismatic revolutionary leaders such as Cárdenas and Castro were treated as communist criminals challenging Western imperialism. Theirs is a geography of rebellion involving the historical movement of revolution from the United States to France to Haiti then to the Americas into the twentieth century via international revolutionary movements.

In the final analysis, revolution is the slow historical process of challenging one empire after another with the last great “battle of ideas” against the remaining super powers.619 In order to understand the revolutionary trajectory of the Mexican and Cuban Revolutions it is important to apply the concept of viewing all revolutions and social movements as transnational antisystemic movements. As revolutions have spread historically, I echo Wallerstein and Tilly’s view that they have improved the conditions of people seeking social justice. The conditions and circumstances may change, but the importance of learning from past rebellions creates a developing charismatic revolutionary leadership seen throughout Latin America and the Caribbean in the beginning of the twenty-first century.

618 Ibid., 307.
619 Castro, “Reflexiones de fidel: La Batalla de Girón.”
IV. The New Geopolitical Reality: The Integrity of Revolution

A true man does not seek the path where advantage lies, but rather the path where duty lies, and this is the only practical man, whose dream of today will be the law tomorrow, because he who has looked back on the essential course of history and has seen flaming and bleeding peoples seethe in the cauldron of the ages, knows that, without a single exception, the future lies on the side of duty.\(^{620}\)  

José Martí, 1895.

The Cuban people, similar to the Mexican populace during the Cárdenas period, have seen Castro successfully confront international crisis. Serving as an example, Castro transformed Cuba’s power structure. Keeping his word (duty), he challenged the loss of legitimacy the Batista dictatorship suffered as it seized power; Castro has since established a charismatic leadership enduring years of aggressions and attempted assassinations.\(^{621}\)

Learning from the Mexican social struggle (1910 -1940) became a catalyst for solidifying the national sovereignty and economic development that has evaded Mexico. Under great pressure, Cuba had a more dangerous learning curve as the world faced nuclear annihilation. The important relationship that developed between Cárdenas and Castro was an overlapping revolutionary integrity that endeared them to their countries.\(^{622}\)

Cárdenas and Castro served other social movements and revolutions as newly independent countries of Africa in the 1960s and 70s, including the Vietnamese, Nicaraguan, and Angolan Revolutions showed that both leaders inspired countries to challenge the rise of the MIC. They also did this by utilizing petroleum resources to promote social development as the United States challenged the national sovereignty of newly liberated countries such as Bolivia, Cuba, Nicaragua, and Guatemala in the post-World War II era.\(^{623}\) Cárdenas and Castro developed their

---

\(^{622}\) White, *Creating a Third World*, 57.
\(^{623}\) Blasier, *The Hovering Giant*, 229.
intellectual abilities based on their experience as revolutionaries and statesmen influencing what
I call intellectual justice based on the commitment of their actions. According to C.L.R. James,
revolution establishes the danger of providing great service historically;

Men in general are so inclined to envy the glory of others, are so jealous of
good which they have not themselves accomplished, that a man often makes
himself enemies by the simple fact that he has rendered great service.624

The Cuban Revolution, considered a great service to humanity inspired the 1968 student
movement protests around the world that was in part due to the assassination of Ernesto Ché
Guevara a year earlier. According to Wallerstein, the death of Guevara was an important event in
the history of the twentieth century with regards to social movements.625 The student movement
of 1968 inspired student activists to “reconsider their relationship with surrounding communities,
especially in urban areas, taking seriously the charge of institutional racism, and began
implementing some democratization of their internal governance structures.”626 As the Cuban
and Mexican Revolutions had implemented reforms (1917 Mexican and 1940/1976 Cuban
Constitutions), opening institutions to the historically underprivileged, they inspired people
around the world to re-evaluate their own institutions.

An extension of the 1968 student movement has been the rise of global critical studies
analyzing the continued need for reassessing social justice. Wallerstein and Skocpol have
inspired scholar activists, calling for intellectuals to be active and critical of the structures in the
world. Wallerstein’s World Systems theory is a call for a unified social science, a social science
presenting a stronger comparative multidisciplinary approach where scholars take a critical view
of institutions and develop action-oriented scholarship (intellectual justice).

626 Wallerstein, The Essential Wallerstein. 35.
Though not explicitly stated, the idea of World Systems can be seen as an ideological child of the Mexican and Cuban Revolutions in the sense that both Revolutions were social in nature, transforming their societies by building new institutions for social justice. Therefore, the identification with the success and integrity of Cárdenas and Castro inspires people to engage in activism. Much as both men have been criminalized for their actions in support of their countries, U.S. foreign policy has been used to racialize and criminalize social movements.\textsuperscript{627} This occurs through the “war on drugs” that began the Latin America’s “Operation Condor” of the 1960s that failed to destroy social movements using torture and murder through U.S. supported dictatorships of the 1960s and 1970s (Argentina, Brazil, Chile, Nicaragua, Paraguay, and Uruguay to name a few).

Wallerstein’s call for social scientists to be responsible for engaging in the pressing issues of the day as a duty follows in the tradition of José Martí’s call for national service through liberation. This involves critically assessing the importance of local and international challenges, seen from a macro-social science lens of placing duty above personal gain as a call to action in the revolutionary trajectory of twentieth century revolutions.

Scholars cannot just sit idly by in the comfort of their institutions but must take responsibility to engage in research that provides important analysis and makes a lasting contribution. As Cárdenas and Castro served as historical revolutionary figures, their trajectory stresses the importance of casting aside caution to take part in what Skocpol and Wallerstein describe as interdisciplinary intellectual research (intellectual justice). Following that approach, I have combined World Systems and Social Revolutions theories using Comparative Historical Analysis as a method to develop this dissertation. Combined with Skocpol’s redefinition of the social relations of people through international solidarity having both a local and international

nature, social relations as described by Hassan Dalband uses Antonio Gramsci’s concept of “liberating hegemony” as “the realization of an intellectual reform and morale able to create new political and social knowledge for greater understanding by the masses.” Furthermore bridging action and intellectual analysis has served successful revolutions.

Understanding the masses, U.S. hegemony, natural resource revolutions, and charismatic revolutionary leadership includes the study of transitions. Cárdenas and Castro are a transition that Wallerstein describes as,

what we call “free will” [which] occurs largely in the process of “transition” when, precisely because of the breakdown of these very structures, the real historical choices are wide and difficult to predict.

The transition from social revolution to revolutionary institutions has implemented constitutions that serve the masses. Determined in the revolutionary era as free will, transitions take the realistic approach that provided Cárdenas and Castro with the skills to confront the immense forces aligned against them. The previous section provided the reader with a more nuanced understanding of the historical importance that a new geopolitical reality using the examples of Cárdenas and Castro’s petroleum nationalization and their development as leaders in an age of revolution. To conclude this section I quote Skopol as she expresses the changing geopolitical dynamics of social revolution:

All revolutions that have become “bureaucratic revolutions” – in the specific sense of creating larger more centralized, and more autonomous state organizations than existed under old regimes. Revolutionary leaders have sought to enhance national standing and have seen the state apparatus as the most important tool to achieve this, especially where the state could be used to guide or undertake national industrialization. International pressures have been more

---

628 Dalband, *Democracia y derechos humanos: en Cuba y Estados Unidos.* 90.
629 Ibid. 63.
effective in determining the outcomes of revolutions than intra-national pressures for equality, participation and decentralization.  

V. Conclusion: Scholarly, Theoretical, and Empirical Direction for Future Research

Political and social chaos in the form of corruption, kidnapping, torture, and murder led to the Cuban Revolution as it had in Mexico and Haiti. The unavoidable importance of social justice lay at the heart of natural and human resource conservation. The article “Cuba’s New Mission? Environmental Internationalism” describes how “From 1959 on Cuba’s revolutionaries began to spread their revolution to other post-colonial peoples. Indeed, the new nation’s survival depended on its ability to take international initiatives. Since 1991 necessity has driven Cuba into environmental consciousness.” To engage in social justice is to engage in environmental justice. The nationalization of petroleum resources by both Revolutions led to the early development of environmental conservation. As in the Mexican case, the Cárdenas’ administration also began the development of early environmentalism through agrarian reform. Cuba followed suit through its own agrarian reform that took on greater importance as Soviet support ended in 1991. That combined with the U.S. blockade challenged Cuba to rely on domestic resources and greater transnational syndicalism for its survival. Both countries later overcame challenges against their petroleum nationalization efforts, but the legacy of the natural resource sovereignty struggle instilled a dedication to attempt self-sufficiency on the part of Cuba.

Cuba has certainly endured many hardships, and after the fall of the Soviet Union, was forced to focus on “adopting an environmentally friendly, self-reliance strategy.” It is reminiscent of the Cárdenas period, and according to Emily Wakild in her article “Revolutionary

---

Skocpol, Social Revolutions in the Modern World, 128.

Resource Populism” represents an approach similar to the one taken in Mexico, “by promoting the rhetoric of conservation and plans for protecting nature, the Cárdenas administration fostered the idea that a revolutionary nation was intimately connected to its nature.” A holistic approach brought about by revolution and constitutional reform where environmental considerations provide for an organic approach to revolutionary sovereignty.

Thus, social revolution is also environmental revolution in the sense that there is a stewardship of the land by the people of a country. Wakild emphasizes the importance of Cárdenas revolutionary environmental policies:

Revering nature was revolutionary because it meant creating new methods of reallocating and providing access to nature’s resources. Because different constituencies were all dependent on nature in different ways, Cárdenas employed a wide spectrum of environmental management strategies, and he readily deferred to experts to establish them. Cárdenas used forestry policies to construct the sort of multiclass alliance so characteristic of populism.

Cárdenas influenced Castro by providing an opening in the world for the ability for intellectuals to develop their ideas; theirs was a call for doing away with the mutual exclusivity of class, race, and gender in limiting revolutionary consciousness and environmental awareness. It is no coincidence that the first Earth Day in 1970 coincided with the death of Cárdenas and the rise of many transnational organizations attempting natural resource sovereignty. This is significant because it followed on the heels of a history of transnational revolutionary support that began with the Haitian Revolution supporting Simón Bolívar carrying on to the Cárdenas-Castro collaboration to the more recent hemispheric wide relations between Castro and Daniel Ortega (Nicaragua), Hugo Chávez (Venezuela), Lula Da Silva and Dilma Rousseff (Brazil), Rafael Correa (Ecuador), Evo Morales (Bolivia), José Mujica (Uruguay), and Néstor Kirchner and

---

633 Wakild, “Revolutionary Resource Populism: President Cárdenas and the Creation of Environmental Policies,” 82.
634 Ibid., 86.
Cristina Fernández (Argentina) to name a few. The work of this dissertation is part of a broader project that looks at the importance of transnational alliances that utilized natural resources as weapons to establish national sovereignty through decisive leadership that began in Haiti in 1791 and continues today.
## APPENDIX A

### Comparative Petroleum Nationalizations Table

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mexico:</th>
<th>Cuba:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. First Revolution of twentieth century -</td>
<td>1. First socialist nationalist revolution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>non-socialist nationalist revolution</td>
<td>in Latin America</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. 1917 Constitution</td>
<td>2. 1940 Constitution modeled Mexico</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. 1936 Expropriation law</td>
<td>3. 1938 Mineral and Combustibles Law</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Did not want to nationalize</td>
<td>4. Did not want to nationalize</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Created precedent for nationalization</td>
<td>5. Learned from Mexico</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>supported</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. 1938 petroleum nationalization</td>
<td>7. 1960 nationalized petroleum refineries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Twenty-eight years after revolution</td>
<td>8. Eighteen months after revolution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Revolution was routinized/institutionalized</td>
<td>9. Revolutions had just begun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Culminated the revolution</td>
<td>10. Defining event of revolution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Party system established</td>
<td>11. No party system</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Eve of World War II</td>
<td>12. Height of Cold War</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. World against Fascism</td>
<td>13. West anti-communist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Multinational Corporations</td>
<td>15. Military Industrial Complex</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Led by Lázaro Cárdenas</td>
<td>16. Led by Fidel Castro</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX B—CHAPTER 3: ORIGINAL SPANISH TEXT OF TRANSLATED SPEECHES

Note 88

“En la lucha por esa América Latina liberada, frente a los voces obedientes de quienes usurpan su representación oficial, surge ahora, con potencia invencible, la voz genuina de los pueblos, voz que se abre paso desde las entrañas de sus minas de carbon y de estaño, desde sus fábricas y centrales azucareros, desde sus tierras enfeudadas, donde rotos, cholos, guachos, jíbaros, herederos de [Emiliano] Zapata y de [Augusto César] Sandino, empuñan las armas de su libertad, voz que resuena en sus poetas y en sus novelistas, en sus estudiantes, en sus mujeres y en sus niños, en sus ancianos desvelados. A esa voz hermana…”

Note 95
Ibid., 27.

“Esa fuerza era la penetración imperialista de Estados Unidos en nuestra tierra; esa fuerza fue la que frustró nuestra plena independencia; esa fuerza fue la que no dejó penetrar a Calixto García y sus bravos soldados en Santiago de Cuba; esa fuerza fue la que impidió el Ejército Libertador haver la revolucion…”

Note 147

“La prevalencia del imperialismo, sistema de explotacion de paises y pueblos extranjeros y generador de las guerras mundiales, motiva nuestra Resistencia latinoamericana, que se traduce en un lucha por la liberacion integral de nuestros pueblos, el medio mas directo con que contamos para que la soberania y la independencia de nuestros paises queden aseguradas y, con ellas, contribuir de la manera mas eficaz, y con la ayuda de los demas pueblos a obtener la paz permanente para el mundo entero.”

Note 156

“El deber de todo revolucionario es hacer la revolución. Se sabe que en América y en el mundo la revolución vencerá, pero no es de revolucionarios sentarse en la puerta de su casa para ver pasar el cadaver del imperialismo.”
APPENDIX C—CHAPTER 4: ORIGINAL SPANISH TEXT OF TRANSLATED SPEECHES

Note 187


“Pero vimos también la Revolución Mexicana, que dio al traste con la decenaria tiranía de Porfirio Díaz y forjó la primera gran revolución social en nuestro hemisferio (Aplausos), y la primera gran Reforma Agraria (Aplausos). Se abrió una etapa de luchas, heroicas y sangrientas, precisamente para salvar la Revolución y para consolidarla. Recuerdo que desde nuestros tiempos de estudiantes se hablaba, con toda razón, de que la Constitución salida de la Revolución Mexicana era una de las más avanzadas y progresistas del mundo (Aplausos). La Revolución Mexicana constituyó una fuente de profunda inspiración para el movimiento revolucionario latinoamericano.”

Note 194


“El general Lázaro Cárdenas era ya para el año 1929 una de las personalidades más relevantes de la política Mexicana, contándose sin duda alguna entre los tres principales dirigentes de la Revolución, junto con el propio Calles y El general Joaquín Amaro; Cárdenas, además, constituía ya el mayor dirigente revolucionario empeñado en rescatar y hacer triunfar la herencia ideológico y política de la Revolución.”

Note 195


“Pero fue también México el primer país de los actuales productores de petróleo, que en condiciones difíciles, cuando no existía la actual correlación de fuerzas en el mundo, cuando era todavía un país pudiéramos considerar débil frente a los grandes poderes imperialistas, en nacionalizar el petróleo (Aplausos). Y recordamos cuán irritadas fueron las reacciones imperialistas y qué dura lucha libró México con aquella valiente y decidida acción, que inmortalizó el nombre de Lázaro Cárdenas (Aplausos).”

Note 209

Castro, “Discurso pronunciado en el acto de amistad Cubano-Bulgara, celebrando en el combinando de implementos agrícolas en construcción Martires del 26 de Julio, el 8 de Abril de

"Saludamos que, alejándose de aquellos que miran el petróleo propio con interés de privilegio egoísta, haya sostenido usted que el petróleo debe ser declarado "patrimonio de la humanidad" —refiriéndose más precisamente a todos los energéticos—, sin que esto sea contradictorio con su decisión de utilizarlo, a la vez, en la construcción del propio país."

Note 213


"A la revolución mexicana la querían exterminar también, porque hizo la revolución burguesa a principios de siglo, y, efectivamente, nacionalizó los grandes latifundios y trajo una serie de medidas de beneficio social. No estaba el país preparado, desde luego, en aquella época para una revolución socialista, pero México fue muy hostigado. Y recuérdense las medidas tomadas cuando el gobierno de Lázaro Cárdenas nacionalizó las empresas petroleras extranjeras, todos los boicot y todas las medidas tomadas contra México; recuérdese la revolución de Guatemala; recuérdese la invasión de República Dominicana a raíz de una revolución cuyos líderes eran, fundamentalmente, militares. El imperialismo no quiere ningún tipo de revolución, mucho menos puede querer una revolución socialista."

Note 216


"Es que la Revolución es un proceso, y es que el socialismo tampoco se logra por decreto. El socialismo es un régimen económico y social que se alcanza a través de un proceso; no se logra por decreto. Por decreto se pueden nacionalizar los centrales azucareros, por decreto se pueden nacionalizar los bancos, por decreto se pueden nacionalizar las grandes industrias, por decreto se pueden ir adoptando una serie de medidas, pero por decreto no se logra un régimen económico-social acabado. Entre otras cosas, la Revolución es un proceso de educación del pueblo, es un proceso de formación de conciencia revolucionaria."

Note 219


"Las concepciones del derecho universal que actualmente rigen la propiedad, consideran a esta función social y no como prerrogativa de abuso o de abandono de las cosas susceptibles de satisfacer las necesidades de los hombres en sociedad, por sus causahabientes. La ley numero 75, promulgada el 28 de enero de 1932, que reglamenta estas modalidades del derecho de propiedad
en cumplimiento de la función social que tales bienes están llamados a llenar en la vida colectiva, estableciendo a la vez los estatutos mediante los cuales determinada propiedad debe pasar a satisfacer necesidades sociales, por causa de utilidad pública, precisando la forma de garantizar su indemnización. La vigencia y la aplicación de esa ley ni siquiera puede calificarse analizando serenamente las condiciones de la vida jurídica en México, como radicalismo del gobierno, sino como el encauzamiento legal de esa modalidad del derecho universal”.

Note 265

Castro, “Discurso pronunciado en la clausura del VII Congreso de la Unión de Jóvenes Comunistas, efectuada en el Palacio de las Convenciones, el día 10 de diciembre de 1998,” “Año del aniversario 40 de las batallas decisivas de la guerra de liberación.”

“No exagero, ni busco ni necesito buscar hechos que expliquen la constante simpatía del pueblo cubano, cuando se recuerda al México que nacionalizó el petróleo en una época en que tal medida parecía inconcebible; al que mantuvo durante tanto tiempo la más vertical conducta con el gobierno legítimo de España, tres años antes de que el fascismo desatará la Segunda Guerra Mundial; al México que dio asilo a los miles de refugiados españoles, a todos los demócratas perseguidos en América Latina.”

Note 284

Castro, “Discurso pronunciado en la clausura del VII Congreso de la Unión de Jóvenes Comunistas, efectuada en el Palacio de las Convenciones, el día 10 de diciembre de 1998,” “Año del aniversario 40 de las batallas decisivas de la guerra de liberación.”

“Omito otras incontables pruebas de solidaridad con nuestro pueblo. Señalo solo tres: cuando el 17 de abril de 1961 fuerzas mercenarias a las órdenes de Estados Unidos desembarcaron en Girón, un hombre glorioso que era entonces, es hoy y será siempre un símbolo y una leyenda viva, quiso venir a luchar con nosotros: Lázaro Cárdenas. México, junto a Venezuela y Cuba, fundó el SELA, primera organización latinoamericana a la que pudimos pertenecer cuando Cuba era siempre excluida, como una cenicienta, de cualquier institución continental; México hizo posible la presencia de nuestro país en la Cumbre Iberoamericana de Guadalajara, que hoy se ha convertido en toda una fuerza de unidad e integración de nuestros países y de relaciones con Europa.”

Note 286

Y, desde luego, cuando hay confianza, y esa confianza está basada en hechos, y se ha forjado durante mucho tiempo, con qué otro país de nuestra área pudiéramos nosotros tan gustosamente desarrollar nuestras relaciones económicas y de colaboración como con México (Aplausos).”
APPENDIX D—CHAPTER 5: ORIGINAL SPANISH TEXT OF TRANSLATED SPEECHES

None

APPENDIX E—CHAPTER 6: ORIGINAL SPANISH TEXT OF TRANSLATED SPEECHES

Note 414

Cárdenas, Ideario político, 291-292.

“Mi actitud frente a Cuba está inspirada en los más altos intereses de México. Pedir respeto a la autodeterminación de ese pueblo hermano y exigir la no intervención en sus asuntos domésticos, es mantener las tesis más entreñables y correctas de política internacional. Y significa, además, conservar incólume la autoridad moral de México para demander siempre un trato igual para nuestro país. Y cabe citar parte importante del memorable y doctrinario discurso que pronunció el señor Carranza, en Matamoros, el 29 de noviembre de 1915: Ya es tiempo que la América Latina sepa que nosotros hemos ganado con la lucha interior el restablecimiento de la justicia y del derecho, que ello sirva de ejemplo para que los pueblos defienden sus soberanías, sus instituciones y la libertad de sus ciudadanos. La lucha nuestra será comienzo de una lucha universal qu dé paso a una era de justicia, en que se establezca el principio del respeto que los pueblos grandes deben tener por los pueblos débiles.” […] En todo el mundo se advierten signos que presagian cambios fundamentales. Los antiguos pueblos que hasta ayer fueron colonias, no solo quieren su libertad política, sino su transformación social.”

Note 425

Ibid., 95.

“La política anticomunista en Latinoamérica trata de presentar como movimientos subversivos de inspiración comunista a todo lucha democrática, a todo intento de independencia económica y a todo afán de preservar la soberanía nacional, por cuanto estas tres corrientes se ven enfrentadas a los intereses del gran capital financiero.”

Note 429


“Sin embargo, refiriéndome al caso de México, el hecho es que ese país atravesó casi 50 años de problemas y dificultades, desde que se inició la Revolución y a través de todos los procesos, la nacionalización del petróleo; muchos de esos problemas que nosotros tenemos hoy los atravesaron los mexicanos, para obtener piezas de repuesto, equipos. Y en realidad en estos
instantes la economía de México es una economía floreciente, es una economía que avanza con niveles más altos que cualquier otro del resto de los países latinoamericanos.”

Note 441


“Pero quien conoce la historia de este siglo, quien conoce la historia de este siglo hasta ahora, hasta hace unos días, pensar en la promoción de la democracia por parte de Estados Unidos es una cosa fabulosa, es de leyenda, cuando ese país ha colmado a este continente de intervenciones; si a los países los intervenían hasta por una deuda de 20 millones de dólares, y eso le pasó a Haití, eso le pasó a Santo Domingo, eso le pasó a Nicaragua, no se sabe a cuánta gente; a Cuba también, pero aquí tenían, además, el derecho constitucional, y lo que quiere establecer Estados Unidos ahora para toda la América Latina es una especie de Enmienda Platt, derecho de intervención institucionalizada.”

Note 447


“Si esta Guerra que no ha querido el pueblo, que representa como ninguna destrucción y muerte, no logra a su tiempo una transformación democrática, solidaria, de hombres, naciones, razas; si esta destructora lucha tan solo sirve para afirmar la debilidad democrática, la inhibición de los mejores, la dominadora codicia de algunos pueblos bien armados para la oppression y el despojo de las naciones débiles, la historia del mundo recogerá en su páginas, refiriéndose a nuestro tiempo, un ejemplo oprobioso del que no existe precedente.”

Note 458


“Decimos que es nuevo este cuadro de una revolución en este continente y con ello no negamos los esfuerzos que otros pueblos han hecho por liberarse, más correctamente podríamos decir que es la segunda revolución de América y para ser más exacto, la segunda revolución libertadora de América (Aplausos). Fue la primera contra el yugo colonial español y es esta la segunda última contra el yugo colonial yanki (Aplausos). Pero, ¿es que se había podido concebir una revolución en América? ¡No! Las revoluciones en América estaban proscriptas, las revoluciones en América estaban prohibidas; estaban prohibidas de hecho, y hasta de derecho. El hecho de la dominación material y el derecho que había implantado el imperio en este continente. Las revoluciones no estaban autorizadas en América. ¡Las únicas revoluciones autorizadas en América eran las revoluciones “made in United States”! (Aplausos). Es decir, los golpes de estado que aquí
llamaban "revoluciones", o los movimientos revolucionarios hasta donde estuviera dispuesto a permitirlo el gobierno norteamericano (Exclamaciones y abucheos de: "Fuera").”

**Note 459**

Castro, “Discurso pronunciado con motivo del premio que le fuera otorgada por la Organizacion Internacional De Periodista, efectuado en el Salon de Embajadores del Hotel Habana Libre, el 25 de Marzo de 1961.”

“Y Lázaro Cárdenas, respondiendo al discurso de Kennedy, a su llamada Alianza para el Progreso, expresó que Kennedy, citando a Juárez, había dicho que América debía ser el continente de la democracia, pero que Kennedy se había olvidado de que Juárez había dicho que "el respeto al derecho ajeno era la paz", y que Estados Unidos le había arrebatado a México la mitad de su territorio, y que sin embargo Kennedy no había dicho una sola palabra sobre esa cuestión (Aplausos).”

**Note 464**


“El ‘New York Times’ afirma en un editorial que en el marco de los temas inscriptos en la orden del día de Punta del Este no parece haberse dado suficiente importancia a ‘uno de los objetivos de la Alianza para el Progreso’ como fue concebida originalmente, es decir, en las reformas sociales. El diario agrega que la agenda prevé prevalentemente un amplio debate sobre los problemas comerciales, financieros, de la produccion y la integracion economica, pero coloca en segundo plano o quizá la de la cuestion central de la justicia social, en la que se apoyó el presidente John Kennedy cuando lanzó la Alianza en marzo de 1961. Según el diario, ‘el grande y vital ideal de la justicia social parece haberse olvidado’.”

**Note 474**

Castro, “Discurso pronunciado en el desfile efectuado en la Plaza Civica, el 2 de Enero de 1961.”

“El imperio poderoso decidió la destrucción de la Revolución Cubana; la Revolución Cubana tenía que chocar, necesariamente, con el imperio poderoso. ¿Hay algún ingenuo en este mundo que se crea que se podía hacer una reforma agraria, privar de la tierra a las grandes compañías imperialistas sin chocar con el imperialismo? ¿Había algún ingenuo en este mundo que creyera que se podían nacionalizar los servicios públicos sin chocar con el imperialismo? ¿Había algún ingenuo que creyera que se podía aspirar a tener una economía independiente y una vida política independiente sin chocar con el imperialismo?”
Note 510

Castro, “Discurso pronunciado en el acto de recordacion a los Martires del asalto al Palacio Presidencial el 13 de Marzo de 1957, celebrando en la Escalinata de la Universidad de la Habana, el 13 de Marzo de 1961.”

“Con razón el distinguido líder revolucionario mexicano Lázaro Cárdenas (Aplausos) ha declarado que si a Kennedy se le ocurriera hacer una visita por América del Sur, iba a tener un recibimiento muy parecido al del señor Nixon (Exclamaciones de: “¡Fuera!”); es decir, que lo iban a recibir con aquellas muestras con que recibieron al anterior vicepresidente. Conferencia Latinoamericana por la Emancipación Económica, la Soberanía y la Paz, que acaba de celebrarse en México (Aplausos); la actitud del Gobierno de México con respecto a Cuba (Aplausos), y el apoyo decidido de una figura política tan querida y de tanto prestigio en México, y en el continente, como Lázaro Cárdenas (Aplausos), son motivos más que suficientes para preocupar al imperialismo. Y estuvieron a punto de herir profundamente el sentimiento nacional mexicano, al proponer uno de esos senadores absurdos, que tanto abundan allí en el Senado norteamericano, nada menos que una investigación, ¡nada menos que una investigación en el Senado americano! sobre una conferencia que habría de celebrarse en México. Pero parece ser que el tremendo prestigio y la personalidad de Lázaro Cárdenas... (Aplausos) los impresionó.”

Note 523

Cárdenas, Ideario político, 47.

“Nuestro territorio, con valiosas riquezas en su entranas, fue objeto de la penetracion de empresas que se habian acostumbrado a considerer a los países hispanoamericanos como simples colonias de explotacion, constituyendose en fuerzas economicas superiors al poder soberano de los Estados. Frente a este problema el gobierno de la Revolucion acudio a la aplicacion de La Carta Magna de 1917 que recupero para la Republica, en forma inalienable, el dominio directo del subsuelo, liberandola asi de la tutela de elementos empenados en que los derechos de la nacion fuesen letra muerta y habituados a obstaculizar la vigencia de las leyes fundamentales mediante coacciones diplomaticas o revueltas mercenarias.”

Note 528


“México es, por fortuna para su pueblo y para júbilo de los demás pueblos de América Latina, un país con inmensos recursos naturales. En años recientes, con su propio esfuerzo, con sus propias técnicas y con sus propias tecnologías, México ha explorado su territorio geológicamente, y ha descubierto grandes yacimientos petroleros, cuyas cifras probadas rebasan los 50 000 millones de barriles, y que potencialmente pudieran cuadruplicarse (Aplausos). Repito, con sus propias técnicas y tecnologías realizó esta hazaña; no necesitó de multinacionales para descubrir y
expolar sus yacimientos petrolíferos y de gas, en la tierra y en el mar. Tamaña riqueza, tratándose de hidrocarburos, tenía que despertar apetencias y ambiciones de otros.”

**Note 532**

Cárdenas, “Alocucion a los directores del Centro Patronal de Monterrey, Nuevo Leon, Sobre la accion gubernamental y la lucha obrera,” *Ideario politico*. 187.

“El mismo derecho que tienen las clases patronales para vincular su organizaciones en un estructura nacional, es el que asiste a los trabajadores para hacer lo propio y aun mantener relaciones de caracter internacional, como ocurre en todos los paises y principalmente, los que alcanzan mayor desarrollo industrial […] Pero no basta con que el gobierno haga lo suyo; e necesario que las empresas tambien se abstengan de interven en las actividades sociales de sus trabajadores. Y es en ese sentido en el que pido a ustedes su cooperacion.”

**Note 538**


“La expropiacion petrolera y la Reforma Agraria representan actos de afirmacion de nuestra soberania y de proteccion de los interes nacionales, con base en las leyes consagradas en nuestra Carta Magna, la que claramente asienta que corresponde a la nacion el domino directo de sus recursos naturales y el derecho de imponer a la propiedad privada las modalidades que dicte el interes public. Por lo tanto, los gobiernos de la Revolucion se han inspirado, como en el caso del petroleo, en nuestras leyes constitucionales, recuperando para el patrimonio nacional industrias vitals que impulsan la economia del pais, entre soberania nacional.”
APPENDIX F—CHAPTER 7: ORIGINAL SPANISH TEXT OF TRANSLATED SPEECHES

Note 541


“Hay en Cuba, con relación a México, una tradición de historia y de amistad que no tiene igual con ningún otro pueblo de América Latina. Nuestras luchas han estado muy vinculadas a las luchas y a la historia de México. Cuando nuestras guerras independentistas, los patriotas cubanos tuvieron en el pueblo mexicano un amigo, y en el país hermano un hogar. Allí vivió un tiempo nuestro Héroe Nacional, José Martí (Aplausos). Allí enriqueció su visión revolucionaria y americana. Martí amó entrañablemente a México, amor que lo acompañó hasta su tumba. Recuerden a nuestra generación, que también allí encontró hospitalidad y asilo.”

Note 553


“…hay muchas cosas afines, mucha simpatía, mucha afinidad entre mexicanos y cubanos, entre la Revolución Mexicana y la Revolución Cubana. La primera revolución social en este hemisferio fue la de México. La primera revolución social o la segunda revolución social, nosotros la llamamos la primera revolución socialista en este hemisferio, la Revolución Cubana. A nosotros nos interesó siempre mucho la Revolución Mexicana, nos interesa hoy y nos interesará mañana, su experiencia, su desarrollo, sus ideas. No podemos olvidar que esta Revolución Mexicana fue siempre una fuente de inspiración para los revolucionarios cubanos y sigue siendo una fuente de muy rica experiencia.”

Note 556


“América Latina nos vincula en una común preocupación y en un similar enfoque cuando aceptamos la urgencia de preservar y mantener las riquezas naturales, suprimir los residuos del colonialismo, eliminar las tiranías y los neofascismos, igualmente proscritos por la historia, y
proclamamos la necesidad de instaurar en nuestras tierras sociedades democráticas que puedan seleccionar, por sí mismas, las vías de su transformación futura.”

Note 567

Castro, “Discurso pronunciado en la Velada Solemne Conmemorativa Del XX Aniversario de la Victoria de Playa Giron, Celebrada en el teatro “Carlos Marx”, el 19 de Abril de 1981,” “Año del XX Aniversario de Giron”.

“Estos factores que señaló tuvieron una importancia determinante, pero tuvo también una importancia determinante la solidaridad internacional (Aplausos). Recordamos con emoción el gesto del general Lázaro Cárdenas pidiendo viajar a nuestro país para luchar junto a nosotros (Aplausos).”

Note 572


“Nos interesan más las relaciones con la Revolución Mexicana que las relaciones con la república mexicana. Yo no entiendo qué quiso decir él con eso, como si la República de Cuba pudiera apartarse o separarse de la Revolución. No hay separación posible, como creo que tampoco México y su historia se pueden separar de la revolución. O sea que muchas cosas que hoy tiene México se deben a que hubo una revolución.”

Note 575


“Yo tengo una conciencia muy clara de lo que significó la Revolución Mexicana, fue la primera revolución social en el siglo pasado. La primera de todas fue la haitiana, a principios del siglo XIX, revolución profunda; pero en México hubo una revolución social: se repartieron las tierras, se construyeron decenas de miles de escuelas, universidades y otras muchas cosas…Yo tengo un altísimo concepto de la Revolución Mexicana como acontecimiento histórico y como revolución social, que llevó adelante la educación, el desarrollo cultural, el desarrollo económico y otros grandes avances que no se habrían podido obtener jamás sin la Revolución Mexicana.”

Note 578

Castro, “Entrevista concedida por Fidel Castro Ruz, Presidente de la República de Cuba 2002.”
“A Cuba no la puedes separar de su historia, a la República de Cuba, que es la República socialista de Cuba, la República independiente de Cuba; nadie la puede separar de su historia. Y la república no es un nombre, esta es una república revolucionaria, y sin discusión, la más independiente del mundo hoy día.”
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