

ISABEL MONAL

Cuban Foundational Marxist Thought

In Latin America in the 1920s, vigorous and creative Marxist thought featured in the rise of revolutionary endeavors, and of the popular movement in general, characterized that decade on the continent. This Marxist thought became the root of an important tradition of struggle for emancipation, nourishing the various revolutionary efforts that occurred and are continuing even today.

Three Latin American figures are prominent in building that foundation: the Chilean Emilio Recabarren, the Peruvian José Carlos Mariátegui, and the Cuban Julio Antonio Mella. Mariátegui was, without a doubt, one of the most profound and creative Latin American Marxist thinkers of the twentieth century. Both Mariátegui and Mella died very young, and it should not be ruled out that their early demise weighed negatively in the subsequent evolution of Marxism and Leninism in Latin America.

It was not with them, of course, that Marx's ideology, or socialism in general, was introduced in Latin America. The influence of social democracy was already present in some countries; for example, the foundation of socialist parties in Argentina (1896), Uruguay (1910), and Chile (1912). The Argentinean socialist Juan B. Justo translated *Capital* into Spanish and propagated, together with others, the ideas of Marx and Engels. In Cuba, social democracy was not present as such; rather, since the end of the nineteenth century, anarchist socialist thought was present in Cuba. The early initiator and promoter of Marxism on Cuban soil was the laborer Carlos Baliño (1848–1926), who had become a Marxist during his long stay in the United States.

The first workers' organizations in Cuba were started by the middle of the nineteenth century, like those of the rest of the continent, but different from other countries because Cuba had not fought its battle for independence at

Isabel Monal is a researcher at the Institute of Philosophy of Havana, the director of the review *Marx Ahora*, and a member of the Cuban Academy of Sciences.

the beginning of that century and, therefore, was not yet independent. The first decades of the evolution of the workers' movement in Cuba took place when the island was still a colony of Spain. Consequently, the workers' movement and the primogenitor socialist thought had an essential characteristic that conditioned and differentiated it: the inevitable reference to the workers' attitude toward the struggle for independence—a struggle, starting in 1868, that included three wars (the intermediate one being short and moderate). Through these actions, national independence and social struggles (including, of course, the urgent problem of slavery) were interconnected.

Those first workers' organizations were created in the middle of the nineteenth century, and they were intended for mutual aid. They had a reformist ideology that denounced the inhumane conditions of workers but did not call for opposition or struggle. They represented, nevertheless, an important step forward in dealing with the social struggles of the people of Cuba and contributed to the creation of a consciousness of the need for unity among workers.

After the end of the Ten Years' war for independence (revolution of 1868) and due to important changes in the socioeconomic conditions of the country, including the abolition of slavery in 1886, which increased the number of workers, a radicalization of the class consciousness of the workers took place. This second movement in the evolution of the workers' ideology was characterized by the influence of anarchist ideas. Anarchists strongly criticized the capitalist system, promoted class struggle, and fought for the betterment of the working class. They also tried to preserve the unity of the working class and supported the struggle for independence. Despite their shortcomings and their well-known ideas about politics, the state, and so forth, they introduced more radical ideas.

Strictly speaking, Baliño was not a theoretician or an original thinker. He devoted himself particularly to propaganda and to the introduction of Marxist ideas using everyday, plain language. Actually, he did not know Marx's work or had scanty knowledge of it, a situation by no means exceptional in the case of the very first Marxists on the continent. After the establishment of the Cuban neocolonial republic (1902), he participated in the foundation and management of various political organizations and parties. The foundation of the Agrupación Comunista de La Habana, in 1923, had particular significance, because it formed, together with other similar organizations, the initial nucleus that gave birth to the founding of the (first) Partido Comunista de Cuba (Communist Party of Cuba) in 1925. Through Baliño's labor, it is possible to identify some of his socialist and Marxist ideas, such as the thesis that social phenomena were subject to laws and that social struggles resulted

from important forces working within society. He thought that a radical revolutionary social change in Cuban society was necessary in order to overcome capitalism and to create a new society through the seizing of political power by the proletariat. His concept of the new society included as an objective the elimination of the exploitation of man by man, and he looked forward to the establishment of a socialist society where the means of production would be socialized. Thanks to José Martí, with whom he became acquainted and began to collaborate with at the beginning of the 1990s, Baliño came to understand that the essential task at that time was not only to gain independence but also to face the nascent imperialist threat of the United States.

Carlos Baliño was a strong defender of independence and supported José Martí in his efforts to create the organization (*Partido Revolucionario Cubano*) to lead the new war for independence. Baliño joined Martí in his efforts to obtain support from the Cuban workers, especially the tobacco workers in Tampa and Key West, Florida, in the United States. He was also one of the founders, together with Julio Antonio Mella (1903–29), of the Communist Party in 1925. So with him, early Marxism clearly established a bridge that links communism, Marxism, and workers with the defense of national independence. The relationship of Martí and Baliño is essential to the history of socialism and Marxism in Cuba. This relationship represents the unity between national sovereignty and the struggle for social betterment, and their work generated a tradition of Marxism in Cuban history that became one of its roots. The fact, on the other hand, that the wars of independence and the early decades of the evolution of labor movements and socialist ideas took place simultaneously provides the basis for subjective favorable conditions in the social and political struggles of the first decades of the twentieth century. The spirit emanating from the wars of independence was an element steadily present in the initial moments of Marxism in Cuba and during the foundational years of the 1920s as well as in the general social and political unrest that characterized that period until the “Revolution of the Thirty” (*Revolución del Treinta*—actually, the Revolution of 1933). With Martí and Baliño, the union of Cuban Marxism with national independence was therefore sealed.

Even since the early part of the Marxist movement in Cuba, an essential trait of Cuban Marxists—including Baliño, Mella, and Rubén Martínez Villena—was that they were *martianos* (Martians). Later, even for other Marxists, Martí was the starting point or the way to become Marxist. José Martí (1853–1895), the Cuban national hero, was not a socialist, but he criticized the evils of capitalism and sought social justice. He showed sympathy toward the socialists and the Marxists and had the ability to attract men like

Carlos Baliño. In 1883, while living in the United States, Martí played public homage to Karl Marx on the occasion of his death. Due to the fact that he lived in the United States during a period of tremendous social struggle and during a time when the United States showed great interest in the weak republics of the south, he became aware that the United States could potentially be a great danger to Latin American nations and thought that the time had arrived for those nations to declare their second independence. One of Martí's main contributions was precisely his anti-imperialist thinking. Even before Lenin and Marxism, in general, expounded the theory of imperialism, he understood that the socioeconomic and political system of the United States pushed it toward expansion and the imperial venture. Cuban Marxism, as well as further anti-imperialism notions, is derived from Martí's deliberation.

For a better understanding of the introduction of Marxism in Cuba and of the strengthening of the popular movement of the 1920s—a decade during which, as already indicated, the Cuban foundational Marxist thought was forged—a brief reference to certain factors of significant impact in the evolution of these ideas in Cuba is necessary.

In this sense, it should be recalled that when Cuba was close to reaching its independence from Spain, U.S. military intervention in 1898, and subsequent occupation, allowed the United States to impose upon Cuba the Platt Amendment, according to which Cuba became a sort of semi-colony of the United States, because it granted the northern power the right to intervene militarily in Cuba.¹ That war of the United States against Spain was, according to Lenin, the first imperialist war. From that time on, and although Cuba was formally and officially independent, it became dependent and submitted to the United States through economic and political systematic impositions. Through the continuous involvement of the United States in Cuban affairs, as well as its military interventions, fostered and promoted the anti-imperialist feelings in Cuba, which culminated in the 1920s.

Comprehending the anti-imperialist ideology is essential when characterizing and understanding the thinking of those years from the end of the nineteenth century and into the twentieth century. Three stages of anti-imperialism in Cuba can essentially be identified before the triumph of the Cuban revolution in 1959. The thought and work of José Martí represent the first. One of the merits of this Cuban patriot in this sense was his awareness of the huge economic and political forces that moved the United States toward imperial expansion, thus rejecting the illusionism and idealization of American society, in contrast to other important Latin American thinkers, who were trapped within the mythology of the northern democracy.

A second stage is closely related to the conditions created by the North American intervention in Cuba at the end of the War of Independence (Revolution of 1895) and its occupation and control over Cuba, in particular, the imposition of the Platt Amendment. During the first two decades of the nineteenth century, a form of anti-interference and anti-imperialism emerged and expanded within some of the liberal tendencies; one of the most pivotal moments was the debate concerning the Constitution of 1901, to which the amendment approved by the U.S. Congress was finally imposed; in that context, other measures were subsequently imposed, including the Treaty of Reciprocity and the Guantanamo Bay settlement. The refusal to accept imperialist penetration can also be found among positivist thinkers like Enrique Jose Varona, an outstanding Cuban philosopher and intellectual. Nevertheless, liberal and positivist anti-imperialism could not allow for complete comprehension of the phenomena, its causes, and its profound socioeconomic roots, as they emanate from the capitalist system itself.

It is only with a Marxist and Leninist interpretation that anti-imperialism reaches its fullness and acuity of analysis in Cuba and in Latin America in general. Its outstanding personalities included Julio Antonio Mella and his partner in political struggle Ruben Martinez Villena (1899-1934). They understood, following Lenin, that the matter was, above all, a question of the world socioeconomic system and that the North American growing imperialism was the worst enemy of the people in the rest of the Americas.

The growing presence of imperialism was, undoubtedly, one of the main causes of the rise of the popular and revolutionary movement of the 1920s, which culminated in Cuba with the failed Revolution of the Thirty. Of course, an ensemble of internal and external factors influenced the formation of that atmosphere. To be objective, it should be added that there was a strong sentiment of frustration because of the "republic" that the Cuban oligarchy and imperialism established, as well as the still active spirit of struggle emanating from the revolutionary tradition of fiercely fighting battles for independence.

Important international events also influenced the situation in Cuba. One was the Mexican Revolution of 1910, which was the first social revolution on the continent, with its strong message of freedom and social justice. Another event was obviously the October Revolution, which had a revolutionary effect on the whole continent that was decisive in the development of Marxism and in the foundation of communist parties linked to Lenin's Third International.

Although of a quite different nature, the *Reforma universitaria* (University Reform) of 1918 in Cordoba Argentina has to be mentioned. This reform movement expanded to the rest of the continent and impelled social unrest and rebelliousness among students, particularly university students. This

movement has had a steadily present role in the social and political struggles of Latin America ever since.

Mella's and Villena's Marxist and Leninist thinking had many common points with similar efforts that were taking place in Latin America. The Russian revolution provided a powerful impetus for expanding and propagating the ideas of Marx and Engels to other continents. It should be taken into consideration, however, that at the time, few of the works of the classics and of Lenin were available in Spanish; in the case of Baliño, this penury was even worse. One of the factors that could have influenced the outstanding quality of the work of Mariátegui could have been related to the fact that his staying in Europe broadened and made more profound his introduction to Marxism—an opportunity that our first Marxist and Leninist thinkers did not have.

The theories of Mella and Villena constitute an expression of creative Marxism for the Cuban and Latin American conditions in general. They belong to a tradition that, starting with Marx and Engels, couples the man of thought with the politician stimulated by the idea of social emancipation. Men like Mariátegui, for whom socialism in Latin America was a heroic creation (*creación heroica*), belong to this same tradition in which we can find—in addition to Marx, Engels, and Lenin—Rosa Luxemburg and Gramsci. Mella, Villena, and Mariátegui clearly were those whom Gramsci nominated as “organic intellectuals.” It is worth noting that Cuban Marxists of that time acknowledge the work of Mariátegui, who likewise did not fail to show his great appreciation for Julio Antonio. The Peruvian spoke of the need for “linking the avant-garde groups,” meaning the revolutionary intellectuals of the continent. On his side, Villena wanted at the same time to establish a system of communication with the avant-garde revolutionary movement promoted and sustained by Mariátegui. On those same lines expressed Mella himself, for whom the “innovative men of the continent form a great family.” The foundational Marxist thought called, in a conscious and intentional manner, upon the need for Marxists to unite in a big family to fight for emancipation in the continent, and for whose fight Marxism and Leninism was the key reference for guidance. It seems that those first intellectuals had full consciousness of the need for linkage among themselves to face the enormous task that history was imposing upon them.

It should be noted that Mella and Villena also concur with the Amauta (Mariátegui) concerning the need for an adequate valuation and appropriation of what could be called traditions of the national and continental revolutionary thought. That is the case, for example, for the recognition by Mariátegui of Manuel Gonzalez Prada, the lucid and progressive Peruvian

positivist thinker; and it is also the case for the already mentioned appreciation of Mella and Villena (and also by the Amauta) for José Martí and for the Cuban positivist (and anti-imperialist) thinker Varona. Many of the Marxists of the time felt great admiration for that outstanding and exceptional intellectual personality of the continent that was the progressive and positivist Argentinean thinker José Ingenieros.

It should not be interpreted that positivists in Latin America were always on the side of the best causes. There is no doubt that under the conditions at the end of the nineteenth century and the beginning of the twentieth century some of their ideas represented in Latin America a progressive tendency, but in many cases, positivism was related to manifestations of social Darwinism or was linked to outrageous dictators like Porfirio Díaz in Mexico after it had been actively compromised with the progressive and patriotic Benito Juárez. A strong antipositivist tendency from different points of view developed at the beginning of the last century. What this paper seeks to underline is that while a conservative critique from irrationalist and spiritualist views took place, Marxism of the time generally developed a more equilibrated critique. This promoted the need to overcome it together with the recognition of the value positivism played at that historical period, and the recognition of some of its progressive relevant figures whom the Marxists not only respected but also sought for personal contact and interchange. Some, like Varona or even Ingenieros during his trip to Cuba, expressed admiration for the young Julio Antonio.

For those countries and continents that encountered Marxism for the first time, one of the first and essential tasks was to delineate its application in the interpretation of the various socioeconomic realities of their respective countries or regions and of their histories. A vast field had to be covered and discovered. Clearly, in the case of Latin America or Cuba in particular, historical evolution had not been the same as for European countries, the privileged field of study and reference of Marx and Engels. The question was, therefore, to analyze, understand, and characterize from the materialist conception of history these new realities in which colonialism and imperialism played a determinant role,² and in which the historical evolution and the structural characterization of the situation of that time imposed important efforts to adapt and rigorously and creatively enrich Marxism. In that effort, they confronted the point of view that historical evolution was an arbitrary or chaotic process not subjected to laws and more or less limited to the concrete, which hinders the possibility of a scientific vision of totalities. Instead, they oppose the conception of a rational historical process ruled by laws accessible to human reason, and capable, consequently, of being studied and

explained by scientific methods. The coming of the new socialist society was, of course, part of that process.

Among other reasons, that is why Lenin's work was so close and inspiring to them. Mariátegui called attention, very clearly, to the fact of how Lenin knew to adapt Marxism to the conditions of struggle in Russia and applied it in a flexible and dynamic manner. Mella had a similar perception of Lenin; this creative capacity of Lenin was also a lesson and an example to follow for the Cuban foundational Marxists. As Mella pointed out, it was the duty of each one of them to carry out in their own land a similar task as that performed by Lenin, in the understanding that to act as Lenin did, did not mean to copy his ways, but to be as creative as he was. The undertaking was, no doubt, of enormous proportion, and they did not ignore it. Two dangers threatened to hinder their efforts. On the one hand, there was the temptation to take the easiest course, by just following the authority of the founders of Marxism or of Lenin. The other danger refers to what I have been calling "exceptionalism" and "circumstantialism," that is, the perception that Latin America—precisely because of its particularities—escapes from the Marxist and Leninist comprehension of history and society; therefore, a new and different theory had to be elaborated that would cover its continental singularity. The need to face this last danger, among other reasons (like Haya's opportunism), prompted Mella to publicly attack the Peruvian Victor Raul Haya de la Torre, founder of *apriismo* (Aprism).

Both Mella and Villena in Cuba, as well as the Amauta in Peru, developed their analyses on three levels of analysis and generalizations: the universal, the continental, and the national. The situation and history of Cuba had to be understood within the framework of the rest of the continent with which Cuba had so many features in common as well as in the wider framework of the world. The matter was to try to identify and to state the specificity of Cuba and of Latin America without excluding or marginalizing them from the general theory of history and society elaborated by Marx and Engels.

The analysis of the ensemble of society (in the interlinkage of the three mentioned levels: universal, continental, and country) led to the conclusion that socialism was the objective to be reached, and that Marxism (and Leninism) was the conception capable of both interpreting and explaining the ensemble of social realities and of guiding the revolutionary endeavors; the theory of Marx had proved, they thought, its capability to adapt and to withstand the course of Cuba's history.

Mella was explicit on this matter: "the cause of socialism in general is the cause of the moment: in Cuba, in Russia, in India, in the United States and in

China; everywhere” (1975: 124). Similar expressions can be found in Villena and in Mariátegui.

According to Mella’s argument, “the only obstacle” for the cause of socialism consisted “in knowing to adapt it to the reality of the environment” (1975: 124). This objective—which implies a program of transformation as well as an important epistemological definition—meant, as he underlined in another document, a refusal to the “servile copies of revolutions made by other men in other climates” (Mella 1975: 86–89). Unfortunately, both Mella and Villena died very young (Mella was murdered by order of the dictator Machado), that is, before their respective thinking could reach its maturity, a fact that prevented them from fully carrying out the task they initiated. They left behind, nevertheless, the bases of creative Marxism and Leninism (particularly Mella), and their legacy resides in the political and conceptual-epistemological objective to carry out the anti-imperialist fight and the socialist revolution on the bases of Cuba’s specificity. Together with other outstanding merits, this was their main contribution, which makes them foundational thinkers.

Because those men were, above all, interested in the revolutionary transformation of reality, the ensemble of problems linked to emancipation appealed to their major interest and is the main focus of their articles and texts. More theoretical and abstract questions concerning philosophy or political economy, for example, were not addressed by them, in general. Only in some other countries of the continent did some, including the Argentinean Anibal Ponce (1898–1938), devoted themselves, in those early years of Marxism in Latin America, to subtle philosophical questions.

Among Ruben’s writings on Cuba, his referential text, *Cuba, factoría yanqui*, deserves to be mentioned. In its pages, the author characterizes the situation of Cuba on the basis of its colonial history and dependence. The author provides a lucid analysis of interpretation that rigorously gathers conceptual and theoretical analyses with a serious compilation of actualized economic and political data on Cuba. It is a fundamental piece for anti-imperialist struggle, because it demonstrates from an academic point of view what has been denounced in the political field. It is an analysis of the situation in Cuba from a Marxist and Leninist standpoint. The text explains the consequences of the monoculture, the kind and amount of properties in foreign hands, the situation of dependence in relation to the United States, and the forms of exploitation of foreign capital, the mechanism through which the country is exploited. It also deals with Cuba’s functioning within the workings of imperialism and how that imperialist domination is carried out. The text provides evidence of both the correctness of the Leninist’s thesis and the uniqueness of Cuba.

Mella became Marxist before Ruben did. He began as a very young student as promoter and leader of the University Reform within the spirit of Cordoba, to soon discover that it was necessary to first transform the society in a radical manner in order to fully achieve the objectives of the reform. His relationship with Baliño was determinant in his process of maturity and radicalization. Soon after he became Marxist, he organized the Congress of Students (1923), upon which he exerted an essential influence in order to ensure that radical political decisions were taken on imperialism and the problems of Cuba, in support of the October Revolution, and in calling for the unity between students and workers in view of the struggle for social justice. These positions together with his relation with Baliño sealed the unity between the students' and the workers' movements, and the union of them both with national and anti-imperialist liberation tradition with Marxism and Leninism. The arc formed by Martí–Baliño–Mella is the real historical expression of links between essential components in the struggle for emancipation, which is one of the fundamental characteristics of Cuban foundational Marxism. On the other hand, the union between students' and workers' movements and struggles constituted one of the specific traits of the Latin American revolutionary process in general; this trait can be valued as an important element that played a very positive role in the history of Cuba and the continent.

Mella was also in touch with Alfredo Lopez, a prestigious anarchist trade union leader who worked for unity. This link allowed, independent of the differences with the anarchists, for the workers' movement to achieve unity, for a period. Mella and especially Villena worked very hard during their lives toward the goal of that unity.

Martinez Villena on his side became Marxist after transiting through various organizations and movements that were part of the social unrest, denunciation, and opposition within the decade. It was his relationship with Mella that led him toward Marxism, and he attained the responsibility of General Secretary of the (first) Communist Party. His participation, acting as general secretary of the Party, in the Revolution of the Thirty was significant. He may not have had the same independence of spirit as his friend Julio Antonio, which led him occasionally to follow the political guidelines of the Third International (like the line: "class against class") that were not the most appropriate, in spite of the fact that Villena was systematically a faithful defender of the unity of the anti-imperialist and revolutionary forces, in general.

The Cuban foundational Marxism of Mella and Villena as well as of the rest of Latin America was interested, above all, as previously seen in this paper, in the fundamental question of historical materialism and its application and en-

richment under the conditions of a country like Cuba that had just abandoned its status as a Spanish colony to become a neocolony of the growing imperialism of the United States. The focus, of course, was on the ensemble of themes related to the theory of revolution. The goal was to identify the nature of the revolution and its moving forces in the light of the historical analysis of the specific moment in history. Under the Cuban conditions, the goal was to determine the characteristics of the class struggle and the role of each class in the revolutionary process and the anti-imperialist fight. Of course, Cuba does not have the indigenous population question, as is the case in many other Latin American countries. But historically quite problematic in Cuba and in the rest of the continent is the role of the bourgeoisie and, in particular, the so-nominated national bourgeoisie—the role these bourgeoisie play is a key question in the colonial and semicolonial countries, as indicated by Lenin. Another subject of crucial importance is the phases or stages of the revolution.

Mella and Villena essentially agreed on the fundamental aspects of this group of problems. None made the mistake, so commonly made for decades in Latin America, of conceiving two separate stages in the revolutionary process; instead, they conceived two stages dialectically united on the basis of the leadership of the proletariat. That is, a first stage, anti-imperialist of national liberation and democracy, and a second, socialist. This dialectical continuity was also possible because none believed in the illusion of the supposed progressive role of a washed-up bourgeoisie. For them also, only the proletariat was in the position to carry out changes of a nationalist type or in defense of the nationality. Formation of a broad alliance of the oppressed was crucial—with the “oppressed” including the peasants, and, as Mella referred to the alliance, an avant-garde party of the working class and peasants (Mella 1975: 426). The alliance also embraces middle sectors. Under the leadership of the proletariat, this alliance should be capable of carrying out the initial national liberation and democratic tasks that the bourgeoisie, due to the weakness and dependency of imperialism, were not capable of conducting or of carrying out. But because Mella and Villena were not sectarians and were not dogmatic, they could conceive a specific conjuncture at which the movement or the party of the nationalists could participate in the democratic nationalist revolution; this was particularly clear in the texts of Mella, who apparently was more flexible than his friend. Nevertheless, the central idea that the bourgeoisie were not able to be trusted and that sooner or later they would betray the cause of revolution did not raise the slightest doubt.

The dialectical unity of the two stages was also grounded in the necessary overlapping of the anti-imperialist tasks and the socialist emancipa-

tion. It was, therefore, clear that the objective or the final goal was the socialist revolution—an objective that could be reached through a process adapted to the conditions of Cuba. Under the neocolonial conditions of the country, the sole national liberation was not enough; moreover, if the process was not conducted in light of socialism, the very objective of national liberation would be wrecked. The tasks of the national liberation revolution became the tasks of the proletarian revolution. Only socialism could lead to a happy end—the much wanted second independence that Martí claimed in his time.

The positions of the friends give testimony of their comprehension—although they never expressed it in a specific manner—that because of its neocolonial status, Cuba faced on one hand a fundamental contradiction between the productive forces and the relations of production, and on the other hand, a principal contradiction between the imperialist power and the neocolony. Of course, this was not their terminology, but the idea was implicit in the core of their works, as well as the awareness that revolutions in colonial and semicolonial or neocolonial countries have to deal with complex interrelations and contradictions specific to these countries.

Mella and Villena anticipated what decades later would be a central characteristic of the present Cuban revolutionary process, that is, the conceptual and practical relationship between the national revolutionary traditions, in particular, that of Martí and Marxism and Leninism. Together with other colleagues, we conceptualized this link as *articulation*, which implies a process of articulating structures without falling into eclecticism. The idea of the articulation can also be traced in Mariátegui, and history has shown that it constitutes a trait of creative Marxism in Latin America.³

Notes

1. The Platt Amendment was approved by the U.S. Congress to be imposed on Cuba as an appendix of the Cuban Constitution of 1901. It gave the United States, among other privileges, the right to intervene even militarily in Cuba and obliged Cuba to rent part of its territory for a *carboneras* (colliery) and naval bases (which gave rise to the now-famous Guantanamo Bay).

2. *L'Internationale communiste*, for example, published some documents regarding this subject: where an interest is shown in dealing with questions relating to realities different from European ones.

3. See, for example, some of the articles of Olivia Miranda on the subject that were published in the Cuban Marxist journal *Marx Ahora*: “Articulación del marxismo, el leninismo y las tradiciones nacionales revolucionarias en Cuba” [Articulation of Marxism, Leninism and the national revolutionary traditions in Cuba], *Marx Ahora*, no. 8, 1999, pp. 45–64, and “Martí, Marx y Lenin en Rubén Martínez Villena” [Martí, Marx and Lenin in Rubén Martínez Villena], *Marx Ahora*, no. 9, 2000, pp. 132–40.

References

- “Aux ouvriers et paysans de l’Amérique du Sud” [To Workers and Peasants of South America]. 1923. *La Correspondance internationale*, no. 2, January 20.
- Mella, Julio Antonio. 1975. *Documentos y artículos*. Instituto de Historia del Movimiento Comunista y la Revolución Socialista de Cuba, Editorial Ciencias Sociales, La Habana [Institute of history of the Communist movement and the socialist resolution in Havana, Cuba].
- “Sur la révolution en Amérique. Appel à la classe ouvrière des deux Amériques” [On Revolution in America. Address to the working class of the two Americas]. 1921. *L’Internationale communiste*, no. 15, January.

Copyright of International Journal of Political Economy is the property of M.E. Sharpe Inc. and its content may not be copied or emailed to multiple sites or posted to a listserv without the copyright holder's express written permission. However, users may print, download, or email articles for individual use.