non-socialist Revolution into a "socialist" one? Certainly not a realization on the part of the Cuban masses that wage-labor, regardless of who or what is the employer, is but slavery! There is no indication that the regime or the "beloved" leader seeks in any way to educate "the people" to this unfortunate fact. Nor did a sudden eruption of Leninist "wisdom" in the brain of Fidel Castro have much, if anything, to do with it. Nothing so old-fashioned! It was apparently the economic war waged on Cuba by the United States which forced her to transfer the overwhelming bulk of her trade to the "Socialist" bloc. The series of American blows and Cuban counter-blows changed Cuba almost overnight, it seems, into a "sovereign socialist state. . . the first nation to have achieved socialism without the 'benefit' of Marxist-Leninist orientation, or Communist Party leadership." (Landau and Hakim, Studies on the Left).

POLITICAL TRANSUBSTANTIATION

There is, then, a new rush on the part of the "experts" of the Left to clarify their long-time revision of basic Marxist economics. The production of goods for sale on the market with a view to profit is not, it seems, necessarily CAPITALIST. If the regime operates under the appellation "socialist" and carries on the bulk of its international trade with countries which operate under the same label, commodity production becomes transformed. What appears to be important, in other words, is not the nature of a thing but rather what it is called. Just as the "mystical" words of the priests convert ordinary wafers and wine into the flesh and blood of a human god, so do the "mystical" words of these professed Marxists change capitalist production to socialist. Profits are no longer profits and the property of a minority but in some strange manner become a possession of the entire population; wages are no longer wages even if they still represent, on the average, the cost of producing and reproducing the laborers, and no more; the rich are no longer the ruling class, although they remain rich; and the poor are now the rulers and seem proud of their poverty, content to work for and wait for that time in the vague future when, the leader assures them, they will no longer be poor. It is all very odd and a strange sort of socialism!

But the answer to the need for socialism now, has become apparent. Why wait for the workers to understand it? Why wait for more Fidel Castros to arise? Let us insist, rather, on demanding that the United States government continue a policy of forcing other nations into trading with the "Socialist" bloc! It might even be possible that the capitalists of nations such as Canada, who do not object to turning over an honest dollar via increased trade with Cuba and China, are all unwittingly leading their countries into socialism (?). But on the other hand, would not the reverse also be true? Would not Soviet Russia, in it efforts at increasing trade with the West, be leading the "Socialist Fatherland" into a capitalist economy? We present this problem to the "Marxian" experts of the Left to fathom, and we know they have an answer, a "dialectical" answer.

REVOLT OF THE PEASANTS

Certainly there is no better tool with which to analyze the Cuban Revolution than Marxism. But Marxism in the hands of the Leftist experts serves only as a means of confusion. When socialism is equated with state capitalism or government ownership; when the Materialist Conception of History is watered down into some sort of variation of the Great Man Theory, the working class is asked to follow the leader down a dead-end alleyway. There is no question that Fidel Castro and his fellow revolutionists recognized the social forces that smoldered in Cuba and acted in the manner called for. If the little band of twelve who survived the 1956 invasion of Oriente province had not been fully aware of the desires of the Cuban peasants prior to that date, they certainly realized it from then on. They learned that the Cuban country people were not all of the classical type, the peasant who

yearns to own his own land — to become a farmer. In Oriente province, they discovered, the **guajiro** was more of a "rural proletariat" because of the one crop (sugarcane) economy with its vast acres (latifundia). And they were rotten ripe for revolution, for ending the social set-up which kept them in abject poverty. They were eager to overthrow the absentee landlords and expropriate their holdings, but in no way were they ripe for socialism.

And so, as the Castro rebels advanced in Oriente province, they seized the land and proceeded immediately to introduce cooperatives with the **guajiros** continuing to work for wages, but ostensibly "for themselves." On the other hand, many of the relatively large section of the peasantry that is now engaged in the production of crops other than sugar, tobacco and coffee have received individual title to their land under the agrarian reform laws. The Castro revolution was supported basically and overwhelmingly by the peasantry; the semi-feudal economy was clearly on its deathbed and Castro has played the role of the undertaker and played it well. Inasmuch as the living standards of the Cuban masses in general, and the peasants in particular, were miserably low under Batista, there has undoubtedly been an improvement since the Castro victory. Even the recent economic blows by the United States could not have been sufficient to prevent a noticeable rise in these conditions.

As for the city workers, reforms were also badly needed. Possibly because of their disillusionment in their erstwhile hero, Batista, and the consequent hesitancy in placing too much confidence in the new revolutionary champion who was fighting his way through the island; possibly because they were effectively suppressed by the Batista police state; the Cuban working-class was not openly enthused over their impending deliverance although there was no doubt of their support at the point of victory and they do appear to be now solidly behind the new regime despite the wishful thinking of the United States capitalist class and its head-fixing press. Not that there isn't considerable, if minority, opposition and unhappiness over the continuing anti-democratic policies. The Libertarian League (Anarchists) in their Views and Comments for Jan.-Feb. 1961, contend that today in Cuba "there are more political prisoners by far than under Batista," and that the Communists and the new regime are managing to "use" each other as was the case under President San Martin and under Batista himself.

THE "PROPERTIED" WORKING CLASS

But the Castro regime has not been slow to do what it could to pacify the mass of propertyless proletarians, for suddenly, in one fell swoop, it has abolished their propertyless status and converted all tenants into home owners! Undoubtedly, Castro and his fellow managers of Cuban state-capitalism hope by this "revolutionary" act to transform the militant working class into an obedient gang of sycophants. We can confidently predict, however, that the insoluble problems of Cuban capitalism will force upon the workers the bitter truth, that their mortgaged shacks in no way relieve their slave condition and hide it in anything but a satisfactory manner; that the capitalist mode of production is in no way effected by their new "status." Sooner or later they will discover that social reform, be it home "ownership," pension plans, sickness insurance, or anything else that may be devised, is introduced primarily as a means of quietening the workers and cheapening their means of subsistence. In the case of Cuba, a despatch from an anarchist group in Havana and reported in Views & Comments tells of a deterioration of working conditions under Castro. But small "owners" are always expected to work harder — isn't it for themselves?

We are not contending, as do the libertarian anarchists, that Castro has "castrated" the revolution; we simply point out that the changes which have taken place since the 26th of July Movement got rid of the dictator