

Concessions

By: Carlos Luque  
06/10/2020



Two projects battle for the present and future of Cuba. One gives continuity to socialism while the other represents the fainthearted betrayal of coward and faltering moderation.

One is rooted in our free and sovereign history since our first independence war back in 1868 while the other, also dating back to those days, does not trust in their real strength and bows under the pretext of the rule of the strongest.

Words shall be always matched by actions. Those who invite us to moderation forget the existence of a revolutionary moderation opposed to the weak moderation. From the very beginning, the Cuban Revolution in power was no stranger to a wise diplomacy that understood the balance of power and so far, such diplomacy has always invited the powerful Caesar of the North into dialogue. Only one condition has been set on the table, the respect for self-determination. But the US, which hates and despises people whose wealth cannot be disposed at will, has always rejected the peace offering. The Revolution radicalized at the pace of aggressions.

Until one black, intelligent President, no less smart and imperialist, but practical after all, understood not only the failure of such stubborn aggression, but he also realized the danger of isolating his nation from that South the imperialists have not stopped longing to rule.

Cuba then made the most unprecedented and brave of all conceivable revolutionary concessions. Cuba allowed the Caesar to fly its sky and set foot on the ground and talk to the same people his predecessors had drowned in blood, forced to starvation and despair with a blockade worthy of Medieval times. He addressed each of them from a theater, and walked by the streets, shared views with the leaders, thought to laugh and made people laugh with some comedians. Cuba made another big concession — in a perfect example of realism and pragmatism — by not claiming that piece of soil that the US unfairly controls in eastern Cuba, a piece of land turned into a den of torture. The visitor was crystal clear. He talked about putting our history behind and starting fresh. Cuba could not do the same if one of our leaders took the stand in Caesar's land. Another concession, but one that makes you stronger, not weaker. A sieged nation had never shown these signs of moral and pure dignity before.

But there are other concessions not fitting this concept. Concessions do not necessarily mean betrayal. Bowing under the law of the strongest would have paralyzed history. Céspedes did not do it, or Maceo, or Martí, or

Guiteras, or Bolívar, or Chávez; and Robespierre, Babeuf, or Garibaldi did not do it either. Fidel never bowed, nor the people following those leaders. They understood the revolutionary concessions and were aware of the difference between concession and cowardice; heroic deeds and apostasy, opportunity and opportunism.

There is a famous scene in *El Padrino* where the patriarch warned his son there is a traitor in the family and he or she will invite him to talk. Similarly, those who trust and invite Cubans to trust in imperialist concessions is either a fool, or a hidden traitor justifying the vision he or she has while traveling the world, detached from his or her people both physically and spiritually. The sole concession — which is indeed a right — Cuba demands from billionaire elites in the US, is the respect for self-determination. If Cuba has endorsed its democracy, its political course of action, approved by the vast majority, no rights have the brutal North to wait for concessions, prior or simultaneous change — to the likes of the United States— so they can make theirs.

We must understand that those accepting the fact that Cuba needs to make some “democratic” changes so the US puts to rest its aggressive policies, are at least traitors, or carpetbaggers showcasing patriotism. First, this person would be explicitly saying yes to the extraterritorial rights of the imperialism. And secondly, this person would have been accepting the imperial elite has a democratic, ethic virtue, which is false, as so is its history and present democracy. What’s more, this person would actually agree with the role of imperialism as eternal aggressor of anything different from its patterns.

If Cuba decides to achieve greater involvement of people in conducting its domestic policy, it is because, as a goal in progress within socialism, it must blossom voluntarily the way Cubans want to implement their democracy, serving as its stronghold against aggressions. If the US wants in Cuba “democratic guarantees on the political involvement of its citizens,” as recently suggested by a Cuban apostate in the guise of an analyst, who will actually believe it is for the greater good of its citizens, not to mention its democracy? Is it democracy — on behalf of freedom — what has devastated Iraq, Libya, Syria and other nations? Have they respected democracy in Venezuela, Brazil, Argentina and Bolivia? In the case of Cuba, the goal is to drive a wedge, piercing the coat that prevents them to rule us. Those who invite us to trust imperialism are traitors or accomplices. We shall all learn to detect traitors, accomplices, false moderates. Our concessions must be revolutionary, wise, embracing diplomacy, convenient, independent. All of which led a US president to acknowledge their failure.

**Translated by Sergio A. Paneque Díaz / CubaSí Translation Staff**