ctp

Cuba Transition Project

AFTER CASTRO:

ALTERNATIVE REGIMES AND U.S. POLICY

By

Edward Gonzalez

INSTITUTE FOR CUBAN AND CUBAN-AMERICAN STUDIES
UNIVERSITY OF MIAMI

UNIVERSITY OF Miami

ISBN: 0-9704916-1-1. Published in 2002.

AFTER CASTRO:
ALTERNATIVE REGIMES
AND
U.S. POLICY

Cuba Transition Project – CTP

The Cuba Transition Project, at the Institute for Cuban and Cuban-American Studies (ICCAS), University of Miami, is an important and timely project to study and make recommendations for the reconstruction of Cuba once the post-Castro transition begins in earnest. The transitions in Central and Eastern Europe, Nicaragua, and Spain are being analyzed and lessons drawn for the future of Cuba. The project began in January 2002 and is funded by a grant from the U.S. Agency for International Development.

Programs and Activities

- The CTP is publishing original research, with practical alternative recommendations on various specific aspects of the transition process, commissioned and written for the CTP by ICCAS Staff and U.S. and foreign scholars with expertise on Cuba.

- The CTP is developing four key databases:

    1. A full-text database of published and unpublished articles written on topics of transition in Cuba, as well as articles on transition in Central and Eastern Europe, Nicaragua, and Spain. It also includes an extensive bibliography of published and unpublished books, theses, and dissertations on the topic.
    2. A full-text database of Cuba's principal laws, in Spanish, its legal system, including the current Cuban Constitution (in English and Spanish), and other legislation relating to the structure of the existing government. Also included are the full-text of law review articles on a variety of topics
    3. A database on joint ventures and foreign investments in Cuba.
    4. Cuba On-Line, a database of historical and current information on Cuba. It includes a chronology from 1492 to the present and a comprehensive bibliography on most Cuba related topics.

- The CTP publishes electronically an information service, *Cuba Focus*, reporting on current issues of importance on Cuba.

All the products of the CTP, including the databases and subscription to *Cuba Focus*, are free and available to the public on the web at http://ctp.iccas.miami.edu.

The CTP can also be contacted at P.O. Box 248174, Coral Gables, Florida 33124-3010, Tel: 305-284-CUBA (2822), Fax: 305-284-4875, and e-mail: ctp.iccas@miami.edu.

AFTER CASTRO: ALTERNATIVE REGIMES AND U.S. POLICY

Prepared for the Cuba Transition Project (CTP)
Institute for Cuban and Cuban-American Studies
University of Miami

By

Edward Gonzalez

This publication was made possible through support provided by the Bureau for Latin America and the Caribbean, U.S. Agency for International Development, under the terms of Award No. EDG-A-00-02-00007-00. The opinions expressed herein are those of the author and do not necessarily reflect the views of the U.S. Agency for International Development.

The author is an Adjunct Staff member at RAND, Santa Monica, California. The views expressed in this study are his and not necessarily those of RAND.

Executive Summary

The collapse of the Soviet Union and the resulting economic crisis that gripped Cuba in the 1990s caused the regime of Fidel Castro to adopt a number of limited economic reforms that have helped the regime remain in power. These included some liberalizing measures for the internal economy and the opening up of the island to foreign investors and tourism. But in the meantime, the crisis weakened Cuba's formerly omnipotent totalitarian state, transforming it into a post-totalitarian state, under which the Cuban people gained a limited degree of social and economic space but not political space. The regime thus continues to employ its totalitarian control apparatus against critics, dissidents, human rights activists, and others who oppose it, using a policy of low-profile or low-intensity repression. Though the regime has survived the crisis thus far, it has left a host of economic, demographic, social, and political problems unresolved, which bodes ill for any government that follows it.

Three regime-types and corresponding sub-types can be extrapolated from Cuba's current post-totalitarian order to a Cuba after Castro: 1) a communist successor regime led by hard-line, centrist, and/or reformist leaders; 2) a military-led successor regime under the control of Raúl Castro and/or his *raúlista* followers; and 3) a democratic-transition regime drawn from the ranks of current dissidents, human rights activists, and other opponents of the Castro regime.

In a communist successor regime, the hard-line and centrist leaders represent varying degrees of continuity with the current post-totalitarian order, but neither appears capable of undertaking the reforms necessary to jump-start the economy and put it on the path of sustainable growth. While a communist regime led by reformers would be more inclined to adopt such reforms, they would first require the backing of Cuba's Revolutionary Armed Forces (Fuerzas Armadas Revolucionarias - FAR). The FAR, however, would most likely seize power if the civilian leadership were unable to govern, much as General Wojceich Jaruzelski did in Poland in 1981. However, a military-led successor regime would be faced with its own difficulties— international isolation, corruption and division within its own ranks, an inability to chart an effective economic

course, and mounting unrest. A democratic-transition regime, on the other hand, would be hobbled by the democratic process itself in trying to tackle Cuba's lingering problems, while history and especially Fidel Castro have left the island ill-prepared for democracy.

Though Cuba's democratic future may prove elusive, U.S. national interests and democratic values compel it to adopt a proactive policy to speed the island's democratic transition. Toward this end, the United States should adopt different objectives and strategies that correspond to the regime-type that emerges in a post-Castro Cuba:

- Toward either a communist successor regime led by hard-liners and/or centrists or a military-led regime, the objective should be *regime replacement* through the use of coercive diplomacy.
- Toward a successor communist regime led by reformers, the objective should shift to *regime change* through conditional engagement.
- Toward a democratic-transition regime, the objective should be one *of regime support* through closer political, economic, and people-to-people ties.

The United States and its democratic allies possess an array of political and economic levers by which to bring about the replacement of both a hard-line and/or centrist communist regime and a military-led regime, as well as to compel system change in the case of a reformist-led communist regime. More difficult to attain will be support for a democratic-transition regime, because the task is infinitely more complex, involving an open-ended process of democratic development over a very long term. The task essentially will be one of nation building, which could become difficult to sustain over the long run. In the Cuban case, however, U.S. policy will be able to draw upon both the support and active participation of the Cuban-American community in the reconstruction of a democratic, market-oriented Cuba. And if Cuban-Americans show leadership and mobilize broad support for a "national project" for reconstruction and prosperity, the democratic forces inside Cuba could ensure that democracy prevails.

Introduction

This study assesses U.S. policy options toward a Cuba after President Fidel Castro is no longer in power by first examining the crisis that engulfed Cuba in the 1990s, the government's response, and the resulting changes that transformed Cuba into a post-totalitarian state. The study posits three future regime-types and corresponding sub-types that can be extrapolated from Cuba today: 1) a communist successor regime led by hard-line, centrist, and/or reformist leaders; 2) a military-led successor regime; and 3) a democratic-transition regime. The analysis then turns to U.S. policy options toward these regime-types and proposes strategies for dealing with each with the objective of speeding Cuba's democratic transition.

As will be demonstrated, Castro and his regime will have left Cuba poorly prepared for a democratic future once he passes from the scene. For U.S. policy, this suggests that it will be easier to replace the Castro regime with a communist or military-led successor regime than to promote a viable democratic government immediately.

Cuba Today: Change and Continuity

The Crisis of the 1990s and the Government's Response

The disintegration of communism in Eastern Europe in 1989, especially the collapse of the Soviet Union two years later, was a seismic event for the Cuban leadership. "To speak of the Soviet Union's collapse," Castro lamented at the Fourth Party Congress in October 1991, "is to speak of the sun not rising." The Cuban leader's alarm was understandable: Beginning in 1960, he had literally hitched Cuba's star to the Soviet Union, and the island's economy became increasingly integrated with the Soviet Union in the decades that followed. Thus, Cuba greatly expanded its sugar milling capacity to produce sugar harvests of upwards of 8 million metric tons in the 1980s in exchange for Soviet oil, manufactured goods, and raw materials imports. During the 1986-1990 period, total resource flows from the USSR to Cuba reached a staggering

$4.3 billion per annum, accounting for over 21 percent of the Cuban gross domestic product (GDP).[1]

As a result, once the economic ties to the former Soviet Union and Eastern bloc countries were sharply reduced or severed, Cuba's GDP contracted by nearly 32 percent in 1993, compared to 1989, with per capita growth falling by 14.2 percent. Though the economic free-fall was arrested by 1996, Cuba's GDP in 1998 was still more than 21 percent below its 1989 GDP.[2]

The Regime's Response

Faced with a severe disruption in the import of oil, machinery, raw materials, and foodstuffs, the Cuban government declared a "Special Period" of austerity starting in 1990. The continued decline in critical imports led to sharp deteriorations in food rations, agricultural production, electricity, public transportation, and Cuba's vaunted public health system through the mid-1990s. Meanwhile, the Cuban people began to take matters into their own hands by resorting to the growing black market, pilfering state warehouses and enterprises, and engaging in prostitution and other anti-social activities, simply to survive. Disturbances had to be put down in Cojímar and Regla in the summer 1993, with a potentially more explosive riot breaking out on the Havana waterfront in August 1994.

To arrest the economy's free-fall, the Cuban government reached out to foreign investors from Europe and Canada. Beginning in 1992, it allowed state property to be transferred to joint ventures formed between the state (or designated Cuban companies) and foreign partners, while clarifying the concept of private property legally, through the 1992 amendments to the Constitution. These steps spurred foreign investments particularly in the tourist and nickel industries. Four years later, a new mining law was also passed to attract foreign investments in petroleum and mining exploration.

On the domestic economic front, the mounting economic and political crisis finally forced the regime to enact a limited number of stabilizing and liberalizing reforms in 1993 and 1994. The most notable were the following:

1. *The dollarization of the economy (mid-1993).* This measure permitted Cubans to hold hard currency legally. It aimed at stemming the

burgeoning black market and at capturing the growing dollar remittances from Cuban exiles to their families and friends on the island.

2. *The self-employment decree (September 1993).* This decree legalized small private entrepreneurs in over 100 trades, services, and crafts—later increased these categories to 160. Through legalization, the government gained control over activities already rampant on the black market. The decree also provided new employment opportunities outside the public sector while easing the plight of consumers.

3. *The creation of agricultural cooperatives (September 1993).* This measure broke up large state farms into basic units of cooperative production and gave the cooperatives use of the land for an indefinite period of time. The cooperatives own the output they produce and are required to sell it to the state through the state procurement system. This measure aimed at giving coop workers a greater incentive to increase production at lower costs.

4. *The creation of farmers' markets (September 1994).* This measure gave small farmers an incentive to produce by allowing them to sell selected products at market prices, provided they first fulfilled their production quotas to the state and paid taxes. Coming on the heels of the Havana riots, this measure sought to ease widespread food shortages.

The Limits of Reform

These liberalizing reforms did not signify that the Cuban government was adopting a market-based economic *system,* only that it was turning to market mechanisms in both the state and non-state sectors of the economy. In fact, some 90 percent of the economy remained—and still remains—under state control. Moreover, most of the reforms worked at cross-purposes, due to all kinds of government restrictions and conditions designed to stem the rise of a new middle class. According to Archibald R.M. Ritter, this was particularly true of the legalized self-employment sector, which was soon hobbled by government policy:

> Despite the demonstrable potential and the possible social contribution of the microenterprise sector, tight regulations, restrictions of many kinds, onerous taxation, and a hostile political environment have limited its evolution and condemned it to low productivity, inefficiency, and ultimately waste of the nation's human and material resources.[3]

Among the government's many restrictions, for example, small entrepreneurs can only employ relatives; they cannot become self-employed in the profession in which they were trained; and home restaurants or *paladares* can only seat a maximum of 12 people. As a result, the number of self-employed fell from nearly 209,000 in 1995, to under 150,000 in 2001.

In sum, the economic reforms of the 1990s were half-hearted, reflecting the ambivalence of the government toward measures designed to improve the economy, but that were ideologically and politically unpalatable to the leadership.

In the meantime, the government still managed to maintain a high level of social spending for public health, education, and other services. The infant mortality rate was reduced from 11 per 1,000 births in 1990, to 7 in 1999, which placed Cuba in the ranks of advanced industrialized countries and far lower than the average of 30 deaths per 1,000 births for the Latin American and Caribbean region as a whole. Similarly, Cuba's mortality rate for children under 5 fell from 13 to 8 per 1,000 over the same period, 50 percent lower than the rate in Chile, which ranked second in Latin America.[4] Though the population was experiencing severe deprivations, the Cuban government sought to maintain popular support—and impress international observers—by its commitment to social spending.

The Post-Totalitarian Order: Continuity and Change

Cuba's totalitarian system emerged in the 1960s, at the height of the regime's ideological zeal, when it nationalized most of the economy, imposed one-party rule, and eliminated most of the vestiges of a civil society.[5] The State Security apparatus with its network of informers, the ubiquitous Committees for the Defense of the Revolution (Comites para la Defensa de la Revolucion, CDRs), other mass organizations, and the Communist Party cadres all penetrated deeply into society. In essence,

the boundaries of the revolutionary state became coterminous with those of society, enabling the Castro government to mobilize the population for the defense of the revolution and for carrying out economic and other tasks, including creating Cuba's "new man" along the lines espoused by Ernesto "Che" Guevara.

The 1970s saw the so-called "institutionalization of the revolution" internally, closer ties with Moscow, and the dispatch of Cuban combat troops to Angola and the Ogaden region of Ethiopia in the Horn of Africa. Meanwhile, the regime's totalitarian structures were supplemented by the creation of the 1.2 million-member Territorial Troop Militia that was ostensibly organized due to the threat posed by the United States under the Reagan administration.

From Totalitarianism to Post-Totalitarianism

With the collapse of the Soviet Union and the crisis of the 1990s, the totalitarian order of Cuba could no longer be sustained for the following reasons:

- Marxist ideology ceased as a source of legitimacy and inspiration for the Cuban leadership; instead, regime survival assumed uppermost importance.
- The mechanisms of societal control lost much of their effectiveness as corruption set in, as CDR members and the police looked out for themselves rather than the state, and as Cubans began losing their fear of the omnipotent state.
- The boundaries of the state shrank further, as Cubans had to fend for themselves once the state could not provide employment, guarantee adequate living standards and sufficient food rations, or provide needed medicines as in the past.
- While the boundaries of the State receded, elements of economic pluralism reemerged, as Cubans worked the black market; became employed in the external, foreign investment sector of the economy; and became legally or illegally self-employed.
- Elements of social pluralism also reemerged, as Afro-Cuban sects, Protestant churches, the Catholic Church, and newly formed nongovernmental organizations (NGOs) began to occupy the social, religious, and cultural space vacated by the weakened state.[6]

Thus, a post-totalitarian order emerged in the Cuba of the 1990s, which was characterized by less ideological zeal, a weakened state, and greater economic and social pluralism. However, what was and is not permitted is *political* pluralism. While criticism of the government may be voiced in private by Cubans, the regime will not permit efforts to organize an opposition or mount a public challenge to its policies - even if these efforts are peaceful and framed in terms of achieving democratic socialism.

Thus, after the Varela Project in May 2002 collected over 11,000 signatures in support of a national referendum to allow free speech and elections, amnesty for political prisoners, and the right to own and operate private businesses, the government responded by flexing its muscles. In July 2002, after first mobilizing the Party apparatus and affiliated mass organizations, it convened a special session of the National Assembly that passed a national referendum – signed by 7.6 million eligible Cuban voters – making socialism "irrevocable."

Hence, it is in the political realm where the regime reverts to its totalitarian practices to intimidate, harass, exile, or jail its opponents and critics, as seen by:

- The crushing of the peaceful coalition group, the *Concilio Cubano,* in February 1996, by Cuban State Security, after the group had requested permission to convene a public meeting in Havana.
- The 1996 harsh attack by Raúl Castro at the Central Committee plenum in April, against regime reformers, most of whom were subsequently ousted from government - and Communist Party - sponsored research institutes.
- The ongoing crackdown by State Security over the past three years on independent trade unionists, journalists, dissidents, and human rights activists, some of whom are facing trial and prison terms.
- The repeated closures by State Security of independent, home-based libraries run by Protestant lay leaders and others throughout the island.

Because of Cuba's new dependence upon the capitalist world, these repressive measures are less visible and harsh than in the past in order to minimize international reaction. As Elizardo Sanchez, Head of the Human Rights Commission in Havana observed, "The government is using a policy of low-profile or low-intensity repression, consisting of

many short-term arrests."[7]

The one independent institution that so far has had some success in fighting for greater social space is the Catholic Church. The Church initially gained followers among young people following the demise of communism and was further revitalized by John Paul II's visit in January 1998. Meanwhile, Caritas, the Catholic Church's international charity organization, became active in the social welfare area, providing food, medicine, and other social services. But Caritas and the Church have had to fight the government every step of the way while engaging in these activities. The Communist Party has criticized the Church for providing social welfare services, while summoning its cadres to stem any further erosion of the State's presence in this area.[8]

Additionally, the totalitarian impulse could be seen in the regime's resurrection of the mobilization politics of the 1960s during the Elián González affair. Thus, mass demonstrations were organized and the appeals of nationalism were employed to rally popular support behind the regime against the Cuban-American "mafia" in Miami.

Fidel Castro: Still the Regime's Linchpin

Although he is nearly 76 years of age, Fidel Castro remains Cuba's Great Helmsman, whose charismatic presence helps legitimize and give direction to his regime. As Eusebio Mujal-León and Joshua W. Busby point out, "The revolutionary founder still has the capacity to limit change, mobilize the population, and affirm the validity of his egalitarian ideology to elites and society alike."[9] In this respect, he is more like Mao, the "Lord of Misrule," than a Deng Xiao Ping, who dramatically transformed his country by charting a new economic course starting in 1978. In contrast with Deng, Castro put the brakes on further reforms after 1996, when Cuba's economic free-fall finally bottomed out, following the infusion of funds from foreign investments, and tourism, and exile remittances. However, Castro resembles Deng in one important respect: He has made it clear that Cuba will not choose the path of liberal democracy, even going as far as to extol the virtues of what he called Cuba's "totalitarianism" in a 1999 speech.[10]

Hence, Castro and his hard-line followers were not compelled to deepen economic reforms after they had served to stabilize the economy and defuse popular discontent. Castro and his loyalists remain totalitari-

ans at heart, insistent that Cuba adhere to their radical Marxist vision. Impelled by hubris, Castro has invested too much in his historical self-image to reverse course – to do so would implicitly acknowledge to the world that he had been pursuing the wrong policies for the past four decades.[11]

In the meantime, Castro and the hard-liners realize that liberalizing economic measures undermine the power of the state, contradict the revolution's socialist and egalitarian principles, and erode everything they fought and stood for. They are fully aware that reforms such as dollarization, self-employment, and farmers' markets produce social and economic inequalities that disadvantage their supporters in the Party, government bureaucracy, military and security organs, and state enterprises. These core constituencies live on fixed incomes denominated in Cuban pesos and are less likely to have access to hard currency sent from abroad. Hence, Castro and other hard-liners are virtually certain to remain staunchly opposed to deepening the reform process, even if the economic situation worsens as a result.

Steps Not Taken: Cuba's Lingering Crisis

The failure of the Castro regime to deepen reforms further bodes ill for Cuba's future. After reportedly reaching a 6.0 percent growth rate in GDP in 1999, compared with 1998's rate of 1.2 percent, the Cuban economy has been slowing down. In 2001, economic growth slowed from a targeted 5.0 percent to 3.0 percent, due to the slowdown of the world economy, soft prices for the island's main export commodities of sugar and nickel, the ravages of Hurricane Michelle, and the drop in tourism following the terrorists' attack of September 11, 2001, on the United States. The Russian pullout from Lourdes further deprived Cuba of a reported $200 million per year that it had received for the electronic listening facility. Soon the regime will likely be faced with a Hobson's choice: Either it must adopt needed economic reforms that undermine its socialist and egalitarian commitments alienating its core constituencies, or it must step-up state repression to remain in power, causing increased economic misery for the Cuban people.[12]

In the meantime, for political reasons, the leadership has failed to address, much less resolve, a number of critical, lingering issues that loom large in Cuba's near- to medium-term future. By not taking steps

now, the current leadership only compounds the problems that will confront a successor or transition government.

One step not taken by the regime has been promotion of Cuban-owned small and medium-sized enterprises, which could boost the economy, alleviate consumer shortages, and provide employment opportunities for a labor force of 4.3 million.[13] Instead, by mid-1997, the government had done the opposite: "… microentrepreneurs were operating in an increasingly hostile environment. They faced a political leadership and press that appeared to be waging a campaign to promote envy and hostility toward the sector."[14]

In the meantime, the government has shelved measures that would close or scale down inefficient state enterprises, because laying off or transferring more than 400,000 workers would greatly worsen the unemployment situation and cause a political backlash. But again, without a thriving private sector to soak up unemployment, this problem looms as a ticking time bomb for any government that follows Castro.

Another policy issue that has been postponed is what to do with Cuba's ailing sugar industry. Although the industry theoretically has the capacity to produce 10 million metric tons per year, sugar harvests have declined sharply from a high of 8.12 million tons in 1988-89 to 4.45 million tons in 1995-1996 to 3.23 million tons in 1997-1998. Production has leveled off with the two most recent harvests producing 3.5 million tons in 2000-2001 and 3.6 million tons in 2001-2002. Using aging sugar mills that in some cases go back to the 19th century and lacking capital and other inputs such as fertilizer, pesticides, and new machinery, the industry is terribly inefficient and cannot compete internationally with Brazil and other major sugar producers and must be heavily subsidized by the government.

The only way to restructure Cuba's sugar industry so that it could produce 5 to 5.5 million tons on a cost-effective basis is to attract foreign investors, while also taking draconian measures that would close down the older, inefficient mills, and relocate and/or retrain many of the 400,000 sugar workers now employed by the industry. These steps carry enormous social, economic and political costs since they would uproot workers' lives, their families, and the communities they live in. Nonetheless, in June 2002, reports circulated that the government planned to shut down 71 out of 156 sugar mills, relocate some 100,000 workers, and turn over a portion of the land now used for sugar crops to

other crops and forestry. Whether the Castro government is prepared to take the risks of going through with such a plan and, if it does, whether it can weather the storm, remains to be seen.

Still another challenge that looms ahead revolves around Cuba's aging population. The percentage of the population age 60 or older will increase from 13.7 percent in 2000 to 21.0 percent by 2020, while the economically active population will decline from 52.1 percent to 49.7 over the same period.[15] Given this demographic shift, the question becomes whether any government that follows Castro will be able to maintain Cuba's present entitlement system, under which women may retire with pensions at age 50, and men at age 55. According to one estimate, government pensions as a percentage of social expenditures are projected to jump from 18.3 percent in 2000 to 29.9 percent in 2020, based on the year 2000 budget.[16] Between now and then, there will be competing demands on the government to fund education, public health, economic reconstruction, and other national priorities, which will make it very difficult for any government to continue with the present entitlements.

The racial issue also looms as another challenge facing a future government. Today, Afro-Cubans represent a large bloc of the population—estimates range between 33 to 60 percent. Blacks and mulattoes benefited from the anti-discriminatory policies of the Castro government during the early years of the Revolution. However, Cubans of African descent have fared much worse from the crisis of the 1990s than have whites because of discrimination in the lucrative tourist industry and because they have had less access to remittances, as they are sent primarily by white exiles. In the meantime, Afro-Cubans have not held high-level positions in the Party and government in proportion to their share of the population.[17] How, then, are blacks and mulattoes likely to position themselves with respect to a new government? Will they demand entitlements in exchange for their support? Will they expect the new government to allocate more resources to the poorer, less developed eastern half of the island, with a proportionately larger Afro-Cuban population?

The Castro regime will bequeath a divisive legacy to the government that follows it. For over four decades, the regime has polarized society by turning Cubans against Cubans, while thwarting the rise of a civil society that could serve as a buffer to mitigate conflict among Cubans.

All of this bodes ill for Cuba's future: As occurred with East Europeans, the targets of popular vengeance are not likely to be confined to prison guards and State Security agents after the present regime is gone. Included, too, will be ordinary Cubans who snitched on their coworkers, neighbors, and relatives or who otherwise are seen as accomplices of a repressive regime.[18]

Succession, Military Intervention, or Democratic Transition?

What course will Cuba take after Castro is gone? Here the experiences of other communist states may be somewhat misleading. Most of the underlying economic, social, and political forces that led to system changes in China, the former Soviet Union, and Eastern bloc nations had taken decades to develop. In Cuba, similar forces have been at work for scarcely a decade. Cuba is unique in many ways; therefore, predictions of a post-Castro future cannot be completely based upon comparison with other countries' experiences. However, worthwhile lessons can be learned studying these cases.

Charting Uncharted Waters

Today Cuba does not resemble communist China under Deng Xiao Ping, the former Soviet Union under Gorbachev, or the Eastern bloc countries when communism collapsed. To begin with, Cuba has not had the level of reforms attained in the Soviet Union under Gorbachev, much less in China under Deng Xiao Ping. Though weakened, Cuba's post-totalitarian state remains stronger than was the case in the Soviet Union in the 1980s, which was in an advanced stage of decay when Gorbachev tried to resuscitate it through *perestroika* and *glasnost.* Cuba also is distinct from Eastern Europe, whose state structures were even weaker than those of the Soviet Union. Largely bereft of popular legitimacy and support, the East European bloc regimes were critically dependent on their ties to Moscow, while Poles, Czechs, East Germans, Hungarians, and others in Eastern Europe for the most part looked West, not East.[19] Cuba is *sui generis* if only because of the charismatic presence of Castro, and the indigenous, nationalist character of the Cuban Revolution—a revolution that is only 43 years old, compared with the 74 years that sep-

arated the Bolshevik revolution from the downfall of the Soviet Union.

Still, Cuba has begun to experience many of the political, economic, and social problems that the former communist states encountered, including loss of ideological zeal, weakening societal control, and growing corruption in the ranks of the civilian and military elites. Also, once Castro is gone, the government that takes his place will be faced with many of the same problems and challenges that confronted the post-communist governments in Russia and Central Europe. Hence, the relevant "lessons" of other communist and former communist states cannot be ignored.[20]

As will be discussed shortly, three different generic types of regimes can be posited for the post-Castro era by extrapolating from present-day Cuba: 1) A communist-led succession regime; 2) a military-led succession regime; and 3) a democratic transition regime. Each will have to surmount different kinds of problems to remain in power. And, as will be seen in the final section of this paper, each will pose different challenges for the United States.

Political Succession and Leadership Divisions

Having survived the crisis of the 1990s, the current regime is now preparing to succeed itself after Fidel passes from the scene—assuming, of course, that Fidel and not his brother Raúl goes first.[21] Because his absence will produce a leadership vacuum, such a communist successor regime will be faced with an enormous challenge—to perpetuate itself without the presence of its founding leader.[22] Equally daunting, a successor regime would need to appear true to "Fidel," yet distance itself enough from him in order to chart a new economic course that would result in a better life for most Cubans. And, of course, the successor regime could splinter into opposing factions that end with deadlock, an inability to govern, growing unrest, and possibly even civil war.

However, barring a U.S. intervention, a successor regime initially would have several things going for it. It could rightly claim to be Fidel Castro's true heir. Besides the Communist Party and mass organizations like the CDR, the new regime could count on the backing of the Revolutionary Armed Forces (FAR) and the Ministry of Interior (MININT), as they have a vested interest in the preservation of the existing order. Additionally, the opposition at present appears too weak, frag-

mented, repressed, and penetrated to become an effective contender for power. The situation could change rapidly, of course, if the successor leadership stumbles, the economy's problems intensify, and the new regime is rent by internal divisions.

In this respect, Castro's commanding presence obscures the existence of potential fault lines in the current regime that are based on policy preferences, institutional allegiance, and personal followings, as in the case of the *raulistas,* or even family ties. These cleavages constitute the basis for the successor regime to develop internal factions after Fidel has departed the scene. However, as with several former communist states, there is no certainty that leaders who are presently identified with a particular policy tendency will remain hard-liners, centrists, or reformers. Their positions could change as the succession process unfolds, new challenges or opportunities present themselves, and personal loyalties shift or become of uppermost consideration, as with the *raulistas* whose ranks include hard-liners as well as centrists.[23] Hence, the groupings below are fluid. They are based upon what we know about the policy preferences of certain leaders and what we can impute from the logic of their leadership or institutional positions, but with the caveat that their policy positions could change after Fidel is gone.[24]

The Hard-Liners

The hard-liners (duros) are found in the Ministry of the Interior and other government ministries, the mass organizations, and the apparatus of the Cuban Communist Party (Partido Comunista de Cuba – PCC). Many represent the older or middle leadership generation such as Minister of the Interior Abelardo Colomé and Politburo (of the Central Committee of the Communist Party) members José Ramón Machado Ventura and Estéban Lazo. But others, like Foreign Minister Felipe Pérez Roque, are drawn from the ranks of a younger generation of leaders.[25]

The *duros* seek to preserve the existing post-totalitarian order, the Revolution's socialist, egalitarian values, and the Communist Party's monopoly of power. They stand for tight internal security, mobilization politics, and defiance of the United States, in their view, to protect the integrity of the Revolution. Because they espouse state control of the economy, they oppose further liberalizing measures of the economy except for autonomous enterprises set up by active and retired military

and security officers. They are against political pluralism, the rise of a civil society, and any political opening that would give the regime's opponents opportunities to organize and openly oppose the government. Despite some policy differences, their natural allies are the centrists.

The Centrists

Included in this group are Raúl Castro, National Assembly President Ricardo Alarcón, Retired General and Minister of Sugar Ulises Rosales del Toro, and Economics Minister José Luis Rodríguez. They hold the middle ground, though they are closer to the hard-liners than to the reformers.

The centrists are as intransigent as the hard-liners concerning internal security, defense, opposition to the United States, the supremacy of the Communist Party, and repression of the political opposition. However, they may be more accepting of internal debate and discussion within the Party and National Assembly of People's Power. Their greatest difference with the hard-liners is that they are more pragmatic on economic issues. Hence, they are more willing to employ market principles and mechanisms to make the state sector of the economy more efficient and to spur economic growth.

In the 1980s, for example, Raúl Castro pushed for the adoption of Western managerial techniques and other reforms to improve the efficiency of enterprises operated by the FAR. Relying on army officers, he also was responsible for having capitalist management techniques applied to the civilian sector of the economy under the *sistema de perfeccionamiento empresarial* (SPE), or "enterprise improvement," during the 1990s. According to Espinosa, however, he has "navigated between reform and retrenchment."[26] Thus, he announced the opening of the farmers' markets in September 1994 but later delivered a harsh indictment of the regime's reformers at the Central Committee plenum in April 1996.

In sum, as symbolized by Raúl, the centrists can accept Western techniques that will improve the efficiency of state enterprises and thereby assure the viability of Cuban socialism. But as with the hard-liners, they are opposed to reforms that would move Cuba toward a Western-style economy based on private property and a free market.

The Reformers

This group has become noticeably silent since their forced retrenchment following Raúl's attack at the plenum in 1996. However, Carlos Lage remains in good standing despite being viewed as the architect of Cuba's modest reforms. Minister of Culture Abel Prieto may be another reformer who has managed to remain in office. Officials who have fallen from grace in recent years – for example former Foreign Minister Roberto Robaina, who was ousted from the Communist Party in July 2002 and possibly former Party Secretary Carlos Aldana - would probably join the reformist camp. At a lower level, the reformist camp would include economists Julio Carranza Valdés, Luis Gutiérrez, and Pedro Monreal, who earlier spearheaded the reform effort, only to be cashiered or transferred from their research positions in 1996.

If they were given carte blanche, the reformers would move away from militant, strident positions on internal security, anti-imperialism, mobilization politics, and revolutionary solidarity. They would be receptive to turning the Party Congress, the Party's Central Committee, and the National Assembly of Peoples Power into more deliberative organs, particularly if such a move would enable them to outflank their opponents. Possibly, too, they might permit a gradual political opening to help defuse domestic political tensions and gain international support. Here their aim would not be to turn Cuba into a liberal democratic state, but instead, to move toward a more benign authoritarian state like that of pre-1988 Mexico under the Institutional Revolutionary Party (Partido Revolucionario Institucional – PRI).

Most of all, the reformers would stand apart from hard-liners and centrists by wanting to rationalize and revitalize the economy along free-market lines. For political and ideological reasons, they would not go as far as to dismantle or privatize all state enterprises. Still, they might advocate other major reforms, such as

- Promoting small and medium-sized private business firms,
- Privatizing some of the agricultural cooperatives,
- Ending state-controlled hiring for joint ventures with foreign partners,
- Ending the ration system for all Cubans except pensioners and the needy,
- Raising the future retirement age of men and women,

- Allowing state enterprises to reduce their workforce to increase efficiency;
- Allowing the free convertibility of the peso to rationalize resource allocations, and
- Lifting price controls and allowing free markets for most products.

In the context of Cuban communism, these reforms would clearly be radical. They would encounter fierce opposition from the hard-liners and centrists, who would move to block them.

Three Variations on Communist Successor Regimes

Given these internal policy cleavages, the initial unity of a successor regime could easily be fractured once factional in-fighting breaks out, with the centrists becoming the pivotal grouping. Moreover, elite divisions would be compounded by the positions taken by institutional actors—especially the Communist Party, the National Assembly of People's Power, the Revolutionary Armed Forces, and the Ministry of Interior—as they align themselves in the power struggle. While necessarily speculative, the following discussion looks at how these institutional players might align themselves in a factional struggle over policy and power, while also assessing the viability of the alignments.

A Communist Regime Led by Hard-Liners

Initially, the hard-liners are likely to draw their main support from the Party's nomenklatura, the mass organizations, the MININT, and the FAR if it is under the leadership of hard-line, senior officers. These institutional actors have a strong stake in perpetuating the existing order and preserving the accomplishments of the Revolution, especially Cuba's independence from the United States. They also place a premium on the imperative of maintaining internal order. In terms of their mass and elite appeal, they would represent continuity with the past.

Precisely because they represent the past, however, a regime led by hard-liners would not be viable for very long. Because of their visceral antipathy toward "capitalism," the hard-liners would be unable to adopt the kinds of market reforms necessary to revitalize Cuba's economy. In turn,

they would find themselves increasingly alone inside the regime at a time when they are sure to be confronted with mounting popular opposition as a result of continued repression and a worsening economic situation.

Without Fidel Castro to champion Cuba's cause, the hard-liners would also find themselves isolated on the international front as governments and public opinion in Canada, Europe, and Latin America would turn against the regime's intransigent, repressive stance. In the meantime, the United States could be expected to exert mounting pressure to bring about long awaited regime change. Hence, if they are to remain a viable force, the hard-liners would have to join in a coalition with the centrists.

A Communist Regime Led by Centrists

By virtue of occupying the middle ground in terms of policy, and because Raúl Castro is Second-Secretary of the PCC and Minister of the Revolutionary Armed Forces, the centrists would probably attract younger Party leaders, most of the FAR's junior and middle-rank officers, and others officials serving in the government. As President of the National Assembly of People's Power, Ricardo Alarcón can also be expected to draw support from that body, especially if he calls for expanding its powers—something he might well do in order to strengthen his position vis-à-vis Raúl and others within the centrist camp. Yet, while seemingly in the driver's seat, the centrists are certain to be beset by serious problems in consolidating their power.

To begin with, Raúl's presence will be as much a liability as an asset for the successor regime, particularly if he occupies a highly visible leadership position. For example, if he takes over as First-Secretary of the PCC or becomes chief-of-state as President of the Council of State, the United States could find it impossible under the Helms-Burton Act to begin the process of normalizing relations with Cuba. Additionally, while the inclusion of the hard-liners in the new regime would help neutralize the MININT, the PCC hierarchy, and other hard-line elements, their presence could further damage the regime's international image. Also, with or without the hard-liners, the centrists have shown themselves unwilling either to undertake deep economic reforms or to open-up the polity, as called for by the United States and the rest of the international community.

All this suggests that it would be tactically advantageous for the

centrists to join with the reformers because the latter could provide needed international cover, as well as the policy prescriptions required to revitalize the economy and popular support. But here the centrists would encounter strong opposition not only from the hard-liners but also from those within their own camp who would be against the liberalizing measures advocated by the reformers.

In short, a centrist-led regime could well find itself at an impasse, unable to chart coherent, effective policies for the economy and polity. If so, then the regime could find itself facing increasing international isolation and pressures, mounting internal resistance, and institutional defections from its ranks.

A Communist Regime Led by Reformers

At present, a succession regime headed by reformers appears to be a long shot. Because their economic policies are radical in the Cuban context, the reformers are not likely to find much support among the major institutional players within the regime, at least not until the economic and/or political situation turns critical. Were the succession struggle to occur within the near term, the reformers would also probably find themselves without much organized support outside the regime, given the current embryonic state of civil society in Cuba, or what one observer calls a "proto-civil society."[27]

In time, if civil society reaches a stage comparable to that of Eastern Europe or the Soviet Union, then the reformers could probably count on receiving internal support from increasingly independent, assertive institutions and groups. These would include the Catholic and Protestant Churches, Afro-Cuban sects, dissident and human rights groups, and the more autonomous state-sponsored NGOs. Until then, however, the reformers' major sources of support are likely to be found outside Cuba — in foreign governments, NGOs, and foreign investors who would view a reformist-led government as the only alternative to stasis or chaos on the island.

Indeed, the prospect of continued stasis due to government paralysis and impending chaos due to a worsening economic and political situation could redound to the advantage of the reformers. Still, they would require more than the support of societal actors inside Cuba and the international community if they were to take power. They would need the FAR —

Cuba's most important institution — to defect and throw its weight behind the reformist movement, actively countering any hostile moves by the MININT, the Party, and the hard-liners.

However, such a scenario seems plausible only if the FAR concludes that it has no other alternative than to side with the reformers if Cuba is to be saved from chaos and the FAR is to protect its institutional interests. However, the reality is that the FAR does have another alternative—to assume power directly in order to stem the collapse of the communist state in the face of rising popular disturbances that probably would be spearheaded by Cuba's restive youth.[28] Here the FAR would be following the path of the Polish army when it imposed emergency rule under the leadership of General Jaruzelski in 1981.

A Successor Regime Led by the Military

The FAR already is well positioned to take power if a civilian-led successor regime falters and/or Castro's sudden, unexpected departure precipitates instability and turmoil. As the FAR now manages many government ministries and sectors of the economy, depending on circumstances, it may not need to share power with civilian elites, whether they be hard-liners, centrists, or reformers.

The Preeminence of the FAR

The Revolutionary Armed Forces have been the regime's preeminent institution and most important pillar of support, while enjoying a popular legitimacy independent of Castro. Following the toppling of the Batista Regime by its predecessor, the Rebel Army, the FAR's creation in 1959 predated the founding of the Communist Party by six years. The FAR not only went on to defend the Revolution in its early years against both its internal and external enemies, it also played a direct role in the economy, particularly by militarizing part of the sugar industry in the late 1960s in an effort to achieve a 10 million ton sugar harvest in 1970. After that, the FAR made its contribution to the economy by running the Youth Labor Army that was created in 1973.

From the mid-1970s through the mid-1980s, the FAR emerged triumphant from three military campaigns in Africa, having twice defeated the South Africans in Angola and Namibia and having routed the

Somalis in Eritrea. By 1987, Cuba had Latin America's largest army, ranking twentieth in size worldwide. Then, in the wake of the arrests, convictions and executions of Division General Arnaldo Ochoa, MININT Colonel Tony de la Guardia, and their two subordinates in 1989, the FAR assumed control of MININT, purged its ranks, and put its own officers in charge of the Interior Ministry.

The 1990s crisis caused a massive scaling down of the FAR from 297,000 active duty personnel in 1987 to 55,000 in 1997. In the meantime, naval vessels, MiG fighters and other aircraft, along with tanks and other weapons systems, either became inoperable, were cannibalized, or had to be mothballed owing to fuel and spare parts shortages.[29] But even as the FAR's order of battle suffered severe degradation, it assumed a new mission in the 1990s by greatly expanding its direct role in running the government and economy.

As Espinosa points out, the FAR is now in possession of much of the government.[30] Excluding Castro, 12 out of 37 key ministries in 2001 were under the control of senior officers from the FAR and to a lesser MININT, which has become an adjunct to the FAR. Besides MINFAR under Army General Raúl Castro, and MININT under General Abelardo Colomé Ibarra, these included Sugar, under the direction of Division General Ulises Rosales del Toro; Chief of Staff (Gobernación), under Colonel Ricardo Cabrizas; Civil Aviation, under Division General Rogelio Acevedo González; Transport and Profits, under Colonel Alvaro Pérez Morales; Higher Education, under Brigadier Fernando Vecino Alegret; and Information Technology and Communications, under Colonel Roberto Ignacio González Planas. Still others control the Attorney General's office, Customs, and Enterprise Improvement.

Additionally, in the economy, Espinsosa notes the presence of nine retired and active-duty senior officers who have become "entrepreneur-soldiers." They have been given a direct role in managing the external sector of the Cuban economy, encompassing foreign investments, tourism, pharmaceuticals, and other non-traditional exports and services. Espinosa also identifies no less than 20 enterprises or major project companies that are under the control of the FAR or MININT, ranging from the sprawling Gaviota and Cubanacán tourist enterprises and the CIMEX import-export conglomerate, to the Habaneros, S.A. tobacco monopoly. Additionally, there are hosts of smaller, lesser known companies run by less prominent entrepreneur-soldiers.[31]

A Military-Led Successor Regime

With the military already in commanding positions in the current government and public/private sectors of the economy, it would be relatively easy for the FAR as an institution to assume control of a post-Castro regime. It could choose to govern with only military officers at the top or with a select number of civilian leaders drawn from the hard-line, centrist, or even reformist factions.

In the first instance, Raúl Castro could remain as minister of the FAR, while turning over the office of president of the Council of State to retired General Ulises Rosales del Toro or another trusted *raulista* general. Another *raulista* officer could be given control of the Party, or the PCC could be left in the hands of a civilian. Under the second variation, centrist leaders such as Ricardo Alarcón and José Luis Rodríguez could remain as president of the National Assembly and Economics minister, respectively, to give the new military-led regime a semblance of civilian participation. Even an apparent reformer like Carlos Lage could conceivably be retained in his present post, given that he has been able to work within the parameters set by Fidel and Raúl over the past decade.

With the MININT at its side and the Party supporting it for lack of a better alternative, the FAR could well impose its rule over society without much resistance, at least initially. But it is likely to face strong condemnation from the United States, Latin America, Europe, and other members of the international community committed to democracy and human rights. Hence, to some degree, a military-led regime could gain some cover if it were to include civilians among its leadership. However, it would probably become an international pariah, with even foreign investors shunning Cuba because of the uncertainties and arbitrariness of military rule.

A military regime in power also risks its own institutional interests. To begin with, if Cuba becomes a pariah state in the eyes of the international community, the FAR's chances of establishing normal, professional relations with the United States and other modern military establishments would be severely compromised. This would mean that the FAR would be unable to secure the military credits and sales needed to replace its aging fleet of run-down planes, tanks, and other weapons systems. This, in turn, could intensify cleavages within the FAR between the traditional professional soldier, whose mission is to defend the revolution and fatherland, and the new breed of politician-soldier and

entrepreneur-soldier, who are enriching themselves through their positions in the government and economy. There already are reports from Cuba that there is growing corruption among the ranks of entrepreneur-soldiers, with the result that a new privileged caste of military officers, families, and associates is emerging.[32]

Still another risk awaits the Cuban military if it assumes direct responsibility for the state of the Cuban economy. The economic and managerial skills of FAR officers do not inspire much confidence, given their poor performance in achieving enterprise improvement in the state sector of the economy and in managing the sugar industry. At least under Raúl's command, they also do not appear to appreciate fully the extent to which deeper reforms are needed for the island's limping economy to recover. If the military were to take over and if the economic situation deteriorated further under a military government, the FAR would lose much of its luster in the eyes of the populace. Worse yet, if the FAR had to use force against civilians to quell disturbances, the population would turn against it and the military itself could become deeply divided.

In sum, a military-led government is fraught with danger for Cuba with respect to blocking needed system changes for the economy and the polity, thereby further delaying prospects for the island's democratic transition. The FAR would also damage itself as an institution if it were unable to govern effectively. And this once proud, highly competent, professional military organization would further tarnish its reputation if troops had to fire on rebellious civilians.

A Democratic Transition Regime

As will be argued momentarily, the emergence of a democratic transition regime seems quite remote at this time, at least in terms of the immediate future. But even if a democratic government were to take office, it would be saddled with politically explosive problems left unresolved by the Castro regime—the dislocations inherent in a transition to a market economy, the future of the ailing sugar industry, the reforming of the pension system, and the looming racial question. If it tried to address these questions, the new government would find that the democratic process itself would constrain its policy options far more than would be the case with a successor communist or military regime.

Moreover, the present correlation of forces on the island is stacked

heavily against Cuba's democrats: The current communist leadership controls the state and its instruments of coercion, most of the economy, and virtually all channels of communication, including the Internet. And the leadership has at its disposal the Party and its affiliated mass organizations with which to mobilize mass support.

In contrast, the dissidents, human rights activists, and small opposition groups are fragmented, repressed, and penetrated by State Security. Their brave leaders — Elizardo Sánchez, Héctor Palacios, Osvaldo Payá, "the Four" (Vladimiro Roca Atúñez, Marta Beatriz Roque Cabello, René Gómez Manzano, and Félix Bonne Carcassés), and other, lesser figures—are better known by foreign governments and international human rights groups than by most Cubans on the island. They are further handicapped in challenging the current elites by the weakness of civil society.

Cuba's nascent democratic opposition must further contend with a history that has left Cubans ill-prepared for a democratic future. During Cuba's 100 years of existence as a republic, only 16 years have been under four civilian presidents, who proved to be poor stewards of the young nation. For the other 84 years, the country was controlled by military men or, as in Castro's case, a revolutionary who imposed a totalitarian dictatorship. How far Cuba must travel to begin its democratic transition can be measured by examining the concept of democratic government and what is required to sustain it.

Democracy and Its Requisites

In liberal democracies, it is the individual who serves as the underlying element for the organization of the polity, rather than a class, vanguard party, and supreme state as in Castro's Cuba. Individuals are empowered with certain rights, including the right to choose who will govern them, and to influence thereafter the making of public policy.[33] In modern states, the primary—indeed, the indispensable—mechanism for ensuring this basic right are free, competitive, and regularly scheduled elections between two or more political parties and their candidates. Such elections provide for the accountability of the rulers and constrain their power because the rulers can be removed from office by voters at the next election. All this has been absent from Cuba since Batista's coup of 1952.

Free, competitive elections further become the *sine qua non* for

democracy in that the party in power cannot ensure electoral outcomes beforehand, again contrary to the elections under Cuba's one-party state. Indeed, a major democratic threshold is crossed when free elections are held that result in the opposition finally taking power, thereby breaking the political monopoly of a long entrenched ruling political elite.[34]

Paradoxically, however, free elections can also lead to the dimming of democratic prospects by allowing anti-democratic forces to gain power. The most notorious example occurred under the Weimar Republic, when the 1932 and 1933 elections enabled Hitler and the Nazi Party to gain power, after which they suspended the Weimar Constitution and imposed totalitarianism on Germany. More recently, the Romanian elections of 2000 resulted in the ruling centrist coalition of Liberals and Christian Democrats being crushed at the polls by the leftist Party of Social Democracy, led by former communists, and by the extreme nationalist party of Greater Romania.[35] Something similar could happen in a post-Castro Cuba if the Communist Party and its allies were to garner a majority of the popular votes in a national election.

Clearly, the mechanism of free, competitive elections is insufficient in itself to guarantee a democratic system. What, then, are the requisite conditions necessary to sustain democracy in the post-Castro era? Some, such as a civil society, a private sector, and a free and independent media, have already been mentioned. But there are other requisites as well that have special salience for a democratic transition in Cuba.

A democratic political class. As indicated by what transpired in the Weimar Republic, democracy cannot thrive without the democratic commitment of the majority of a country's political class. Contending political elites must abide by the rules of the game by holding free elections, accepting the outcome of the popular vote, and not imposing closure after they gain power, as Hitler did in 1933.

At present, Cuba's ruling political class adheres to anti democratic values, thus posing a future threat to democracy once it is attempted on the island. In Poland and other former bloc countries, however, some of the communist parties have reconstituted themselves along democratic-socialist lines. The same conversion would have to occur to Cuba, or at least the recalcitrant old guard communists would need to be marginalized to assure the island's democratic future.

A political class untainted by venality. The public's perception of a corrupt political class undermines its legitimacy, thereby weakening a

democratic government's ability to withstand attacks from anti democratic forces on both the left and right. This occurred in Cuba almost immediately with the triumph of the Revolution when the young, charismatic Castro repeatedly accused the *batistianos* and *Auténticos* of plundering the national treasury, betraying the public trust, and selling out the fatherland.[36]

It remains to be seen whether contending political elites in a democratic Cuba will behave with more probity than their predecessors in the pre-1959 period. So far, corruption has not tainted the ranks of dissidents, human rights activists, and other opponents of the regime, which should redound to their political advantage in any future electoral contest with the current communist elites.

The military's subordination to civilian rule. The military and security forces are uniquely positioned to defend the democratic order — or to nullify it through a coup. In Latin America, coups tend to occur when a high degree of institutional independence and a low degree of professionalism exist simultaneously, according to Samuel P. Huntington's thesis that military professionalism leads to political control by civilian authorities.[37]

Huntington's thesis has been largely borne out by the experience of the former bloc countries of Eastern Europe, where the military was subordinated to the authority of the ruling Communist Party. Since 1989, most of these countries have continued to accept civilian authority under a democratic system, though the internal security services have proved more difficult to bring under control.[38]

The European experiences suggest that the same pattern could be followed by the FAR in a democratic Cuba, particularly if junior and middle-ranking officers replace hard-line senior officers. However, if Raúl and/or the *raulistas* remain in charge of the military, then Cuba would resemble Nicaragua when Humberto Ortega controlled the Sandinista armed forces. Such an arrangement could give the Cuban military veto power over the civilian government. An even more serious threat would come from the MININT until it could be dismantled and replaced by a new internal police force.

The diffusion of democratic values in society. A democratically oriented political class would find it difficult to govern democratically if the bulk of society adhered to an authoritarian or anti-democratic political culture.[39] A viable democracy requires that society as a whole be

imbued with the values of political participation and mutual trust, as the former is made difficult by the absence of the latter. A sense of civility and the sanctity of the individual, a tolerance for unpopular ideas, and an acceptance of the government's inability to meet all of society's expectations,[40] are also attributes of a democratic political culture. So, too, is the acceptance of citizenship for all members of society.

The Castro regime's long rule has been corrosive to a democratic political culture on all these counts. Political participation in Cuba has been directed from above by the regime in the form of mass mobilization, rather than autonomous participation from below. Trust has been replaced by mistrust of fellow citizens, thus inhibiting collective action except when it is orchestrated by the regime. Civility has been replaced by incivility toward so-called *gusanos* (literally "worms" who abandon or otherwise undermine the Revolution) and counter-revolutionaries, who cease being members of the national community. Envy and class hatred have been exploited and turned against those accused of "ill-gotten gains." And until the crisis of the 1990s, Cubans were conditioned to rely on the state for their livelihood, basic necessities, and welfare.[41] In the post-Castro era, it may take considerable time — perhaps more than a generation — before Cubans can be inculcated with a democratic political culture.

A law-based state. The observance of the rule of law is a major divide that separates "law-based states" from lawless ones, whether under authoritarian, totalitarian, or post-totalitarian rule. The rule of law reins in the power and authority of the state, while endowing individuals with certain essential rights — among them, the rights to free speech, protection from the abuse of state power, free association, and private property. It requires that rulers as well as the ruled be subject to the law, specifies the manner in which the former must gain power to be legitimate, and makes them accountable to the citizenry. The rule of law is also essential to the development of a market economy because it creates predictable, equally applied, and binding laws and regulations necessary for commerce, trade, and investments to flourish.

Cuba is a lawless state despite having finally promulgated a new, formal Constitution in 1976, some 17 years after the Revolution triumphed—in itself evidence of the regime's lawless character. Whether in the Constitution or through laws and decrees, the "law" is rigged to favor the state, not the individual. The regime applies the law arbitrarily,

sometimes retroactively, and seldom holds its own members accountable except when it suits Castro's motives, as in the arrest, trial, and execution of Division General Arnaldo Ochoa in 1989 — a further sign of the politicization of the law. Whether toward the self-employed or foreign investors, the law has also been changeable and fickle in its application, thus not conducive to private enterprise. Finally, both the application and observance of the law have declined with the crisis of the 1990s, as ordinary Cubans were obliged to trade on the black market, steal from state firms, and engage in other illicit activities simply to survive. A democratic Cuba, in short, will have to create the rule of law from scratch.

Factors Favoring a Democratic Cuba

In overcoming the above challenges, Cuba's democratic forces can take heart from the example of those Central European states that have successfully overcome the legacy of communist rule. Moreover, Cuba's democratic prospects are brightened by the certainty that the U.S., Canadian, and European governments, the World Bank, the International Monetary Fund, and the Inter-American Development Bank and other multilateral organizations, will provide support for a new democratic government. A democratic Cuba should be able to draw further international support not only from the Roman Catholic Church and its lay organizations, but also a network of non-governmental organizations in the human rights area, such Amnesty International, Human Rights Watch, Pax Christi, and others. In addition, the Cuban-American community can play a critical role in the reconstruction of a new Cuba by supplying investment capital, trade ties, and technical expertise and assistance.

Cuba's budding democrats may have another ally as well—time. The longer the current Cuban situation festers, the weaker Cuba's post-totalitarian state is likely to be, and the more time there may be for a democratic opposition and a civil society to take root on the island. The Soviet and Eastern bloc experiences are instructive in this respect: With the weakening of the communist state during the 1980s, people lost their fear, dissidents grew bolder, the underground press spread, independent labor unions sprang up, and students and the intelligentsia formed independent associations, all of which undermined communist rule.

A democratic Cuba would also have another advantage over either a successor communist or military regime. As Charles Fried argues, soci-

eties are better able to prosper over time if they have free markets that are tempered by law and democracy.[42] Thus, difficult as it may be, by adopting democratic institutions and practices and the rule of law, the new government could begin to construct the political and legal infrastructure needed for a successful market-driven economy.

U.S. Policy Options for Accelerating a Democratic Transition

While a democratic Cuba is the preferred outcome for U.S. policymakers, they may first have to deal with either a communist- or military-led successor regime following Fidel Castro's departure from the scene. Both alternatives would conflict with the U.S. commitment to democracy and human rights. A communist- and probably a military-led successor regime would also be unacceptable to the Cuban-American community, thus perpetuating the civil war between those in exile and the regime on the island.

Yet, if Cuba's domestic political situation begins to deteriorate, the United States could be faced with a policy dilemma - it would have to choose between stability under a communist- or military-led successor regime, or instability on the island and the prospect of a failed state. The latter outcome could open the doors to uncontrolled out-migration by 1.5 million (or more) Cubans and transform the island into a wide-open haven for drug-trafficking and a source of instability for the rest of the Caribbean. Still another dilemma could arise if the policy that the United States adopts risks producing the very instability that Washington wants to avoid.

These are false policy dilemmas, however. As was earlier pointed out, neither a communist-led successor regime, with the possible exception of a reformist one, nor a military-led regime would produce a stable, prosperous Cuba over the long term. On the contrary, stability under both types of regimes would come at a high price through continued repression by the state, while the failure to improve the economy markedly would sooner or later lead to growing unrest on the island. Moreover, both types of regimes would leave Cuba as a festering source of anti-Americanism and antidemocratic values in the hemisphere.

Indeed, a successor communist regime under the hard-liners and/or moderates would have every incentive to continue with Castro's intransigent, defiant posture toward Washington because they have little else to

offer the Cuban people. Their interest would lie in continuing to exploit what Irving Louis Horowitz calls the historical "ambiguity" in Cuba's tortured relationship with the United States, during which Havana was either subservient to Washington under the conditional or quasi-independence of the pre-1959 period or assumed the offensive under the expansionist, hyper-nationalism of the Castro era.[43] By perpetuating Cuba's struggle with "imperialism," these groups would thus lay claim to the *comandante's* nationalist legacy. In doing so, they would seek not only to win popular support, but also to put on the defensive those military officers and the reformers who wish to normalize relations with the United States.

As was noted earlier, even some anti-democratic military officers might accept improved relations with the United States for the purpose of modernizing the FAR's aging, cannibalized weapons inventory. But it is the reformers who most of all would seek to ameliorate the Cuba-U.S. relationship, because their strongest card in winning over popular support and in gaining the upper hand in the succession struggle, lies in promising to speed the island's economic recovery. They can only deliver on their pledge, however, if a post-Castro Cuba is able to normalize relations with Washington. Accordingly, though there may be limits on how far they can go initially, the reformers will be far more inclined to push for rapprochement with the United States much in the same way that Deng Xiao Ping reversed Mao's policy toward the West.

Hence, the United States has little choice but to adopt a proactive policy to speed Cuba's democratic transition by pursuing different objectives and strategies that correspond with the type of regime that emerges after Castro:

- Toward either a communist successor regime led by hard-liners and/or centrists or a military regime, the objective should be *regime replacement* through coercive diplomacy.
- Toward a successor communist regime led by reformers, the objective should shift to *regime change* through conditional engagement.
- Toward a democratic transition regime, the objective should be one of *regime* support through close political, economic, and people-to-people ties.

It should be noted that in actuality the United States may confront a regime that is out of sequence with the above line-up—for example, a reformist communist regime could precede a hard-line communist or military regime. The important point is that the United States should be prepared to shift quickly to the policy objective and strategy that corresponds with whatever regime is in power.

Regime Replacement Through Coercive Diplomacy

The United States' objective should be replacement of a communist successor regime led by hard-liners and/or the centrists or a military-led regime if either follows in Castro's wake. Within the United States, this goal should receive widespread support among not only Cuban-Americans, but also the broader policy-making community, though there is likely to be debate regarding the strategy and instruments to be used. Support of this objective could also be expected from Canada, the European Union, and the democratic governments of Latin America, with their differences again confined more to the means to be employed rather than the goal of U.S. policy.

Strategy and Instruments

There are various economic, political, diplomatic, and military levers the United States can employ to accelerate regime replacement. Many have been employed in the past by the Clinton and Bush administrations, but not always in a sustained, coordinated manner. In the post-Castro era, they are likely to prove more effective because a successor communist or military regime is certain to be far more vulnerable due to the *comandante's* absence, internal factionalism, a worsening economy, and lack of popular support.

The following are some of the instruments the United States can employ unilaterally to exert pressures and provide inducements to achieve regime replacement:

- Issue a presidential declaration that notifies the Cuban people that the United States will maintain the economic embargo and withhold diplomatic recognition until the regime is replaced from within by means of a negotiated settlement or by force.[44]

- Use public diplomacy to signal further the United States' resolve to see a free, democratic government installed in Cuba and its readiness to improve relations with Cuba quickly once that occurs.
- Launch a sustained public diplomacy campaign, pledging U.S. respect for the independence, dignity, and sovereignty of a free, democratic Cuba, along with economic and technical assistance and trade and investment ties.
- Provide increased funding and technical assistance (such as computers, fax machines, and so on) to human rights activists, dissidents, and opposition groups.
- Communicate to the FAR that the United States is ready to have normal military-to-military relations and to provide technical assistance to the FAR, once the Cuban military detaches itself from a successor communist or military regime.
- Reassure civilian officials and especially military officers that they will have a role to play in a democratic Cuba if they are innocent of human rights violations.

The first four policies would intensify the pressure on the regime and its isolation within society. The last two would seek to exploit the cleavages within the new regime by driving a wedge between the FAR on the one hand, and the regime and MININT on the other. The potential effectiveness of such a strategy should not be dismissed. Following President Clinton's reassuring message to the FAR contained in his 1997 offer of help for Cuba's peaceful transition, all active and reserve military personnel were required to swear an oath of allegiance publicly to Fidel and Raúl Castro.

On the international front, the United States should move to enlist the Canadian, European, and Latin American governments in a concerted, coordinated campaign to isolate and ultimately replace Cuba's new regime. They should be urged to condemn Cuba's human rights violations in international forums, deny credits and loans to the new regime, and in general demand that Cuba's polity and economy be opened up. These governments should be urged to curtail foreign investments from their countries or to at least make them conditional on Cuba's observance of labor rights along lines of the Arcos Principles and to discourage tourist travel to the island.

On the non-governmental level, human rights organizations should be encouraged to keep a close watch on the island and to disseminate their reports on the human rights situation widely. Internet contact between Americans and Cubans should be facilitated when possible to open up the island. Contacts between U.S. and foreign NGOs with their Cuban counterparts should also be facilitated in order to strengthen civil society and the Cuban people's ties to the outside world. Once again, the aim here would be to increase the internal isolation of the successor communist or military regime within Cuba itself.

Responses and Outcomes

The successor communist regime, led by hard-liners or centrists or a military regime, is certain to try to portray U.S. policy as an act of aggression in order to rally domestic support. However, the appeal to Cuban nationalism may well fall on deaf ears, not only because Castro will no longer be around to manipulate public opinion against "imperialism," but also because U.S. policy would be clearly targeting the regime, not the Cuban people.

The regime might also threaten to open the floodgates of immigration to counter U.S. policy. Such a move, however, would be particularly dangerous for the regime, given what is certain to be a volatile atmosphere in the post-Castro period. Indeed, were it to get out of control, a mass exodus from the island could unhinge the regime itself. In any event, the U.S. government needs to make clear that it would be prepared to take whatever steps necessary to prevent a new wave of rafters from coming across the Florida Straits. This includes stationing Coast Guard vessels off Cuban waters and returning Cubans to the island. Once again, the aim is to intensify pressure on the regime.

Regime replacement could come about through popular uprising in the streets or a military revolt. Or, as happened in many of the former East European bloc states, the regime could buckle in the face of popular demonstrations and external pressures, exiting power peacefully through a negotiated pact with opposition groups. Here, the lessons of Central Europe may be instructive: Where the ruling communist leadership remained inflexible and unwilling to make concessions, as in Czechoslovakia, the German Democratic Republic, and Romania, regime change was compressed into short time intervals. In the case of Romania,

it was also accompanied by violence.

But Central Europe also holds another lesson that concerns negotiated pacts between the outgoing regime and opposition groups. The pact sometimes left the communists entrenched in the party, the mass organizations, the bureaucracy, the judiciary, and the military, while also carrying over many of the constitutional and other arrangements of the old order. In Cuba, it will be up to the opposition and perhaps the reformers to preclude a similar negotiated pact in order to remove obstacles to Cuba's advancement toward a democratic polity and market-based economy.

Regime Change Through Conditional Engagement

Were a successor regime under communist reformers to come to power, the United States would shift to a strategy of engagement for the purpose of gaining optimal leverage in pressing for further regime change. The reformist-led regime would thus be viewed as a temporary way station on the road to a transitional democratic government.

In the United States, engagement is likely to encounter opposition from the Cuban-American community and conservative politicians and policymakers. They would argue for the application of maximum pressures against the reformist-led regime in order to install a democratic transition regime in power. Depending on the internal situation in Cuba, however, such a policy preference may not be attainable. For instance, the reformers may enjoy domestic support from the populace and key organs of power such as the FAR. Or the opposition might not be strong enough to assume and hold onto power even with United States help, with the attendant risk that the island would then be plunged into anarchy. Hence, the reality inside Cuba may require that the United States not only deal with but also actively engage a reformist-led successor regime as the best alternative for speeding Cuba's ultimate democratic transition.

A policy of engagement would probably attract even stronger support abroad than would a policy of replacement. This would be particularly true of socialist and Social-Democratic governments, who have long been critical of U.S. policy and who would be more inclined to view a reformist-led successor government as the way to bring Cuba back into the democratic fold. Most Latin American governments would also be generally supportive of engagement, if only because it smacks less of U.S. interventionism than does the replacement policy.

Strategy and Instruments

To gain optimal leverage over the regime, a strategy of engagement would capitalize on the regime's vulnerabilities in the aftermath of Castro's passing and on the reformers' interests in surviving politically and starting Cuba on the path of economic recovery. The leverage gained would also be used to obtain political and economic concessions that would commit the regime to:

- Set a timetable for the holding of free, internationally supervised elections;
- Legalize the formation of opposition political parties;
- Observe civil liberties and human rights for all Cubans;
- Open the state-owned media to all groups and permit the establishment of a free, independent press, radio, and television;
- Open-up Cuba to foreign visitors without discriminating against Cuban-Americans or others critical of Cuban communism;
- Open-up Cuba to the Internet;
- Foster the formation of Cuban-owned private enterprise;
- Begin the privatization of agriculture and state enterprises; Abide by the Arcos Principles by allowing Cuban workers to be directly hired and paid by foreign enterprises;
- Begin replacing the Constitution and legal system with the rule of law; and
- Commence negotiations on the issue of compensation for the $1.8 billion in certified U.S. property claims.

Engagement would not be a zero-sum game for Cuban reformers, however. In return for the above concessions, the United States would:

- Restore diplomatic relations with the new regime and lift the economic embargo;
- Provide economic and technical assistance through USAID to the government, new small and medium-sized private Cuban businesses, and Cuban NGOs;
- Facilitate new lines of credit, promote trade and investments by United States companies, and facilitate tourist travel to the island;

- Support Cuba's requests for assistance before multilateral lending agencies; and
- Provide scholarships to qualified Cuban students to study economics, management, public administration, and law in U.S. universities.

To reiterate, these offers would not be made unconditionally but would be contingent upon the Cuban regime following through with its commitments.

Normalization; lifting the embargo; and prospects of concrete assistance, investments, trade, and tourism would all serve the regime's interests — and reduce its vulnerabilities — by supplying the reformers with the means by which to begin redressing the island's problems and launching it on the path toward economic recovery. This, in turn, would advance the reformers' immediate and longer-term political interests by improving their chances of winning public office in Cuba's future democratic elections.

Well before elections were scheduled, however, the regime would have to allow USAID, the National Endowment for Democracy and its affiliates (the National Democratic Institute and National Republican Institute), private foundations, and NGOs to work with opposition groups and others in building democracy. Through their efforts in political-party building, devising a competitive electoral system, and developing democratic government institutions, these organizations would help ensure that opposition groups in Cuba would be operating on a level playing field as election time approached.

On the international front, the United States would work with Western governments to coordinate their policies on trade, investments, and credits with those of the United States. The aim would be to act in concert, maintaining pressure on the regime to fulfill its promises of political, economic, and juridical reforms.

The Central Europeans could play a special role in spurring the reform process by holding seminars and training programs in Cuba on the lessons that can be applied from their experiences of transitions. Where needed, the United States should assist in this effort by helping to fund the salaries and expenses of the Central European contingents.

On the non-governmental front, Congress could provide incentives for universities to establish training programs in Cuba and exchange programs with Cuban universities. Major U.S. foundations as well as NGOs

could be encouraged to establish their on-site presence in Cuba to contribute to the rebuilding of civil society. Programs could also be devised for providing ordinary Cubans with unfettered access to the Internet. This could be done, for example, through donations — with tax write-offs — by corporations and other organizations of new and used computers for use in cyber-cafés throughout the island. These and other measures would be aimed at building up civil society and stoking the fires of change from below.

Responses and Outcomes

As with a democratic transition regime, a reformist-led regime would be vulnerable to charges from Castro's admirers and old-line communists of yielding to the dictates of Washington, the IMF, global capitalism, and so forth. Here, the reformers would need to articulate Cuba's interests forcefully when negotiating with the United States. Just as important, they would need to refute their critics by countering that they are in fact pursuing a genuine nationalist course—not by adopting an intransigent, self-defeating posture of defiance, but by putting Cuba squarely on the path to economic recovery and prosperity.

In the meantime, there would have to be incentives for reformers to carry through not only with sweeping economic reforms, but also with the democratic reforms that could ultimately cost them their power. Here, the reformers would need to be assured by the United States and other governments and by internal opposition groups that they would remain part of the political community with the same rights as other Cubans to run for office when democratic elections are held. Given that in the Communist Party, or its progressive wing if the party splits, they would control an organized, disciplined political party, they would have reason to believe that they stood a good chance of being voted back into office, particularly if they ran on a record of accomplishment.

Regime Support Through Closer Ties

A proactive U.S. policy that aims at fully supporting a democratic transition regime is certain to garner widespread support in the United States, Canada, Western Europe, and Latin America, and among international organizations and NGOs dedicated to promoting development and

democratic societies. Equally critical, support for a democratic transition regime would draw the backing of the Cuban-American community, whose role in the reconstruction of Cuba cannot be minimized. Whether as a source of new investments, trade opportunities, and technical assistance; as an intermediary with Washington; or as a source of academic expertise in management, economics, political science, law, communications, and other disciplines; Cuban-Americans will surely become pivotal players in the reconstruction of a democratic Cuba.

As was emphasized earlier, however, Cuba's transition to democracy, markets, and the rule of law will not be easy for a country that has experienced the likes of a Fidel Castro and decades of totalitarian and post-totalitarian rule. In fact, achieving a successful democratic transition could prove much harder and take considerably more time than bringing down a communist- or military-led successor regime because the task is infinitely more complex. It will require sustained effort and the shoring-up of the new government by the United States, other western countries, private foundations, NGOs, and Cuban-Americans if democracy is to prevail in a new Cuba.

Strategy and Instruments

The strategy for supporting a democratic transition regime would essentially resemble the engagement policy toward the reformists, except that levels of assistance would need to be increased substantially, while the same kinds of conditions would not be attached. The United States would thus step-up its economic and technical assistance, promote greater investments and trade, develop closer academic and NGO ties between the two countries, and assist in the building of democratic institutions and practices. The latter, especially with help from USAID and the National Endowment for Democracy, along with international organizations and observers, is critical to the establishment of democratic election procedures, electoral political parties, and a de-politicized bureaucracy and judiciary, among other things.

However, two significant differences would distinguish the policy of support for a democratic transition regime from the policy of engagement:

First, rather than having a finite set of goals, such as the holding of democratic elections or the privatization of sectors of the economy, the

policy would focus on supporting an open-ended process of democratization, marketization, and law- and institution-building.

Second, rather than being realizable within a relatively short period of time, as in the case of setting up an election timetable, the policy of support would have to be sustained over an indefinite number of years, perhaps decades.

Both of the above suggest that United States will be burdened with a nation-building task in the post-Castro era. This may prove difficult to sustain domestically over the long term, although the Cuban-American community should serve as a countervailing force that supplies constancy and commitment in U.S. policy toward the island. In any event, the United States cannot afford for Cuba to exist as an impoverished or failed state across the Florida Straits: With its close proximity, more than 11 million people, and strategic location, Cuba is the Caribbean's largest island and second only to Mexico in terms of a Latin American country's importance to U.S. national interests.

Responses and Outcomes

Well over a century after it gained independence, Cuba may ultimately take its place as a democratic, market-oriented, law-based state, but, to get there, it will first have to travel a long, uncertain path. Democratic elections will be the first threshold the new Cuba must cross, and here the outcome could be critical for the island's democratic future — much as Violeta Chamorro's stunning 1990 electoral victory over Sandinista President Daniel Ortega launched Nicaragua on the road to democracy.[46]

However, elections would not only need to be closely monitored by international observers. They also should not be called too soon in light of the current absence of opposition parties and a civil society. Opposition groups would require time to coalesce, organize themselves into political parties, agree on party platforms, gain access to the state and privately owned media, establish grass-roots support, and begin campaigning. Otherwise the communist party or its successor, which may or may not represent itself as a socialist democratic party, could have an immense organizational advantage.

On the other hand, the anticommunist or democratic opposition groups do have some potential advantage, provided they form a single

opposition party or an electoral front, promise to maintain a social safety net for the populace, and field an attractive candidate for the presidency. The opposition can present itself as the party of inclusiveness and national reconciliation and as the party of individual liberty and freedom for all in contrast with its communist opponents. It can further present itself as the one party capable of effectively pursuing a new "national project" for the reconstruction and prosperity of the island, because only the democrats - not the communists - can count on broad U.S. and international support.

A national project of reconstruction and prosperity could have particular appeal to nationalist-minded Cubans. It could be especially important to Afro-Cubans, potentially the key bloc of voters, in that they would expect to receive a more equitable share of power and wealth in the new Cuba, including more resources devoted to the development of the eastern half of the island. And such a reconstruction effort would have broad appeal to the majority of Cubans, who are exhausted by more than 40 years of misrule by the Castro regime.

END NOTES

[1] See Jorge Pérez-López, "Waiting for Godot: Cuba's Stalled Reforms and Continuing Economic Crisis," *Problems of Post-Communism*, November-December 2001, 44-45.

[2] *Ibid*, p. 45.

[3] Archibald R.M. Ritter, "Entrepreneurship, Microenterprise, and Public Policy in Cuba: Promotion, Containment, or Asphyxiation?" *Journal of Interamerican Studies and World Affairs*, 40:2 (Summer 1998) 63-64. For an equally severe indictment of the government's economic policy by a left-wing economist, see Andrew Zimbalist, "The Cuban Economy at the Millennium," *U.S. Policy Toward Cuba, Congressional Report*, First Conference, The Aspen Institute, April 17-21, 2000, esp. 19-23.

[4] Jim Lobe, "Learn from Cuba, Says World Bank," InterPress Service, April 20, 2001. However, Cuba's impressive infant mortality rate is aided by the country's high rate of abortion and by the practice of hospitals not reporting births until the third day of the infant's life.

[5] The discussion of Cuba's totalitarian system is informed by J. Linz, "Totalitarian and Authoritarian Regimes," in *Handbook of Political Science*, Fred J. Greenstein and Nelson Polsby, (CITY: Addison-Wesley, 1975). Linz notes that totalitarianism differs from authoritarianism because it is ideologically driven, has high rates of political mobilization, is intolerant of even limited pluralism, and demands a high level of citizen involvement and participation in the political system.

[6] On the ways in which Cuban society changed in the 1990s, see Susan Eckstein, "The Quiet Transformation of Cuba," in *U.S. Policy Toward Cuba, Congressional Program*, Second Conference, The Aspen Institute, January 12-16, 2001, 25-31.

[7] "Cuba: Repression by Harassment," *The Economist*, March 18, 2000.

[8] Eusebio Mujal-Leon and Joshua W. Busby, "Much Ado About Something? Regime Change in Cuba," *Problems of Post-Communism*, November-December 2001, 14.

[9] *Ibid*., p. 11.

[10] On November 12, 1999, before an audience of Latin American journalists in Havana, Castro declared, "We prefer our socialism with all its imperfections; we prefer the totalitarianism of truth, justice, sincerity, authenticity; the totalitarianism of truly humanitarian feelings, the totalitarianism of the type of multi-party system we practice." Cited in Mujal-Leon and Busby, 2001 fn. 30, 18.

[11] David Ronfeldt has described Castro as being possessed by a "hubris-nemesis mindset." See Edward Gonzalez and David Ronfeldt, *Castro, Cuba, and the World*, (Santa Monica: RAND, June 1986), 3-32.

[12] "…Castro and the Cuban leadership are unwilling to accept the political consequences of economic reform. They are willing to accept economic stagnation, falling standards of living, and slower economic growth in order to preserve their overwhelming influence over the island's polity. A new rectification process to reverse the meager liberalization and restructuring measures implemented in the 1990s is not out of the question." Pérez-López, *op cit*. 50.

[13] In 1996, fully 44 percent of the labor force over the age of 20 was not formally employed. Presumably, many were plying the black market or working illegally.

[14] Ritter, *op. cit*., 80.

[15] Ricardo A. Donate-Armada, "The Aging of the Cuban Population," in *Cuba in Transition* (Miami: Association for the Study of the Cuban Economy, 2001), 485, 487.

[16] *Ibid*., 486-488.
[17] See Alejandro de la Fuente, *Recreating Racism: Race and Discrimination in Cuba's "Special Period*," Georgetown University Cuba Brieifing Paper Series, No. 18, July 1998.
[18] On how this phenomena played out in the former East European communist states, see Tina Rosenberg, *The Haunted Land: Facing Europe's Ghosts After Communism*, (New York: Random House, 1995).
[19] Of course, there is ample evidence that many Cubans look neither West nor East, but North—to Miami. However, many of the Cubans who fled the island did so out of economic desperation, particularly in the 1990s, whereas the Europeans wanted their societies to be like those in the West.
[20] See Edward Gonzalez and Thomas S. Szayna, *Cuba and Lessons from Other Communist Transitions—A Workshop Report*, National Security Research Division, RAND, 1998. On the East European comparison, see Michael Radu, "Cuba's Transition: Institutional Lessons from Eastern Europe," *Journal of Interamerican Studies and World Affairs*, 37:2 (Summer 1995), 82-111.
[21] If Raúl departs first, the dynamics of the succession struggle are sure to be much more volatile and less predictable.
[22] This point is made by Mujal-Leon and Busby, 15-16,
[23] Prior to 1985, for example, few Soviet specialists identified Gorbachev as the reformer he turned out to be after he came to power. Deng Xiao Ping was known as a reformer because Mao had punished him for advocating reforms, but even Deng himself probably did not know the extent to which he would promote economic liberalization after 1978.
[24] The following discussion of hard-liners, centrists, and reformers, has been taken and updated from Edward Gonzalez, *Cuba: Clearing Perilous Waters?* (Santa Monica: RAND, 1996).
[25] According to Juan Carlos Espinosa, these would include Support Group Leader Carlos Balenciaga, Communist Youth Leader Otto Rivero, and University Student Union President Hassan Pérez. Juan Carlos Espinosa, "'Vanguard of the State': The Cuban Armed Forces in Transition," *Problems of Post-Communism*, November-December 2001, 23.
[26] *Ibid*., 23.
[27] This term is used by Damián J. Fernandez to describe the present state of development of Cuba's civil society: He further observes, "Compared to the experiences of Eastern Europe and the Soviet Union, civil society in Cuba is somewhere between a passive stage in which private individuals and independent groups actively or passively defend their autonomy, identity, and interests vis-à-vis the state and an emergent stage in which groups take their limited demands into a wider social arena." In "Society, Civil Society, and the State," *Problems of Post-Communism*, November-December 2001, 60.
[28] For a vivid picture of the alienation and anomie of sectors of the Cuban youth, see "Cubans stand by for a long, hot summer," *The Economist*, June 13, 1998, 35-36.
[29] Defense Intelligence Agency, *The Cuban Threat to U.S. National Security*, November 18, 1997.
[30] Espinosa, 23-24.
[31] Espinosa, p. 24.
[32] Espinosa, 25-27.

[33] While most theories of democracy hold that the voters elect representatives who express their policy preferences, the type of democratic system that is in place largely determines the extent of actual voter influence over policy. In a majoritarian system of winner-take-all, the winning party that assumes office may more or less be unencumbered in its policymaking, especially in a parliamentary system, as in the United Kingdom. In such a system, only the majority has effective influence through its elected representatives. In a proportional representation system as in other western countries, all citizens at least in theory have influence over policy. No single party is likely to command a parliamentary majority; instead, power is weakened and dispersed among several parties, with the result that minority views must often be entertained and reflected in the outcome of policy. See C. Bingham Powell, Jr., *Elections as Instruments of Democracy: Majoritarian and Proportional Views*, Yale University Press, 2000.

[34] The year 2000 was thus a banner election year for democracy: The PRI in Mexico lost its more than 70-year grip on power, the Socialist Party in Senegal lost its 40-year hold on the presidency and parliament, and the Kuomintang (KMT) in Taiwan similarly was turned out of office by the opposition after decades of monopolizing power.

[35] See Grigore Pop-Lelches, "Romania's Politics of Dejection," *Journal of Democracy* 12:3 (July 2001), 156-169.

[36] See Edward Gonzalez, *Cuba Under Castro: The Limits of Charisma*, (Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1974), esp. 25-52. The ineffectiveness and corruption of Venezuela's two major political parties similarly allowed Hugo Chavez to come to power through a popular mandate at the polls and then subsequently to begin dismantling the country's democratic institutions in his march toward authoritarian rule.

[37] According to Samuel P. Huntington, professionalism instills the officer corps not only with expertise in military affairs and a sense of military corporateness, but also with a sense of civic responsibility toward state and society. The latter includes the professional soldier's belief in and acceptance of civilian authority. See his *The Soldier and the State: The Theory and Politics of Civil-Military Relations*, (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1957).

[38] For example, see the country case studies in Constantine P. Danopoulos and Daniel Zirker, eds., *The Military and Society in the Former Eastern Bloc* (Boulder, Colo.: Westview Press, 1999); and Kleran Williams and Dennis Deletant, *Security Intelligence Services in New Democracies: The Czech Republic, Slovakia and Romania*, Palgrave, 2001.

[39] One reason why democratic institutions and practices have been so slow to take root in Russia is because of the imprint left by seven decades of communist rule. Save for intellectuals and dissidents, it was not until the 1980s, when the information revolution began to spread and a younger generation emerged, that sectors of society began to act independently from the Communist Party and state. Much of the population, however, remained ill-prepared for Russia's abrupt democratic transition.

[40] The overloading of a government with excessive demands is the underlying theme of Samuel P. Huntington's seminal work, *Political Order in Changing Societies* (New Haven, Conn.: Yale University Press), 1968.

[41] Compare Cuba to the United States, for example, where the American ethos of

individualism and self-reliance provides a margin of safety for the government by helping to reduce the level of demands that society would otherwise make on the government.

[42] Law and democracy, Fried points out, are missing in either "bandit or tyrant capitalist societies" like China and Russia. See Charles Fried, "Markets, Law, and Democracy," *Journal of Democracy*, 11:3, (July 2000), 5-18.

[43] Irving Louis Horowitz, "One Hundred Years of Ambiguity — U.S.-Cuba Relations in the 20th Century," *The National Interest*, Spring 2002, 64.

[44] The use of the embargo as an instrument by which to bring about change in a Cuba after Castro thus constitutes one reason for not lifting it at this time.

[45] See the selections in Jirí Pribán and James Young, eds, *The Rule of Law in Central Europe: The Reconstruction of Legality, Constitutionalism and Civil Society in the Post-Communist Countries* (Brookfield, VT: Ashgate/Darmouth Publishing, Ltd., 1999_.

[46] The Nicaraguan experience is not an analogous case for Cuba because in 11 years the Sandinista National Liberation Front (Frente Sandinista de Liberación Nacional – FSLN) never established a totalitarian state. The Church, civil society, a private sector, and even political parties existed.

About the Author

Edward Gonzalez is Professor Emeritus of Political Science at the University of California, Los Angeles, where he taught undergraduate and graduate courses in comparative politics and international relations, mainly in the Latin America area, for 29 years before he took early retirement in 1994. Since 1969, he has been a member of the Adjunct Staff, RAND Corporation, where he continues serving as a consultant on Cuba and U.S. policy toward Cuba and Central America.

Beginning with his Ph.D. dissertation on Cuban-Soviet relations, Dr. Gonzalez has specialized in Cuba under Castro, and soon established himself as a recognized authority in the field. His academic and policy research has concentrated on Cuba's domestic and foreign policies and on U.S. policy toward the Castro government. He has written over 40 studies on Cuba beginning with his first published article in 1968 in *World Politics.* Other articles have appeared in *Foreign Affairs, Problems of Communism, Orbis,* numerous edited volumes and anthologies, and most recently, *U.S. Policy Toward Cuba, Second Conference,* published by the Aspen Institute in 2001.

Dr. Gonzalez's major works include: *Cuba Under Castro: The Limits of Charisma,* Houghton-Mifflin Co., 1974; *Cuba, Castro, and the World* [co-authored with David Ronfeldt], RAND, 1986; *Cuba Adrift in a Postcommunist* World [co-authored with David Ronfeldt], RAND, 1992; *Storm Warnings for Cuba* [co-authored with David Ronfeldt], RAND, 1994; and *Cuba: Clearing Perilous Waters?,* RAND, 1996. Written for the Under-Secretary of Defense for Policy, the last three reports assessed Cuba under crisis in the 1990s and the policy options available to the U.S. Government.

In 1998, Dr. Gonzalez co-organized with Dr. Richard Nuccio a RAND-sponsored policy forum on Cuba. Funded largely by The Ford Foundation, and held in Washington, D.C. over the course of three sessions, the Forum brought together academic specialists, congressional assistants, and members of the foreign policy community inside and outside the U.S. government, to review the Cuban situation and make U.S. policy recommendations. The Forum's findings were then published under the joint authorship of Drs. González and Nuccio as *The RAND Forum on Cuba,* RAND, 1998.

Institute for Cuban and Cuban-American Studies - ICCAS

The Institute for Cuban and Cuban-American Studies is unique in that ICCAS is a leading Center for Cuban Studies emphasizing the dissemination of Cuban history and culture. ICCAS sponsors academic and outreach programs and helps coordinate Cuban-related activities at the University of Miami including the Casa Bacardi; the Emilio Bacardi Moreau Chair in Cuban Studies; the Cuba Transition Project; the Cuban Heritage Collection at Otto G. Richter Library; the John J. Koubek Memorial Center, and other University components related to Cuban and Cuban-American Studies.

Programs and Activities

The Institute undertakes a variety of programs and activities, including sponsoring and hosting public lectures and seminars. The Institute's Information Center provides current and historical information on Cuba and responds to requests from the academic, business, media and government communities. ICCAS publishes research studies and occasional papers, sponsors original research, and coordinates interdisciplinary courses at the University of Miami. The Institute also organizes art exhibits, musical programs, and an annual film festival.

Forthcoming CTP Publications

The Role of the Judiciary: Alternative Recommendations for Change – **Laura Patallo Sanchez**

Confiscated Properties in a Post-Castro Cuba: Two Views - **Matias Travieso,** *"Alternative Recommendations for Dealing with Confiscated Properties in Post-Castro Cuba"* and **Oscar M. Garibaldi,** *"The Treatment of Expropriated Property in a Post-Castro Cuba"* with an introduction by **Laura Patallo Sanchez**

Alternative Recommendations on Dealing with Corruption in Post-Castro Cuba. – **Sergio Diaz Briquets, Jorge Perez Lopez,** and **Olga Nazario**

The Cuban Communist Party and Electoral Politics: Adaptation, Succession and Transition – **William M. LeoGrande**

A Constitution for Cuba's Political Transition: The Utility of Retaining (and Amending) the 1992 Constitution – **Jorge I. Dominguez**

The Military in Cuba's Transition – **Brian Latell**

The Greatest Challenge: Civic Values in Post-Transition Cuba – **Damian J. Fernandez**

The Rule of Law: Recommendations for Implementation - **Laura Patallo Sanchez**

Growing Economic and Social Disparities: Impact and Recommendations for Change – **Carmelo Mesa Lago**

International Organizations and Post-Castro Cuba – **Ernesto Betancourt**

Economic Reconstruction: Suggestions and Recommendations – **Antonio Jorge**

Recommendations on Privatization – **Antonio Jorge**

Foreign Investment in Post-Castro Cuba: Problems, Opportunities, and Recommendations – **Robert Cruz**

Role of the Cuban-American Community in Cuba's Transition - **Sergio Diaz Briquets** and **Jorge Perez Lopez**

What Has Gone Wrong with Transitions in Post Communist Eastern Europe: Lessons for Cuba – **Vendulka Kubalkova**

Nicaragua: Procesos Politicos y Transicion Democratica - Posibles Lecciones Para el Futuro de Cuba [Nicaragua: Political Processes and Democratic Transition - Possible Lessons for Cuba] – **Alvaro Taboada Teran**

Rehabilitating Education in Cuba: Assessment of Conditions and Policy – **Graciella Cruz-Taura**

The Role of Education in Promoting Cuba's Integration into the International Society: Lessons in Transition from the Post-Communist States of Central and Eastern Europe – **Andy Gomez**

Republic of Cuba Telecommunications Fundamental Plan – **Manuel Cereijo**

Securing the Future: A Blueprint for the Reconstruction of Cuba's Security Services – **Eugene Rothman**

Lessons for Cuba of the Romanian Transition – **Michael Radu**

Transition in Spain: Lessons for Cuba – **Carlos Alberto Montaner**

UNIVERSITY OF Miami