



12-1994

Revisiting the Issue of Terrorism: An Institutional Analysis of U.S. Sponsored Terrorism Directed Toward Cuba

Rick A. Matthews

Follow this and additional works at: https://scholarworks.wmich.edu/masters_theses



Part of the Terrorism Studies Commons

Recommended Citation

Matthews, Rick A., "Revisiting the Issue of Terrorism: An Institutional Analysis of U.S. Sponsored Terrorism Directed Toward Cuba" (1994). *Master's Theses*. 3835.

https://scholarworks.wmich.edu/masters_theses/3835

This Masters Thesis-Open Access is brought to you for free and open access by the Graduate College at ScholarWorks at WMU. It has been accepted for inclusion in Master's Theses by an authorized administrator of ScholarWorks at WMU. For more information, please contact wmu-scholarworks@wmich.edu.



REVISITING THE ISSUE OF TERRORISM: AN INSTITUTIONAL
ANALYSIS OF U.S.-SPONSORED TERRORISM
DIRECTED TOWARD CUBA

by

Rick A. Matthews

A Thesis
Submitted to the
Faculty of The Graduate College
in partial fulfillment of the
requirements for the
Degree of Master of Arts
Department of Sociology

Western Michigan University
Kalamazoo, Michigan
December 1994

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

First, and foremost I must extend my appreciation to the members of my committee, Dr. Susan Caulfield, Dr. Doug Davidson, and Dr. Ronald Kramer. I am indebted to Dr. Caulfield's guidance throughout this process, particularly during those times when I had difficulty focussing on the task at hand. Dr. Caulfield's patience and understanding during this process has been deeply appreciated. Dr. Doug Davidson's influences on this project are rooted in the extremely insightful and thought provoking times in which I have listened to him dissect U.S. foreign policy with an admirable degree of precision. Dr. Ronald Kramer's helpful critiques and knowledgeable suggestions were extremely appreciated and well timed. Also, Dr. Kramer's contributions to the literature of state-corporate crimes have been an invaluable resource.

Second, I would like to express my gratitude to my parents, both of who have given me encouragement, advice, love, and support throughout my academic career. Finally, I must thank my wife Deb, who has always been extremely understanding and supportive of a husband who is often busier than he should be.

Rick A. Matthews

REVISITING THE ISSUE OF TERRORISM: AN INSTITUTIONAL
ANALYSIS OF U.S.-SPONSORED TERRORISM
DIRECTED TOWARD CUBA

Rick A. Matthews, M.A.

Western Michigan University, 1994

Consistent with Herman's (1982) call to more critically examine state-sponsored terrorism, this study assesses the sociopolitical and economic context in which the U.S. has terrorized the nation-state of Cuba. While the definitional framework in which the U.S. has traditionally examined acts of terrorism excludes from it the possibility of self incrimination, this research uses a single standard and nondiscriminatory definition which examines the behavior in question and harms done, as opposed to a definition based on power considerations alone. The method in which this research is conducted is qualitative, consistent with the principles of a sociohistorical case study, using an interdisciplinary approach. Finally, the theoretical approach is derived from institutional theory, rooted in the critical paradigm of criminology. The study concludes that the U.S.-sponsored terrorist activities directed toward Cuba have their genesis in the core values of the existing sociopolitical, economic, and ideological arrangements in the U.S.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS.....	ii
CHAPTER	
I. INTRODUCTION.....	1
Critical Criminology.....	2
White Collar Crime and Beyond.....	7
Defining State Criminality.....	8
International Criminal Law and Terrorism.....	11
Terrorism by Any Other Name.....	15
An Institutional Approach for Studying State Crimes.....	18
Methods.....	20
Triangulation and Data Sources.....	22
II. DEFINING TERRORISM.....	25
Terrorism; What Is It? The Reader Wants to Know.....	25
The Mechanisms of Terrorism.....	33
III. THE MECHANISMS OF STATE TERROR.....	37
Introduction to the Chapter.....	37
A Case Study in Transference.....	38
The Cold War: Pretext for Terrorism.....	39
Covert Action as a Vehicle for Foreign Policy Implementation.....	44
Beyond Incrimination (Plausible Denial).....	45
Supplying Repression.....	47
Subversion.....	53
Economic Pressure.....	54

Table of Contents--Continued

CHAPTER

Assassination Attempts of Castro.....	58
Disseminating Disinformation.....	61
The Bay of Pigs Invasion.....	66
IV. DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION.....	72
Discussion.....	72
Limitations of the Study.....	76
Implications for Future Research.....	78
Concluding Remarks.....	80
ENDNOTES.....	82
BIBLIOGRAPHY.....	84

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

This research focusses on United States' foreign policy regarding Cuba, which has taken the form of state-sponsored terrorism since the Guevara- and Castro-led revolution in 1959. Much of United States' attention toward Cuba was marked by anti-communist sentiment, and this foreign policy, in general, has taken the forms of subversion, militarism, assassination attempts, and attempts to overthrow the Cuban government.

While the relationship between the United States and Cuba has been the subject of much study, little work has addressed it within the field of criminology¹. However, if one closely examines U.S. foreign policy toward Cuba, it is difficult to differentiate its effect from many of the social harms studied by critical criminologists. Much change has occurred within the critical study of criminology, with movement away from the use of traditional, state-based, legalistic definitions of behavior to an analysis of patterns of harmful behavior, patterns that are observed from the interpersonal to the structural. It is my contention that an analysis of U.S. foreign policy toward Cuba is a logical extension of such analysis, with a focus on structural patterns of behavior.

What is presented in this chapter is a brief review of changes in critical criminology, focusing on the development of the crimes by

both extant and as I elaborate. Subsequently, I will also examine the state literature; as well as definitions of state criminality, the legalistic framework by which the actions of the United States toward Cuba could be considered criminal in nature. This examination will first address how the United States has used international law to define others' actions as terrorist in nature, and then move toward a discussion of international law documents which define the actions of the U.S. as terrorist in nature.

Finally, the methods by which this research will be conducted will be discussed. In short, this research will be conducted in a manner consistent with a socio-historical case study.

Critical Criminology

Perhaps the most important research question which must be considered by any criminologist is how to define what constitutes a crime. Naturally, the definition chosen is neither right or wrong, but rather, useful or not. The definition with which one begins, however, does have consequences in influencing the questions and issues raised by the researcher.

Historically within the discipline of criminology there has been a tendency to use state-defined criminal law as the mechanism by which to define crime. Therefore, the purview of past research has been those acts or behaviors which violate criminal law. Following from this, a great deal of attention has been focussed on the nature, extent, and distribution of what is commonly known as "street crime" (e.g., juvenile delinquency, rape, murder, theft, ect.). Moreover,

the attempts to explain this phenomena over the past 30 years have centered on social psychological explanations of crime, which include the paradigms of social control and strain theory (Stitt & Giacopassi, 1992). Generally speaking, Stitt and Giacopassi (1992) are referring to what is traditionally known as mainstream criminology.

Recently, mainstream criminology has been challenged by those who claim that criminality is a label or legal status as opposed to a type of behavior. Most notably, these approaches have included the labeling and conflict/power perspectives. For these criminologists, emphasis is placed not on examining individual behavior, but on the definitional process, and how the status of criminal is ascribed by those who create and administer criminal law. In short, these criminologists maintain that there is no such thing as an inherently criminal act.

Quinney (1970), for example, argued that the definition of crime itself is "a definition of human conduct that is created by authorized agents in a politically organized society" and that "criminal definitions describe behaviors that conflict with the interests of segments of society that have the power to shape public policy" (pp. 15-16). Therefore, the creation of criminal laws and categories, the enforcement of these laws, and the functioning of the criminal justice system are studied with reference to the transformation of persons into criminals, and behaviors into crimes. The issues of crime and crime control, according to Barak (1994), are therefore "subject to a myriad of questions and interpretations"

(p. 5).

These questions and interpretations which Barak (1994) refers to do not necessarily mean that those who reject the mainstream approach are not concerned with behavior. However, the type of behavior these criminologists are concerned with may or may not be considered criminal under state-defined law. For example, those working outside the mainstream paradigm who study street crime, may base their work in broader theoretical traditions which examine structural, sociopolitical, institutional or economic factors in their attempt to explain a specific behavior. While some criminologists use alternative theoretical traditions to examine state-defined criminal acts, others may be likely to focus on other behavior, such as white collar crimes, political crimes, corporate crimes, and a wide variety of behaviors which may not be ascribed the status of crimes under state-defined law. Indeed, these criminologists often use other mechanisms (such as international law, or human rights documents) to classify a wider variety of behavior as criminal for the purposes of study. Those criminologists who either reject the notion that certain acts are intrinsically criminal in and of themselves and/or use alternative mechanisms other than state-defined criminal law to classify behavior as criminal fall within what is known as the critical paradigm.

Although the debate over inherently criminal acts is a breaking point between the mainstream and critical paradigms, there are several more specific distinctions which can be made between the two.

First, the mainstream paradigm assumes that the mechanism they use to define criminal acts (i.e., state-defined criminal law) is based on consensus. The consensus of law, for mainstream criminologists, is grounded in the assumption that there is consensus in the moral values of society, either through a collective conscience or a social contract. Therefore, the issues of law, crime, order, and justice are givens, for the mainstream criminologist, and they generally do not examine anything other than individual behavior which violates state-defined laws. Critical criminologists, as mentioned earlier, do not accept the assumption that state-defined criminal law is based on consensus, but rather on power considerations and conflict. These criminologists therefore turn, in some cases, to alternative mechanisms (e.g., human rights laws, or international law) to classify behavior as criminal for the purposes of study.

The second specific point of departure between the mainstream and critical paradigm is related to how criminal behavior is explained. The mainstream paradigm, for example, is rooted in the classical and positivist schools of thought. The classical and positivist schools of thought represent the dichotomy of human behavior as either being free-willed (classicalism), or determined (positivism). For example, mainstream theories within the positivist school include biological, psychological, social disorganization theories, and social control theories, to name a few. The central unifying theme throughout these theories is the emphasis on deterministic elements, whether they are intrinsic or external. On the other hand,

mainstream criminologists from the classical school view human behavior in terms of rational choice. Therefore, criminal behavior is the end result of an individual rationally calculating the benefits of carrying out a crime with those consequences of being caught.

Rather than viewing behavior in terms of being entirely determined (positivism) or based solely on rational choice (classicalism), critical criminologists often view human beings as subject to, and makers of those structures and institutions which ultimately constrain them (Barak, 1994). Therefore, critical criminologists do not take an overly deterministic or free-will stance in their attempt to explain behavior. In this light, then, it is entirely possible for the critical criminologist to give consideration to both determinism and free-will.

Finally, Barak (1994) cites that critical criminologists do not believe that the value-neutral or objective study of social phenomenon is possible. In short, the critical paradigm rejects the assertion of the positivists that social research may be objective, maintaining that ideological, institutional or moral influences upon the researcher make this impossible.

Having distinguished the critical from the mainstream paradigm, it should be noted here that neither the critical or the mainstream approach are necessarily correct in and of themselves. Rather, each paradigm defines a set of assumptions that the criminologist will be working from; whether doing research and/or creating theory. From this, these assumptions are neither right or wrong, but only an

epistemological/philosophical starting point at which one begins examining the social world around us. With this in mind, it should be stated that this research will be conducted in a manner consistent with the critical perspective, focussing specifically on the historical sociopolitical context in which U.S. government agencies have engaged in state-sponsored terrorism against Cuba. Ultimately, this research will focus on criminal behavior on the United States, particularly at the organizational level. In the meanwhile, I will briefly examine the development of the subject matter of white collar crime which has eventually led to the exploration of state crime.

White Collar Crime and Beyond

Recently, some criminologists have shifted their focus away from discussions of criminal behavior to larger issues of criminality, which have included studies of white collar crimes (Clinard & Quinney, 1973; Schrager & Short, 1978; Sutherland, 1949), corporate crimes (Clinard & Yeager, 1980; Cullen, Maakestad, & Cavender, 1987; Hills, 1987; Michalowski & Kramer, 1987), occupational crimes (Coleman, 1989), and political crimes (Caulfield & Wonders, 1993; Tunnell, 1993; Turk, 1982). More recently, constructs of state-corporate crimes have been introduced (Kauzlarich & Kramer, 1993; Kramer, 1992). Following from this, others (Barak, 1990, 1991; Chambliss, 1989) have used white collar crime as a segue to reach yet another level of inquiry, which Chambliss (1989) called state-organized crime.

Barak (1990) has argued that the incorporation of state crimes within the boundaries of criminological investigation is the "logical extension of the inclusion of the behaviors of white-collar and corporate offenders into the traditional boundaries of criminological inquiry" (p. 272). With the exception of Barak (1990, 1991), Chambliss (1989), and Grabosky (1989), there have been few noteworthy works within the field of criminology which have specifically addressed the issue of state criminality.

Defining State Criminality

State crime can take a variety of forms, ranging from the theft of constitutional rights by agents of the state, such as with the COINTELPRO program waged by the FBI against numerous dissenting groups (see, e.g., Caulfield, 1991; Churchill & Vander Wall, 1990; Davis, 1992), to the intentional violation of international law, whereby one nation-state engages in harm-producing action against another nation-state, as with U.S. action against Cuba. As Barak (1991) notes, "crimes by the state . . . are usually far more subtle and covert. . . . [However], as contemporary data and analysis reveal . . . crimes by the state are more lethal and destructive than more traditional crimes committed against the state" (pp. 4-6).

In attempting to operationalize state criminality, there have generally been three competing arguments. The first type of argument centers around what has been commonly called a social harms perspective. Scholars using the social harms perspective have attempted to

transcend legalistic state definitions of crime in an attempt to place socially harmful acts which are not defined as crimes within the boundaries of criminological inquiry. Schwendinger and Schwendinger (1970), Barak (1990, 1991), Sellin (1938) and Tifft and Sullivan (1980) have all noted that the problem with limiting criminological investigation to categories of state defined criminal law lies in the fact that these laws often reflect the interests of those individuals creating law. As Kennedy (1970) notes, there has been a historical tendency for certain groups to define their own behavior as being beyond incrimination. Following from this, behaviors by the powerful, with consequences often far more severe than that of street crime, are generally excluded from consideration in the criminal law. With regard to terrorism, for instance, Herman (1987) notes that those in power define terms such as terrorism to exclude not only their own actions, but also the actions of their friends and client states. This consistent theme suggests that state defined criminal law, as constructed, is an inappropriate forum for the reduction of harm, due its inability to address all harmful behaviors.

However, these efforts to move outside the state definition of crime have been met with resistance from those who claim that social harms perspectives reflect nothing more than researchers' personal moral agenda (Shapiro, 1983). Others, such as Braithwaite (1985), have been more vehement in denouncing this approach. Braithwaite (1985) claims that "those who choose to study violations of 'politically defined human rights'" will deserve to be ignored for

"indulging their moralities in a social science that has no relevance for those who do not share that morality" (p. 18).

Be that as it may, as Michalowski and Kramer (1987) point out, neither the legalistic nor the social harms perspective provides clear guidance regarding why one should be chosen over the other. Furthermore, the contrast between the social harms and legalistic perspectives appears to be quite sharp. On one hand you have those who choose to dismiss the legalistic constructs of crime in favor of expanding the scope of inquiry to include socially harmful behavior which may not fall under any definition of criminal law. On the other hand are those such as Braithwaite (1985) who dismiss any attempt to transcend legally defined criminal law as being moralistic. Seeing as the traditional approach is no more value-free and objective, or less moralistic than a social harms approach, Braithwaite's (1985) argument falls short. More importantly, an examination of international law can include both perspectives, as it focuses on legalistic criteria which incorporates activities not generally considered criminal under nation-state specific law. Which brings me to the third perspective, the international law approach.

The international law perspective attempts to ameliorate this definitional problem, suggesting that criminologists turn to broader constructs of criminal behavior based on principles of human rights as defined by various international treaties and covenants (e.g., Barak, 1990, 1991, 1994; Tifft & Sullivan, 1980). This approach is particularly sound when the nation-state in question has codified the

covenant or treaty.

The issue as to whether or not the actions of the powerful or, as I address, the activities of nation-states should fall under criminological scrutiny can be addressed by first asking the question of whether or not these actions violate some form of international law. In answering this question, the demonstration of the existence of a set of codified and legally binding principles which govern the interaction of states certainly advances the argument that states are, in fact, subject to law. Barak (1990) echoes this sentiment by stating that criminologists should look to higher criteria, such as international laws, covenants, and treaties when studying the harmful behaviors of nation-states. This approach allows the researcher to use a set of codified and internationally recognized standards to classify behavior as criminal in nature. In short, the use of international law allows the researcher to transcend narrowly defined state law, (which usually does not recognize its own behavior as criminal in nature), placing the activities of a state within the boundaries of criminological inquiry.

International Criminal Law and Terrorism

With regard to international criminal law, there are several codified covenants and treaties which strictly prohibit the use of international terrorism, either by individuals or by nation-states. The specific documents I will examine here which legally prohibit acts of international terrorism include the Charter of the

Organization of American States (OAS), the United Nations' Declaration on Principles of International Law Concerning Friendly Relations and Cooperation Among States, and the United Nations' Charter.²

With reference to the OAS Charter, the 18th and 21st articles prohibit unwarranted acts of aggression such as terrorism, although the word terrorism is not explicit in either article. For instance, article 18 of the OAS (cited in Ball, 1969) states that

no state or group of states has the right to intervene, directly or indirectly, for any reason whatever, in the internal or external affairs of any other State. The foregoing principle prohibits not only armed force but also any other form of interference or attempted threat against the personality of the State or against its political, economic and cultural elements (p. 617).

Additionally, article 18 of the OAS Charter prohibits armed force in state interference, and article 21 (Ball, 1969) specifically states "the American States bind themselves in their international relations not to have recourse to the use of force, except in the case of self-defense in accordance with existing treaties or in fulfillment thereof" (p. 617).

Clearly, articles 18 and 21 of the OAS Charter bind member states in an agreement of non-violence, except in self defense. Additionally, the cultural, political, and economic elements of the member states of the OAS are clearly sovereign. The sovereignty of OAS member states certainly questions the authority of the U.S. to intervene in Cuba's political and economic affairs, particularly in the light of anti-communist fervor which has historically been used to legitimize U.S. terrorism directed towards Cuba. Finally, the

element of non-intervention found in article 18 provides guidance as to the legitimacy of U.S. aggression toward Cuba over the past thirty-five years. Clearly, the U.S. does not have the legal authority, according to the OAS Charter, to intervene in the political, economic or cultural affairs of Cuba.

While the OAS Charter is a regional one which encompasses the nations of North America, Central America, the Caribbean, and South America, the United Nations is more global in scope. According to the Charter of the United Nations (Riggs & Plano, 1994), all member states are obligated by Article 1 to "maintain international peace and security, and to that end: to take effective collective measures for the prevention and removal of threats to the peace, and for the suppression of acts of aggression and other breaches of the peace" (p. 314). Indeed, the Charter of the United Nations, according to Riggs and Plano (1994), attempts to promote peace among its member states, as clearly defined by article 51 which states that the use of force is legitimate only in member states' "inherent right of individual or collective self-defense if an armed attack occurs against a Member of the United Nations, until the Security Council has taken measures necessary to maintain international peace and security" (p. 324). Once again, it is clear that the use of force is justified only in acts of self defense, and that the sovereignty of nation-states is to be respected by all members of the United Nations.

According to Lahey and Sang (1975), the United Nations'

Declaration on Principles of International Law Concerning Friendly Relations and Cooperation Among States affirms that "no state may use or encourage the use of economic, political or any other type of measures to coerce another State in order to obtain from it the subordination of the exercise of its sovereign rights and to secure from it advantages of any kind" (p. 202). Furthermore, as Lahey and Sang (1975) note, this article also specifies that "no state shall organize, assist, foment, finance, incite or tolerate subversive, terrorist, or armed activities directed towards the violent overthrow of the regime of another state" (p. 202).

Certainly, the United Nations' Declaration on Principles of International Law Concerning Friendly Relations and Cooperation Among States prohibits the use of terrorism, and seemingly, provides clear guidance as to whether or not U.S. aggression toward Cuba is, in fact, considered legal under international law. However, as discussed previously, the issue of clear legal guidance as to what is and is not terrorism has become twisted in the interpretation of the law through the ideologically-tainted lenses of U.S. officials, as the words terrorism and terror, according to Mallison and Mallison (1975), "are not words which refer to a well defined and clearly identified set of factual events" (p. 67). As Mallison and Mallison (1975) add, terrorism and terror do not have "any widely accepted meaning in legal doctrine" (p. 67). With this in mind, I will now examine the double standard the U.S. has embraced when condemning acts of state-sponsored terrorism with reference to international

law.

Terrorism by Any Other Name

According to Shank (1987), "terrorism has been condemned by the world's nations as a criminal act" (p. 61). The United States' condemnation of terrorism as a criminal act was quite evident in former President Reagan's war on terrorism which he began shortly after the inception of his first term. This war on terrorism, however, would take a particular form, a form not at all consistent across either actions or consequences. Herman (1982), refers to terrorist actions waged by nation-states, usually directed at independence or revolutionary movements as wholesale terrorism. Retail terrorism, according to Herman (1982) refers to those terrorist acts committed against governments by independence or revolutionary movements. Herman's (1987) distinction between wholesale and retail terrorism is critical in application here in that the war on terrorism was primarily concerned with retail terrorism, while ignoring the much larger issue of wholesale terrorism, particularly the wholesale terrorist activities the U.S. had engaged in. For example, U.S. foreign policy, throughout the latter half of the 20th century, consisted of both overt and covert forms of terrorism. Overt action consisted of events such as the U.S. military air strikes against Libya. The more insidious forms of terrorism, however, were covert and, as the Iran-Contra hearings demonstrated, without democratically approved support. Covert activities initiated by the CIA included

the overthrow of Chile's Allende, U.S. action to denationalize Brazilian industry, and a host of other activities throughout the Western Hemisphere. These latter actions include U.S. aggression toward the nation-states of Central America; most notably, Nicaragua and El Salvador.

Interestingly, forms of international law are supposedly designed to protect nation-states from such intervention. Former Secretary of State George Shultz (as cited in Shank, 1987) claimed that the law is

a weapon on our side and it is up to us to use it to its maximum extent. . . A state which supports terrorist or subversive attacks against another state, or which supports or encourages terrorist planning and other activities within its own territory, is responsible for such attacks. Such conduct can amount to an ongoing armed aggression against the other state under international law (p. 51).

The semantics surrounding the word terrorism are quite fascinating indeed. In the traditional sense, terrorism, according to Herman (1982), refers to "a mode of governing or of opposing government, by intimidation" (p. 21; emphasis in original). In terms of U.S. policy, however, terrorism refers to only those acts of warfare committed against democratic states by totalitarian regimes, which is clearly illustrated in how Shultz (as cited in Shank, 1987) defined the parameters of who is and is not a terrorist when he claimed that

we do not practice terrorism and we seek to build a world which holds no place for terrorist violence, a world in which human rights are respected by all governments, a world based on the rule of law. . . If freedom and democracy are the targets of terrorism, it is clear that totalitarianism is its ally (pp. 42-43).

Indeed, the placement of terrorism within the boundaries of

international law has been commonplace for the United States government over the past 15 years. Former President Ronald Reagan, for example, stated in a speech given to the American Bar Association in 1985, that he considered the governments of five countries as culpable in engaging in what he called serious state terrorism (Herman, 1987). Moreover, both former presidents Reagan and Bush would call upon international law when it would benefit the U.S. as nation-state, which was well evidenced by the air-strikes carried out by the U.S. against Libya. In the case of the air-strikes against Libya, for example, the U.S. claimed its activities were justifiable under article 51 of the United Nations Charter, as the U.S. was exercising its right to self defense through preemptive counterterrorist measures.

Although it is often said that governments respond to terrorism with counterterrorism, counterterrorism is still a form of terrorism. Nowhere is this fact more evident than in National Security Directive (NSDD) 138 which was implemented by former President Ronald Reagan to justify the air-strikes on Libya. NSDD 138 stated that the United States could, in fact, use preemptive strikes on known terrorist groups (Shank, 1987).

However, the willingness of the United States to use preemptive, or counterterrorist measures, as was claimed, was in violation of international law. As Shank (1987) notes, the Reagan administration used this appeal to international law in an attempt

. . . to satisfy the need to legitimate its unilateral armed

interventions to the NATO powers, to assuage world opinion, and to avoid destabilizing an international system which has, after all, made possible the mechanism of unequal exchange, a process favoring the accumulation of capital in the imperial centers. In practice, however, the administration shows no interest in acting in accord with international law, preferring instead to rationalize its actions in accord with its perceived national security interests (p. 49).

Shank's (1987) analysis of NSDD 138, as well as the Reagan administration's attempts of rationalizing its own terrorist policies, is particularly insightful in the larger historical context of U.S. sponsored terrorism. Indeed, the United States has rarely examined its own policies with reference to international law, except in those instances in which this law was on its side.

In summary, then, the definitional debate between the legalistic and social harms approach may be ameliorated by turning to an international law perspective. Using international law as the mechanism to classify behavior as criminal for the purposes of study is the approach which will be taken in this thesis. As I have already noted, there are numerous codified treaties which obligates members to refrain from using terrorist acts against others. However, there is a great deal of hypocrisy by U.S. officials when examining the actions of the U.S. in this same light. Before moving to a more comprehensive operationalization of terrorism for the purposes of this study, I will revisit the issue of the theoretical framework in which I will be working.

An Institutional Approach for Studying State Crimes

While this research will focus on the role of various U.S.

governmental agencies (particularly the CIA) and their criminal sponsoring of terrorist acts against Cuba, little attention will be given to the individual actors responsible for these crimes. Rather than focussing on attributing proximate personal blame for these crimes, this research will be concerned with what others outside the discipline of criminology (e.g., Albert, 1994; Chomsky, 1992a, 1992b; and Herman, 1982) have termed an institutional theory.

In using an institutional approach, this research will focus on systemic causes of trends and events. For example, Chapter II will examine the manner in which terrorism has been defined by the U.S. and its client states, paying particular attention to the role of ideology and the avoidance of self incrimination. Chapter III, furthermore, will emphasize the historical, political and economic context in which these crimes were committed. While it is true that the crimes and actors responsible for them will be discussed in Chapter III in relation to a specific definitional framework of terrorism, they will be explained as facts needing explanation as opposed to explanations in and of themselves. Indeed, the primary reason I have opted not to focus on the individual actors is that these crimes have persisted for nearly 35 years. It would be difficult at best to generate any theory as to the longevity of these crimes considering the turnover in individuals within these organizations. Quite simply, there has been a constant assault on Cuba which has outlived (quite literally in some cases) the actors responsible for creating the initial policy directives. Therefore, I will examine the

sociopolitical and economic pressures on these organizations which have given rise to these crimes.

Albert (1994) succinctly summarizes the approach of an institutional theory. Albert (1994) states that

in an institutional theory, personalities and personal motivations enter the discussion only as a result of more basic factors. The personal actions culminating in some event do not serve as explanation. The theory explains phenomena via roles, incentives, and dynamics of underlying institutions. An institutional theory doesn't ignore human actions, but the point of an institutional explanation is to move from personal factors to institutional ones. If the particular people hadn't been there to do it, someone else would have (p. 85).

The institutional factors which have been pertinent to this research center around the context in which the CIA was created, particularly the role of the Cold War, and economics. Indeed, I will demonstrate in Chapter III that the Castro/Guevara led revolution in Cuba provided the context in which the institutional goals of the U.S. (read: investment climate) were threatened to the degree that the CIA was given carte blanche to wage a terrorist campaign against Cuba. Furthermore, I will argue that the CIA itself is an organization whose means in accomplishing their goals with respect to Cuba (read: the removal of Castro from power) were illegal. In the meanwhile, however, I will address the methodology by which this research will be conducted.

Methods

This section presents the methodology by which this research will be conducted. The approach to this research will be a

socio-historical case study of terrorism directed towards Cuba by the United States government. Yin's (1989) definition of a case study will guide this research. Yin (1989) defines a case study as "an empirical inquiry that: investigates a contemporary phenomenon within its real-life context; when the boundaries between phenomenon and context are not clearly defined; and in which multiple data sources are used" (p. 23).

The real-life context which Yin (1989) speaks of includes both temporal and spatial elements. Placing these events within their proper spatial and temporal context creates a continuum which Yin (1989) calls a chain of evidence. It is this chain of evidence which will allow me to investigate current and past U.S. violations of international law which are relevantly positioned in time and space.

Temporally, 1959 to the present is the period within which transgressions against Cuba will be examined. Nineteen fifty-nine is an important starting date because this was the year in which Batista fled Cuba and Castro's revolutionary forces seized control. Castro's revolution occurred in the height of anti-communist sentiment, in the years immediately following the Korean War, the McCarthy era, and the height of the Cold War. Since this time, the United States has engaged in a number of actions which violate international law, culminating in the 1992 United Nations' condemnation of the U.S. economic embargo placed on Cuba which has been in effect since 1964.

Spatially, the Castro and Guevara revolution established a communist state a mere 90 miles from Key West, Florida. The fear by

U.S. officials that the establishment of a communist state in such close proximity to the U.S. led the U.S. to take many measures attempting to contain further hemispheric infection (U.S. Senate, 1975). The 1961 CIA-sponsored Bay of Pigs invasion, which occurred only two years after Castro's revolution, is just one example of many illegal U.S. actions attempted to contain Cuban communism. Indeed, many U.S. actions cited throughout this study were often delineated by the United States as preventative anti-communist inoculation measures during the Cold War.

Triangulation and Data Sources

In this study, triangulation will be used in both the theory and data. Denzin (1989) defines four types of triangulation: (1) data triangulation, which has three subtypes--time, space and person; (2) investigator triangulation which includes the use of multiple observers; (3) methodological triangulation which can entail within method triangulation and between method triangulation; (4) theory triangulation which consists of multiple rather than single perspectives in relation to the same set of objects (p. 237).

Of these four triangulation methods, only data and theory triangulation will be used in this thesis. Investigator triangulation will not be used as I am the sole investigator on this project. The reason why methodological triangulation will not be used lies in the fact that I have opted to use the methods consistent with those of a qualitatively based historical case study.

The use of theoretical triangulation is warranted since there is sparse criminological literature pertinent to the issue of U.S. terrorism directed towards Cuba. In addition to the previously mentioned criminological theory, I will also use the theoretical works of Chomsky (1982, 1985, 1987, 1992a, 1992b, 1993), Herman (1982, 1987), Chomsky and Herman (1979), and Purdue (1989). In making use of interdisciplinary theoretical models to explain this phenomenon, I hope to, as Denzin (1989) states, widen the theoretical framework as empirical materials are interpreted. Data triangulation will be used in this study with reference to the sources used. The data used in this study will include government documents, international documents, secondary accounts, and finally, recent secondary analysis. Data from government documents will primarily be drawn from State Department releases and Senate Hearing reports. International documents will include United Nations treaties and charters, and regional charters such as the OAS. Secondary accounts will include interviews with former CIA officials and operatives, as well as statements made by former presidents of the United States, and Che Guevara. Recent secondary analysis will include the works of Chomsky (1982, 1985, 1987, 1992a, 1992b, 1993), Herman (1982, 1987), and Falk (1988).

In summary, then, this research will examine U.S. state-sponsored terrorism directed at Cuba from 1959 to the present. The method by which this research will be conducted will be consistent with that of a socio-historical case study as defined by Yin (1989).

The theoretical approach guiding this research will rely on a critical perspective, defining state-sponsored terrorism as the violation of international law. Finally, although the behaviors of certain individuals may be used for the purpose of fully understanding what has occurred, no attempt will be made to proximate personal blame. From this, emphasis will be placed on the functioning of the organization(s) in question. I will, however, use an institutional approach to examine the sociopolitical and economic factors which have influenced these events. In short, the level of analysis will focus on organizational behavior and the institutions which have influenced these behaviors. What follows in the next chapter is the operationalization of terrorism for the purposes of this research, as well as an examination of Herman's (1987) mechanisms of state-sponsored terrorism.

CHAPTER II

DEFINING TERRORISM

Terrorism; What Is It? The Reader Wants to Know

In an attempt to more critically examine the specifics of what terrorism is, Herman (1982) advances the argument that there are, in fact, two types of terrorism: wholesale and retail. Wholesale terrorism, according to Herman (1982), refers to terrorist actions waged by nation-states, usually directed at independence or revolutionary movements. Retail terrorism, on the other hand, refers to the commonly accepted definition of terrorism, which includes such groups as the Palestinian Liberation Organization (PLO), Red Brigade, Irish Republican Army (IRA), African National Congress (ANC) or the Nicaraguan Sandanistas. As Herman (1982) correctly notes, there is a tremendous difference between these types of terrorism, both in terms of the resources available to those so labeled, as well as the perceived extent of involvement in terrorism. The activities of organizations such as the PLO, IRA, Red Brigade, and Sandanistas are unequivocally denounced by the United States, while terrorist activities supported by democratic nation-states such as the United States go virtually unnoticed (e.g., U.S. support of the Contras in their terrorist actions against the Sandanistas). As Barak (1990) points out, there has been a selective examination of terrorism, a selectivity which "refers not only to countries emphasized and neglected, but

to the various forms of terrorism committed" (p. 14).

Certainly, ideology plays a crucial role in who is or is not defined as a terrorist. Purdue (1989) notes that the ideological war on terrorism has been closely linked to anticommunist sentiment. A passage from the Senate Subcommittee of the Senate Committee of the Judiciary (1975, cited in Purdue, 1989) is particularly insightful, as they state that

in previous hearings, it has been established that the Communists, despite their repeated declarations that they do not engage in terrorist activities, do in fact provide training and logistical and financial support for terrorist groups...This is true of the Moscow Communists, the Maoists, the Trotskyists and the Castro Communists. Indeed, a majority of those groups which are actively engaged in terrorism consider themselves Marxist-Leninists of some kind (p. 11).

Thus, according to the United States Senate, the reader is asked to consider that the majority of terrorist activities are financed and supported by Marxist-Leninists. However, this narrowly construed and ideologically motivated definition of terrorism paints terrorism as something which comes primarily from fragmented groups of individuals supported by communist governments. Furthermore, the ideological framework in which the United States has defined terrorism excludes its own activities, as well as the activities of its client states from consideration. Purdue (1989) notes that the term terrorism, as well as its negative connotation, is often emphasized when discussing the alleged activities of those possessing enemy ideologies.

As Chomsky (1992b) notes, there are two things which define terrorism, "first it's done against states, not by states against

their citizens, and its done by them, not by us" (p. 50, emphasis added). Herman (1987) notes that the actions of the ANC, IRA, PLO and other traditionally defined terrorist groups are often done in the context of reacting to state-sponsored repression. However, actions by the state directed at groups of individuals, which are often more harmful, are not defined as terrorism.

Certainly, there is difficulty in formulating a single definition of the word terrorism which is acceptable to everyone, as one person's freedom fighter may be considered a terrorist by others. Indeed, what is called terrorism seems to be dependent upon one's point of view. Certainly, actions such as car bombings, airplane hijackings, assassination attempts, kidnapping, mail bombs and the taking of hostages are acts which are, generally speaking, condemned by all. However, these activities encompass only a fraction of all terrorist acts and harms, particularly if one considers broader definitions which move beyond sensationalized stereotypes of terrorism.

As mentioned earlier, similar actions with similar consequences are not always given the same label. Jenkins (1974) points out that the use of the word terrorism often "implies a moral judgement, and if one party can successfully attach the label terrorist to its opponent, then it has indirectly persuaded others to adopt its moral viewpoint" (p. 14). Jenkins (1974) then adds that "each nation wants to proscribe, and therefore define international terrorism in a way that will include those acts which it considers terrorism -

particularly those for which it may be a likely target" (p. 21). Purdue (1989) adds that, "ultimately, terrorism is a label of defamation, a means of excluding those so branded from human standing. . . it is a means of organizing both the perceptions and reactions of others in the world community" (p. 4).

Jenkins (1974) notes that the United States has consistently resisted definitions of terrorism in international law which move beyond what Herman (1982) has termed retail terrorism, and has generally worked to maintain a narrowly defined, ideologically tainted construct of terrorism which excludes the actions of the United States and its client states. For example, according to Bassiouni (1975), in 1972 the United States submitted the United States Draft Convention For the Prevention and Punishment of Certain Acts of International Terrorism to the United Nations General Assembly. According to this Draft Convention submitted by the United States, the actions of governments committed towards its citizenry, and the actions of governments directed at the citizenry of other nations is not explicitly prohibited. This Draft Convention, furthermore, addresses terrorism in terms of individuals committing various acts such as kidnapping, murder, or the causation of serious bodily harm against another government's officials.

For purposes of this thesis, I will use the definition of terrorism provided by the government of Haiti to the United Nations General Assembly. According to Jenkins (1974), the government of Haiti proposed that "any threat or act of violence committed by a person or

group of persons on foreign territory or in any other place under international jurisdiction against any person with a view to achieving a political objective" be considered a terrorist act (p. 22). As Jenkins (1974) points out, "this is also a fair definition of war" (p. 22).

Naturally, when terrorism is broadly defined as such, the immediate inclination is, by some, to reject such definitions outright, particularly if such a definition encompasses acts in which they have historically engaged. Purdue (1989) astutely observes that it is "plausible that a Habermas-style legitimation crisis may result if and when forms of state violence are redefined as institutional terrorism" (p. 8). Quite simply, terrorist acts committed by nation-states which are cloaked as counter-terrorism may face, as Purdue (1989) notes, "broad-scale rejection" when the state is no longer able to maintain a false distinction between the two (p. 8).

In terms of the amount of harm done by various acts, however, Mallison and Mallison (1975) note that the use of military tactics such as aerial bombardment during times of war, "causes much greater terror than the efforts of non-governmental terrorists" (p. 82). Speaking on the issue of aerial bombardment as a form of terrorism, Ambassador Charles W. Yost (cited in Mallison & Mallison, 1975) stated that there has been a historical double standard in that

when the Nazis bombed Warsaw or Rotterdam or Coventry, we called it "terror-bombing", but when we bomb North or South Vietnam we call it "protective reaction." Yet we are killing incomparably more people, including more wholly innocent civilians, than the Palestinian terror-

ists have killed in all these years. The fact is, of course, that there is a vast amount of hypocrisy on the subject of political terrorism. We all righteously condemn it - except when we ourselves or friends are engaging in it. Then we ignore it or gloss it over or attach to it tags like "liberation" or "defense of the free world" or "national honor" to make it seem something other than it is (p. 83).

While a complete analysis of the connections between terrorism and war are beyond the scope of this thesis, there are several reasons why I have chosen to operationalize terrorism in a manner which is consistent with the principle of aerial bombings and war. First and foremost, the language which is used in traditional Western definitions of terrorism (particularly by the United States) excludes the concept of states committing terrorist acts against civilians. As Chomsky (1992b) notes, this was not always the case, and terrorism, during the 18th century, was reserved for violent states which committed violent acts against its or other states' citizens. However, the perpetrators and victims of the word terrorism have become inverted in recent history, and the word terrorism has not been used in its original meaning. Second, a broader definition of terrorism places similar actions and consequences together in an attempt to sort through the semantics of Western definitions of terrorism, and call things what they really are. Chomsky (1992b) notes that

language is, after all, a tool for thought. If you debase the language, you debase the thought. I don't want to exaggerate this element of it, but it is one element, and one that's certainly consciously manipulated in order to introduce confusion and lack of perception. (pp. 49-50)

Third, as Mallison and Mallison (1975) note, the language used to define who and who is not a victim of terrorism, as well as a

continued double standard in the use of the word terrorism, may have racist implications.

Mallison and Mallison (1975) note that "the Vietnamese, and other South-East Asians, along with the Palestinians, and other South-West Asians as well as North Africans are functionally the present day North American Indians" (p. 83). Mallison and Mallison (1975) then add that

they may be killed with impunity and without suggestion of guilt. The same treatment applied to European settlers or their descendants, such as the white Rhodesians or the Zionists in Palestine, would be regarded as genocide (p. 84).

With respect to the historical treatment of Native Americans within the U.S., Takaki (1993) notes that the "colonists quickly justified their violence by demonizing their enemies" (p. 43). However, the transference of one's own negative tendencies to another group is not something new. While Native Americans were seen as unruly, "God-less" savages, Takaki (1993) notes that the atrocities committed by the civilized whites against the Native Americans, were, in fact savage. It is in this light, then, that Native Americans became an enemy worthy of indiscriminate killing. In much the same manner, the indiscriminate killing of the "God-less" communists of South East Asia was also justified. Finally, Purdue (1989) states "expressed polemically, the good guys are free enterprisers, democratic, Christian, and civilized. The bad guys are communists, Marxists, Islamic fundamentalists and assorted crazies" (p. 9). In short, terrorism is a term reserved for what the bad guys do.

Fourth, Herman (1987) notes that the actions of terrorists are often portrayed as indiscriminate (or random) killings in which no concern is given to whether or not the victims are innocent bystanders. Herman (1987) states that "this is presumably less moral than non-random killing, and the claim is used to lend an aura of evil to terrorist and benignness to the other (frequently) state killers" (p. 4). Certainly, if one uses the amount of indiscriminate killing as a measure of terrorism, the definition provided by the Haitian government makes the indiscriminate carpet bombings conducted over rural South-East Asia during the Vietnam War acts of terrorism as well.

Finally, the definition of terrorism provided by the Haitian government provides both a comprehensive single standard, as well as a nondiscriminatory conception of terrorism which defines terrorism in terms of acts committed and harms done, as opposed to a definition based on power alone.

What follows is a discussion of Herman's (1987) mechanisms of terrorism. Herman's (1987) concern is with four conceptual mechanisms of terrorism, which are: (1) supplying repression, (2) subversion, (3) invasion, and (4) rehabilitating fascists. Although the activities of the CIA with respect to Cuba fall neatly into only three of Herman's (1987) categories of state-sponsored terrorism (i.e., supplying repression, subversion and invasions), I will briefly discuss all four mechanisms of state-sponsored terrorism in the following section. However, the fourth category, rehabilitating

fascists, will not be discussed in the application in Chapter III, as I have found little evidence of this occurring with regards to CIA involvement in Cuba. Having said this, I will discuss Herman's (1987) mechanisms of state-sponsored terrorism in the order listed, as the degree of overt involvement increases from supplying repression to actual invasions.

The Mechanisms of Terrorism

The typical image of a terrorist, as depicted by U.S. media coverage, is usually that of an individual working to advance the cause of an extremist group. The tools of destruction for these individuals are often bombs placed in locations where innocent persons are likely to be injured. However, as Herman (1982) notes, these are the images and actions of retail terrorists. The mechanisms of terrorism for retail terrorists, according to Herman (1987) kill lesser amounts of people using less technologically advanced methods. Herman (1987) states that wholesale terrorists on the other hand, have vast amounts of resources, person-power, and technologically advanced equipment to kill or harm far greater numbers of people than their retail terrorist counterparts. While the image of a retail terrorist bombing incites fear in most, the methods of state-sponsored terrorism have gone largely unnoticed. The mechanisms by which nation-states engage in terrorist activities, according to Herman (1987) include the use of any or all of the following categories: supplying repression, subversion, invasions and rehabilitating

fascists. Although these mechanisms often have substantial overlap and are often used in concert, I will discuss each one in turn with regard to their distinguishing characteristics.

Supplying repression, as defined by Herman (1987), encompasses "the buildup, financing, arming, and training of Third World police, intelligence, and military personnel" (p. 13). With respect to Cuba, these activities include supplying Cuban dissidents with the materials necessary to sabotage key economic installations.

Subversion tactics, according to Herman (1987) include the use of "actions taken to discredit and destabilize opposed governments, including the use of disinformation, economic pressure and harassment, manipulating the institutional environment of the victim by bribery and the discriminatory use of aid, and encouraging and supporting conspiracies and coups" (p. 12). Certainly, the mechanism of subversion, as defined by Herman (1987) includes many subcategories, such as the economic embargo placed on Cuba, the assassination plots which were designed to inspire a coup, and the dissemination of disinformation by U.S. officials.

Invasions are defined by the Random House College Dictionary (1988) as "the act or instance of invading or entering as an enemy, especially by an army" (p. 701).³ With respect to Cuba, the infamous Bay of Pigs Invasion was the most overt and obvious form of state-sponsored terrorism the U.S. has engaged in. As I will demonstrate later, this invasion was likely the result of failed assassination attempts (supplying repression) and failed attempts to

subvert the Cuban government.

Rehabilitating fascists, according to Herman (1987) began shortly after World War II when the U.S. "protected and positioned for Cold War Services" many Nazi war criminals (p. 11). Prouty (1992) also claims that many Nazi intelligence specialists were secretly transported from the Ukraine at the end of World War II on U.S. military planes. These individuals, by Herman's (1987) account, were protected from prosecution during the Nuremberg trials, given fabricated documents, and relocated throughout the world. In fact, Herman (1987) cites a former CIA analyst's description of Thailand's Phibum Sonkram as the "first pro-Axis dictator to regain power after the war" (p. 11). Indeed, the rehabilitation of fascists after World War II was an integral part of a much larger interest of the United States, namely containing Soviet expansionism during the Cold War. Clearly, the Cold War, with the conflict between capitalist democracy and communism has driven much of the terrorist activities of the U.S. since the end of World War II. However, there is no clear link between this mechanism and U.S./Cuba relations, therefore this mechanism will not be discussed further in this research.

Clearly, the mechanisms of terrorism, as outlined by Herman (1987), do not always represent neat categories into which all forms of state-sponsored terrorism fall. Indeed, these mechanisms, upon closer scrutiny, become intricately woven and inseparable in the case of Cuba, as they were often done in concert. Nevertheless, I will attempt to designate the activities in question to those mechanisms

they most closely resemble while attempting to maintain the integrity of Herman's (1987) original work.

As was mentioned earlier, other criminologists, (Barak, 1990, 1991; Kennedy, 1970; Schwendinger & Schwendinger, 1970; Sellin, 1938; Tifft & Sullivan, 1980) have noted that there are problems in investigating the actions of those who define criminal law, as the law often reflects their interests. Following from this, I have decided that using a legalistic framework may not be the most appropriate method to examine the phenomenon of state-sponsored terrorism.

From this, I have chosen to conceptualize terrorism in a nondiscriminatory manner using a single standard applicable to the acts of nation-states against citizens which aims to achieve a political objective. Terrorism, therefore, will be examined in terms of the amount of harm done, as opposed to acts which are ideologically legitimate from the standpoint of the perpetrator. Furthermore, the issue as to whether or not these acts are criminal in nature lies in the international covenants and treaties previously discussed which strictly prohibit acts of terrorism. Finally, Herman's (1987) mechanisms of wholesale terrorism will provide the theoretical framework in which U.S. aggression toward Cuba will be placed.

CHAPTER III

THE MECHANISMS OF STATE TERROR

Introduction to the Chapter

What follows in this chapter is an examination of the rationale for studying U.S. sponsored terrorism against Cuba, as well as an examination of specific terrorist acts. There are five principal propositions set forth in this chapter.

As was mentioned in Chapter I, there is a historical double standard employed by the U.S. in defining what constitutes state-sponsored terrorism, and this process of transference will be examined first. Second, the historical context in which the U.S. government allowed the CIA to engage in terrorist activities will be examined, with particular emphasis on the perceived threats posed from a communist Cuba. Third, the means by which the U.S. government attempted to eliminate this threat will be addressed. In short, the CIA was the predominant vehicle used to accomplish these goals. Fourth, the issue of accountability will be addressed as to provide an understanding of the organizational mechanisms which absolve individual actors. However, as mentioned in Chapter I, the focus of this research is not necessarily the individual actors responsible for carrying out these crimes, therefore, this issue is only discussed in larger organizational terms. Finally, Herman's (1987) mechanisms of state-sponsored terrorism will be documented and

discussed in their order of increasing involvement, beginning with the covert activities of the CIA to supply repression and ending with the Bay of Pigs invasion.

A Case Study in Transference

The justification for examining the United States and Cuba is perhaps best given by Chomsky (1992a) when he states that "in respected scholarship, U.S. terrorism against Cuba has been excised from the record in a display of servility that would impress the most dedicated totalitarian" (p. 149). Elsewhere, Chomsky (1987) notes that

a twenty year war has been waged against Cuba. Cuba has probably been the target of more international terrorism than any other country, and, therefore, in the American Ideological system it is regarded as the source of international terrorism, exactly what Orwell would have predicted (p. 328).

Certainly, there has been little scholarly research done in reference to terrorism committed against Cuba, notwithstanding the large amounts of work done about terrorist acts committed by Cuba (for one such example see Sterling, 1981). Herman (1987) succinctly summarizes the belief that Cuba is not the recipient of terrorism when he states that "the attacks on Cuba by the United States provide a remarkable case study in multi-dimensional state terror combined with the process of 'transference' --that is, accusing Cuba of doing precisely what the United States is doing to Cuba" (p. 9; emphasis in original).

Finally, Barak (1990) states that there is much work to be done regarding the problem of state criminality, as well as re-examining

its scope. With reference to state sponsored terrorism, Barak (1990) notes that some terrorist acts have been selectively examined. This selectivity, according to Barak (1990) "refers not only to countries emphasized and neglected, but to the various forms of terrorism committed" (p. 14). In point of fact, Barak's (1990) observation of the neglect with respect to the various forms of terrorism closely parallels Herman's (1982) call to more critically examine the mechanisms of state-sponsored terrorism.

The Cold War: Pretext for Terrorism

Shortly after World War II, the United States and the former Soviet Union began another war-the "Cold War". This war was an ideological one, pitting communism against capitalism and democracy. According to Prouty (1992), this war was "an alternative, all-new type of invisible war to be waged under the cloak of propaganda, black budgets, and secrecy" (p. 7). Interestingly enough, however, the invisibility of this war was due to the fact that the battle fields were often in Semi- Peripheral (i.e., Third World) countries. Aside from the Korean war, and the conflict in Vietnam, these battlefields have not received much attention.

Arguably, from the standpoint of officials in Washington, the Cold War was designed to protect U.S. citizens from an invading communist ideology. However, one could also argue that it was designed to foster and protect U.S. economic interests. In point of fact, the goals of protecting friendly investment climates for U.S.

corporations, as well as U.S. wealth can readily be seen in the former head of the U.S. State Department's planning staff George Kennan's thoughts on the matter in Policy Planning Study of 23 February 1948 when he stated that

we have about 50% of the world's wealth, but only 6.3% of its population...In this situation, we cannot fail to be the object of envy and resentment. Our real task in the coming period is to devise a pattern of relationship which will permit us to maintain this position of disparity without positive detriment to our national security. To do so, we will have to dispense with all senti-mentality and day-dreaming; and our attention will have to be concentrated everywhere on our immediate national objectives. We need not deceive ourselves that we can afford today the luxury of altruism and world-benefaction. . . We should cease to talk about vague and unreal objectives such as human rights, the raising of living standards, and democratization. The day is not far off when we are going to have to deal in straight power concepts. The less we are then hampered by idealistic slogans, the better (cited in Chomsky, 1985, p. 48).

Kennan's statement clearly illustrates typical concerns that U.S. officials had during the era when the Cold War started, and nicely elucidates the conflict between the commitment to human rights and democracy on the one hand, and the maintenance of the disparity between the U.S. and the rest of the world on the other hand. As Tifft and Markham (1991) note, "commitment to democracy, human rights, and people's needs is often in conflict with foreign policies established to promote and secure U.S. based corporate investment and to guarantee our entitlement to a disproportionate share of the world's wealth" (p. 129). The belief in entitlement to a disproportionate share of the world's wealth is not something new to the United States. Unquestionably, there has been a historical tendency for the U.S. to claim for itself those things which could be taken

from others, which is clearly illustrated by the early expansionism in the U.S., which, according to Takaki (1993), was "celebrated as manifest destiny" (p. 167).

During the initial years of the Cold War, the U.S. developed the means by which to contain the communist threat to its manifest destiny when the CIA was created. During the early years of the Cold War, the CIA was responsible for disrupting the governments, economic systems, and militaries of many countries throughout the Western Hemisphere, most notably Guatemala in 1954, Cuba in 1960, the Dominican Republic in 1961, Brazil in 1964, and Chile in 1970. All of these countries were the victims of covert CIA insurgency, often times under the protective auspices of the U.S. government. With respect to Cuba, the role of the Cold War is of importance not only for the ideological differences between the U.S. and Cuba, but also because Castro's revolution threatened many U.S. economic interests.

The initial concern by the U.S. over the Castro/ Guevara-led revolution centered around the fear that the revolutionary forces in Cuba would nationalize U.S. companies in Cuba. Although the U.S. attempted diplomatic relations with Cuba to assuage the fears of U.S. businesses, by March of 1960, according to Meyer and Szulc (1962), the relationship between the United States and Castro's Cuba had become severely strained. Meyer and Szulc (1962) claim that the explosion on board a French munitions ship in the Havana harbor which killed seventy Cubans was the turning point in U.S.--Cuban negotiations in 1960. Prior to the explosion of the La Coubre, the U.S. had been

conducting diplomatic negotiations with Castro in an attempt to resolve tensions created from Castro's desire to nationalize U.S. owned property in Cuba (Meyer & Szulc, 1962). Meyer and Szulc (1962) state that "the original expectation had been that the United States companies would lose their land under the provisions of the Agrarian Reform Law, and that in time the American-owned utilities would be taken over" (p. 43).

However, after the La Coubre explosion, Castro's revolutionary forces succeeded in seizing three U.S. owned sugar mills and the Moa Mining Company in Oriente Province, which was worth, according to Meyer and Szulc (1962), over \$75,000,000. Soon after this massive seizure of U.S. owned property, Major Che Guevara declared an "economic war with the great power of the North" (Meyers & Szulc, 1962, p. 43). Major Guevara (cited in Meyers and Szulc, 1962) asserted that an ideological and economic war would be undertaken by Cuba against the United States by claiming that

. . . to conquer something, we have to take it away from somebody, and it is well to speak clearly and not hide behind concepts that could be misinterpreted. This something that we have to conquer is the sovereignty of the country; it has to be taken away from that somebody who is called the monopoly . . . although monopolies in general have no country, they have at least a common definition: all the monopolies that have been in Cuba, that have profited from the Cuban land, have very close ties with the United States. This is to say that our economic war will be with the great power to the North . . . our road toward liberation will be founded in the victory over the monopolies, and concretely over the American monopolies (pp. 43-44).

Guevara also accused the U.S. of engaging in economic colonialism, economic slavery and grossly exploiting the people and resources

of Cuba, while warning that Cuba was not another Guatemala which could be easily overtaken (Meyers & Szulc, 1962). Certainly, Guevara made no attempt to mask the fact that he and Castro would not allow the Cuban revolution to be derailed by the United States.

It should be noted here that United States' relations with Cuba during the initial stages of the revolution were not entirely diplomatic. As Meyers and Szulc (1962) note, covert military operations against Cuba were initiated long before Guevara's threat of economic war. These activities, according to Meyers and Szulc (1962) included harassment flights over Cuba by U.S. military planes in which bombs were dropped on either crowds of people or utility plants. Therefore, Guevara and Castro's fears of an outright military retaliation by the United States were not without merit, particularly since they had decided to nationalize the U.S. owned companies. In fact, Meyers and Szulc (1962) point to the fact that Castro, almost prophetically, informed the Cuban people that an invasion by the U.S. was forthcoming.

Ball (1969) claims that the ultimate breaking point between the U.S. and Cuba was the result of Khrushchev's threat "to support Cuba with 'rocket firepower' against any United States aggression" (p. 142). In fact, the Cuban acceptance of Soviet support against U.S. aggression would eventually lead to the Cuban Missile Crisis. Nevertheless, the U.S., as will be demonstrated in the following section, relied heavily upon covert activities against the Cuban government to implement its foreign policy directives.

Covert Action as a Vehicle for Foreign Policy Implementation⁴

According to the United States Senate Select Committee which studied the alleged CIA assassination plots of foreign leaders, covert action is defined as "activity which is meant to further the sponsoring nation's foreign policy objectives, and to be concealed in order to permit that nation to plausibly deny responsibility" (p. 9).

Although the National Security Act of 1947 which established the CIA did not originally give this organization specific authority to engage in covert actions, the National Security Council (NSC) gave them this authority in a top secret directive upon their first meeting in 1947 (U.S. Senate, 1975). From 1955 to 1970, the basic authority of the CIA to engage in covert activities resided in NSC directive 5412/2 (U.S. Senate, 1975). The primary intent of these covert activities, as defined by NSC directive 5412/2 was to "counter, reduce, and discredit 'international communism' throughout the world in a manner consistent with United States' foreign and military policies" (U.S. Senate, p. 9). The means by which these covert activities were to be implemented included "any covert activities related to propaganda, economic warfare, political action (including sabotage, demolition, and assistance to resistance movements) and all activities compatible with the directive" (U.S. Senate, p. 9).

In short, the CIA was given carte blanche to wage a war on communism, as the CIA, was, in fact, held unaccountable for the larger consequences of its actions. Indeed, the CIA engaged in not only

ethically questionable activities during its formative years, but also activities which would be defined as illegal in any other context; namely conspiracy to assassinate a foreign head of state.⁵

Beyond Incrimination (Plausable Denial)

As Kennedy (1970) notes, there has been a historical tendency for certain groups to define their own behavior as being beyond incrimination. Behaviors by the powerful, with consequences often far more severe than that of those who are considered dangerous, are not defined as criminal in nature. Often times, these individuals also have the luxury of the doctrine of plausible denial. It is clear that the CIA has (and to a large extent still does) existed in an area which is beyond incrimination, protected by plausible denial.

Plausible denial refers to the notion that the actions of either individuals or groups can not be attributed to them, even if they have prior knowledge of such actions. With reference to the concept of plausible denial, the U.S. Senate committee (1975) concluded that "evidence before the committee clearly demonstrates that this concept, designed to protect the United States and its operatives from the consequences of disclosures, has been expanded to mask decisions of the President and his senior staff members" (p. 11).

Although the individuals responsible for the assassination plots were not held accountable under the doctrine of plausible denial, their knowledge of such plots, even if disclosed, would not have implicated them of having engaged in any illegal activity.

Prior to the 1975 Senate hearings on the alleged assassination plots of foreign leaders, there were no U.S. laws making it illegal to assassinate a foreign head of state outside the boundaries of the United States. Actually, according to this committee (U.S. Senate, 1975), the existing statute on this issue

made it a crime to kill, or to conspire to kill, a foreign official or foreign official guest while such a person is in the United States. However, there is no law which makes it a crime to assassinate, to conspire to assassinate, or to attempt to assassinate a foreign official while such official is outside the United States (p. 283).

Unquestionably, the extant law on the matter of conspiracy to assassinate, or the actual assassination of a foreign head of state, was very narrowly interpreted by the U.S. Senate as not to include those crimes of which the CIA had been accused. Subsequently, the U.S. Senate (1975) decided to recommend that conspiracies, attempts and actual assassinations by U.S. officials be declared illegal, irrespective of the geographic location of said official. However, both the doctrine of plausible denial and a narrowly interpreted law functioned to absolve the CIA from its alleged involvement in the assassination attempts of several heads of foreign states.

Although the attempted assassinations of Fidel Castro represent a clear incidence in which a crime was committed, the totality of the CIA-sponsored terrorist activities are much larger in scope. In the following section, I will apply Herman's (1987) mechanisms of terrorism to these CIA-sponsored acts.

Supplying Repression

As was mentioned earlier, Herman (1987) defines supplying repression as "the buildup, financing, arming, and training of Third World police, intelligence, and military personnel" (p. 13). With respect to U.S. involvement in supplying repression, these activities include those of Operation Mongoose, and the Cuban Coordinating Committee which were conducted in the early 1960s.

In November of 1962 the proposal for a major new covert offensive against Castro's Cuba was developed by former President Kennedy's assistants, Richard Goodwin and General Edward Lansdale. Goodwin and Lansdale were both experienced in counter-insurgency tactics developed by the CIA. The primary intent of Operation Mongoose, as developed by Goodwin and Lansdale, was to "use our available *** [sic] assets to help Cuba overthrow the Communist regime" (U.S. Senate, 1975, p. 139). In the following sections I will examine some of these counter-insurgency tactics designed to help the citizenry of Cuba overthrow Castro.

There were eventually 33 tasks designed for implementation under Operation Mongoose, which included a variety of activities ranging from intelligence collection to planning for "use of U.S. military force to support the Cuban popular movement", as well as the development of an "operational schedule for sabotage actions inside Cuba" (U.S. Senate, 1975, p. 142). The final task, Task 33, involved a plot to "incapacitate Cuban sugar workers during the harvest by the use of chemical warfare means" (U.S. Senate, 1975, p.

143).

It is unclear as to the extent to which these plots were carried out, as much of the information concerning the specificities of Operation Mongoose are still classified. However, evidence has surfaced that some of these plans did come to fruition. As Chomsky and Herman (1979) note, reports of subversive activities have been confirmed by others. Chomsky and Herman (1979) note that "according to a recent statement of a Canadian advisor to the Cuban government, as early as 1962 he was paid \$5,000 by a Defense Intelligence Agency representative to infect Cuban poultry with a viral disease" (p. 25). Chomsky (1982) also adds that

apart from the attempts to assassinate Castro, which are well known, these terrorist actions included attacks on fishing boats and Cuban civilian installations, and poisoning of crops and livestock-projects that were, in fact, very effective, apparently requiring the destruction of half a million pigs after an outbreak of African swine fever caused by U.S. based terrorists in what the U.N. Food and Agricultural Organization call the 'most alarming event of 1971' (p. 49).

In addition, Chomsky (1987) notes that

in 1987 it was revealed that one of the many terrorist operations mounted against Cuba took place at a particularly tense moment of the Cuban missile crisis; a CIA-dispatched terrorist team blew up a Cuban industrial facility with a reported death toll of 400 workers, an incident that might have set off a nuclear war (p. 113).

These accounts of sabotage are not that different from what was called for in the original plans of Operation Mongoose. Acts which were considered called for a major sabotage operation at a Cuban copper mine, as well as "blowing up bridges, to stop communications, and blowing up certain production plants" (U.S. Senate, 1975, p. 146).

Indeed, the tasks called for in Operation Mongoose were not only violent, but also innovative. One such innovative plan called for the dropping of leaflets within Cuba to encourage the citizenry to consider bounties on Communist leaders such as Castro. These dead or alive bounties ranged from \$5,000 for an informer to \$100,000 for government officials. As for the price on Castro's head, the bounty was 2 cents. This figure was designed "to denigrate Castro in the eyes of the Cuban population" (U.S. Senate, 1975, p. 144). Lansdale, however, claimed he shelved this plan personally, as he thought it was not something that could be seriously undertaken.

Shortly after the Cuban Missile crisis in 1963, Operation Mongoose was disbanded, and an interagency "Cuban Coordinating Committee" was established within the State Department (U.S. Senate, 1975). The disbandment of Operation Mongoose, however, did not include a total cessation of sabotage plans, as the Cuban Coordinating Committee soon began to evaluate possible courses of covert action which could be taken against Castro and Cuba.

According to the Senate Report (1975), the sabotage plans of the Cuban Coordinating Committee contrasted Operation Mongoose in the sense that the new efforts were designed to "nourish a spirit of resistance and disaffection which could lead to significant defections and other byproducts of unrest" (p. 173). Eventually, 13 major sabotage operations were approved in 1963, including plans to sabotage economic installations such as an electric plant, an oil refinery and a sugar mill (U.S. Senate, 1975, p. 173).

According to Herman (1982), the activities of the CIA-sponsored Cubans continued into the 1970s. The Cuban refugee terrorist network (CRN), which consists of an elite group of 100 to 200 hard-core ex-iles, was left to incorporate violence as a political strategy under the protective auspices of the U.S. government (Herman, 1982). This group is believed to be responsible for more than 28 bombings of Cuban Embassies and Missions, killing 6 people from 1973 to 1979 (Herman, 1982). Herman (1982) also notes that during this same period 14 economic facilities were sabotaged, as well as a commercial airliner, resulting in the deaths of 73 passengers, among which were the members of Cuba's gold medal fencing team. Finally, 8 individuals died between 1973 and 1979 as the direct result of individual bombings (Herman, 1982). The net loss of lives during this time period was 94.

The interesting thing about the CRN is that they were trained by the CIA in the 1960s in the arts of demolition and assassination. Herman (1982) claims that this CIA prodigy has never been disarmed, and has existed for nearly 30 years. The longevity of this group, as Herman (1982) notes, may very well have to do with the fact that "they are apparently killing the right people for the right people (DINA, the CIA perhaps), in which case the law ceases to function" (p. 69).

Indeed, the case of Orlando Bosch, who was a member of the CRN, well illustrates the reluctance of the U.S. to admonish those terrorists they sponsor. According to Herman (1982), Bosch was paroled by

the U.S. in 1972 after serving two years of a ten year sentence for a bombing attack, and subsequently left the U.S. in violation of his conditions of parole. Bosch then traveled to Venezuela, Chile, Nicaragua, Costa Rica, and the Dominican Republic before being arrested in 1974 for two more bombings in Caracas, Venezuela (Herman, 1982). Herman (1982) states that the Venezuelan government twice offered to extradite Bosch to U.S. officials for rearrest and incarceration, however, the U.S. government declined both times. Subsequently, according to Herman (1982), Bosch admitted to Venezuelan officials that he had participated in the bombing of the Cuban airliner in which 73 lives were lost. However, Herman (1982) claims that the then newly elected pro-Reagan Social Christian movement of Venezuela "shifted his trial to a military tribunal, which found him innocent of anything but faulty identification papers" (pp. 68-69).

In 1985 yet another case of the U.S. supplying repression against Cuba surfaced, as Cuban officials alleged that the U.S. had deliberately introduced the Dengue virus which causes a potentially fatal disease called Dengue hemorrhagic fever. In fact, the U.S. Department of State (1985) acknowledges that within three months 344,203 cases of Dengue fever were reported in Cuba, resulting in 116,146 hospitalizations and 159 deaths. Although the U.S. Department of State (1985) officially denied these allegations, there is evidence to suggest that the Dengue outbreak in 1981 may have been introduced by Cuban exiles working for the United States.

The crux of the Cuban claim that the virus had been

deliberately introduced to Cuba relied upon the testimony given by convicted terrorist Eduardo Arocena. Eduardo Arocena's (U.S. Department of State, 1985) testimony states that

the mission of the group I headed was to take certain germs and to introduce them into Cuba so that they could be used against the Soviets and against the Cuban economy in order to begin what was called the chemical.[sic] warfare. The results of this were not as expected. We had thought that they were to be used against the Soviet forces but they were used against our people and we did not agree with that (p. 3).

The U.S. Department of State (1985) maintained that the Dengue virus had not been introduced to Cuba, but was a result of insufficient mosquito control on the part of the Cuban government. Furthermore, the U.S. Department of State (1985) told the Cuban government that their accusations were baseless and should be retracted at once. Cuba, however, claimed that the Dengue virus was only one of many biological attacks on the nation of Cuba, and was not at all inconsistent with other attacks and plots against either Castro or the nation-state of Cuba. The Cuban government (cited in U.S. Department of State, 1985) claimed that within a period of

three years, five serious diseases and epidemics have struck Cuban livestock, crops and people. These are swine fever, blue mold (tobacco), red rot (sugar cane), hemorrhagic dengue and conjunctivitis. These calamities have caused considerable material and human damage (p. 3).

Clearly, both the U.S. and Cuba differ in their analysis of the Dengue outbreak. However, in so much as the U.S. Department of State (1981) denied U.S. responsibility for the Dengue fever epidemic, it did not address whether or not any other forms of biological warfare had been directed towards Cuba.

In summary, then, the U.S. has been accused of, and has admitted conspiring to, supply repression against Cuba. Undoubtedly, the effects of those actions which were carried out have had a negative impact on not only the economy of Cuba, but on its citizenry as well. More importantly, however, these acts have caused indiscriminate harm to persons, and certainly would be considered terrorist in nature had they occurred in most any other context.

Subversion

Subversion tactics, according to Herman (1987) include "actions taken to discredit and destabilize opposed governments, including the use of disinformation, economic pressure and harassment, manipulating the institutional environment of the victim by bribery and the discriminatory use of aid, and encouraging and supporting conspiracies and coups" (p. 12). I will focus on economic pressure, assassination attempts (which also includes the support for coups) and disinformation, respectively, in the following sections. I have opted to condense Herman's (1987) subcategories of subversion with the hopes of maintaining the original integrity of his conceptual model, while at the same time making it easily applicable to the case of Cuba. For instance, the support of conspiracies and coups cited by Herman (1987) is, as I will demonstrate later, inextricably tied to assassination attempts. Similarly, economic pressure is broadly defined by Herman (1987) to include everything from the indiscriminate use of aid to economic embargoes. It is in this light, then,

that I will categorize the subcategories of subversion in Herman's (1987) framework.

The reason I have chosen to examine these subcategories of subversion in this order is because of their temporal sequence. For example, the economic embargo has been in effect since 1960, and it was shortly thereafter that the assassination plots were hatched. Finally, during the 1980s the U.S. attacks on Cuba's human rights violations peaked in concert with a campaign of disinformation.

Economic Pressure

Ball (1969) claims that the context in which the economic embargo was placed upon Cuba by the U.S. and its allies was marked by anticommunist sentiment. According to Ball (1969), the embargo was placed on Cuba in 1960, under the authority of the Trading With the Enemy Act, by the Johnson and Kennedy administrations in order to "increase internal unrest in Cuba, diminish Cuba's capacity for subversion in the hemisphere, reduce Cuba's showcase appeal to Latin America, and to burden the Communist nations so that they will be persuaded that they are backing a losing and expensive horse" (p. 130). The immediate effects of the embargo, however, did not accomplish most of the aforementioned goals.

Shortly after the U.S. imposed the economic embargo on Cuba, the Cuban government turned to the socialist-bloc Community for Mutual Economic Assistance (CMEA). According to Kuntz (1994), approximately 85% of all Cuban trade from the early 1960s to 1990 was

conducted through the CMEA. The remaining 15%, according to Kuntz (1994), was conducted with trading partners in the West, including foreign subsidiaries of U.S. companies. During this time Cuba made significant gains in education, medicine and poverty reduction. With respect to education, for example, Kuntz (1994) states that by 1990 Cuba had achieved a literacy rate of nearly 100%. Cuba has also achieved, according to Kuntz (1994), "comprehensive, accessible health care to the entire population without charge" (p. 163), an accomplishment not yet achieved by the United States. Kuntz (1994) cites that Cuba's infant mortality rate as well as their under 5 years old infant mortality rate⁶ have decreased dramatically since 1960. In fact, Kuntz (1994) points out that Cuba's 1991 rates for both these indicators place them well ahead of all other Latin American countries, as well as all other developing countries world wide. In comparison to the United States (which ranks 22nd in the world for both indicators), Kuntz (1994) claims that Cuba ranks 26th for both indicators, a feat accomplished with less than one-twentieth of the Gross National Product (GNP) of the United States. Indeed, Cuba has invested a great deal of its resources in health. Currently, Kuntz (1994) states that Cuba's "advanced research facilities, including biotechnology and genetic engineering centers, are among the most sophisticated in the world" (p. 163).

However, with the collapse of the former Soviet Union and the communist block in 1990, Cuba was forced to look elsewhere for trading partners. With respect to Cuba's medical products, for example,

Kuntz (1994) states that until 1990 60% of Cuba's imported medical products came from CMEA, and 40% from Western trading partners. After 1990, Cuba was forced to import nearly 70% of its medical products from the West, which, according to Kuntz (1994), were far less in volume than previous years as the result of Cuba's hard currency shortages.

If anything, the long term impact of the economic embargo on Cuba has caused recent hard currency shortages. As for the aforementioned goals of the Johnson administration, however, Castro's commitment to communism remains. Whether or not the embargo has been successful in terms of other U.S. goals is perhaps best stated by one of the major proponents of the embargo, Michael Kozak (cited in U.S. Senate, 1990). Kozak (cited in U.S. Senate, 1990) states that

some say that our embargo policy has failed given the survival of Fidel Castro's communist regime. Such criticism misses the point. Given Castro's ideological commitment to his vision of revolution, it is unlikely that economic sanctions alone will ever induce him to abandon his goals. What the embargo does is to deny Cuba opportunities to earn hard currency and acquire goods, thus limiting the resources available to the government to carry out policies inimical to U.S. interests. To put it in starker terms, every dollar that the embargo prevents Cuba from earning from an American tourist is a dollar that Cuba cannot spend to provide a rifle to overthrow a democratically elected government in our hemisphere. (pp. 103-104)

Whether or not the embargo has prevented the Cuban government from overthrowing democratically elected governments in "our" hemisphere, is certainly debatable. However, the embargo has created, according to Richard Newcomb (cited in U.S. Senate, 1990), "obvious hard currency shortages and other costs on the Cuban economy"

(p. 113). Naturally, these effects have been felt by the populace of Cuba, and although it is difficult to assess the full impact of the economic embargo over the past 34 years, its current impact is quite substantial.

According to Cesar Chelala (1993) "for more than a year and a half each Cuban has had access to only one pound of rice, six pounds of beans, two eggs, a pint of oil, and less than 15 kilograms of potatoes per month" (p. 19). Chelala (1993) cites the economic collapse of the former Soviet Union as the other contributing factor for Cuba's shortages. This embargo, according to Tessitore and Woolfson (1993), was recently declared by the United Nations' General Assembly as "violating such Charter principles as sovereign equality and non-intervention and noninterference in internal affairs as well as the commercial freedoms enshrined in many international legal instruments" (p. 291).

Certainly, the harmful effects of economic embargoes on the general population of a nation-state have received much attention recently with the case of Haiti. Chomsky (1992b) claims that former President Bush was hesitant to place an economic embargo on the nation of Haiti, as he thought its effects on the general populace would be too severe. Despite former President Bush's recognition of the indiscriminate and detrimental effects of economic embargoes, Chomsky (1992b) notes that the 34 year embargo placed on Cuba by the U.S. was not addressed by former President Bush.

Assassination Attempts of Castro

Although Ball (1969) states that the intent of the economic embargo was to destabilize the Cuban government, during the 1960s the CIA was taking more overt measures to remove Fidel Castro from power and sponsor coups.

In August of 1975, Fidel Castro met with Senator George McGovern, at which time McGovern was given a list of twenty-four alleged CIA assassination attempts on Castro (U.S. Senate, 1975). These alleged assassination attempts were then investigated by a U.S. Senate Committee, which concluded that there had been eight plots to assassinate Fidel Castro from 1960 to 1965, although the CIA denied any direct involvement (Hamm, 1993). Although the details of seven plots were disclosed in the Senate Hearings, the eighth plot remains classified (U.S. Senate, 1975).

While the plots to assassinate Castro are certainly deserving of much attention, for the sake of this research, I will only briefly discuss the major tactics used. The first plot to assassinate Castro, occurring in 1960, involved a conspiracy with the Mafia to kill him with the use of poisoned capsules. These capsules were given to a Cuban "asset" in Cuba who worked at a restaurant which Castro regularly frequented. In 1961, a second attempt was carried out, this time with the help of the Cuban attorney, Humberto Sori. This plot involved the use of plastic explosives; however, the plot was uncovered before it could be implemented, and Humberto Sori was put to death at the order of Castro. The third attempt, in 1962, resorted

to the poison capsules again, which met the same fate as the first poisoned capsule attempt (U.S. Senate, 1975).

Not being easily deterred, two more plots were hatched by the CIA in 1963. The first of these plots included the use of an explosive seashell, which was to be placed underwater in an area where Fidel Castro frequently went skin diving. The second plot of 1963 was also related to Castro's passion for skin diving, and consisted of a plan to send Castro a "gift" of a skin diving suit laced with a fungus which causes a disease called Mandura Foot, and a breathing apparatus contaminated with tubercle bacillus, which is a tuberculosis germ (Hamm, 1993). Neither of these plots were carried out, however, because as former director of the CIA Richard Helms stated, these plans "seemed to be cock-eyed" (U.S. Senate, 1975, p. 86). In truth, Hamm (1993) notes that those who have studied Fidel Castro's life know that he does not use such devices.

In the sixth plot to assassinate Castro, the CIA employed the services of Rolando Cubela Secades, a high ranking Cuban government official who was, at the time, considering defecting to the United States (Hamm, 1993). Cubela was given an arms cache by the CIA which included hand grenades, and a high powered rifle with telescopic sights. Cubela quickly realized that an all-out ambush-style assassination would cost him his own life, therefore, he decided to ask the CIA if they could provide him with a more sophisticated means of accomplishing his task. The CIA then provided Cubela a pen which contained a very fine hypodermic needle. Cubela was told that he

should lace the needle with "Blackleaf-40", a deadly poison which can be bought over the counter. The plan called for Cubela to "accidentally" prick Castro with the pen, which would cause instant death. This plan was abandoned, however, with the death of former President Kennedy in November of 1963. Cubela, however, would conspire with the CIA once again in 1964 for a seventh attempt.

The seventh attempt to assassinate Castro was to be the "first step" in Cubela's coup d'etat. Apparently, Cubela wanted to overthrow the Castro regime and, in response, the CIA put him in contact with a Cuban exile in Miami by the name of Artime. According to Hinkle and Turner (1981), Artime was a former Bay of Pigs invader. Artime assured Cubela that if he could assassinate Castro, Artime and his Cuban exiles would help him escape Cuba, and within 48 hours of the assassination a force of 750 Cuban exiles would be conveyed to the shores of Cuba to "raise the morale and spirits of the Cuban people" (Hamm, 1993, p. 332). This plan, furthermore, was largely financed by the CIA and the Mafia (Hinkle & Turner, 1981).

It is unclear as to why the CIA decided to sever their ties with both Cubela and Artime in 1965 (the official reason given was that of "security interests"). What is known, however, is that Castro somehow uncovered Cubela's planned coup d'etat, and in 1965 Cubela was arrested and charged with plotting to kill the Cuban head of state (Szulc, 1986).

It is evident that the CIA intended to remove Castro from power and to replace him with a more amenable figure. Certainly, the

assassination attempts were designed to work in conjunction with coups. In terms of Herman's (1987) mechanisms of state terrorism, the assassination conspiracies and plots for coups are clearly attempts to subvert the Cuban government. Although the assassination conspiracies by the CIA represent one of the most visible mechanisms of state-sponsored terror, it is evident that other mechanisms were used concurrently, such as the sabotage plans and the economic embargo. It is perhaps because of the continued failure of these independent mechanisms of state-sponsored terror that others were incorporated to remove Castro from power.

Disseminating Disinformation

The campaign to disseminate disinformation about Cuba has been studied by relatively few people in the profession of criminology. Others, however, have examined this issue with some depth (e.g., see Biancalana & O'Leary 1988; McCaughan & Platt 1988). McCaughan and Platt's (1988) study of U.S. press coverage of Cuba during 1986 revealed that it was decidedly one sided. It is important to note that during this same time, the United States claimed to be waging a war on terrorism, with former President Ronald Reagan at the helm. Although the press had been accused of being sympathetic towards Cuba during the 1980s, McCaughan and Platt (1988) provide evidence to the contrary. For instance, McCaughan and Platt (1988) state that 14.5% of the 331 newspaper and periodical articles analyzed in their research of U.S. press coverage of Cuba in 1986 documented the

"failures, problems, setbacks, disasters, and poor results of Cuba's socialism" (p. 72). While 14.5% of the articles in the McCaughan and Platt (1988) study reported problems Cuba was experiencing, 10% of the articles failed to report the positive achievements of Cuba, most notably their advances in health care, education, and economic construction. Citing that "most positive news about Cuba is ignored, reinterpreted, or mystified" (p. 75), McCaughan and Platt (1988) claim that the articles which failed to report Cuba's positive achievements were often dispassionate.

While McCaughan and Platt (1988) found that Cuba's achievements were down-played and its problems given considerable attention, the emphasis that Cuba was a Soviet "beachhead in our backyard" remained (p. 77). Twenty of the 331 articles analyzed by McCaughan and Platt (1988) carried this theme. However, little attention was given in these articles, as McCaughan and Platt (1988) note, to the fact that relations between the former Soviet Union and Cuba were strained during this time, nor was the fact considered that the U.S. had effectively isolated Cuba in the Western Hemisphere. Consistent with the theme of Cuba being a Soviet beachhead in our backyard, the image of Cuba as an exporter of revolution was also found in several of the articles about Cuba during 1986 (McCaughan & Platt, 1988).

Although the articles pertaining to Cuba's relationship with the former Soviet Union, as well as those painting Cuba as an exporter of communist revolution were abundant in the McCaughan and Platt (1988) study, many more (189 of 331; 57%) painted Cuba as a

prison run by a tyrannical Castro. As McCaughan and Platt (1988) note, much of this attention was the result of U.S. attacks of alleged human rights violations during this time.

As McCaughan and Platt (1988) note, much of this coverage was greatly influenced by State Department releases during this time. In so much as the CIA was not solely responsible for creating an ideological environment which made their activities acceptable, other government figures played a crucial role in the development of an ideology conducive to such one-sided reporting, particularly the U.S. Department of State and George Shultz. It is important to note that during this time, the United States was also attempting to use the United Nations as a vehicle to sanction Cuba for its alleged human rights violations. Indeed, releases from the Department of State severely criticized Cuba for its alleged human rights violations. One such United States Department of State (1987) report notes that the "repression of basic human rights today is so pervasive that Cuba holds the dubious distinction of being the Western hemisphere's most serious violator of human rights and fundamental freedoms" (p. 459). However, Cuba's human rights violations, presumably the worst in the Western Hemisphere, were not compared to the U.S. supported atrocities occurring in Nicaragua or El Salvador at that time. Indeed, Chomsky (1992b) estimates that as many as 100,000 Nicaraguans were killed by their own government during the 1980s.

However, the United States' official stance on human rights violations is, as McCaughan and Platt (1988) note, a very narrowly

defined, legalistic definition. Indeed, as Barak (1991) points out, the United States had not, at that time, ratified treaties and covenants which recognized economic and social rights as defined in the United Nation's Universal Declaration of Human Rights, nor the following treaties: the Convention on the Reduction of Statelessness (1961), the International convention on the Elimination of All forms of Racial Discrimination (1965), the American Convention on Human Rights (1965), the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights (1966), the International Covenant of Civil and Political Rights (1966), the International Convention on the Suppression and Punishment of the Crime of Apartheid (1973), and finally, the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination Against Women (1979).

Although the United States had not even ratified the Universal Declaration of Human Rights in 1986, the attacks on Cuba peaked when

the U.S. mobilized all its efforts to bring accusations against Cuba before the United Nations . . . Unable to generate support for a condemnation of Cuba, the U.S. withdrew its resolution in 1986 and prepared for a new campaign at the annual session of the U.N. Human Rights Commission in Geneva, in February and March, 1987 (Platt, 1988, pp. 41-42).

Finally, one only need look at the human rights concerns of the United States in examining the plight of the 6,800 Cuban Marielitos living in substandard conditions in U.S. prisons during the 1980s. These people came to the United States in 1980 during the Mariel boat-lift and were imprisoned after the United States failed to deport these supposedly unsavory characters back to Cuba. Subsequently, they were confined in substandard conditions which included 23

hour per day lock downs, in cells holding up to eight prisoners (McCaughan & Platt, 1988).

It is in Cuba's alleged gross violations of human rights where most of the U.S. attention was focussed in the 1980s, and Cuba's achievements were not recognized. Tom Farer of the Rutgers Law School (cited in Chomsky, 1987), who was a member of the Inter-American Commission on Human Rights of the OAS and former State Department assistant for inter-American affairs made the following statement concerning Cuba's advancements:

there is a consensus among scholars of a wide variety of ideological positions that, on the level of life expectancy, education, and health, Cuban achievement is considerably greater than one would expect from its level of per capita income. A recent study of 113 Third World countries in terms of these basic indicators of popular welfare ranked Cuba first, ahead even of Taiwan-which is probably the outstanding example of growth with equity within a capitalist economic framework . . . Cuba excelled according to all main indicators of human needs satisfaction . . . What has changed remarkably is not so much the gross indicators as those that reflect the changed conditions of the poor, particularly the rural poor. In 1958, for example, the one rural hospital in the entire country represented about 2 percent of the hospital facilities in Cuba; by 1982 there were 117 (rural) hospitals, or about 35 percent of all hospitals in Cuba (pp. 360-361).

Farer's (cited in Chomsky, 1987) statement provides a clear example of McCaughan and Platt's (1988) findings, particularly those things which are ignored. However, while the fact that Cuba has greatly advanced its health care system since 1958 was ignored, Cuba's alleged involvement in creating instability were given much press by the U.S. media, fueled by U.S. State Department releases during the 1980s. For example, the U.S. Department of State released

a 12 page report in 1981 claiming that Cuba had renewed its support for violence in Latin America. While acknowledging that Cuba was not the sole source of instability in the Western Hemisphere, the U.S. Department of State (1981) claimed that the Cuban government was responsible for destabilizing its neighbors through "armed opposition movements" (p. 1). In 1982, another U.S. Department of State release depicted the Cuban military as an extension of the Soviet Union, which posed considerable "military threats to the U.S. security interests in the hemisphere" (p. 5). Certainly, these two examples of the threat of Cuba as an exporter of communism, as well as a threat to U.S. national security, are things which have historically been given much attention in the U.S. press.

The Bay of Pigs Invasion

Perhaps the most visible action taken by the CIA against Cuba was the failed Bay of Pigs invasion in April of 1961. The Bay of Pigs Operation, which later became the Bay of Pigs invasion, was originally approved by former President Eisenhower (Prouty, 1992). Eisenhower's Bay of Pigs Operation, as remembered by Prouty, (1992) originated as a "program of covert action against the Castro regime" (p. 121). This covert action, furthermore, was to be carried out by 300 Cuban exiles trained by the CIA at Fort Gulick, Panama (Prouty, 1992).

As Prouty (1992) notes, the context in which the initial approval for covert activities against Cuba was given is of great

importance. Although former President Eisenhower had approved the CIA's training of Cuban exiles for covert paramilitary operations against Cuba, the CIA did not have Presidential approval for any plans to use these forces to invade Cuba. Initially, according to Prouty (1992), the CIA saw Cuban exiles as persons who could be trained by the U.S. to overthrow the Cuban government. Indeed, the recruitment of Cuban exiles as a paramilitary force can be readily seen in former CIA director Allen Dulles' March 17, 1960 presentation to the National Security Council. Dulles (cited in Prouty, 1992) stated that preparations

have already been made for the development of an adequate paramilitary force outside of Cuba, together with mechanisms for the necessary support of covert military operations on the island. Initially a cadre of leaders will be recruited after careful screening and trained as paramilitary instructors. In a second phase a number of paramilitary cadres will be trained at secure locations outside of the United States so as to be available for immediate deployment into Cuba to organize, train, and lead resistance forces recruited there both before and after the establishment of one or more active centers of resistance. (p. 123)

It was during Eisenhower's presidency when, according to Prouty (1992), the CIA, at the directorship of Allen Dulles, began to increase the scope of its paramilitary operations without Presidential approval. Operation Trinidad, according to Prouty (1992), was implemented by the CIA to train the paramilitary Cuban exiles in conventional, amphibious, and airborne combat tactics. Prouty (1992) claims that former CIA director Richard Bissell, as well as other high ranking CIA members, felt that if Richard Nixon were elected president they would have support to move forward with their plans of

an outright invasion. If, however, John F. Kennedy were elected, agency leaders of the CIA, Prouty (1992) states, felt confident that "they could work with, or around, Kennedy, and they contrived to lock him into as many programs as possible" (p. 129). Eventually, the CIA did train the Cuban exiles who became known as Brigade 2506.

According to Johnson (1964), Brigade 2506 was supported and trained by the CIA in Guatemala and consisted of nearly 1,500 men who were not, according to Montaner (1981), "a revolutionary organization with a determined political projection, but an army arbitrarily recruited by the CIA for a strictly military battle" (p. 199). Indeed, the leadership of the CIA, as well as former Presidents Eisenhower and Kennedy knew that NSC directive 5412 strictly prohibited the use of any U.S. military personnel in military operations except in a time of war (Prouty, 1992). Therefore, the only personnel who were to carry out the Bay of Pigs invasion were the CIA-trained Cuban exiles. However, as Johnson (1964) notes, it was later revealed that the CIA had intended for the first men to land at Playa Giron and Playa Larga to be Americans. Although the plan to use U.S. military personnel in this manner was in direct violation of U.S. law, Johnson (1964) states that the CIA during this time was "acting at times contrary to established United States policies, and even contrary to the wishes of the President of the United States" (p. 227; emphasis in original).

The Bay of Pigs invasion, which was termed Operation Zapata by the CIA, was named as such because the CIA intended to capture the

airfields near Zapata beach. Prouty (1992) states that U.S. military personnel believed the airfields at Zapata to be suitable for U.S. donated B-26 aircraft, which would be used to give Brigade 2506 adequate air support from Castro's troops once the invasion began. Indeed, the role of the B-26 bomber was of crucial import to the CIA's invasion plans, as they were used to destroy seven of the ten Cuban T-33 jets which comprised Castro's airforce prior to the actual invasion (Prouty, 1992).

On April 17, 1961 former President Kennedy gave the final approval for the Bay of Pigs invasion (Prouty, 1992). The invading troops of Brigade 2506, according to Prouty (1992), would occupy Cuban soil for at least seventy-two hours at which time the "Cuban government-in-exile would call upon the OAS for support of the brigade immediately and that the United States, with nominal OAS assistance, would sustain the brigade and its new government" (p. 130). It was felt, furthermore, that in the show of OAS support and strength, tens of thousands of Cubans would join the brigade and revolt against Castro's Cuba (Prouty, 1992). Although Former President Kennedy's approval called for the destruction of the Cuban airforce's remaining three T-33 jets prior to the invasion, Prouty (1992) states that Kennedy's aide, McGeorge Bundy, delayed the final air-strike which was to be conducted early in the morning on the day of the invasion. The three T-33 jets which were not destroyed later shot down sixteen of the Brigade's B-26 aircraft, sank their off shore supply ships, and laid down heavy gunfire on Zapata beach

(Prouty, 1992). Ultimately, Prouty (1992) notes that Operation Zapata failed primarily because of the Cuban T-33 jets which were not destroyed prior to the invasion.

In terms of Herman's (1987) mechanisms of state terrorism, it is clear that the failed Bay of Pigs Invasion was an attempt by the U.S. to overthrow the Cuban government. Although U.S. military personnel were not used during the invasion itself, as that would have violated NSC directive 5412, it is clear that U.S. military equipment was given to the Cuban exiles who were trained by the CIA. Clearly, Brigade 2506 was acting as an extension of the U.S. military.

Certainly, the question as to whether or not U.S. military resources should be used in this manner is a legitimate one. If U.S. training and equipment are used to support activities that the U.S. itself could not legally engage in, one can certainly wonder where the distinction between what is legal and illegal begins and ends. For example, in a state defined criminal act, such as a bank robbery, those persons responsible for arming, training and financing someone to carry out the robbery for them would be held accountable under criminal law, at least in terms of conspiracy to commit a crime. With regards to the CIA-sponsored, and U.S.-endorsed Bay of Pigs Invasion, the U.S., by proxy, engaged in an unwarranted act of war.

Herman (1987) states that proxy invasions, such as the Bay of Pigs Invasion, are closely tied to other mechanisms of state terrorism such as supplying repression. Herman (1987) states that

supplying repression, in short, involves the financing, arming, and training of third world forces with the intent of making them an extension of the U.S. military. Although the Bay of Pigs Invasion could be considered supplying repression by Herman's (1987) definition, the distinction between invasions and repression lies in the fact that repression comes from within the country, and invasions generally come from the outside.

In summary, then, the U.S. has clearly engaged in three of the four conceptual mechanisms of state-sponsored terrorism provided by Herman (1987). The primary objective of the U.S. have been to remove Castro from power and replace him with a more amenable figure. Furthermore, in the attempt to remove Castro from power the U.S. has embarked on a set of policy directives which have been both indiscriminate, as well as harmful to the people of Cuba. These activities have ranged from the absurd (i.e., the bounties on Castro) to the illegal, such as the sponsoring of an invasion by proxy. Taken in their entirety, however, these activities represent a clear case of state-sponsored terrorism.

CHAPTER IV

DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

Discussion

I mentioned in Chapter I that the approach to this research would involve an analysis of the sociopolitical and economic context in which the U.S. has engaged in the crime of state-sponsored terrorism against Cuba. Having documented the groundwork for this discussion in Chapter III, I will now turn to a brief discussion of these findings and their implications.

Historically, the U.S. has attempted to maintain a disproportionate share of the world's wealth. In this endeavor, however, U.S. foreign (and domestic) policy has encountered difficulties relieving the tension created by the commitment to democracy and human rights and foreign policies designed to promote and secure U.S. wealth. Indeed, I would argue that commitment to democracy and human rights lags far behind the United States' more immediate concerns of capital accumulation. Perhaps nowhere is this more evident than in the non-discriminatory and anachronistic embargo which has been placed on Cuba, while at the same time the U.S. denounced the Cuban government for its alleged human rights abuses.

In the U.S. the void between the commitment to human rights and democracy on one hand, and capital accumulation on the other, is probably best illustrated by the contrast between the concentration

of wealth in the hands of a privileged few, and the four million homeless Americans, the 60 million illiterate people, the millions of unemployed (as well as the under-employed), the 50% of the U.S. population which is uninsured, or the 30 million people who are under-fed and malnourished (Elias, 1991). Indeed, Cuba could similarly charge that the U.S. is violating the political, social and economic rights of many of its citizens. However, as Elias (1991) notes, for the U.S. to recognize these rights would require "fundamental changes in the American system, which would upset its prevailing concentration of power and resources" (p. 258).

With regard to the Castro/Guevara-led revolution, it is clear that initial U.S. concern was over the presence of economic democracy (i.e., communism) in such geographic proximity to the United States. As the U.S. Senate (1975) stated that

the fear of Communist expansion was particularly acute in the United States when Fidel Castro emerged as Cuba's leader in the late 1950s. His takeover was seen as the first significant penetration by the Communists into the Western Hemisphere. United States leaders, including most Members of Congress, called for vigorous action to stem the Communist infection in this hemisphere. These policies rested on widespread popular support and encouragement (p. XIII).

This "infection" (U.S. Senate, 1975, p. XIII), apparently, was something which could be cured through the illegal activities of the CIA. Indeed, as I mentioned earlier, the context in which the CIA was created was conducive to the existence of an organization to eliminate the threat of communism at any cost. The often times false connections between the early Cuba and the former Soviet Union made these activities even more palatable to U.S. officials and their

constituents at home. Aggressive foreign policy (i.e., terrorism) was justified as an attack against a Soviet threat. If we didn't stop "them" in Cuba, then the communists would be pouring into Key West, Florida.

Although the fear of the "domino effect" was great during the Cold War, I would also suggest that a successful communist Cuba would perhaps be an even greater threat to the U.S. Given the fact that Cuba was an extremely poor country when Castro seized control, any success experienced in Cuba would challenge those persons in other countries with more resources to ask, then, "Why not us?". Nowhere is this more evident than in the previously mentioned disinformation about Cuba's progressive social accomplishments. For all its alleged human rights violations and economic shortcomings, Cuba has succeeded in something which the U.S. has not: providing universal health care to all its citizens. Given then, the context of the Cold War, as well as the sociopolitical climate, the economic structure, and the latitude the CIA was given during the Cold War, it should come as no surprise that these terrorist activities have occurred.

I have attempted to address the issue of state-sponsored terrorism in a manner consistent with a critical approach to the study of state criminality. In this effort, an attempt has also been made to demonstrate that state-sponsored terrorism must be defined in a non-discriminatory manner to fully recognize the scope of the harm caused by the U.S. toward Cuba. If the word terrorism continues to be confined to lesser acts of retail terrorism, primarily through

ideological hegemony, then those greater harms caused by nation-states such as the U.S. will continue. Certainly, those retail terrorists which occupy so much U.S. concern, cause significantly less harm than the anachronistic embargo which has caused much suffering to the Cuban people. The introduction of the dengue virus, the sponsoring of sabotage acts, assassination plots, the sponsoring of the Bay of Pigs Invasion, and the campaign of disinformation about Cuba have all caused considerable harm as well. Nevertheless, these acts are not recognized by the U.S. as being either illegal, or forms of terrorism. As a matter of point, the doctrine of plausible denial has insulated many of the policy makers from responsibility.

Although the definitional framework provided in this thesis is not legally recognized by the U.S., the reasons why I have chosen this definition are not without merit and are the logical extension of both the social harms and legalistic approaches. As stated earlier, the extant International Criminal Law on the matter of state-sponsored terrorism is based primarily on power considerations; both the power to define other's actions as terrorist, and the power to remove one's actions from consideration. In short, the extant law on the matter of state-sponsored terrorism allows a double standard to exist.

This double standard, however, is not confined to interpreting International Criminal Law. Clearly, the U.S. has maintained a double standard in interpreting international definitions of human rights. On the one hand, the U.S. has increasingly used human rights

violations as the reason for implementing and maintaining certain foreign policy directives, while on the other hand the U.S. has not codified many of those same human rights documents which they have used to condemn others. If the official U.S. stance on these human rights documents were truly consistent, the U.S. would be in clear violation of many of the economic rights enshrined in the international documents. Kennedy's (1970) analysis of those creating state law to define their own behavior as being beyond incrimination is also applicable, it would appear, to the state defining its own behavior as beyond incrimination in the international community as well.

Limitations of the Study

The limitations of this research center around the data sources used. Indeed, the documents surrounding the eighth assassination plot of Fidel Castro illustrate one of many classified documents which I have not been able to obtain. Conversely, I have not been able to obtain any original documents from the Cuban government either, aside from their response to the Dengue Fever epidemic which was reprinted in the U.S. Department of State Bulletin. Nevertheless, I have attempted to use as many memoirs and participants' reports as possible to trace the development of U.S. state-sponsored terrorism against Cuba.

Although I believe the area of state criminality provides promise for those criminologists willing to turn a critical eye to the activities of nation-states, I must state that data sources are

difficult to obtain. Moreover, these sources, as Chambliss (1993) notes, must be examined cautiously. Chambliss (1993) states that

government hearings, court trials, interviews, newspaper accounts, and historical documents are replete with problems of validity and reliability. In my view they are no more so than conventional research methods in the social sciences, but that does not alter the fact that there is room for error in interpreting the findings. It will require considerable imagination and diligence for others to pursue research on this topic and add to the empirical base from which theoretical propositions can be tested and elaborated (p. 311).

In reading these accounts, I have been aware of the fact that the content of one person's writing may be totally contradicted by that of another. Admittedly, there have been times throughout this research when I have struggled with the issue of whether or not my research was, in fact, a truthful representation of what actually happened. During these times I would read and re-read these conflicting sources in an attempt to find points of consensus, often times drawing the conclusion that although one author's reasons as to why an event occurred were different than another's, the occurrence of the event in question was often not the issue.

The issue of researcher bias on my part must also be considered here. I indicated earlier that I have taken a critical approach to this research. In admitting that my approach has been critical in nature, I do not believe that my research has been any more or less biased. Certainly, the direction in which my critical perspective has taken me has been different from many others who have studied the relationship between the U.S. and Cuba. Nevertheless, I attempted to follow a path consistent with answering a single research question:

has the U.S. engaged in state-sponsored terrorism with respect to Cuba?

Implications for Future Research

In examining the U.S. and Cuba, I have found evidence for many other instances of state criminality on the part of the United States. As was mentioned earlier, the CIA has been investigated for its involvement in the assassination plots of four other foreign heads of state. Certainly, the U.S. Senate Report contains enough information about these plots to begin a research project of the U.S. role in assassinations. Also, I have found evidence that the mechanisms of state-sponsored terrorism as defined by Herman (1987) were also used in many other countries in this hemisphere, namely Brazil, the Dominican Republic, Nicaragua, El Salvador, Panama, Chile, and Argentina. Moreover, outside this hemisphere, there is evidence to suggest that countries such as Iran, Libya, the Congo, and South Vietnam have also been the targets of U.S. state-sponsored terrorism. Certainly, there is much to be done with respect to state-sponsored terrorism within the field of criminology.

For critical criminologists, I think that the issue of state-sponsored terrorism illustrates well the patterns of violence which others (e.g., Pepinsky, 1991; Tifft, 1979; Tifft & Markham, 1991; and Tifft & Sullivan, 1980) have noticed. Clearly, these criminologists have laid the groundwork for understanding the connections between interpersonal and structural violence and the institutions which

maintain them.

I have alluded to the fact that the pattern of abuse in Cuba is not dissimilar from that experienced in other countries. Indeed, the connections between both the ideological beliefs and institutions which have caused harm to Cuba have caused harm in other countries, as well as to persons within the United States. Pepinsky's (1991) work illustrates the similarities of the patterns of structural violence (war) and interpersonal violence (crime). Although Pepinsky's work nicely elucidates these patterns, Tifft and Markham (1991) provide a highly illustrative example in their analysis of the battering of women and Central Americans. With reference to the process by which the battering of women and Central Americans are similar, Tifft and Markham (1991) state that

recognizing that violence, intimidation, exploitation, dependency and diminishment have their genesis in the core values and everyday social arrangements of our society is a powerful awakening to the realities of structural suffering, and the necessity for both personal and social structural change (p. 114-115).

With reference to violence, Tifft and Markham (1991) also recognize (as does Pepinsky) that it is systematic, ranging from the structural down to the interpersonal. Tifft and Markham (1991) note that

systematic violence can only be understood in the context of a society in which many accept and even encourage violence as a means of resolving conflict, creating dependency, and establishing dominance (p. 115).

Indeed, the patterns which Tifft and Markham (1991), speak of fall within the theoretical framework of an institutional theory

which is not bound in the false dichotomy of free-will and determinism. For instance, the terrorist acts committed against Cuba, do, on the interpersonal level, contain an element of free will. However, the structural conditions (i.e., sociopolitical and economic) as well as the dominant ideology of the era (i.e., anti-communist sentiment and the Cold War) created a situation in which terrorist foreign policy was viewed as an acceptable means of dealing with an economic threat.

In terms of future research, then, I would challenge other criminologists to examine the role these institutions have played in state-sponsored terrorism conducted by the U.S. since the end of World War II. I would also challenge them to examine these patterns of violence in all arenas, particularly reference to the current violent and repressive war with crime at home.

Concluding Remarks

To fully recognize the scope of the problem of terrorism, we need to recognize that the U.S. has engaged in activities which are indistinguishable from those which have been traditionally defined as terrorists. The key similarity of these activities is their violent nature. The key distinction, however, lies in the power to define such activities as something other than what they are. Following from this, Herman (1987) notes that "in a sequence of violence, it is often very difficult to determine where the process began, and thus the distinction between terror and retaliation is often

arbitrary and depends upon the ability of one side to establish its claim by sheer power" (p. 3). If, indeed, terrorism and counter-terrorism are arbitrary distinctions for forms of violence, and if indeed the distinctions are politically partisan, then it is morally and epistemologically unacceptable for criminologists to accept those definitional distinctions which have been traditionally put forth from Washington.

ENDNOTES

1. It should be noted that others, outside the discipline of criminology, have addressed this issue, such as Chomsky (1987; 1993), Herman (1982; 1987), and Chomsky and Herman (1979). While the works of Chomsky and Herman will guide much of the analysis and application in this paper, such work is recognized as limited regarding its lack of application within the criminological literature. It is hoped that this analysis will aid in the development of such an interactive approach to the analysis of U.S.-Cuba relations.

2. Although there are other treaties and covenants which could be considered here, they are primarily concerned with terrorism in times of war. Specifically, these treaties include the Geneva Convention (see article 3), and the Nuremberg Charter.

3. Herman (1987) neither defines or discusses specific instances of invasion as a mechanism of state-sponsored terrorism. Herman (1987) states that "invasions have been important but they are relatively familiar and obvious in character and will not be discussed further in this article" (p. 11). Nevertheless, I have opted to provide the reader with a working definition of invasions, as the Bay of Pigs invasion will be discussed at length in Chapter III.

4. This title is taken from the U.S. Select Senate Report on Alleged Assassination Plots Involving Foreign Leaders, 1975.

5. Aside from the assassination attempts of Fidel Castro, the CIA was also investigated by the U.S. Senate Select Committee to Study Alleged Assassination Attempts of Foreign Leaders with respect

to Patrice Lumumba of the Congo, Rafael Trujillo of the Dominican Republic, General Rene Schneider of Chile, and Ngo Dinh Diem of South Vietnam.

6. Kuntz (1994) notes that these two indicators are used most often by the United Nations agencies such as UNICEF and the World Health Organization to assess a country's overall health status.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Albert, M. (1994). Stop the killing train. Boston, MA: South End Press.
- Ball, M. M. (1969). The OAS in transition. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.
- Barak, G. (1990). Crime, criminology and human rights: Towards an understanding of state criminality. The Journal of Human Justice, 2 (Autumn), 1-28.
- Barak, G. (1991). (Ed.) Crimes by the capitalist state: An introduction to state criminality. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.
- Barak, G. (1994). (Ed.) Varieties of criminology: Readings from a dynamic discipline. Westport, CT: Praeger.
- Bassiouni, M. C. (1975). International terrorism and political crimes. Springfield, IL: Charles C. Thomas Publisher.
- Biancalana, F. & O'Leary, C. (1988). Profile of U.S. press coverage of Cuba. Social Justice, 15(2) 63-71.
- Braithwaite, J. (1985). White collar crime. Annual Review of Sociology, 11, 1-25.
- Caulfield, S. L. (1991). Subcultures as crime: The theft of the legitimacy of dissent in the United States. In Barak, G. (Ed.) Crimes by the capitalist state: An introduction to state criminality (pp. 49-61). Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.
- Caulfield, S. L. & Wonders, N. (1993). Personal AND political: Violence against women and the role of the state. In Tunnell, Kenneth D. (Ed.) Political crime in contemporary America: A critical approach (pp. 79-100). New York: Garland Publishing.
- Chambliss, W. (1989). State-organized crime. Criminology, 27, 183-209.
- Chambliss, W. (1993). State-organized crime. In Chambliss and Zatz (Eds.) Making law: the state, the law and structural contradictions (pp. 290-314). Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press.

- Chelala, C. (1993, June 30). Cuba's citizens suffer from US blockade. Christian Science Monitor, 19.
- Chomsky, N. (1982). Towards a new cold war. New York: Pantheon.
- Chomsky, N. (1985). Turning the tide: U.S. intervention in Central America and the struggle for peace. Boston, MA: South End Press.
- Chomsky, N. (1987). The United States and the world. James Peck (Ed.) The Chomsky reader. New York: Pantheon.
- Chomsky, N. (1992a). Deterring democracy. New York: Hill & Wang.
- Chomsky, N. (1992b). Chronicles of dissent. Monroe, ME: Common Courage Press.
- Chomsky, N. (1993). Year 501: The conquest continues. Boston, MA: South End Press.
- Chomsky, N. & Herman, E. S. (1979). The United States versus human rights in the third world. The Monthly Review, 29, 22-45.
- Churchill, W. & Vander Wall, J. (1990). The Cointelpro Papers. Boston, MA: South End Press.
- Clinard, M. & Quinney, R. (1973). Criminal behavior systems: A typology. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston.
- Clinard, M. & Yeager, P. (1980). Corporate crime. New York: The Free Press.
- Coleman, J. W. (1989). The criminal elite: The sociology of white collar crime. 2nd Ed. New York: St. Martins Press.
- Cullen, F. T., Maakestad, W. J. & Cavender, G. (1987). Corporate crime under attack: The Ford Pinto case and beyond. Cincinnati, OH: Anderson Press.
- Davis, J. K. (1992). Spying on America. Westport, CT: Praeger.
- Denzin, N. (1989). The research act. 3rd Ed. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Elias, R. (1991). Crime control as human rights enforcement. In Quinney, R. & Pepinsky, H. E. (Eds.) Criminology as peacemaking (pp. 251-262). Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press.
- Falk, R. (1989). United States Foreign policy as an obstacle to realizing the rights of peoples. Social Justice, 16(1), 57- 69.

- Grabosky, P.N. (1989). Wayward governance: Illegality and its control in the public sector. Sydney, Australia: Australian Institute of Criminology.
- Hamm, M. S. (1993). State-organized homicide: A study of seven CIA plans to assassinate Fidel Castro. In Chambliss, William (Ed.) Making law: The state, the law, and structural contradictions (pp. 315-346). Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press.
- Herman, E. S. (1982). The real terror network: Terrorism in fact and propaganda. Boston, MA: South End Press.
- Herman, E. S. (1987). U.S. sponsorship of international terrorism: An overview. Crime and Social Justice, 27-28, 1-31.
- Hills, S. L. (1987). (Ed.) Corporate violence: Injury and death for profit. Totowa, NJ: Rowman & Littlefield.
- Hinkle, W. & Turner, W. T. (1981). The fish is red. New York: Harper & Row.
- Jenkins, B. M. (1974). International terrorism: A new mode of conflict. In Leuridifk, Henk (Ed.) International terrorism and world security (pp. 13-49). New York and Toronto: John Wiley and Sons.
- Johnson, H. (1964). The Bay of Pigs. New York: W. W. Norton & Company.
- Kauzlarich, D. & Kramer, R. C. (1993). State-corporate crime in the U.S. nuclear weapons production complex. Journal of Human Justice, 5(1), 4-28.
- Kennedy, M. C. (1970). Beyond incrimination: Some neglected facets on the theory of punishment. Catalyst, (Summer), 1-37.
- Kramer, R. C. (1992). The space-shuttle challenger explosion: A case study of state-corporate crime. In Schlegel, Kip and D. Wiesburd (Eds.) Ethics, public policy, and criminal justice (pp. 33-58) Cambridge, MA: Oelgeschager, Gunn & Hain.
- Kuntz, D. (1994). The politics of suffering: the impact of the U.S. embargo on the health of the Cuban people. International Journal of Health Services, 24 (1), 161-179.
- Lahey, K. A. & Sang, L. M. (1975). Control of terrorism through a broader interpretation of article 3 of the four Geneva Conventions of 1949. In Bassiouni (Ed), Inter-national terrorism and political crimes (pp. 191-200. Springfield IL: Charles C. Thomas Publisher.

- Mallison, W. T. & Mallison, S. V. (1975). The concept of public purpose terror in international law: Doctrines and Sanctions to Reduce the Destruction of Human and Material Value. In Bassiouni (Ed), Inter- national terrorism and political crimes (pp. 67-85) Springfield, IL: Charles C. Thomas Publisher.
- McCaughan, E. & Platt, T. (1988). Tropical Gulag: Media Images of Cuba. Social Justice, 15(2), 73-103.
- Meyers, K. E. & Szulc, T. (1962). The Cuban invasion: The chronicle of a disaster. New York: Frederick Praeger.
- Michalowski, R. J., & Kramer, R. C. (1987). The space between laws: The problem of corporate crime in a transnational context. Social Problems, 34(1), 34-52.
- Montaner, C. A. (1981). Secret report on the Cuban revolution. New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Books.
- Pepinsky, H. E. (1991). The geometry of violence and democracy. Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press.
- Platt, T. (1988). Cuba and the Politics of Human Rights. Social Justice, 15(2), 38-53.
- Prouty, L. F. (1992). JFK, the CIA, Vietnam, and the plot to assassinate John F. Kennedy. New York: Carol Publishing Group.
- Purdue, W., D. (1989). Terrorism and the state: A Critique of domination through fear. New York: Praeger.
- Quinney, R. (1970). The Social Reality of Crime. Boston, MA: Little, Brown.
- Random House College Dictionary (1988). New York: Random House Inc.
- Riggs, R. E. & Plano, J. C. (1994). The United Nations: International organization and world politics. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth Publishing Company.
- Schrager, L.S. & Short, J. F. (1978). Toward a sociology of organizational crime. Social Problems, 25, 407-419.
- Schwendinger, H. & Schwendinger, J. (1970). Defenders of order or guardians of human rights? Issues in Criminology, 5, 123-157.
- Sellin, T. (1938). Culture, conflict and crime. New York: Social Science Research Council.

- Shank, G. (1987). Counterterrorism and foreign policy. Crime and Social Justice, 27-28, 33-65.
- Shapiro, S. (1983). The new moral entrepreneurs: Corporate crime crusaders. Contemporary Sociology, 12, 304-307.
- Sterling, C. (1981). The terror network: The secret war of international terrorism. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.
- Stitt, B.G. & Giacopassi, D. J. (1992). Trends in the connectivity of theory and research in Criminology. The Criminologist, 17(4), 1-6.
- Sutherland, E. H. (1949). White collar crime. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston.
- Szulc. T. (1986). Fidel: A critical portrait. New York: Avon.
- Takaki, R. (1993). A different mirror: A history of multicultural America. Boston, MA: Little, Brown & Company.
- Tessitore, J. & Woolfson, S. (Eds.). (1993). A global agenda: Issues before the 48th general assembly of the United Nations. New York: University Press of America.
- Tifft, L. (1979). The coming redefinition of crime: An anarchist perspective. Social Problems, 26, 392-402.
- Tifft, L. & Markham, L. (1991). Battering women and battering Central Americans: A peacemaking synthesis. In Quinney, R. & Pepinsky, H. E. (Eds.). Criminology as peacemaking pp. 114-153. Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press.
- Tifft, L. & Sullivan, D. (1980). The struggle to be human: Crime, criminology and anarchism. Orkney, UK: Cienfuegos Press.
- Tunnell, K. D. (1993).(Ed.) Political crime in contemporary America: A critical approach. New York: Garland Publishing.
- Turk, A. T. (1982). Political criminality: The defiance and defense of authority. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publications.
- U.S. Department of State (1981). Cuba's renewed support for violence in Latin America. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.
- U.S. Department of State (1982). Cuban Armed Forces and the Soviet Military Presence. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.

- U.S. Department of State (1985). Case Study of Cuban Hypocrisy: The 1981 Dengue epidemic in Cuba. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.
- U.S. Department of State (1987). Country Reports on Human Rights Practices for 1986. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.
- U.S. Senate (1975). Senate select committee to study governmental operations with respect to intelligence activities. Alleged assassination plots involving foreign leaders. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.
- U.S. Senate (1990). Senate hearing before the sub-committee on human rights and international organizations, western hemisphere affairs, and international economic policy and trade. Cuba and the United States: Thirty years of hostility and beyond. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.
- Yin, R. K. (1989). Case study research design and methods. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publications.