

Note: Snapshot PDF is the proof copy of corrections marked in EditGenie, the layout would be different from typeset PDF and EditGenie editing view.

Author Queries & Comments:

Q1 : Please check whether the affiliation details have been set correctly.

Response: Yes

Q2 : Please clarify whether this is "Guevara, 1970a" or "Guevara, 1970b."

Response: It should be 1970a, 1970b

Q3 : Please clarify whether this is "Guevara, 1970a" or "Guevara, 1970b."

Response: 1970a

Q4 : Please clarify whether this is "Guevara, 1970a" or "Guevara, 1970b."

Response: 1970a

Q5 : Please clarify whether this is "Guevara, 1969a" or "Guevara, 1969b" or "Guevara, 1969c".

Response: 1969a

Q6 : Please clarify whether this is "Guevara, 1970a" or "Guevara, 1970b."

Response: Guevara March 12, 1965 'Socialism and Man in Cuba' - Note: this should be changed in the reference list also as it is listed there as April 1965

Q7 : Please clarify whether this is "Guevara, 1969a" or "Guevara, 1969b" or "Guevara, 1969c".

Response: 1969a

Q8 : Please clarify whether this is "Guevara, 1969a" or "Guevara, 1969b" or "Guevara, 1969c"

Response: 1969a

Q9 : Please clarify whether this is "Guevara, 1969a" or "Guevara, 1969b" or "Guevara, 1969c"

Response: 1969a

Q10 : Please clarify whether this is "Guevara, 1969a" or "Guevara, 1969b" or "Guevara, 1969c"

Response: 1969a

Q11 : Please clarify whether this is "Guevara, 1969a" or "Guevara, 1969b" or "Guevara, 1969c"

Response: 1969a

Q12 : Please clarify whether this is "Guevara, 1970a" or "Guevara, 1970b."

Response: 1970a

Q13 : Please clarify whether this is "Guevara, 1970a" or "Guevara, 1970b."

Response: 1970a

Q14 : Please clarify whether this is "Guevara, 1969a" or "Guevara, 1969b" or "Guevara, 1969c"

Response: 1969a

Q15 : The disclosure statement has been inserted. Please correct if this is inaccurate.

Response: yes

Q16 : The CrossRef database (www.crossref.org/) has been used to validate the references. Mismatches between the original manuscript and CrossRef are tracked in red font. Please provide a revision if the change is incorrect. Do not comment on correct changes

Response: This is fine

Q17 : Please provide missing original publication year for the "Besancenot and Löwy, 2017" references list entry.

Response: It is 2017

Q18 : The reference "Guevara, 1969a" is listed in the references list but is not cited in the text. Please either cite the reference or remove it from the references list.

Response: It is now cited in the text frequently as 1969a

Q19 : The commented references listed below Besancenot & Löwy (2017), Guevara (1961a/2006), Guevara (1969c), Guevara (1970a) and Guevara (2003) have been followed as per the manuscript. Please check if this is correct.

Response: This reference can be removed as it is the Bonachea/Valdes volume. ALSO note that Valdes has not been capitalised in 1969c. Please amend this

Q20 : Please note that the references listed below "Besancenot, & Löwy (2017), Guevara (1961a/2006), Guevara (1969c), Guevara (1970a) and Guevara (2003)" have been set as per the manuscript. Please check if this is correct or suggest changes if necessary.

Response: yes - these are all correct

Q21 : Please provide missing original publication year for the "Mariátegui, 2014" references list entry.

Response: it is 2014

Q22 : Please provide missing editors name for reference "Marx, 1975" references list entry.

Response: there is none

CM1 : Punta del Este

CM2 : Punta de Este

CM3 : delete "all"; change to "many"

CM4 : amend to: "one of the earliest founders of..."

Che lives! The legacy of Che Guevara in world politics

Recto running head : GLOBALIZATIONS

Verso running head : S. BRINCAT AND M. LÖWY

 Shannon Brincat^a, Michael Löwy^b

^a School of Social Sciences, University of the Sunshine Coast, Sippy Downs, Australia

^b French National Center of Scientific Research, Paris, France[**Q1**]

CONTACT Shannon Brincat  sbrincat@usc.edu.au

History : received : 2022-1-10 accepted : 2023-5-9

Copyright Line: © 2023 Informa UK Limited, trading as Taylor & Francis Group

ABSTRACT

This article introduces the discipline of International Relations (IR) to the ideas of Che Guevara and their legacy in world politics. As one of the most famous revolutionaries of all time, Che's legacy is complex, multifaceted, and deeply political. His thought carries across many concerns central to IR theory, especially decolonialism and anti-imperialism, offering a unique radical Marxist-humanism focused on revolutionary praxis. This paper explores Che's writing and speeches, arguing that the most important aspects of Che's legacy do not reside in his contemporary romanticization but in Che's emphasis on class analysis as a means to interrogate neo-imperialism in world order and thereby expose the possibilities for a genuinely internationalist (or cosmopolitan) politics of emancipation leading to a decolonized, self-determining world.

KEYWORDS

- Che Guevara
- class
- Marxism
- neo-imperialism
- emancipation

'Let us be in union with the whole word and not with just a part of it, not with one part against another.'

– Che Guevara (1961a/2006, 21)

It is difficult to begin describing the legacy of Ernesto 'Che' Guevara in world politics. Sartre called him an 'intellectual' and 'the most complete human being of our age' (quoted in Guevara & Vincent, 2017). Hobsbawm mentions him repeatedly as a leading revolutionary figure of the era (1999, 2002), and Korda's *Guerrillero Heroico* is inscribed in popular consciousness as one of the most iconic images of the twentieth Century. Lauded across the world as either the greatest freedom fighter, or denounced accordingly, Che's legacy remains – like his life – absolutely political. The cinematic dramatization of his early life in the *Motor-Cycle Diaries* and of his revolutionary life in *Che* have drawn wide contemporary interest. There have many biographies, with Anderson's (1998) *A Revolutionary Life* becoming a best-seller, though many other worthy biographies present less grandiose aspects of Che's life, such as his ministerial work (Saenz, 2009). Alongside two *Collected Works* of Che (Guevara, 1970[Q2]; Guevara, 1977), one spanning nine volumes (Guevara, 1977), there are also many collections on Guevara's writings, notably Deutschmann's (2003) compiled with the Che Guevara Studies Center, and an older version edited by Bonachea and Valdes (1969c).¹ Whilst there has been much work on his death, despite many documents remaining classified (see Castañeda, 1998), there has been surprisingly little scholarly engagements in the field of International Relations (IR) outside some interest in the subfield of Security Studies concerned with Che's theory of guerrilla warfare and foquismo (Aribowo and Risman (2020); Rich, 2017). Studies of Che's political theory remain modest and those that exist are sometimes problematic in their analysis (see Hurd, 1972), with Che's philosophical thought on humanism the exception (see Kronenberg, 2009; Löwy, 1973). His thought on policy, economic development, or planning, has rarely been made the focus of serious attention across the political sciences. It is important, then, to re-examine Che's legacy in world politics and re-engage ideas long subdued under Cold War rivalries and obfuscated under ideological baggage. Crucially, this endeavour should not be seen as some mere academic exercise in historical curiosity because the contradictions that Che's thought revolved around – the problems of neo-imperialism, dependency, and exploitation – remain endemic across world politics. Despite its technological advances, ours is a world that Che would be very much familiar.

As such, we need to first 're-present' Che in the sense of Stuart Hall. Che was, after all, killed twice: his revolutionary practice was executed in Bolivia and his ideas banished to a romanticized past. Yet, like Che said of Martí, we must see him 'as if he were alive,' living on in and through his ideas (Guevara, January 28, 1960 in Bonachea & Valdes, 1969c, p. 212) – ideas that, as we will show, resonate in the contradictions of today. Che may have been popularly sanctioned today but only as a revolutionary figure for an era long-past, meaning that, he is now politically safe for the time wherein his revolutionary praxis could have been effective is now long past. This removes Che's legacy from the present so that the idealization of his revolutionary thought and deeds has the pernicious effect of serving to distance them even further, reducing his actions as some 'little soldier of fortune' (Che's words) (Guevara, 1965 in Deutschmann, 2003, p. 384) or his ideas as moral aspirations far too idealistic for our time. Of course, Che's unswerving ethics and demeanour, 'his resolute devotion to moral standards and human values' (Kronenberg, 2009, p. 66) as an exemplar of what a revolutionary should be, and as an anticipation of the 'new man' that will build the communist future, are well documented (see Saenz, 2017). Nevertheless, we need to humanize not just Che's personal ethics but to demonstrate the contemporary relevance of his ideas. The challenge is to appreciate these ideas in three ways. Firstly, as the confluence of all the elements that animated Che's thinking in his many roles, as a doctor, diplomat, communist, humanist, minister, orator, guerrilla, father (and so on). Secondly, the experiences in which these ideas incubated and developed – whether his travels across South America that awakened his political conscious, to the turning-point in Guatemala in which he became 'the fully consciousness revolutionary' (Guevara 1959–1964 in Deutschmann, 2003, p. 58), to the Cuban revolution and then his wider transnational revolutionary attempts (amongst other pivotal events). And thirdly, the interrelated contexts to which he directed his praxis at national, regional, and international levels, especially within the dramatic geopolitical context of the 1960s. Whilst this is a complex approach, it is the only way to engage Che's ideas meaningfully and without falling to preconceived assessments, especially the dangers of romanticization or demonization.

As we will show, despite the demoralization of contemporary social movements against global exploitation, Che's legacy offers insights into human emancipation in ways that bridge Marxist, Critical Theory, and Decolonial perspectives in IR. Specifically, we highlight three elements of Che's thought that speak directly to the socio-political concerns of world order today: the importance of class in understanding the state, society, and world order; the importance of understanding neo-imperialism as a function of how world order is constituted and dominated by core, capitalist states (led by the US); and in understanding the constraints that these realities place on an emancipatory, class-based and decolonial politics. Che was

not just a heroic guerrilla fighting for the liberation of all peoples but a thinker, a man of reflection, who never stopped critiquing revolutionary praxis. And so we ground our account in Che's important contributions to a critical Marxist IR, specifically, his analysis of neo-imperialism and his socialist-humanism, that resonate with some approaches in IR, especially Dependency Theory (DT). These fundamental ideas informed by Che's keen awareness of the complex internal relationships between politics, economics, education, ethics, ideologies, knowledge, justice and conduct (Martinez Heredia, 1989, p. 39–40).

Che's critique of imperialism

Che was one of the most important innovators of Marxism in Latin America (perhaps the most important after José Carlos Mariátegui), and a leading theorist of decolonial Marxism in world politics generally. Nevertheless, Che's importance for championing the legitimate grievances grounded in the histories of exploitation of the Global South is only rarely recognized in postcolonial approaches (exceptions see San Juan, 1998; Zubel, 2019). More curious, most of the recently published biographies of Che fail to account for this essential aspect of his thought. Even authors who express sympathy for Che fail to understand or belittle his Marxist work. For example, in Paco Ignacio Taibo II's (1997) beautiful book, Che's writings during the discussion on the law of value are dismissed as a 'maze of quotations' inspired by a 'biblical Marxism.' As for the French journalist Pierre Kalfon (1997), he considers Che's passionate essay *Socialism and Man in Cuba* as 'a bunch of formulas' inspired by 'a dogmatism of other times', that is to say, by the 'traditional Marxist logomachy.' Our interpretation differs sharply: if we ignore Che's thought, his ideas, his values, his revolutionary theory, his critical Marxism, how can we understand the coherence of his life, the essential motives of his actions, and the political intentions behind his practices in world politics?

Che called himself a radical which, as he was fond of repeating, is one who gets to the root of a problem (Guevara, March 1960 in Bonachea & Valdes, 1969c, p. 216). According to Che, echoing the *Communist Manifesto*, the root of the world's problems was exploitation that divided the world into two great forces: 'The exploiters and the exploited' (Guevara, October 1962, Bonachea & Valdes, 1969c, p. 81). It was why he claimed that *the* 'strategic' objective of all revolutionary activity, its emancipatory purpose, was for 'the destruction of the system of exploitation of man by man' (Guevara, October 1962, Bonachea & Valdes, 1969c, p. 87). In world politics, exploitation lay at the base of the contradiction between national sovereignty and real self-determination. To be properly free, Che insisted, humans must actualize economic *and* political sovereignty (Guevara, March 1960 in Bonachea & Valdes, 1969c, p. 213). Only this could lead to what Marx (1975) called full, human emancipation. It was in solving this contradiction – a contradiction that remains a fault-line across world politics today – that Che directed his actions *against* capitalist imperialism and *for* an international-socialist-humanism. Unlike most of the leaders of the Cuban revolution, Guevara already had a Marxist background when he joined the 26th of July Movement in Mexico in 1955. He discovered Marxism not as an academic or as part of 'coffee-shop theories' (Guevara, January 1959, Bonochea & Valdes, 1969c, p. 204) – though he did read Marx, thanks to the library of his partner Hilda Gadea and his Mexican friend Orfila Reynal, and read Lenin and the novels of Nazim Hikmet, Miguel Angel Asturias and Jorge Icaza. He discovered Marxism thanks to his political experience in Guatemala, at the time of the fall of Arbenz, victim of the CIA, the United Fruit, and the betrayal of the armed forces. As such, Che did not come to Marxism through the experience of the Cuban revolution itself, but, on the contrary, he tried to decipher that revolution by resorting to Marxist references and so he was the first to fully grasp the historical-social significance, proclaiming, in July 1960, that it 'also discovered, by its own methods, the paths pointed out by Marx' (Guevara, July 28, 1960 in 1970a, Vol. 2, p. 392). Well before that, in April 1959, he had foreseen the course that the Cuban process would take after the fall of Batista's dictatorship: it was a question, Che said in an interview with a Chinese journalist, of 'an uninterrupted development of the revolution' until the abolition of 'the existing social system' and its 'economic foundations' (Guevara, 1970b, p. 372).

This highlights one of the most significant aspects of Che's thought: the centrality of class analysis to understand how and why world politics manifests in exploitation, precipitating both imperialist wars and emancipatory revolutions. Imperialism and world order are conceived by Che in terms of class analysis (Besancenot & Löwy, 2017, p. 97). This is a markedly different starting point for IR theory, the discipline in which the 'Red Elephant' in the room – *class* – is such a glaring feature of world order and yet remains largely ignored as a tool of analysis in nearly all mainstream approaches to IR theory. Whilst the intersectional and decolonial turns are important shifts in this regard, promising ways to engage systems of exploitation in gender, race, and culture, these are yet to offer systematic engagements with class and status as key determinants of exploitation, though logically they should inevitably lead back to this. As yet, however, there is no major study in recent years directed to understanding class relations in world order, the links between class as a system and the international system, nor in examining the direct relation between class exploitation and neo-imperialism.² Rendering itself essentially blind to class, mainstream IR theory tends to get stuck at formalism or appearances: so political sovereignty or some vague

concept of social construction that then stands in place of real material relationships, and under which class is, once again, absent. Che, in distinction, based his political analysis on this key axis of exploitation, from the grass-roots, individual level of the suffering of the peasantry and proletariat, all the way up to how imperialist world order functions in continuing this exploitative economic system globally under the hegemony of the USA. For example, according to Che what best explained the underdevelopment of the Global South was determined by both the land system and imperialism, that together reduced people to wage labour and thus exploitation (Guevara, April 1961, Bonachea & Valdes, 1969c, p. 62). Imperialism, for Che, is understood in ways that echo Lenin's account in *Imperialism: The Latest State of Capitalism* but also Frank's Dependency Theory (DT), nascent during Che's time. The economic dynamic is centred internally on support of national monopolies that are then extended outwardly via finance capital to colonies and empires (sometimes forcefully or with complicity of the national bourgeoisie) – it is this process that 'makes the political power of many republics disappear' (Guevara, March 1960 in Bonachea & Valdes, 1969c, p. 215). This was, quoting Castro, the 'philosophy of plunder' that underlined all international wars – only when it was overcome would 'the philosophy of war' also disappear across world politics (see Guevara March 25, 1964 in Deutschmann, 2003, pp. 305–324). Che names Hitler's racial-based imperialism as exemplar in this regard but he views the same processes in the demands of United Fruit Company or Standard Oil Company against the political independence of other states (Guevara, March 1960 in Bonachea & Valdes, 1969c, p. 215). It is because of this analysis that Che insisted on the fundamental relation between economics and politics, those fundamental relations deliberately obscured by liberal theory and its practitioners in Western diplomacy (see Guevara, 1961a/2006). Only by maintaining the link between economics and politics at the forefront of analysis can the operations of imperialism be revealed rather than obscured by superficialities of sovereign equality and principles of non-intervention.

IR audiences may have a familiarity with some of Che's central claims here as they are compatible with DT (developed in the late 1960s) and World-Systems Theory (WST) (developed in the early 1970s) that have more of a readership in the discipline. Guevara's ideas certainly had an influence on Marxist social science (on this see Llorente, 2018) but it is difficult to assess the extent of his reception in these contemporary developments in IR and IPE. On several occasions at the Conference in Algiers (see Guevara February 24, 1965 in Deutschmann, 2003, pp. 340–349), Che made reference to the 'world imperialist system' but whilst this indicates a shared nomenclature, quite widespread even at this time, it is not likely that the founders of the WST were heavily influenced by Guevara (even though one could compare their respective views which would be an important contribution for future research). A relation with DT is more probable, given the temporal overlap. It is well-known that the authors belonging to the Marxist wing of DT – André Gunder Frank, Ruy Mauro Marini, Theotonio dos Santos, Vania Bambirra – were all familiar with Guevara's ideas, even if Che is not often mentioned in their writings. Moreover, there is a clear overlap in Che's thought with Paul Baran's earlier economist conceptions of dependency that focused on the removal of wealth from oppressed countries to the classes of wealthier states (see Llorente, 2018). One can suppose that one of the sources of the reflections of this group – on the political level rather than the purely economic – was the better-known speeches of Che at Punta del Este, the Algiers Conference, and the Tricontinental that were widely publicized at the time. For example, in the same Algiers Conference, Che refers at length to 'dependent countries' and 'under-developed nations' (February 24, 1965 in Deutschmann, 2003, pp. 340–349) arguing that their emancipation from imperialist domination could happen only through a socialist revolution – a view he radically extends in his April 1967 *Message to the Tricontinental*. Much earlier at Punta del Este in 1961 (where the dependency theories of Raúl Prebisch were popular) Che consistently referred to the imbalance of trade that accompanied the power imbalances between North and South (see Guevara, August 8, 1961a/2006), so that by the time of his speech at the *Tricontinental* Che understood that long-term growth in the periphery will remain imbalanced, unequal, in worsening terms of trade and unequal exchange, if there was no real transference of technology and industrialization from core states (or the socialist bloc), to the under-developed.

Nevertheless, whilst there is clearly compatibility between Che's ideas and DT and WST, there are some crucial differences. The most important revolve around praxis and historical agency. For Che, whilst sharing much of the analysis of the causes for dependency of the global South, his solution was far more than the highly structured approach of DT and, to a lesser extent, WST would permit. The question of the potential for autonomous and dynamic processes in the periphery is in this regard critical. DT was focused on the necessity of innovation in technology and/or the division of labour as something the periphery could not overcome (see Vernengo, 2006, p. 555). In distinction, Che was far more emphatic regarding the social and military capacities of the under-developed in initiating anti-imperialist struggle, thus giving them an autonomy typically denied in the over-determinism of DT/WST. Similarly, Che's contribution to socialist political economy and economic management was based on practical possibilities for the constructions of socialist project in conditions of underdevelopment (like Cuba) (see Yaffe, 2009). In this sense, his approach was far more socially embedded than WST analysis, and far more possibilist than what was curtailed by DT. Arguably, it is here that Che's legacy in IR today can be most productive because of his focus on the revolutionary content and possibilities within the periphery. This approach is

what is common to Critical Theorists like R.W. Cox(1983) and radical de-colonialists like Samir Amin(2010), because they do not over-determine cultural/civilizational difference but concentrate on class relations and resistance in the periphery as the key potential for any meaningful decolonization.

It is important then to trace how Che's unique Marxist-humanism developed, coming to be adjacent to and more radical than DT and WST. From 1959 until his death, Che's Marxism evolved. He moved further and further away from the initial illusions about the Soviet (Stalinist) model. One perceives more and more explicitly, especially in his writings from 1963 onwards, the search for an alternative model, the attempt to formulate another road to socialism, one that was far more consistently internationalist. Che's assassination by CIA agents and their Bolivian partners in October 1967 interrupted this process of political maturation and autonomous intellectual development. His work, then, is not a closed system, a finished approach that has an answer for everything. On many questions – democracy in socialism, the struggle against bureaucracy and so on – Che's reflections are incomplete. Nevertheless, Che's Marxism is different from the dominant variants of his time and which remains relevant today precisely because it is an anti-dogmatic, ethical, pluralist, humanist, and revolutionary. We will illustrate some of these characteristics below.

Most apparent is Che's critique of Marx who he showed was not blessed with the gift of infallibility. In his 'Notes for the study of the ideology of the Cuban Revolution' (1960), Che underlines that even though Marx was a giant of thought, the author of *Capital* had made mistakes that can and must be criticized. For example, in regards to Latin America, he said Marx's interpretation of Bolivar or the analysis of Mexico (that he made with Engels) 'even taking for granted certain theories of races or nationalities' of his time, were 'inadmissible today' (Guevara, 1970[Q3], Vol. 2, p. 416). Similarly, according to Che, rather than Marx's speculation that capitalism would fall due to exhaustion of productive capacities, it was the struggle against foreign oppression, liberation movements against neo-colonialism, and the misery of war and privilege 'on the backs of the exploited' that were causing the global system to 'explode' (Guevara, 1965 in Deutschmann, 2003, p. 216). More serious than Marx's mistakes however, were the phenomena of bureaucratic dogmatization of Marxism in the twentieth century: on several occasions, Guevara complains about the 'scholasticism that has slowed down the development of Marxist philosophy' – an obvious reference to Stalinism – that had systematically prevented the study of the period of the construction of socialism (Guevara, 1970[Q4], Vol 2, p. 416, 190).³ Unlike Orthodox Marxism that had ossified into a stagist theory of communism's 'inevitable' emergence, for Che the point was not to 'cross their arms and wait' (Guevara, 1963 in Bonochea & Valdes, 1969c, p. 104) passively, for stages of development 'until in some mechanical way all necessary objective and subjective conditions are given without working to accelerate them' (Guevara, 1969[Q5], p. 13). Rather, he took an incredibly active posture to history to which he channelled all his activities, whether the direct revolutionary work in Cuba, Angola, or Bolivia or in building socialist ethics through education, health, and economic planning – the essential aspects of *Bildung* for the emergence of a new 'man and woman' in which the individuals would develop themselves toward an image that 'will never be finished' (Guevara, April 1965, Bonochea & Valdes, 1969c, p. 160).


Much has been said on the theory of the guerrilla foquismo in Che's writings. But this tends to obscure that Che was aware how social revolution is a task not only of the indispensable vanguard but of the great majorities: it is 'the masses (who) make history as a conscious group of individuals fighting for the same cause (...) fighting to leave the realm of necessity and enter the realm of freedom' (Guevara, 1970[Q6], vol. 2, p. 249, 375, 383). A good part of Che's last writings, and particularly his critical comments on the 1963 edition of the *Soviet Handbook of Political Economy* explore these insights (though they remain incomplete). These comments became known only in 2006 when published in Cuba as *Critical Notes on Political Economy*⁴ and were written during Che's 1965–1966 stays in Tanzania and Prague, after the failure of his mission in Congo and before leaving for Bolivia. These critical notes document his intellectual independence, his distancing from the Soviet model of 'actually existing socialism,' and his search for a radical alternative. As in the earlier economic debates in Cuba, Guevara defends planning as the key element in the process of building socialism because it 'liberates the human being from his condition of economic thing.' But who should make the plans? During the 1963–1964 debate he did not answer this question. It is in these later notes that one finds new insights, and we can discern clearly his intention for the production and distribution to be democratically decided (rather than managers, which he had previously also limited the reliance on, or the party). One such paragraph is extremely important, for it shows that in some of his final political thoughts Guevara came close to the idea of direct, socialist democracy, a democratic planning process in which the people themselves, the workers, 'the masses,' to use his terminology, will make the major economic decisions:

In contradiction with a conception of the plan as an economic decision by the masses, conscious of the peoples' interests, we are offered a placebo, in which only the economic factors determine the collective fate. This is a mechanistic, non-Marxist technique. The masses must be able to direct their fate, to decide which share of production will be assigned respectively to accumulation and consumption. Economic technique must operate within the limits of this

information and the consciousness of the masses must ensure its implementation. (Guevara, 2006, pp. 132–133)

These link to his earlier thought on the role of labour and its relation to the state but shift it far more toward a participatory frame than of the party or moral exhortation (Guevara, August 21, 1962 in Deutschmann, 2003, p. 143ff). These sentiments can be also seen earlier in comments on direct democracy via labour councils (Guevara, April 1965, in Bonachea & Valdes, 1969c, p. 409). One can consider these notes as an important stage, albeit cut-short by his death, in Guevara's path toward a radical alternative to the Soviet (Stalinist) model and the 'heroic creation' of a new revolutionary socialism and a democratic communism.

Unfortunately, as these reflections were neither widely known or keenly developed, many continue to criticize Che's economics on this point (see Farber, 2016). Even though Che never managed to formulate a finished conception of socialist democracy, he defended the freedom of discussion in the revolutionary camp and respect for the plurality of opinions with the most striking example his response to the criticism of 'Trotskyism' that Soviet officials complained, to which he rejected blocking the 'free development of intelligence.'⁵ Che's spirit of independence was evidenced as far back as Guatemala where he claimed would only join the communist party on 'conviction' not 'obligation.'⁶ He reiterated across many of his speeches the importance of acknowledging and being 'severe' of one's own mistakes and to ensure 'self criticism' (Guevara, 1963 in Bonachea & Valdes, 1969c, p. 104), highlighting the importance of critical reflection, alongside promoting self-education and the 'creative spirit' (Guevara, October 20, 1962 in Deutschmann, 2003, p. 161). Similarly, Che's comments against bureaucratization are pronounced attacks on dogmatism that limit what he called 'political clarity' (Guevara, February 1963, in Deutschmann, 2003, p. 181).

In these fundamental ways Che's Marxism differed markedly from that of his time – but what were their effects then and now? In an article published in 1928, José Carlos Mariátegui (see 2014), the true founder  of Latin American Marxism, wrote:

Of course, we do not want socialism in Latin America to be an imitation or a copy. It must be a heroic creation. We must inspire Indo-American socialism with our own reality, our own language. That is a mission worthy of a new generation. (Mariátegui, 1971, p. 249)

This warning went unheard. In that same year, the Latin American communist movement fell under the influence of the Stalinist paradigm, which for close to a half century imposed on it an imitation and copy of the ideology of the Soviet bureaucracy. It served as a justification for a reformist policy of subordination of the workers movement to an alliance with the supposed 'national bourgeoisie,' for the sake of a supposed 'democratic, national and anti-feudal revolution' ('Codovilla', just to mention a symbolic name of a whole political system of Stalinist style). We do not know whether Che was acquainted with Mariátegui's article. He may have read it, for his companion Hilda Gadea loaned him Mariátegui's writings in the years preceding the Cuban revolution. Equally so, when Che made his odyssey through South America and stopped in Peru, he spent some time with Dr. Hugo Pesce, who was one of those closest to Mariátegui, and presented some of his theses to the First Meeting of Latin American Communist Parties.⁷ Whatever the case, much of his political thought and practice, especially in the 1960s, can be said to have been aimed at emerging from the impasse to which the servile imitation of the Soviet model had led Eastern Europe. From 1959 to 1967, Che's thought evolved considerably. He distanced himself from his initial illusions concerning the Stalinist version of Marxism. In a 1965 letter to a Cuban friend, he harshly criticized the 'ideological tailism' that was manifested in Cuba by the publication of Soviet manuals for instruction in Marxism. These manuals, 'Soviet bricks' to use Che's expression, 'have the disadvantage of not letting you think: the Party has already done it for you and you have to digest it.'⁸ Still more explicit, especially in his post-1963 writings, was Che's rejection of 'imitation and copy' and his attempt to formulate another alternative path toward socialism, one more radical, more egalitarian, more fraternal, and more consistent with the communist ethic.

Here, we come to what is arguably the most important aspect of Che's Marxism, its uncompromising humanist internationalism. Che's speech in Algiers in 1965 is the exemplar of this defining feature of Guevarism; both an incendiary rebuke of real-existing socialist states and an astute outline of what a consistent internationalist praxis *should* look like (Guevara, February 24, 1965, in Bonachea & Valdes, 1969c, pp. 350–359). But it was in essence an extension of Che's thought already germane in 1964. Che's class analysis into the basis of imperialism in politics and economics was outlined clearly in his speech to the UN General Assembly in 1964. Here, he reiterated that 'the faults of colonialism which impede the people's development are not confined to the political field,' citing the deterioration of trade and unequal exchange which meant that despite decolonization economically dependent peoples will, inevitably, fall 'once more under the political domination of the imperialists and the colonialists' (Guevara, December 1964, in Bonachea & Valdes, 1969c, p. 342). In *International Affairs* Che developed this argument in direct relation to the history of Cuba in which 'the political-military oppression of the

United States' may have been 'formally ended' in May 1902 'but her monopolistic power remained.' Cuba then became 'an economic colony of the United States' under which 'a very considerable foreign trade that bore all the characteristic marks of colonialism: primary products to the metropolis, manufactured goods to the colony' (Guevara, October 1964, pp. 589–590). Without seeing the radical connection between economic and politics, continuing to define sovereignty merely formalistically would allow the fiction to be maintained that national sovereignty is divisible from economic realities, thus permitting 'world powers' to simply 'call their colonies free associated states' to hide 'the fact of colonisation behind the phrase' – King Leopold used this strategy in the Congo Free State, just as the US continues in Puerto Rico. Real sovereignty, Che continued, was not just the principle of non-interference but the right of a people to its 'way of life' – something that would remain 'fictitious,' according to Che, 'if there is no economic independence' (Guevara, March 1960 in Bonachea & Valdes, 1969c, p. 216).

What made Che's speech at Algiers distinct from this earlier analysis, however, was that he now directed these criticisms also against real existing socialist states. Whilst he modulated his tone, the argument was cutting to the socialist-bloc. The speech would become steeped in controversy, some suggesting it was the beginning of Che's ostracism by the Soviet leadership.⁹ The speech pinpointed the glaring contradiction in 'real socialist' assistance to national liberation movements in which Che observed a lack of 'proletarian internationalism' – a sentiment he would take even further in his 'Message to the Tricontinental' in 1967. As far back as 1959 however he was already calling for unity of all the world's oppressed as the strategy of proletarian internationalism – 'We still must open up roads to get all of our underdeveloped countries to unite' (Guevara, April 18, 1959, in Bonachea & Valdes, 1969c, p. 375). On the one hand, this meant that economically, the fight against imperialism had to be 'under-written' by socialist countries via a 'spirit of responsibility.' Yet rather than solidarity, both the Soviets and China, Che alleged, were imposing conditions of trade on developing states to the degree that they were 'accomplices to imperialist exploitation.' Che insisted that competition between 'brother countries' (a principle derived from a capitalist theory of value) must be 'subordinated to a fraternity policy toward the people' (Guevara, February 24, 1965, in Bonachea & Valdes, 1969c, pp. 350–353). This differs sharply from Che's earlier account of the 'favourable economic implications' of the forms of trade in the 'socialist camp' (specifically trade between Cuba and the USSR) he made in October 1964 (Guevara, 1964, p. 597). In the *Critical Notes on Political Economy* he finds that relations between self-professed socialist states are beset by 'expansionism, unequal exchange, competition' even 'exploitation', and certainly 'submission of weak states to the strong' (Guevara, 2006, p. 189, 192–193). Sinclair (1970) describes Che's theoretical justification for this critique of cynical realpolitik within so-called socialist states. Instead, Che's plea was simple: real socialist states must invest in (socialist) developing states, rather than in investing in their own domestic industries. This would assist under-developed countries to economically develop, defend themselves against reaction, and in the end offer the socialist world long-term economic diversity – all of which would be 'under-written' by established socialist states. Tablada's (1998) work explores how Che accounted for why capitalist categories (profit, balance of trade, individual interest, etc.) – what Che called the 'dull instruments left to us by capitalism' (Guevara, 1965 in Deutschmann, 2003, p. 217) – could not be yardsticks for measuring progress in the transition to socialism. Elsewhere, Che went so far as to speculate an alternate, socialist internationalist system of trade in which the more developed and industrialized socialist states would give to these national liberation movements both arms and industrial goods, the latter on the basis of long-term development projects that could help rapidly achieve the economic needs of self-determination, ushering in a 'new era of authentic international division of labour' (Guevara, February 24, 1965, in Bonachea & Valdes, 1969c, p. 353).

On the other hand, politically, Che observed how the diversity of national liberation movements was united under a 'common aspiration' to defeat imperialism but had to be fortified by an international 'revolutionary jurisprudence' (Guevara, February 24, 1965, in Bonachea & Valdes, 1969c, p. 350). This would replace the older form of interstate relations with the 'establishment' of *real* equality between countries. This idea was premised on adjudicating capitalist and socialist states, a form of radical non-interventionism, that Che called 'world international solidarity' and identified in the UN Charter as a deterrent to imperialism and barrier to foreign aggression (see Guevara, December 1964 in Bonachea & Valdes, 1969c, p. 346; Guevara, 1969[Q7], p. 138). Yet the 'revolutionary jurisprudence' between socialist-state would go much further, heralding a new juridical form of world politics based on genuine economic and political self-determination.¹⁰ In the absence of this alternative however, Che alleged to the *Tricontinental* that the 'two biggest' socialist states had hesitated to make Vietnam 'inviolable' on the basis of either the UN Charter, or revolutionary jurisprudence!¹¹ This was the practical effect of the lack of proletarian internationalism of real-socialist states with the liberation movements across the Global South. Bereft of a militant, proletarian internationalism, Che's answer to the isolation of national liberation movements like Vietnam was for *all* exploited nations to create fronts against imperialism. Otherwise, they would face the 'primacy of American capital' (in Latin America), blockades (in Asia), and neo-colonial invasions (in Africa)(Guevara, April 1967, in Deutschmann, 2003, pp. 354–355, 360). It was for these ultimately pragmatic reasons that we can see why he claims that

'Proletarian internationalism is a duty, but it is also a revolutionary necessity' (Guevara, 1965, in Deutschmann, 2003, p. 226). In this context, he cites not only Latin American states but Lusophone decolonial movements that were taking place at the time in Angola and Mozambique (Guevara, April 1967, in Deutschmann, 2003, p. 358). Earlier, he had consistently called for a progressive bloc of states – socialist and others – to fight against the US, Belgian and UK forces in the Congo (see Gott, 1996). Without such united fronts, all movements would be vulnerable to foreign interventions that would re-install imperialism and it is this idea that also explains Che's urgency in undertaking risky revolutionary ventures abroad. That is, to 'create,' as he said, 'two or three more Vietnams,' was to not only support those fighting for freedom in Vietnam but to overstretch American imperialism so that other fronts of liberation could also be successful. He wrote this message from Bolivia where he was attempting to accomplish precisely that. It was not voluntarism, then, that led Che to his fate as many suggest but a strategic choice – albeit one miscalculated on assumptions of a spontaneous solidarity that did not emerge.

All of this positions Che as the exemplar of anti-colonial movements at the time. He often focused on the 'nations of colonial America' and their struggles against foreign monopolies (especially from the North), linking the recent revolutionary moments in Guatemala, Bolivia, and Venezuela to older South American revolutionary tendencies of Bolivarianism and Zapatismo. He often cites how Latin American states gave reciprocal aid across the continent, especially in struggles against the Spanish. In his later years however, the interrelation of all de-colonial movements across Asia, Africa and Oceania are emphasized (Guevara, 1969 [Q8], p. 132; Guevara, July 28, 1960, in Deutschmann, 2003, p. 231ff) – they are united as the 'we' of 'the dispossessed,' as he poetically expresses it (Guevara, April 1967: in Deutschmann, 2003, p. 361). Che celebrated the Bandung Conference in which Asia and Africa 'joined hands' (1969 [Q9], p. 132–133) an event that has been made much of in postcolonial literature in IR as well (Pham & Shilliam, 2016). Importantly, however, Che subsequently went much further extolling the more radical form of solidarity in the Second Declaration of Havana, made after Cuba's expulsion from the Organisation of American States.¹² As Che explains, it was based on a deeper sense of solidarity, a 'solidarity among peoples does not now come from religion, customs, tastes, racial affinity or lack. It arises from a similarity in economic and social conditions and from a similarity in desire for progress and recuperation' (Guevara, 1969 [Q10], p. 132). Moreover, unlike Bandung that was purposed around economic and cultural cooperation between Asia and Africa as a means to fend off neo-colonialism, the Second Declaration of Havana took the radical position based on the shared history of 'the most merciless and cruel exploitation by imperialism' across Asia, Africa, and Oceania (Guevara, October–November 1962, in Deutschmann, 2003, p. 296). In Che's lexicon, the Declaration was made in firm view of the political and economic foundations of imperialism in exploitation. The Tricontinental that developed, in part, from this was premised on the shared 'pain, humiliation' across these regions as they each suffered the ongoing legacies of 'slavery, semi-slavery, feudalism and now neo-imperialism' (Guevara, October–November 1962, in Deutschmann, 2003, pp. 296–297). Despite how these horrors were experienced differently by the nations, cultures, and races of the Tricontinental they nevertheless formed a 'single whole' in which 'economic forces have been distorted by imperialism,' first by the European bourgeoisie and later 'US imperialist capital' (Guevara, October–November 1962, in Deutschmann, 2003, pp. 296–297). This distortion prevented the enjoyment of economic independence, and thus full sovereignty of all these peoples. It was because of this shared material exploitation that the initial aims between these liberation movements were also comparable: agrarian reform (leading to change in ownership for the benefit of the peasantry), nationalization of key industries (especially mining), and suppression of the military in civilian affairs, amongst others (see Guevara, 1969 [Q11], p. 132).

Nevertheless, Che's advocacy for the deployment of foquismo as the tactic for a successful revolutionary strategy was not as well-made, nor necessarily well received. On his travels throughout Africa for instance, Che met with representatives of Mozambique's independence movement, FRELIMO (Mozambique Liberation Front) (see Seddon, 2017). A story recounts how Eduardo Mondlane rejected foquismo (and the offer of aid) because of the distance of the doctrine from integrating with the peasantry, replying to Che that 'we must be with the peasantry, as a fish is to water.'¹³ So whilst Che's analysis of the conditions of imperialism is based on sound class analysis, the same analysis of the objective conditions for revolution is not. The problem seems to be Che's focus on a global grand strategy of socialist revolution rather than tactical imperatives necessary in specific contexts and the lack of coordination between them.

Che's Humanism

As we can see, there is a distinct socialist-humanism underpinning Che's critical Marxism. Referring to *Capital*, Che wrote that: 'The weight of this monument of human intelligence is such that it has often made us forget the humanist character (in the best sense of the word) of its concerns' (Guevara, Vol. 2, 1970 [Q12], p. 252). Arguably, this humanism is most protean in Che's conception of solidarity in proletarian internationalism but *all* the central themes of his Marxism have their foundation in it: his critique of capitalism as a society in which 'man is man's wolf,' his reflections on the transition to socialism, and his vision of a communist utopia. The most profound and personal formulation of Che's humanism is found in the essay *El*

socialismo y el hombre en Cuba (1965) where he makes the now famous statement that 'the true revolutionary is guided by great feelings of love.' As he explains, without love for the people, love for humanity, without these feelings of generosity 'it is impossible to think of an authentic revolutionary' (Guevara, Vol. 2, 1970 [Q13], p. 382; Guevara, 1965, in Deutschmann, 2003, p. 217). Revolutionaries must be the 'most complete of human beings,' Che says on the role of Marxist-Leninism, and that it was 'precisely love for man' that Marxism was 'conceived' (quoting Fidel Castro, Guevara, 1963, Bonachea & Valdes, 1969c, p. 110). Che developed these ideas largely independently. It is likely he had read Aníbal Ponce's work on humanism that echoes Marx's critique of the *Paris Manuscripts* regarding the incomplete nature of the bourgeois revolutions, how formal rights were insufficient for full, human emancipation. Regardless of its origins, however, this ethical basis renders Che's Marxism completely different from the structuralist, 'anti-humanist', Althusserian vulgate, that was so widespread in Latin American Marxism in the 1960s and 1970s. It also renders Che's Marxism prefigurative: international solidarity was necessary for overcoming imperialism *and* as practices of the infancy of the socialist project, they would lay the conditions for emancipation by creating the future of a new man and women. As Che expressed it, in these ways the masses 'are now making history as consciences collective of individuals' and their 'reward is the new society' (Guevara, 1965, in Deutschmann, 2003, p. 220). For these same reasons, we can better understand Che's personal ethic and leading by example not just as some moral imperative but as the means to overcome alienation in the very process of defeating exploitation and imperialism.

Many have noted the humanism of Che's thought. For Saenz, it is Che's addition to Marxism that emphasizes the 'subjective' aspects of praxis, especially conscience and ideology (Saenz, 2017, p. 94). For others, it leads to a universalism of equality and dignity (Kronenberg, 2009, p. 70). For us, it is fundamental because Che's revolutionary praxis can only be understood from these humanist ethical values¹⁴ and we can see this in at least two ways. Firstly, according to Che, the construction of socialism is inseparable from certain ethical values, contrary to the economic-determinist conceptions – from Stalin to Charles Bettelheim – which only consider the 'development of the productive forces'. In the famous interview with the journalist Jean Daniel (July 1963) Che stated, in what was already an implicit criticism of 'real socialism' that 'Economic socialism without communist morality does not interest me. We fight against misery, but at the same time against alienation. (...) If communism ignores the facts of conscience, it may be a method of distribution, but it is no longer a revolutionary morality' (Guevara, July 25, 1963, p. 9). Elsewhere he argued that the moral aspect of the Cuban revolution – its 'moral influence' and its 'moral missiles' – was its real 'value' (Guevara, October 1962, in Bonachea & Valdes, 1969c, p. 78; Guevara, October–November 1962 in Deutschmann, 2003, p. 295). Secondly, his humanism recalls a radical cosmopolitan ethic stretching (in the West at least) as far back as Hierocles. In Critical IR Theory, Linklater (amongst many others) has made much of the Kantian premise in *Perpetual Peace* where 'a violation of right in one place of the earth is felt all over it' as the principle basis for an emancipatory cosmopolitanism (1981, p. 27). Che echoes this sentiment but via a different tradition, that of Martí, and his famous quote that 'Every true man must feel on his own cheek every blow dealt against the cheek of another' (Guevara, 1963, in Deutschmann 2003, p. 177). The importance of this principle for Che cannot be understated. He repeats this sentiment in one of his last letters to his children, asking them to 'be capable of feeling deeply any injustice committed against anyone, anywhere in the world' (Guevara, 1965, in Deutschmann 2003, p. 383). In his talk to the young communists in 1962, Guevara insisted that the revolutionary must 'always consider the great problems of humanity as his own problems,' that is, 'to feel anguished when a man is assassinated in any corner of the world and to feel enthusiastic when in some corner of the world a new flag of freedom is raised.' He had asked rhetorically whether 'our brotherhood transcends' distances, shared language, close cultural links (Guevara, September/October 1959, in Bonachea & Valdes, 1969c, p. 44) and he extolled Martí precisely because he 'belongs' to all nations of the Americas and was well-known champion of human rights, denouncing injustices everywhere and dying for these ...' (Guevara, January 28, 1960 in Bonachea & Valdes, 1969c, pp. 209–211). From this fundamental tenant, it is easy to see why Che answered María Rosario Guevara, who was inquiring if they were related, by replying that 'if you are capable of trembling with indignation each time that an injustice is committed' that this was a far stronger bond than just family (Guevara, 1964, in Deutschmann, 2003, p. 376). Beyond his tactical errors, Che's personal commitment to the revolutions in the Congo, Angola and Bolivia, at the risk of his life, is the translation in deeds of this humanist ethic.

These humanist principles were able to articulate not only the grievances of Cuba and the Tricontinental across the Global South but also mirrored the nomenclature of post-1945 international order. At this time, the language of rights and self-determination were at their high-watermark in the decolonization movement and Che was able to celebrate how all liberation movements, especially Cuba, had raised the flag and the way of 'dignity' – a word often used by both Che and Castro in the early 1960s. We may consider this choice of language deliberate, as it was a clear discursive way for Che to legitimize these liberation movements via the defining normative principles in the preambles to both the UN Charter and the Universal Declaration of Human Rights (Guevara, 1969 [Q14], p. 134). He takes this language up in his diplomacy,

especially his famous speeches at Punta Del Este,¹ where he champions those revolutions with 'humanist characteristics' that seek to actualize 'the dignity of the human being' (1961a/2006, p. 34, 36). Dignity, he makes clear, includes the abolition of racial discrimination and equality of women (that remains the two of the four bedrocks of the Cuban revolution – alongside education and healthcare) and was an obvious attack on the civil rights movement in the US at the time. He often reiterates Martí's sentiment claiming that the internationalist is one who sees any affront to 'human dignity and happiness anywhere in the world' as a personal affront (Guevara, 1963 in Bonachea & Valdes, 1969c, p. 110; 1961a/2006, p. 35). This focus on dignity is said to be the essence of the 'practice of true proletarian internationalism' in the Second Declaration of Havana, as it aims to guide revolutionary movements in Latin America by holding high the 'flag of human dignity' (Guevara, 1963 in Bonachea & Valdes, 1969c, p. 110). And in Algiers he claims that 'We cannot remain indifferent in the face of what occurs in any part of the world' (Guevara, February 24, 1965 in Bonachea & Valdes, 1969c, pp. 350–351). The concept of dignity then becomes a source of normative legitimation within world order for these liberation and independence movements as they each work toward a world of emancipation, a way that Che's far more radical notions of proletarian solidarity and revolutionary jurisprudence can be expressed. In so doing, questions of international aid and regional assistance are given an alternative grounding to the mere forms of economic integration pursued, for instance, by the US at Punta Del Este.² Whereas these would threaten to make Latin American states 'a herd of cattle', Che's form of self-determination was to free all states from the 'tutelage' of any dependency and lead toward a socialist internationalism (Kronenberg, 2009, p. 70).

Conclusion

All the writings and speeches of Che from 1959 until his death, whether on the Latin American reality, on the guerrilla war, on the international struggle against imperialism, or on the economic problems of Cuba, have a central, concrete and urgent objective: the revolutionary transformation of international society. As Bensaïd commented, Che was fighting 'a desperate race against time with barbarism' (in Besancenot & Löwy, 2017, p. 114). Che's sense of urgency to fight exploitation 'wherever it is' is felt today with even greater urgency given the exploitation of man-by – man mirrors that of nature, and the ecological clock is ticking toward our final hour. The world has, of course, changed in the decades since Che's death. It is not a question of going back in time and looking to Che's writings for the answer to all our current problems. But the truth is that people remain, today as yesterday, under the domination of imperialism; that capitalism, in its neo-liberal form, continues to produce the same effects of social injustice, oppression, unemployment, poverty, commodification of the spirit, and increasing environmental chaos the world over. Worse, never before has multinational finance capital exercised such overwhelming power over the entire planet, cancelling all³ democratic controls and oversight. Never, as now, has capitalism succeeded in drowning all human feelings in the 'icy waters of selfish calculation'. Che was aware – more so than his contemporaries – of the 'relative lack of development of social consciousness' that, arguably, has only receded even further under the weight of neo-liberal ideology in late-stage capitalism (Guevara, 1965, in Deutschmann, 2003, p. 215). In the same passage, his critique of the Rockefeller myth of the self-made man, the depravity and the suffering of others it entails, is still to be learned. He feared that ideas of property and the relations could extend beyond the conditions that produced them (see Guevara, February 1964, in Deutschmann, 2003, pp. 184–211). As he once reflected of pre-revolutionary Cuba, 'The people were conscious of the need for change but lacked the certainty of the possibility of change' (Guevara, 1963, in Bonachea & Valdes, 1969c, p. 106). That is why we need, today more than ever, Che's Marxism, an anti-dogmatic, ethical, pluralist, revolutionary, humanist Marxism. Whilst Che's language, filled with passion and brimming with idealism, seems to speak to an alien world, we have shown that his analysis of the conditions of world order based on exploitation and neo-imperialism remains relevant today. Most of all, the outline of a theory of emancipation he leaves us with reminds us of the fundamental importance of self-determination in world politics: political independence allows for a state's way of life to remain its own; economic independence allows it to develop in the ways necessary for it to actualize its way of life; and the juridical relation of 'revolutionary jurisprudence' would offer the legal recognition of this across international society. His socialist-humanism is the key component of his proposal for a new international order.

Notes

1 Che's Speeches and writings taken from these two sources are referred to as Deutschmann (2003), and Bonachea & Valdes (1969c). ✗

2 This may appear a difficult claim to sustain, but no major work i.e. manuscript-length has been focused on class and IR in the last decade. Outside of some studies in IPE, the latest was Budd (2013), before that Teschke (2003), and Van der Pijl (1998). Moreover, most IR textbooks and introductory texts omit reference to class as an analytical category altogether.

✗

3 In Che's April 1962 speech on Escalante and his attempt to Stalinize the Cuban revolutionary party Guevara stresses the intimate relationship between alienation from the masses, bureaucratism, sectarianism and dogmatism (see Guevara, 1967, p. 333). ✗

4 During 40 years this document remained 'invisible'. After the end of the USSR, some Cuban researchers were allowed to consult it and take a few notes. But it was only in 2006 that it was decided to publish them in Cuba, together with other material from the same period (see Guevara, 2006). ✗

5 Che said:

"In this respect, I believe that either we have the capacity to destroy with arguments the opposing opinion or we must let it express itself ... It is not possible to destroy an opinion with force, because that blocks all free development of intelligence. A number of things can also be taken from Trotsky's thought, even if, as I believe, he was mistaken in his fundamental concepts, and if his subsequent action was erroneous ... " (Guevara, December 1969, p. 37)

It should also be noted the relation of Guevarism to Trotskyism (especially the idea of combined and uneven development, given Che's reflections on the inability of Cuba to industrialize and his rejection of socialism in one country) and Maoism (especially related to guerrilla warfare, foquismo, and relations between peasant and proletariats) are not yet well theorized and should make the focus of future research but are beyond the scope of this article (see Guevara, July 28, 1960, in Deutschmann, 2003, p. 234).

✗

6 Story recounted in Rojo (1968, p. 56). ✗

7 We thank an anonymous reviewer for this point. ✗

8 This is from 'Letter from Che to a Cuban friend' (1965), one of Che's documents that remain unpublished. Carlos Tablada quotes from it in his article (1996, p. 168). ✗

9 Documents suggest Che "had become undesirable" to the Soviet leadership (see Bensaïd, 2009, pp. 113, 115). ✗

10 Though we are left with only a fragment of this idea, its implications for an alternative basis for international law and the relations between states are profound. ✗

11 The Tricontinental was the Organisation of Solidarity with the Peoples of Asia, Africa and Latin America (OSPAAAL) established in January 1966 in Havana. Che wrote this message in the inaugural edition of its publication *Tricontinental Magazine* (see Guevara, April 1967, in Deutschmann, 2003, 352–353). ✗

12 The Second Declaration of Havana, February 4, 1962 was Cuba's response to their expulsion from the Organization of American States (OAS). Available here: <http://www.walterlippmann.com/fc-02-04-1962.pdf> ✗

13 Discussion with Supreme Court Judge Abdul Carimo Issah in Beline, Mozambique, 1 January 2022. ✗

14 One of the examples is the clemency to prisoners (see Taibo II, 1997, p. 299). ✗

Notes on contributors

Shannon Brincat is a Senior Lecturer in Politics and International Relations at the University of the Sunshine Coast, Australia

Michael Löwy is emeritus research director in social sciences at the French National Center of Scientific Research and lectures at the École des hautes études en sciences sociales.

Disclosure statement

No potential conflict of interest was reported by the author(s) [Q15].

ORCID

Shannon Brincat <http://orcid.org/0000-0002-1426-5793>

References

- Bensaïd, D. (2017). *Che: A thinker of acts* (pp. 111–118).
- Economics cannot be separated from politics (Speech at Punta del Este August 8, 1961).
- The battle is not yet decided (Press Conference in Cuba on the Punta del Este Conference August 23, 1961).

- Honoring Jose Martí. January 28, 1960 (pp. 209–212).
- Political sovereignty and economic independence. March 1960 (pp. 213–229).
- Tactics and strategy of the Latin American Revolution. October 1962 (77–88).
- Social ideals of the rebel army. January 1959 (pp. 196–204).
- Cuba: Exception case or vanguard in the struggle against colonialism? April 1961 (pp. 57–70).
- The role of a Marxist-Leninist Party. 1963 (pp. 104–111).
- Socialism and man in Cuba. April 1965 (pp. 155–169).
- Interview with Al-Talí-ah. April 1965 (pp. 405–418).
- Revolution and Underdevelopment. February 24, 1965 (pp. 350–362).
- Colonialism is doomed. December 1964 (pp. 334–349).
- A new old Che Guevara interview. April 18, 1959 (pp. 368–376).
- Latin America as seen from the Afro-Asian Continent. September/October 1959 (pp. 43–45).
- Al Primer Congreso Latinoamericano de Juventudes. Speech of July 28, 1960.
- At the Afro-Asian conference in Algeria. February 24, 1965 (pp. 340–349).
- To my parents. 1965 (p. 384).
- Episodes of the revolutionary war. 1959–1964 (pp. 19–60).
- The philosophy of plunder must cease. March 25, 1964 (pp. 305–324).
- Socialism and man in Cuba. 1965 (pp. 212–230).
- A new culture of work. August 21, 1962 (pp. 143–152).
- Speech to the First Latin American Youth Congress. July 28, 1960 (pp. 231–241).
- To be a young communist. October 20, 1962 (pp. 158–168).
- Against Bureaucratism. February 1963 (pp. 178–183).
- Create two, three, many Vietnams (Message to the Tricontinental). April 1967 (pp. 350–364).
- Tactics and strategy of the Latin American Revolution. October–November 1962 (pp. 294–304).
- A party of the working class. 1963 (pp. 169–177).
- To my children. 1965 (p. 383).
- To María Rosario Guevara. 1964 (p. 376).
- On the budgetary [Q20]finance system. February 1964 (pp. 184–211).

Amin, S. (2010). *Eurocentrism* (2nd ed.). Monthly Review Press.[Q16]

Anderson, J. L. (1998). *Che Guevara: A revolutionary life*. Grove Press.

Aribowo, T., & Risman, H. (2020). The comparison of Guerrilla warfare framework of Mao Tse-Tung, Vo Nguyen Giap, and Che Guevara. *Journal of Social and Political Sciences*, 3(4). <https://doi.org/10.31014/aior.1991.03.04.239>

Besancenot, O., & Löwy, M. (2017). *Che Guevara: His revolutionary legacy* (J. Membrez, trans.). Aakar.[Q17]

Budd, A. (2013). *Class, states and international relations*. Routledge.

Castañeda, J. (1998). *Compañero: The life and death of Che Guevara*. Penguin Random House.

Cox, R. W. (1983). Gramsci, hegemony and international relations: An essay in method. *Millennium*, 12(2), 162–175. <https://doi.org/10.1177/03058298830120020701>

Farber, S. (2016). *The politics of Che Guevara: Theory and practice*. Haymarket.

Gott, R. (1996). Che Guevara in the Congo. *New Left Review*, 1/220.

Guevara, E. (1961a/2006). In **M. D. C. A. Garcia & J. Salado** (Eds.), *Our America and Theirs: Kennedy and the Alliance for Progress – The Debate at Punta Del Este*. Ocean Press.

- Guevara, E.** (1963, July 25). Interview with Jean Daniel. *L'Express*.
- Guevara, E.** (1964, October). The Cuban economy: Its past, and its present importance. *International Affairs*, 40(4), 589–599. <https://doi.org/10.2307/2611726>
- Guevara, E.** (1967). *Obra revolucionaria*. Era.
- Guevara, E.** (1969, December). Il piano i gli uomini. *Il Manifesto*, n° 7.
- Guevara, E.** (1969a). *Guerrilla warfare*. Pelican[Q18].
- Guevara, E.** (1969c). *Che: Selected works of Ernesto Guevara* (Bonachea, R. E., & valdes, N. P., eds.). The MIT Press.
- Guevara, E.** (1970a). *Obras Escogidas*. Havana: Casa de las Américas, volumes 1–2.
- Guevara, E.** (1970b). *Selected works*[Q19]. MIT Press.
- Guevara, E.** (1977). *Escritos discursos*. Editorial Ciecias Socialies. volumes 1–9.
- Guevara, E.** (2003). *Che Guevara reader* (Deutschmann, D., ed., 2nd ed). Ocean Press.
- Guevara, E.** (2006). *Apuntes criticos a la economia politica*. Ocean Press, Editorial de Ciencias Sociales.
- Guevara, J. M., & Vincent, A.** (2017). *Che, my brother*. John Wiley & Sons.
- Hobsbawn, E.** (1999). *Revolutionaries*. Abacus.
- Hobsbawn, E.** (2002). *Age of extremes*. Abacus ed. Time Warner Books.
- Hurd, G. W.** (1972). The political theory of Ernesto Che Guevara. *International Relations*, 4(5), 527–544. <https://doi.org/10.1177/004711787200400510>
- Kalfon, P.** (1997). *Che, Ernesto Guevara*. Plaza & Janes Editores.
- Kronenberg, C. W.** (2009). Manifestations of humanism in revolutionary Cuba: Che and the principle of universality. *Latin American Perspectives*, 36(2), 66–80. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0094582X09331953>
- Linklater, A.** (1981). Men and citizens in world politics. *Review of International Studies*, 7(1), 23–37. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0260210500115104>
- Llorente, R.** (2018). *The political theory of Che Guevara*. Rowman & Littlefield.
- Löwy, M.** (1973). *Che Guevara's Marxism*. Monthly Review Press.
- Mariátegui, J. C.** (1971). *Ideología y Política, Obras Completas 13* (2nd ed.). Editorial Amauta.
- Mariátegui, J. C.** (2014). *An anthology* (Vanden, H. E., and Becker, M., eds., & trans.) (pp. 127–131). Monthly Review Press. [Q21]
- Martinez Heredia, F.** (1989). *Che, el socialismo y el comunismo. Premio Casa de las Américas*. Casa de las Américas.
- Marx, K.** (1975). On the Jewish question. In *Karl Marx, Frederick Engels collected works* (Vol. 3, pp. 146–174). Lawrence & Wishart.[Q22]
- Pham, Q. N., & Shilliam, R.** (2016). *Meanings of Bandung postcolonial orders and decolonial visions*. Rowman & Littlefield.
- Rich, P. B.** (2017). People's war antithesis: Che Guevara and the mythology of Foquismo. *Small Wars and Insurgencies*, 28(3), 451–487. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09592318.2017.1307616>
- Rojo, R.** (1968). *My friend Che*. Grove Press.
- Saenz, T. W.** (2009). *Minister Che Guevara*. Garamond.
- Saenz, T. W.** (2017). Che Guevara e o Homem Novo. *Revista Encontros com a Filosofia*, Ano V, No 8 (OUT), 94–102.
- San Juan, E.** (1998). *Beyond postcolonial theory*. Palgrave-Macmillan.
- Seddon, D.** (2017, April 4). Che Guevara in the Congo. *Jacobin*. <https://jacobinmag.com/2017/04/che-guevara-cuba-castro-congo-patrice-lumumba-colonialism>
- Sinclair, A.** (1970). *Guevara*. Fontana/Collins.
- Tablada, C.** (1996). Le marxisme d'Ernesto (Che) Guevara. *Alternatives Sud* III, no. 2.
- Tablada, C.** (1998). *Che Guevara: Economics and politics in the transition to socialism (The Cuban revolution in world politics)*. Pathfinder Press.

Taibo, P. I. (1997). *Guevara, also known as Che*. St Martins Press.

Teschke, B. (2003). *The myth of 1648*. Verso.

The Second Declaration of Havana. (1962, February 4). <http://www.walterlippmann.com/fc-02-04-1962.pdf>

Van der Pijl, K. (1998). *Transnational classes and international relations*. Routledge.

Vernengo, M. (2006). Technology, finance, and dependency: Latin American radical political economy in retrospect. *Review of Radical Political Economics*, 38(4), 551–568. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0486613406293220>

Yaffe, H. (2009). Che Guevara's enduring legacy: Not the *foco* Bu the theory of socialist construction. *Latin American Perspectives*, 36(2), 49–65. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0094582X09331956>

Zubel, M. (2019). Translating Che in the socialist bloc. *The Global South*, 13(1), 125–144. <https://doi.org/10.2979/globalsouth.13.1.07>