

THE MAIN RESEARCH AREAS OF THE U.S. POLICY TOWARDS THE CUBAN REVOLUTION IN THE SOVIET AND POST-SOVIET HISTORIOGRAPHY

Kateryna KASATKINA

Zaporizhzhya National University (Ukraine)
E-mail: ka.kasatkina@gmail.com

Abstract: *The article is an attempt to detect the main research areas of the U.S. reaction towards the Cuban Revolution in the current historiography. The main groups of the works in the Soviet, post-Soviet, American and Cuban historiography were analysed. There were shown the basic research centres that had studied various aspects of the U.S. actions towards the Cuba. In the article, there were also considered the main dimensions and approaches towards the issue. There were revealed changes which happened in the studies at the post-Cold war period. It was also determined that the formation and change of the main approaches to the U.S. reaction towards the Cuban Revolution depended on the ideological context and transformation of the international situation. In the American historiography, the main research areas have reflected a plurality of views and were dominated by a more balanced approach in the post-Cold War period. In the Soviet and post-Soviet historiography, we found the substitution of the main concept: the notion of the American imperialism has been replaced by the conception of U.S. geopolitical interests in Latin America. The Cuban historiography was characterized by two different groups: Cuban studies and the publications of historians-emigrants.*

Keywords: *U.S., Cuban Revolution, Historiography, Cold War, the Soviet Union, Cuba, imperialism*

Rezumat: *Principalele direcții de cercetare ale politicii SUA față de Revoluția Cubaneză în istoriografia sovietică și post-sovietică. Articolul este o încercare de a identifica principalele direcții de cercetare ale politicii SUA față de Revoluția Cubaneză în istoriografia contemporană. Autoarea a analizat lucrările fundamentale produse de istoriografiile sovietică, post-sovietică, americană și cubaneză. De asemenea, în studiu au fost prezentate principalele centre de cercetare care au studiat diverse aspecte legate de acțiunile Statelor Unite față de Cuba. Cercetătoarea a insistat asupra diverselor niveluri și abordări ale problematicei în cauză. Studiul inventariază modificările survenite în abordările cercetătorilor în timpul și după încheierea Războiului Rece. De asemenea, autoarea constată că formarea și modificarea principalelor abordări ale reacției SUA față de Revoluția Cubaneză a depins de contextul ideologic și de transformările survenite pe arena internațională. În istoriografia*

americană, principalele direcții de cercetare au fost caracterizate de pluralitatea de opinii, evidențiindu-se o abordare mai echilibrată în perioada post-Război Rece. În istoriografia sovietică și post-sovietică, autoarea a identificat fenomenul substituirii conceptului principal: noțiunea de imperialism american a fost înlocuită cu conceptul de interese geopolitice ale SUA în America Latină. Istoriografia cubaneză a fost caracterizată prin împărțirea studiilor publicate în două grupe diferite: studiile cubaneze și publicațiile istoricilor-emigranți.

Résumé : *Les principales directions de recherche de la politique des États-Unis vis-à-vis la révolution cubaine dans l'historiographie soviétique et postsoviétique.* L'article ci-joint représente une tentative d'identifier les principaux domaines de recherche de la politique des États-Unis vis-à-vis la révolution cubaine dans l'historiographie actuelle. On y analyse les travaux les plus importants de l'historiographie soviétique, postsoviétique, américaine et cubaine. De plus, on y montra les centres principaux de recherche qui étudièrent divers aspects des actions des États-Unis à l'égard de Cuba. On y examina, aussi, les divers niveaux de recherche et les approches de la question en cause. On constata des changements dans l'attitude des chercheurs pendant la Guerre Froide et la période d'après la Guerre Froide. On y détermina également que la formation et le changement des principaux abords de la réaction des États-Unis à l'égard de la Révolution Cubaine furent influencés par le contexte idéologique et la transformation de l'arène internationale. Dans l'historiographie américaine, les domaines principaux de recherche réfléchissent la pluralité des points de vue, étant dominés par une approche plus équilibrée dans la période d'après la Guerre Froide. Dans l'historiographie soviétique et postsoviétique, l'auteur identifia le phénomène de la substitution du concept principal: la notion des intérêts géopolitiques américains en Amérique Latine remplaça la notion d'impérialisme américain. L'historiographie cubaine se caractérisa par la division des études publiées en deux groupes différents: les études cubaines et les publications des historiens-émigrants.

INTRODUCTION

The U.S.–Cuba relationship has been plagued by distrust and antagonism since 1959, the year Fidel Castro overthrew the U.S.-backed regime in Havana and established a socialist state allied with the Soviet Union. The Cuban Revolution shattered some of the most important policy formulations by which the United States had traditionally defined its place and defended its interests in the Western Hemisphere. During the half century that followed, successive U.S. administrations pursued policies intended to isolate the island country economically and diplomatically. Indeed, the United States has sanctioned Cuba longer than any other country. Therefore, the study of U.S. foreign policy towards Cuba in the second half of the twentieth century has always attracted the attention of researchers, in particular the theme of the Cuban revolution of 1959 which has become one of the traditional subjects for Latin American studies. As a proof of this we can find the numerous studies of historical, political, sociological, and even

cultural orientation, which appeared almost immediately after the revolution.

For more than 50 years the response of the United States to the revolution in Cuba was interpreted by researchers in different ways. That was dependent on many factors; it proceeded from the ideological and political conjuncture, the conditions of the Cold War, and the realities of the post-bipolar world. This is especially evident in the Soviet and post-Soviet historiography.

In the USSR, History as a science was the object of ideological and political influence. The theoretical basis for Soviet historiography was the Marxist-Leninist ideology and idea about the struggle to overthrow the capitalist system and to build a world communist community. At the same time, History was seen as a "party's science". The leadership of the Communist Party completely controlled historical science and determined main approaches of research. The Soviet historiography served the authorities' political interests. In their investigations historians had to select certain facts, which reflected the official position of the Soviet government on any issues, including the U.S. policy towards Cuba. In contrast to the Soviet times, the post-Soviet scholars received the opportunity to be free of the Cold War ideological pressures, leading to a pluralistic approach in the historical researches and in the studies of the U.S. reaction towards the Cuban Revolution.

Despite the large number of publications devoted to this issue in the Soviet and post-Soviet historiography there is a necessity to make some generalizations. In this article, we will focus on the main interpretations of the U.S. reaction to the 1959 Cuban Revolution that were proposed by the representatives of the Soviet and post-Soviet (in particular Russian and Ukrainian) historiography. The author realizes that it is impossible to make a detailed analysis of the whole amount of publications which already exist in historiography since 1960s. The main goal is to identify the key approaches and to investigate how these approaches changed after the Cold War. We will also take a brief look on some publications of the American and Cuban historiography in order to compare a few key areas of the studies in the mentioned field.

THE MAIN APPROACHES OF THE U.S. REACTION TOWARDS THE CUBAN REVOLUTION DURING THE COLD WAR

Soviet historians responded to the Cuban revolution with great interest and enthusiasm. The first travelogue, journalistic articles, and popular science pamphlets on revolutionary Cuba were published in 1959. After the proclamation of the socialist character of the Cuban revolution, the interest towards the island had increased in the USSR.

Among general features of the Soviet historiography in this field it is

worthwhile to mention: a concentration of the Cuban studies in Moscow, the low level of scientific research, the great impact of the political component, and the dominance of the anti-American orientation in these studies. Let's make a brief overview of the mentioned peculiarities.

For the first decades - after the revolution of 1959 - in the Soviet Union there was a comprehensive library established containing scientific studies dedicated to the revolutionary process in Cuba. The history of this country began to be studied in several research centres and universities. But as it was typical for the Soviet science there was some kind of monopolization by the capital city in the study of certain topics, especially in the field of international relations. That is why the research of American-Cuban relations was concentrated mostly in the central scientific institutes in Moscow. In 1961 the Institute of Latin America was created within the Academy of Sciences of the USSR. As Vladimir Davydov (one of the directors of this Institute) mentioned, the "Cuban impulse" influenced the creation of this research institution that was formed earlier than other establishments oriented on regional studies (such as Institute of the Far East -1966, Institute of the USA and Canada -1967, Institute of Europe -1987)¹. Other centres of the Latin America studies were also located in Moscow; among them we can name: Institute of the International Relations, Diplomatic Academy of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Moscow State University, and a number of scientific establishments of the Academy of Sciences of the USSR such as the Institute of History or the Institute of the World Economy and International Relations, etc.

Another feature of the Soviet historiography in the field of the USA-Cuban studies was the low level of scientific research. The weakness of these studies was caused mostly by the limited range of sources which were available for Soviet researchers. In addition, the lack of cooperation and interaction between Soviet and foreign scientists entailed the limitations of reliable information as well as fragmentariness of the scientific representation.

On the other hand, the shortcomings of the Soviet- Cuban studies were provoked by the political component. As it was already mentioned, the Soviet historical science served the political interests of the Soviet government, explaining why the majority of these studies were characterized by excessive politicization and subjectivity in the assessment of the U.S.-Cuban relations. As a result, the main approaches had evolved in the context of the Cold War and ideological confrontation. This was reflected in the anti-American orientation of the Soviet historiography dominance as one of the specific feature of the U.S.-

¹ В.М. Давыдов, *Институт Латинской Америки РАН: полвека научной деятельности* [The Institute of Latin America RAS: the half-century of scientific activity], "Новая и новейшая история", 2011, 3, с.3-14.

Cuban studies. As it is well known the United States was interpreted as the most important external enemy of the Soviet Union and its image greatly influenced on all spheres of historical research and teaching as well as news making and propaganda as a whole. The negative features of American policies were too exaggerated, while the positive or neutral characteristics were understated. Such one-sided interpretation of the U.S. policy predetermined a low degree of the research objectivity.

In general, the Soviet historiography presented the U.S. policy towards Cuba in two principal dimensions. The first one was within the framework of the main research stream dedicated to the global confrontation of communist and capitalist systems². The second one was in the context of the study of the local confrontation: the revolutionary struggle in Latin America³. In both cases, the interpretation was focused on the American imperialism and on the related issues of the U.S. anti-Cuban activities, fraternal support of Cuba by the USSR and other socialist countries, encouragement for the Cuban people in the face of the U.S. threats.

We have to underline that the concept of "American imperialism" was central within the Soviet ideological system of the global confrontation of communist and capitalist systems during the Cold War. It was suggested that from

² А.М. Ковалев, *современная эпоха и мировой революционный процесс* [The Modern Era and the World Revolutionary Process], Москва, Издательство Московского университета, 1970; Г. Б. Старушенко, Ю. А. Бочкарев, *Сотрудничество СССР с освободившимися странами и международная безопасность* [The Cooperation between the USSR and the Liberated Countries and the International Security], Москва, Международные отношения, 1983; Н. И. Китаев, Е. И. Рыбкин, *Противоборство сил прогресса и реакции в современном мире* [Struggle Between the Forces of Progress and Reaction in the Modern World], Москва, Издательство "Университетское", 1986.

³ *Национально-освободительное движение в Латинской Америке на современном этапе. Материалы расширенной сессии Ученого совета Института мировой экономики и международных отношений Академии наук СССР, посвященной 150-летию войны за независимость народов Латинской Америки* [The National Liberation Movement in Latin America at the Present Stage. The Materials of Extended Session of the Academic Council of the Institute of World Economy and International Relations of the USSR Academy of Sciences, that Dedicated to the 150th Anniversary of the Independence War of Latin America Peoples]. Москва, Соцэкгиз, 1961; А. В. Вяткин, Н. В. Мячин, М. И. Мохначев, *Борьба за единый рабочий и антиимпериалистический фронт в странах Латинской Америки* [The Struggle for a United Workers' and Anti-Imperialist Front in Latin America], Москва, Изд-во ВПШ и АОН, 1963; Б. М. Мерин, *Революция и контрреволюция в Латинской Америке* [The Revolution and Counter-Revolution in Latin America], Москва, Политиздат, 1977.

the first days of the Cuban revolution Washington was hostile to the actions of Cuban rebels and their leader Fidel Castro and that this enmity was a result of “the United States’ imperial ambitions in Latin America”. In the Soviet historiography the issue of American imperialism was partially touched in general studies, which belonged to the history of international relations⁴, the history of Cuba⁵ and Cuban Revolution in 1959⁶, the history of the U.S. foreign policy⁷, especially, the U.S. policy in Latin America⁸. Taking into account the specific of the ideological confrontation between socialist and capitalist blocks, in the USSR there had been published many works about methods and means of the United States’ “secret war” against Latin America and Cuba⁹. For example, we can mention the works of E. Checkmazov, B. Merin, E. Grinevich, and B. Gvozdzarev. These authors studied the U.S. reaction towards the Cuban Revolution as a manifestation of the American

-
- ⁴ *Международные отношения после Второй мировой войны, 1956-1964 гг.* [International Relations after the World War II, 1956-1964], т. 3, Москва, Политиздат, 1965.
- ⁵ Э. А. Гриневич, Б. И. Гвоздарев, *Куба в мировой политике* [Cuba in World Politics], Москва, Международные отношения, 1984; О. Дарусенков, Б. Горбачев, В. Ткаченко, *Куба – остров созидания* [Cuba – the Island of Creation], Москва, Политиздат, 1975.
- ⁶ *Пять лет кубинской революции* [Five years of the Cuban revolution], Москва, Академия Наук СССР, 1963; В. В. Вольский, *Куба: 10 лет революции* [Cuba: 10 years of Revolution], Москва, Наука, 1968; *XX лет Кубинской революции. Материалы международной конференции* [XX Years of the Cuban Revolution. The Proceedings of the International Conference], Москва, декабрь 1978 г., Москва, Наука, 1980.
- ⁷ В. И. Лан, *США в военные и послевоенные годы* [The USA in the War and the Post-War Years] Москва, Наука, 1978; Г. А. Трофименко, *США: политика, война, идеология* [The USA: Politics, War, Ideology], Москва, Мысль, 1976.
- ⁸ А. Н. Глинкин, Б. Ф. Мартынов, П. П. Яковлев., *Эволюция латиноамериканской политики США* [The Evolution of the U.S. Latin American policy], Москва, Прогресс, 1982; Б. И. Гвоздарёв, *Эволюция и кризис межамериканской системы* [The Evolution and the Crisis of the Inter-American System], Москва, Международные отношения, 1966; К. А. Хачатуров, *Идеологическая экспансия США в Латинской Америке: доктрины, формы и методы пропаганды США* [The United States Ideological Expansion in Latin America: the doctrines, forms and methods of U.S. propaganda], Москва, Международные отношения, 1978.
- ⁹ К. С. Тарасов, *Тайная война империализма США в Латинской Америке* [The Secret War of the U.S. Imperialism in Latin America], Москва, Политиздат, 1978; В. В. Листов, В. Г. Жуков, *Тайная война против революционной Кубы* [The Secret War against Revolutionary Cuba], Москва, Политиздат, 1966; Ф. М. Сергеев, *Тайная война против Кубы* [The secret war against Cuba], Москва, Прогресс, 1982.

imperialism^{10,11,12}. In their opinion, the U.S. was decidedly antagonistic to the Revolution because of the “imperialist role” played by the United States in the Western Hemisphere. They described the U.S. policy as the Washington's attempts “to strangle the revolution” and to establish a full economic blockade of the island. The Soviet historians had shown the growth of the international prestige of Cuba, the consolidation of the Cuban regime and the USSR's support in the protection of revolution achievements, of freedom and independence.

It is necessary to mention that a great influence on Cuban studies as well as on the formation of anti-American views of Soviet scholars (and the Soviet people) was played by some personalities of the Cuban revolution and especially by Fidel Castro. His political biography and speeches¹³ or the biographies of other heroes of the Cuban Revolution¹⁴ have been published in the Soviet Union in large editions. The central place in Castro's orations was occupied by the “anti-imperialist struggle of the Cuban people for the ideals of the Revolution”. Fidel Castro's accusation of Washington carrying out anti-Cuban policy was within the general line of the Soviet approaches towards the United States.

If the Soviet historians had studied the issue solely within the ideological context, on the contrary the American historiography of 1960s – mid-1980s had been characterized by a plurality of views on the U.S. reaction towards the Cuban Revolution. The issue was presented using different level of analysis. The main ones were in the context of the peculiarities of U.S.-Cuban relations, the U.S. policy

¹⁰ В. Г. Чекмазов, *Политика империализма США и революционная Куба (американо-кубинские отношения, 1959 – 1962 гг.)* [The Policy of the U.S. Imperialism and revolutionary Cuba (American-Cuban relations, 1959 – 1962)], автореф. дисс. на соискание наук. степени канд. ист. наук, Москва, ИЛА АН СССР, 1968.

¹¹ Б. М. Мерин, *Американо-кубинские отношения (1959-1961 гг.)* [American-Cuban relations], автореф. дисс. на соискание наук. степени канд. ист. наук, Москва, Моск. обл. пед. ин-т. им. Н. К. Крупской, 1963.

¹² Э. А. Гриневич, Б. И. Гвоздарев, *Вашингтон против Гаваны: Кубинская революция и империализм США* [Washington against Havana: the Cuban Revolution and the U.S. Imperialism], Москва, Международные Отношения, 1982.

¹³ Фидель Кастро, *Речи и выступления* [Speeches and Statements], Москва, Издательство иностранной литературы, 1960; Фидель Кастро, *Избранные произведения, 1952-1986 гг.* [Selected Works, 1952-1986], Москва, Издательство политической литературы, 1986.

¹⁴ Антонио Нуньес Хименес, *В походе с Фиделем. 1959* [In the Campaign with Fidel. 1959], Москва, Политиздат, 1984; А. М. Зорина, *Камило Сьенфуэгос – герой Кубинской революции* [Camilo Cienfuegos, Hero of the Cuban Revolution], Москва, Наука, 1966; И. П. Лаврецкий, *Эрнесто Че Гевара* [Ernesto Che Guevara], Москва, Молодая гвардия, 1973.

in Latin America and Western Hemisphere, within the framework of the Cold War and the confrontation with the Soviet Union. Most interpretations of the United States' actions towards revolution were focused on the issue of U.S.-Soviet rivalry, communist subversion, or U.S. imperialism.

Traditionally, there were three main approaches of the mentioned studies: a conservative, a liberal, and a radical. Representatives of the conservative approach mainly focused on the growth of Soviet power. In their opinion, Washington was "fooled" by Castro and did "too little and too late" to prevent the consolidation of his regime; thus, it allowed the creation of a serious threat to U.S. security. This view was reflected in the works of D. James¹⁵, E. Smith¹⁶, and N. Weyl.¹⁷ The authors of the liberal approach were mostly concerned about maintaining of the U.S. influence in the Third World countries, in the circumstances of the undergoing rapid change in international relations caused by decolonization and lasting struggle with the USSR for the spheres of influence. They expressed the opinion that the United States could have prevented the spread of Castro's communism in Latin America by becoming much more active in promoting the non-revolutionary change in the Western Hemisphere. Among the representatives of this second approach we can mention P. Bonsai¹⁸ and A. Schlesinger Jr.¹⁹. Among the American researchers, who held radical views on the U.S. reaction towards the Revolution of 1959 were L. Huberman and P. Sweezy²⁰, W. Williams²¹, M. Zeitlin and R. Scheer. Their opinions were almost similar to those of the Soviet historians. They believed that Washington was early and decidedly hostile to the Cuban Revolution and that this hostility was a result of the "imperialist role" played by the United States in the Third World²². Some researches of the left-wing radical historians had been even translated and published in the Soviet Union.²³

¹⁵ Daniel James, *Cuba: The First Soviet Satellite in the Americas*, New York, Avon Book Division, Hearst Corporation, 1961.

¹⁶ Earl E. T. Smith, *The fourth floor: an account of the Castro communist revolution*, Washington D. C., U.S. Cuba Press, 1962.

¹⁷ Nathaniel Weyl, *Red star over Cuba: The Russian assault on the Western Hemisphere*, New York, Devin-Adair, 1960.

¹⁸ Philip Bonsai, *Cuba. Castro, and the United States*. Pittsburgh, Pittsburgh University Press, 1971.

¹⁹ Arthur Schlesinger, *A Thousand Days: John F. Kennedy in the White House*, Boston, Houghton Mifflin, 1965.

²⁰ Leo Huberman, Paul Sweezy, *Cuba – Anatomy of a Revolution*, New York, Monthly Review, 1968.

²¹ William A. Williams. *The United States. Cuba and Castro*, New York, Monthly Review, 1962.

²² Maurice Zeitlin, Robert Scheer, *Cuba: Tragedy in Our Hemisphere*, New York, Grove, 1963.

²³ Г. Аптекер, *Внешняя политика США и «холодная война»* [The U.S. Foreign Policy and

In this connection, it was of interest to compare the Soviet and American historiography with the Cuban historiography. The post-revolutionary Cuban historiography was characterized by the division into two different groups. The first one included the studies of the Cuban researchers who lived on the island under the new regime. These studies were characterized by the symbiosis of Marxism and Leninism theory of imperialism (which was borrowed from the Soviet historical science) and the national anti-American traditions. The approach of Cuban historians and political scientists to the study of the U.S. reaction towards the Cuban Revolution was determined mainly by the local government, and in fact was a reflection of the official position. The Cuban researchers were mainly focused on Washington's imperial ambitions in Latin America.²⁴ Some Cuban researches were published in the Soviet Union as representatives of the studies undertaken in the socialist bloc countries.²⁵ The second group included the historical works which were published abroad, consisting of almost exclusively English language materials. It was known by varieties of methodological approaches and ideological persuasion and differed by scope, structure, and sources. Most of the Cuban immigrant researchers lived in the United States. Their works can be considered as a part of American historiography and the authors mostly belonged to the conservative approach. They advocated more active U.S. policy to overthrow the regime of F. Castro.²⁶

Thus, during the Cold War, the explanations of the main approaches of the U.S. reaction towards the Cuban Revolution in Soviet, American and Cuban historiography were considered mostly in the context of bilateral tensions and ideological struggle between communist and capitalist systems. Moreover, the Soviet historiography has been subjected to the ideological influence. It was distinguished by the unification of scientific research on the specific issue and reflected the official position of the Soviet government on the U.S. policy towards Cuba.

the Cold War], Москва, Госполитиздат, 1963; Д. Норт, *Кубинская революция* [Cuba's Revolution], Москва, Иностранная литература, 1960.

²⁴ Sergio Guerra Alberto Prieto. E.E.U.U. contra America Latina: dos siglos de aggression. - La Habana, 1978; Guerra Ramiro. En el camino de la Independencia. - La Habana, 1974.

²⁵ Антонио Нуньес Хименес, *Аграрная реформа на Кубе* [The Agrarian Reform in Cuba], Москва, Издательство ИМО, 1960; Хулио Ле Риверенд, *Кубинская республика: зависимость и революция* [The Cuban Republic: Dependence and Revolution], Москва, Прогресс, 1970.

²⁶ Jules Dubois, *Fidel Castro: Rebel-Liberator or Dictator?* Indianapolis - New York, Bobbs-Merrill, 1959; Jorge Garcia Montes, Antonio Alonso Avila, *Historia del Partido Comunista de Cuba* [History of the Cuban Communist Party], Miami, Ediciones Universal, 1970.

POST-COLD WAR APPROACHES OF THE U.S. REACTION TOWARDS THE CUBAN REVOLUTION

After the collapse of the Soviet Union the historical science appeared in completely new conditions. First of all, the historians from former Soviet republics received an opportunity to study their own national history, which in the previous times was allowed exclusively within the framework of the Soviet paradigm. That is why more attention was paid to the topics that were previously forbidden. For example, in Ukraine, new research areas were entirely connected with Ukrainian issues (national revolution in 1917-1921, Holodomor 1932-1933, Ukrainian Insurgent Army, etc.), and even international relations and world history issues were studied in the context of Ukrainian history.

Scholar interest towards U.S. foreign policy remained as topical one, but different areas had different scale of attention. In general, interest to U.S. policy towards Cuba lost its priority, but still was in the focus of post-Soviet researchers. Among the common features of the post-Soviet historiography in the mentioned field we can talk about new possibilities for the scholars because of the growing cooperation between them and availability of the sources, de-monopolization and spread of these studies out of Moscow, appearing of the plurality of approaches and denial of exclusively ideological approach. Let's take a look on this in more details on the example of the Ukrainian and Russian historiography.

If to start with the new possibilities for the scholars we have to mention that since the end of the Cold War, in the late 1980s – early 1990s, the ideological confrontation has lost its edge. The declassification of the documents in the American and Cuban archives created new conditions for the historical researches and led to some intensification of the Cuban studies. As a result, a number of new publications and conferences on various aspects of U.S.-Cuban relations were conducted. This also marked the beginning of bilateral and multilateral cooperation in this field. The growing cooperation between post-Soviet historians with their foreign colleagues (especially with American) as well as accessibility of the sources led to the higher level of the researches.

After the collapse of the Soviet Union another specific feature of the historical science was that the study of U.S.-Cuban relations has ceased to be monopolized. If earlier the majority of the scientific centres for studying this issue were concentrated in Moscow, since early 1990s such centres appeared in the former republics of the Soviet Union. In Ukraine, for example, the American studies dealing with the U.S.-Cuban policy took place in Kyiv, Odessa, and Kharkiv. In addition, in post-Soviet U.S.-Cuban studies had appeared the plurality of

approaches and denial from class approach to the perception of historical events. This feature is closely connected with the refusal of exclusively ideological approach. Evaluating the Cold War period, we can observe the increasingly use the terms of geopolitics, not ideology. As in previous times historical works were focused entirely on the issues of the struggle of the two opposite systems, after disappearing of the bipolar world the interest to the study of the Cuban Revolution has decreased. Let's overview the mentioned above specific features with the help of a few concrete examples.

In the most of post-Soviet scientific researches, the U.S. response to the Cuban revolution is studied as part of some specialized issues. The most of these studies have analysed the U.S.-Cuba conflict after the Cold War. There is considered the U.S. policy towards the revolution in retrospect and regarded the events of 1959 as one of the reasons for the long-lasting U.S.-Cuban conflict. In the Russian historiography such opinions are shared by E. Bendyuk²⁷ and I. Hilov.²⁸ In Ukraine, these studies are conducted by O. Skliarenko,²⁹ H. Saveliev.³⁰ The important difference between recollected Russian and Ukrainian studies is that Russian historians still analyse the U.S. policy towards the Cuban revolution mostly in the context of the global Soviet-American confrontation, while Ukrainian researchers try to move away from this approach, considering the U.S.-Cuban relations through events in the Latin America.

But the study of the U.S. policy towards Cuban revolution from the standpoint of Soviet-American confrontation remains a separate line of historical researches.³¹ Some scientists recognize that one of the reasons of the Washington

²⁷ Е. С. Бендюк, *Эволюция конфликта США – Куба после завершения "холодной войны"* [The Evolution of the Conflict between the USA and Cuba after the Cold War], автореферат дисс. на соискание наук. степени канд. полит. наук, ИЛА РАН, Москва, 2004.

²⁸ И. С. Хилов, *Американо-кубинские отношения в современных условиях: 2000-2007 гг.* [American-Cuban relations in present conditions: 2000-2007], автореф. дисс. на соискание наук. степени канд. ист. наук, Москва, Дипломатическая академия МИД РФ, 2009.

²⁹ О. О. Склярченко, *Політика США щодо Куби: формування та основні принципи: (початок 1990-х-2008 р.)* [The U.S. Policy toward Cuba: the Formation and Basic Principles: (Early 1990s-2008)]: автореф. дис. на здобуття наук. ступеня канд. іст. наук, Київ, Київ. нац. ун-т ім. Т. Г. Шевченка, 2014.

³⁰ Г. С. Савельев, *Політика США щодо Куби у 1980-х-1990-х рр. Аналіз концепції американської політології* [The U.S. policy toward Cuba in the 1980s-1990s. The Analysis of the American Political Science Concept], автореф. дис. на здобуття наук. ступеня канд. політ. наук, Одеса, Одес. гос. ун-т ім. И. И. Мечникова, 1997.

³¹ Д. Е. Горюнов, *Советско-американские отношения и Кубинская революция, вторая*

reaction towards the Cuban Revolution was the U.S. confidence in its huge economic, political, and military power. They did not want to share its sphere of influence in the Western Hemisphere with the USSR. Among the studies, a special place is occupied by works which are dedicated to the Cuban missile crisis. The authors of these researches focus on the cause-and-effect relationships between the U.S. reaction towards the Cuban Revolution and the Bay of Pigs Invasion, the Soviet-Cuban cooperation and the Cuban missile crisis in 1962.³² As an example we can mention the dissertation of the Ukrainian researcher O. Saltan who tried to rethink the role of the political elites of the United States and the Soviet Union in the process of resolving the Cuban crisis. On one hand the author made an attempt to show the expectancy and regularity of the U.S.-S.U conflict; on other hand he is talking about certain adventurism of the steps of both the American and Soviet leadership³³.

Among the general studies of the post-Soviet historiography that address the issue of the U.S. reaction towards the Cuban Revolution we would like to highlight the research "Interdependence and Conflict of Interest. The United States and Latin America (Second Half of the 20th Century)". The Russian author (V. Sudarev) draws attention to the relationship between the White House reaction towards the Cuban revolution and the creation of "Alliance for Progress" by J. Kennedy. He describes Washington's actions towards Cuba as "*a policy of fire suppression*". Sudarev believes that the U.S. reaction towards the revolution was an evolutionary path from recognition of F. Castro's government to the breakdown of U.S.-Cuban relations and the embargo. In this action, the United States responded to their geopolitical interests in the Western Hemisphere.³⁴

половина 1950-х-начало 1960-х гг. [Soviet-American relations and the Cuban Revolution, the Second Half of 1950s-Early 1960s.], автореф. дисс. на соискание наук. степени канд. ист. наук, Москва, МГУ им. Ломоносова, 1996; О. М. Салтан, *Американо-радянське ракетно-ядерне протистояння в 1945-1962 рр.* [The U.S.-Soviet nuclear missile confrontation in the 1945-1962], автореф. дис. на здобуття наук. ступеня канд. іст. наук, Харків, Харьков. нац. ун-т ім. В. Н. Каразіна, 2009.

³² Александр Фурсенко, Тимати Нафтали, *Адская игра. Секретная история Карибского кризиса* [A Hell of a game. The Secret History of the Cuban Missile Crisis], Москва, Гей итэрум, 1999; V. A. Vorodaev, *Плава Гирон: 1961*, in "Новая и новейшая история", 2011, № 3, pp. 151-161; Н. С. Пасічник, *Адміністрація Дж.Ф.Кеннеді і Кубинська ракетна криза 1962 р.* [The John F. Kennedy Administration and the Cuban Missile Crisis in 1962]: автореф. дис. на здобуття наук. ступеня канд. іст. наук, Київ, Київ. нац. ун-т ім. Т. Г. Шевченка, 2006.

³³ О. М. Салтан, *Американо-радянське ракетно-ядерне протистояння в 1945-1962 рр.* [US-Soviet nuclear missile confrontation in 1945-1962], Харків, 2009. – 26 с.

³⁴ В. П. Сударев, *Взаимозависимость и конфликт интересов. США и Латинская*

It should be noted that in the post-Soviet historiography the concept of "American imperialism" (in the main interpretation of U.S. reaction towards the Cuban Revolution) has been replaced by the concept of "U.S. geopolitical interests in Latin America". However, for adherents of the old Soviet school - represented in current Russian historiography and especially in the memoirs of contemporaries - the term "imperialism" is still preferable by S. Khrushchev,³⁵ S. Mikoyan³⁶ or D. Yazov.³⁷

Among a few studies devoted directly to the U.S. reaction towards the Cuban Revolution we should point out the article "Interference of the USA in the Affairs of Cuba during the Rise of Anti-Imperialist Struggle and Victory of the Revolution 1946-1959".³⁸ In his paper, V. Borodaev (another Russian author) examines the situation in Cuba after the Second World War, the U.S. interference into the internal affairs of this country in the conditions of the Cold war, the rise of the anti-imperialist struggle and the victory of the revolution. He thinks that the victory of the Cuban Revolution of 1959 was a serious geopolitical challenge for Washington, because the United States used to consider Latin America as its dominion. As we see, this approach repeats the Soviet tradition and even the title of the article reflects it.

We also have to mention that another round of tension in the U.S.-Russian relations in recent years caused some kind of renewal of the usage of ideological clichés in some Russian works where authors returned to the concept of American imperialism in describing of the U.S. reaction towards the Cuban Revolution. This can be explained by the rise of anti-Americanism in today's Russia and needs a special research.

Despite the fact that some current researchers continue to consider the U.S. policy towards the Cuban revolution through the Cold War ideology, the main

Америка (вторая половина XX века) [Interdependence and Conflict of Interest. The United States and Latin America (Second Half of the 20th Century)], Москва, ИЛА РАН, 2000, с. 63-64.

³⁵ С. Хрущев, *Никита Хрущев: кризисы и ракеты*. [Nikita Khrushchev: Crises and Missiles], т. 1, Москва, Новости, 1994.

³⁶ С. А. Микоян, *Анатомия Карибского кризиса* [Anatomy of the Cuban Missile Crisis], Москва, Academia, 2016.

³⁷ Д. Язов, *Карибский кризис. 50 лет спустя* [The Cuban Missile Crisis. 50 Years Later], Москва, Центрполиграф. 2015.

³⁸ В. А. Бородаев. *Вмешательство США в дела Кубы в условиях подъема антиимпериалистической борьбы и победы революции. 1946-1959 годы* [Interference of the USA in the Affairs of Cuba during the Rise of Anti-Imperialist Struggle and Victory of the Revolution. 1946-1959] in "Новая и новейшая история", 2015, № 6, с. 109-128.

approaches of the post-Soviet historiography have become closer to American historiography. The development of current historiography is dominated by a more balanced approach to the assessment of U.S.-Cuban relations. The most of American historians try to explain the U.S. actions towards Cuba by the impossibility to avoid conflict with the new regime in Havana in the context of over 100 years of North American predominance in Cuban affairs.³⁹ However, some of these researchers accept the alternative of the U.S. action towards Cuba under certain conditions. It should be noted the continuity of the study of the key issues of the United States' policy towards the Cuban revolution. This is the Embargo,⁴⁰ the Cuban missile crises and the problem of nuclear safety,⁴¹ the Cuba's foreign policy and F. Castro's regime.⁴²

In the Cuban historiography approaches to U.S. reaction towards the Revolution has changed less. Most of the Cuban current publications are still characterized by high politicization, lack of critical attitude to the Castro's regime and policy.⁴³ However, the process of normalization of relations between the U.S. and Cuba - which was declared by Obama administration - seemed like an opportune time to reassess the history of the Cuban Revolution and its consequences. This process supposed to encourage a reexamination of the traditional views on the U.S. reaction towards the Revolution. But as current

³⁹ Jules R. Benjamin, *Interpreting the U.S. Reaction to the Cuban Revolution, 1959-1960* in "Cuban Studies", 1989, Vol. 19, pp. 145-165; Mark Falcoff, *Cuba and the United States: Back to the beginning* in "World Affairs", 1994, No. 156(3), 111; Louis A. Pérez, *Cuba and the United States: Ties of Singular Intimacy*, Athens, London, University of Georgia Press, 2003; Samuel Farber, *The Origins of the Cuban Revolution Reconsidered*, Chapel Hill, University of North Carolina Press, 2006; Julia E. Sweig, *Cuba: What Everyone Needs to Know*, New York, Oxford University Press, 2009.

⁴⁰ Joy Gordon, *The U.S. Embargo against Cuba and the Diplomatic Challenges to Extraterritoriality* in "The Fletcher Forum of World Affairs", 2012, Vol.36:1 Winter, pp. 63-79; William M. LeoGrande, *A Policy Long Past Its Expiration Date: US Economic Sanctions Against Cuba* in "Social research", 2015, Vol. 82, No. 4, Winter, pp. 939-1050.

⁴¹ Stephen G. Rabe, *After the Missiles of October: John F. Kennedy and Cuba, November 1962 to November 1963* in "Presidential Studies Quarterly", 2000, 30, no. 4 (December), pp. 714-726; Barton J. Bernstein, *Reconsidering the Perilous Cuban Missile Crisis 50 Years Later* in "Arms Control Today", 2012, October, pp. 39-44.

⁴² Melanie M. Ziegler. *U.S.-Cuban Cooperation Past, Present, and Future*. Gainesville: University Press of Florida, 2007; Francisco López Segrera, *The United States and Cuba: From Closest Enemies to Distant Friends*, Lanham, Rowman & Littlefield, 2017.

⁴³ Miriam Zito Valdés, *Asalto [The Assault]*, La Habana, 2001; Jorge Hernández Martínez, *Estados Unidos, hegemonía, seguridad nacional y cultura política [The United states, hegemony, national security and political culture]*, La Habana, Editorial de Ciencias Sociales, 2010.

development showed president D. Trump declared the revision of announced by Obama changes in the U.S. policy towards Cuba, so this may cause the slowdown in the historical research interest.

In general, even with some reminiscences from the Soviet traditions, post-Soviet historiography shows more balanced approaches towards the research of the U.S. policy towards Cuba and Cuban revolution in particular. And we can also mention that current political events are still play an essential role on the rise or decrease of the historical interests.

CONCLUSIONS

The purpose of the study was to present the specifics of the main interpretations of the U.S. policy towards the Cuban Revolution and to generalize basic groups of the works which represents the Soviet and post-Soviet (in particular, Russian and Ukrainian) historiography with a brief look on some publications of the American and Cuban historiography, just to compare some key areas of the studies in the mentioned field.

The first aim of current study was to investigate the main approaches of the historians on the U.S. reaction towards the Cuban Revolution during the Cold War. The ideological confrontation influenced the researches made in this field, causing the differences in approaches and interpretations of the U.S. activities towards Cuba. In conclusion, we can say that the principal interpretation of the Soviet historians was focused on the "American imperialism" and on the related issues of the U.S. anti-Cuban activities. While the American historiography had been characterized by a plurality of views on the issue (conservative, liberal and radical), the Cuban historiography evolved in two different ways: the first one was characterized by the Cuban national anti-American traditions and interpreted the U.S. actions towards the Cuban Revolution as "imperialism"; the second one (considered as a part of American historiography because of the authors - Cuban historian-emigrants) belonged to the conservative approach and advocating more active U.S. policy to overthrow the regime of F. Castro.

The second aim of this study was to analyse the post-Cold War approaches on the United States' reaction towards the Cuban Revolution. The American and the post-Soviet historiography had tended to revise the earlier statements. That became possible due to the radical changes in the international political situation after the end of the Cold War. We could resume that in the current historiography the main interpretation of the issue (which formally belonged to the sphere of ideological contradictions after the end of the Cold War) has been replaced by the concept of "U.S. geopolitical interests". Yet, in the post-Soviet (Russian and

Ukrainian) historiography we can find some differences: if the Russian historians analyse the U.S. policy towards the Cuban revolution in the context of the global Soviet-American confrontation, the Ukrainian researchers try to move away from this and consider U.S.-Cuban relations through events in the Latin American. The current American historiography is dominated by a more balanced approach to the assessment of U.S.-Cuban relations. At the same time, the current Cuban publications are still characterized by a high level of politicization.

In general, on the example of brief analysis of the Soviet and post-Soviet (Russian and Ukrainian) historiography we can note that the formation and change of the main approaches to the U.S.-Cuban relations, and American reaction towards the Cuban Revolution in particular is still dependent on the ideological context and transformation of the international situation.