

Trump: "The United States Should Not Lecture Others on How to Live"

By: Francisco Delgado Rodríguez

29/05/2025



U.S. media outlets recently echoed the "philosophical" reflections made by President Donald Trump, who stated that it is not the role of the United States to "*lecture others on how to live*"—in other words, the U.S. should refrain from interfering in or changing other governments. More or less, that was his message.

Specifically, during his address at the Saudi Arabia–U.S. Investment Forum, Trump spoke out against what he called U.S. interventionism, emphasizing that every country has the right to chart "*its own destiny in its own way*." He concluded these reflections by announcing that he would always prioritize peace and collaboration.

In a more dramatic tone, U.S. Secretary of Health Robert Francis Kennedy Jr. has also spoken on the matter, stating that the country's foreign policy is based on the "illusion" that U.S. intervention abroad will bring about democracy. He warned of the paradox that "*forever wars equal internal bankruptcy*," referencing America's history of invasions

and the impact those actions have on domestic affairs.

Skepticism is entirely justified in the face of such remarks. For the U.S. to genuinely tolerate the independence or dissent of other nations, profound changes would need to take place within its core identity—essentially, it would have to relinquish its imperial nature.

As for Trump, he is well known, and it is most likely that his remarks—typical of the brutally frank rhetoric that characterizes his administration—are aimed at reinforcing the image he cultivates of radical isolationism. Naturally, if his priority is only his own country, how could he justify interfering in the affairs of others?

Nevertheless, from an analytical standpoint, it is important to consider the potential impact this type of rhetoric might have on the microcosm of the Cuban counterrevolution, which, as is well known, has been fueled and financed by mercenary money, largely backed by the neo-Batista elites dominant in the political circles of South Florida.

In simple terms, if President Trump now claims that the U.S. should not interfere in other nations' affairs, or that promoting "regime change" is not America's job—if, on top of that, he says peace is his guiding principle—then what becomes of these actors?

An unsuspecting observer might suppose that, going forward, the opponents of the Cuban Revolution might take matters into their own hands and launch, through their own political initiative and means, a campaign to defeat the Revolution—a process rooted in Cuban history since the uprising of Carlos Manuel de Céspedes in 1868.

Let it be clear: that is absolutely unlikely and unrealistic. Over 60 years of dependence on federal funds for sustenance, more than six decades of being politically, operationally, and ideologically guided—especially by U.S. intelligence services—have rendered any counterrevolutionary movement, group, or leader incapable of independently achieving the goals they claim to pursue for Cuba.

So either some of the usual suspects are prepared to contradict President Trump, or they simply remain unaware of these supposed "new" winds blowing through the White House corridors.

Take, for instance, the nostalgic liars from the early days, now gathered in the so-called 21st Century Ideas Lab, often cited by media outlets hostile to Cuba.

Their latest "idea" was to revisit the infamous Helms-Burton Act, passed by the U.S. Congress—a prime example, in glaringly obvious terms, of what it means to interfere in another country's affairs. As is known, the law stipulates what Cuba's economic and political system should look like—under Washington's direction.

There are even more outlandish cases. Consider American businessman Palmer Luckey, founder and CEO of Anduril Industries, who proposed turning the Guantánamo naval base into a sort of futuristic city, calling it something like the "*Singapore of the Caribbean*," according to his own words.

Anduril Industries is a mid-sized firm within the military-industrial complex, specializing in the use of artificial intelligence for military purposes. It is regarded as a "key player" in advanced warfare technologies.

This absurd project, even for any AI system, contradicts the very legal precepts that originally established the base on Cuban territory—not to mention the fact that the occupation is illegal and against the will of the Cuban people and government, who are sovereign over the entire island.

Moreover, Luckey expects us to believe that someone who literally profits from war is suddenly proposing a project of peace, civility, and sustained prosperity? Please, Mr. Luckey—have some respect for the intelligence of others.

On another front, a certain celebrity figure—whose identity is best left unmentioned and who operates in "Homeland no, Visa yes" mode—recently repeated their demand for a military invasion of Cuba. Though not the majority opinion, similar calls can still be found on social media platforms.

This would mean asking the Marines—who are frankly good for

nothing—to do exactly the opposite of what Trump says he believes in: peace.

The truth is, there is a sense of unrest right now among the anti-Cuban groups—a particular type of desperation and frustration that continues to grow as the current Trump administration advances. These anxieties are self-reinforcing, as some still believe that the Cuban Revolution will simply vanish thanks to “Trumpist magic.”

To make matters worse, one must acknowledge that, for reasons of his own, the U.S. president has made decisions such as reducing the size of USAID, which—at least publicly—sends the message that traditional mechanisms for U.S. interference in foreign countries are being shut down, whether or not that is truly the case.

Meanwhile, figures like Senator Marco Rubio and the so-called Four Horsemen of the Apocalypse—legislators of Cuban descent such as Representative María Elvira Salazar, Carlos Gimenez, and the remaining Diaz-Balart—appear unable to deal with the perfect storm they face, particularly their failure to confront the anti-immigrant backlash.

The deeply interventionist stances of these individuals—not just toward Cuba, but in general—have played a major role in their political careers. Now, however, those same positions are becoming a source of friction with the emerging rhetoric out of the White House.

It remains to be seen whether the U.S. government and its contradictory structure are truly willing to implement this “new” foreign policy agenda championed by Trump. In the meantime, the wisest approach is to always expect the worst—just as Che Guevara said on November 30, 1964, in Santiago de Cuba: *“You can’t trust imperialism even a tiny bit, not at all.”*

Translated by Sergio A. Paneque Díaz / CubaSí Translation Staff
