

**Caroline  
Levander**

## Confederate Cuba

**A**t a time when the U.S. faces very real terrorist threats in the Middle East and elsewhere, the administration's absurd and increasingly bizarre obsession with Cuba is more than just a shame, it's a dangerous diversion from reality." So says Senator Max Baucus, Democrat of Montana and ranking member of the Finance Committee, in response to the Bush administration's use of military aircraft to help American broadcasters reach Cuba and increase the money supply for Cuban critics of Fidel Castro's government.<sup>1</sup> Despite its recent resurgence in U.S. international policy, this "bizarre obsession" with Cuba is not new but has a history of almost two hundred years. Charting such a history, I want to suggest, not only reframes familiar accounts of U.S. national involvement with Cuba that can tend to see the legal institution of the 1901 Platt Amendment as an affirmation and extension of U.S. democratic ideals, but just as important, it delineates Cuba's ongoing imaginative significance for a nation intent on using the threat of terrorism to justify an agenda of increasing international dominance.<sup>2</sup>

By focusing on Cuba's constitutive importance to nineteenth-century U.S. expansionism, the following pages uncover new motivations, meanings, and dynamics behind American intervention in Cuba; develop new avenues for linking the history of race with the history of empire; and suggest new ways of thinking about the recent increase in U.S. imperial activity. In order to excavate the mutual interdependencies that have long shaped domestic policies within the United States and foreign policies in Cuba, the following pages will assess, first, how U.S. regions that were resistant to Northern abolition, such

*American Literature*, Volume 78, Number 4, December 2006  
DOI 10.1215/00029831-2006-053 © 2006 by Duke University Press

as the South, turned to Cuba to enact a program of insurgent white supremacy; second, how Cuba's struggle for national independence articulated a vision of an antiracist nation that was threatening to the racial politics driving both the antebellum South (as seen in *Dred Scott v. Sanford* [1857]) and the postbellum United States (as seen in *Plessy v. Ferguson* [1896]); and, third, how Cuban debates about race filtered North—how, in other words, many black Americans critiqued U.S. policies in Cuba that, they recognized, reproduced and justified the U.S. federal policies underpinning the rise of race hatred in the postbellum South.<sup>3</sup> Immanuel Wallerstein has argued that the emergence of the modern capitalist world-system created a new peripheral region that stretches from northeast Brazil to Maryland.<sup>4</sup> By bringing Cuba's relation to the Confederacy into focus, I hope to place the U.S. South in a hemispheric context that complicates rather than flattens its northern as well as southernmost borders. Furthermore, analyzing the interplay between the South as the center of U.S. domestic racial policies and Cuba as the locus of the nation's emerging imperial logic puts pressure on the boundary separating the foreign and domestic, revealing their mutual, constitutive dependencies—dependencies all too often obscured by the rise of U.S. imperialism in the twentieth century.<sup>5</sup>

In excavating the rich, ongoing dialogue between the United States and Cuba in both pre- and postwar periods, I want to suggest that Cuba disrupts as well as enables national fantasies of imperial mastery that, as the administration of George W. Bush reminds us, remain alive and well today. While there have been significant changes in the nature of U.S. foreign policy over the last hundred years, the following analysis emphasizes points of continuity rather than rupture. By reaching back before the Cold War to consider Cuba's political significance to the United States, we can see that the enduring obsession of the United States with Castro is not only a sign of the Cold War's ongoing relevance in a post-1989 U.S. imaginary but, just as important, it is only the most recent sign of Cuba's protracted importance in U.S. national culture.<sup>6</sup> In other words, if U.S. intervention in Cuba has traditionally been viewed as one of the developments that signaled the emergence of the United States on the world stage, Cuba's reemerging significance at times of U.S. imperial aggression and instability suggests the necessity of putting Cuba, rather than the United States, at the center stage of American cultural and political analysis. Doing

so shows us not only the historic impact the United States has had on Cuba but, conversely, Cuba's crucial transnational impact on U.S. culture—be it Confederate proslavery culture or the African American intellectual culture of W. E. B. DuBois and other African American men of letters. Excavating the long history and ongoing conceptual centrality of Cuba's racial politics to the smooth functioning of U.S. imperial machinery, therefore, reveals the founding importance of racial inequality to the logic that naturalizes and therefore enables the United States to export its ideas of freedom and liberty worldwide.

### Daring Ambitions

“Cuba is the great western slave mart of the world—the great channel through which slaves are imported annually into the United States,” wrote Martin Delany in 1849.<sup>7</sup> Delany's observation is echoed by many others in the antebellum period, particularly those, such as Frederick Douglass, who are concerned about the increasing power of the U.S. slaveholding constituency in Washington. Indeed, Douglass expresses grave concern that “the slaveholding part” of the United States desired to annex Cuba to increase the South's representative power in the White House.<sup>8</sup>

I begin my analysis by taking seriously Delany and Douglass's recognition of Cuba's centrality to U.S. Southern slave states. Approaching the U.S. South not from the usual vantage point of its relation with the increasingly abolitionist states to its North but from the vantage point of its dependence on the slaveholding regions to its south reveals the Confederacy's location within and dependency on a hemispheric framework—a framework that elucidates the complex interdependencies between slaveholding Spanish American nations such as Cuba and the United States. While scholars have examined the history of slave institutions and slave rebellions in the United States and in Cuba and Brazil, there has been scant comparative work that approaches these institutions as interlocking and mutually constituting phenomena. Such a hemispheric approach reveals that U.S. abolition and emancipation are the outgrowth not only of national but, equally important, of hemispheric cultural and literary forces that reach across national boundaries to shape pro- and anti-slavery literature. Further, such an approach elucidates how an alternative, if short-lived, nation like the Confederacy displaced onto out-

lying geographic regions such as Cuba its own unique position within the United States. Just as the freedom and liberty of the new United States was predicated upon a simultaneous opposition to and ownership of the U.S. South, so too was the Confederacy's goal of assuming a "separate and equal" national status dependent upon colonizing Southern slave-holding territories such as Cuba—territories that had their own multivalent histories of colonization. Locating writings on the U.S. South within these hemispheric dimensions—be they writings of Frederick Douglass and Martin Delany or of Southern apologists such as Lucy Holcombe Pickens and Loreta Janeta Velazquez—therefore reveals the complex and protracted interchange about slavery ongoing among American nations, reframing our understanding of U.S. slave literature by showing such literature to be the outgrowth not simply of black-white, U.S. North-South conflicts but, rather, of a series of mutually constituting hierarchies involving criollos, mestizos, and "negroes" across the hemisphere.

As nineteenth-century political commentators consistently noted, Cuba was the target not only of turn-of-the-century U.S. imperial outreach but, earlier in the century, of a plan by Southern leaders to "found a gigantic tropical slave empire" that would outstrip and finally conquer the "free republic" to the North.<sup>9</sup> As such, Cuba aligns U.S. imperialism with Southern separatism, revealing a complex, and often occluded, history of intervening sectional, regional, and national interests underpinning U.S.-Cuban relations throughout the nineteenth century. Indeed, the term *manifest destiny* was used, as Oliver Morton recalls, to describe not only U.S. westward expansion but also "the daring ambition" of Southern leaders, writers, adventurers, and filibusters "to 'liberate' Cuba from its 'despotic oppressor,' Spain."<sup>10</sup> As prominent nineteenth-century political economist John Elliot Cairnes argued, the "Southern party since 1820 had as its leading idea, its paramount aim, almost its single purpose . . . to extend slavery, and to achieve power by extending it." In his 1862 lecture, "The Revolution in America," he therefore contended that "the Seminole War, the annexation of Texas, the war with Mexico, and the filibustering attempts on Cuba and Central America over the previous half-century were all about Southern aggression."<sup>11</sup> John Stuart Mill agreed with Cairnes that the South's increasing dual commitments to separatism and expansionism were the direct result of "American slavery [which] depended on a perpetual extension of its field and must go on barbar-

izing the world more and more” if it were to survive. “Set[ting] themselves up, in defiance of the rest of the world, to do the devil’s work,” the South needed to expand if it wanted to flourish as an independent, agricultural entity, and so it must necessarily “propagate [its] national faith at the rifle’s mouth in Mexico, Central America, and Cuba” were it to succeed in forming a separate nation.<sup>12</sup> Modeled on the Texas Republic’s territorial aggression, this essentially separate South in the minds of political philosophers from Mill to Cairnes to Frederick Law Olmsted was therefore led by Southern slaveowners who, as Olmsted contended, explicitly “wished to expand their holdings.” “Moved by romantic excitements and enthusiasm” and “inflamed by senseless appeals to their patriotism and their combativeness,” these Southern slaveowners specifically targeted slave-holding territories outside of their sphere, such as Cuba, because in “annexing Cuba they might secure larger estates and make use of much cheaper [Cuban] land and labor.”<sup>13</sup>

Declaring that the goal of antebellum Southern filibustering expeditions to Cuba was not only to acquire more land and “to conquer the Spaniard” but primarily to give Cuba the liberty and freedom that only the South could truly represent and defend, the Southern novelist Lucy Holcombe Pickens advocated for an imperial South by identifying Cuba as the South’s own “southern territory.”<sup>14</sup> Recognizing Cuba as “the fairest child of southern waters,” Pickens asserted in *The Free Flag of Cuba* (1854) that all true “sons of Washington” were obligated to “liberate the degraded children of tyranny” from Cuba’s “despotic oppressor”—Spain (*FFC*, 60). Declaring that the goal of Narciso López’s 1851 filibustering expedition to Cuba was to give “the bright child of the waves” the liberty that only the South could truly represent and defend, Pickens (like those from Louisiana, Mississippi, Texas, and Florida who created the Order of the Lone Star and mounted a “Lone Star Expedition” to invade Cuba) advocated for an imperial South by relying on the racial logic that the North seemed to be abandoning its commitment to abolition. “Free[ing] the beauteous child” from the “dark oppressors” who make “so many *slaves*” of their subjects would, according to Pickens, bestow “the greatest amount of good to our race” and to the young Southern nation that supposedly embodied, upheld, and extended it (*FFC*, 124, 117–18). Pickens’s fictional account of López’s expedition to Cuba revealed the South to be an ambitious imperial enterprise that imagined, and often undertook,

a series of expansionist projects aimed at proving its racial superiority by absorbing new territory. As these accounts of a rival Confederate nation remind us, the idea of manifest destiny was a hotly contested right, facilitating not only the expansion of the United States but also the creation of other young nations, such as the Confederacy, that attempted to lay successful claim to the expansionist agenda too often associated exclusively with the United States.

The “vast populous empire” that Pickens predicted the South would establish in “South America and Mexico” became the joint project of a number of Southern writers, adventurers, and filibusters before, during, and after the Civil War who, like Pickens, argued for expansionist undertakings such as creating the 1854 Republic of Sonora, founding a “Universal Republic” with the Confederacy as capitol, and invading Cuba.<sup>15</sup> A minority of Southerners, such as William Gilmore Simms, believed that “bringing the State of Cuba” under the control of “the people of our Southern States” while separating from the United States was a mistake and that there “will be time enough to think of adding Cuba to our domain when we ourselves are rendered secure . . . from the perpetual annoyance of abolition”; however, most Southerners believed that Cuba offered enticing opportunity for wealth, territory, and influence.<sup>16</sup> As Samuel Walker argued in his 1854 article, “Cuba and the South,” “The great beauty of our system of governance is in its power of expansion,” so “the question of Cuba . . . is of momentous import to the people of this Union . . . and to the South.” Arguing for the need to “acquire Cuba as we acquired Texas,” Walker contended that “the safety of the South is to be found only in the extension of its peculiar institutions, and the security of the Union in the safety of the South—toward the equator.” According to Walker, Cuba was a “southern question demanding the consideration of the people of the south and south-west” precisely because the people “of the north are antagonistic to the institution of slavery.” Once “assimilated to our own in their government, what a splendid prospect of commercial eminence opens to the South!” Walker concluded.<sup>17</sup> Thus, according to Southern separatists such as Walker and Evans, the Confederacy was a separate nation that not only upheld the white supremacy threatened by U.S. abolitionist zeal but also testified to its national vitality and promise by undertaking to expand its domain to include a Cuba that was being threatened by British abolitionists much as the U.S. South was threatened by U.S. antislavery advocates. Indeed, after the aboli-

tion of the slave trade in the British empire, Cuba became the primary location where the Atlantic slave trade continued on a large scale and, therefore, Cuba became a beleaguered fortress where white planters attempted to protect slavery from British abolitionists who went to Cuba to superintend new slave policy.

Not only did the Confederacy look South to Cuba to expand its influence but many slave-owning Cubans, conversely, aligned themselves with the Confederacy in their efforts to uphold slavery in the face of British opposition. As the subtitle of her 1876 Civil War narrative stipulates, Velazquez identifies herself as both a “Cuban woman and a Confederate soldier.” Throughout her account of her experiences as a Cuban resident and then a cross-dressing Confederate soldier, Velazquez reiterates that she is “a Cuban and a true Southern sympathizer.”<sup>18</sup> Her movement between Cuba and the Confederacy throughout the narrative reinforces her desire to imagine an independent Cuba aligned with an independent South. Velazquez and Cuban members of such groups as the Club de la Habana, who actively pursued Cuban annexation to the United States, hoped that such an alliance would create a new transnational Southern slaveocracy in which the Confederacy and Cuba would jointly maintain a colonial fantasy of white privilege through black slave labor.<sup>19</sup>

Yet not all Cubans applauded Cuba and the Confederacy’s joint commitment to upholding slavery. Widely recognized as “the most perfect picture of Cuban slavery that has ever been given to the world,” Juan Francisco Manzano’s *Life and Poems of a Cuban Slave* (1840) was written at the request of the British abolitionist Richard Robert Madden, who arrived in Cuba in 1835 as Superintendent of Liberated Africans.<sup>20</sup> Because of his efforts to press for the end of slavery in Cuba, Madden was identified by the Cuban slave-holding elite as a person “whose opinions and conduct were dangerous to the safety of the island of Cuba.”<sup>21</sup> The only extant Spanish-American slave narrative, Manzano’s text determined the direction in which Cuban antislavery commentary would unfold. Madden translated the text into English and included it in the antislavery portfolio that he presented to the General Anti-Slavery Convention in Britain (1840). This portfolio of Cuban slavery in general and Manzano’s text in particular led the convention to adopt a formal resolution stating that because “the literature of Great Britain exercises so vast an influence over the public opinion of America, British abolitionist periodicals must spread before

the American public evidence of the deep indignation of the civilized world against the slaveholding republic.”<sup>22</sup> The circulation of Manzano’s slave narrative through Cuba, to Great Britain, and finally to the United States points to the complex routes that abolitionist literature traveled and to the intricate transnational influences informing but too often overlooked in U.S. slave narratives. Indeed, there are a number of striking similarities between Manzano’s 1840 narrative and North American slave narratives such as Douglass’s 1845 *Narrative*—similarities that collectively point to the importance of Cuba in shaping the antislavery as well as proslavery narratives produced in the United States in the years leading up to the Civil War.<sup>23</sup>

Fifty years later, as the United States undertook control of Cuba in the Spanish-American War, U.S. political commentators would return to the antebellum South’s expansionist project in Cuba in order to deny U.S. imperialist designs on Spanish territory. Murat Halstead’s *The Story of Cuba* (1898), for example, asserts that “the ill-fated López expedition . . . was of course in the interest of the formation of more Slave States in the United States” and concludes that the “Cuban filibustering expeditions of a former generation . . . were distinctly to provide for the admission of more Slave States in the American Union.”<sup>24</sup> Precisely because they were associated with the South, such imperialist interests had no relation to “the true feelings of the American people and the real state of affairs in the American Union” when war with Spain finally did occur, according to Italo Canini.<sup>25</sup> Because “the general condition of things in the United States is very different from what it had been at the time of the expeditions of López and during the period which immediately followed it,” Canini asserts that “the sympathy which the people of the American Union feel for the cause of Cuban liberty is purified from suspicious motives and influences” (*FC*, 109). Indeed, if Cuba had initially been “an object of dread” for the United States because of slavery, “it became at a later period an object of vehement desire” (*FC*, 75) because the nation could no longer “be accused of having gone into this war for want of more territory” (*FC*, 191). “The questions of Annexation, Expansion, and Imperialism,” therefore, were not part of the U.S. agenda, according to T. G. Steward, as it “launched forces to drive Spain” out of Cuba.<sup>26</sup> Supposedly purified of the self-interested motives that characterized Southern efforts to acquire Cuba, the United States was not engaged in “a war of conquest” but merely recognized in Cuba’s fight against Spain “the same

genius which prompted the thirteen infant colonies to declare themselves free from the mother country" (*FC*, 193). Such declarations of a U.S. similarity to Cuba, on one hand, and its dissimilarity to the antebellum South, on the other hand, worked to sanitize U.S. imperial designs on Cuba—designs that, as we will see, used racial logic to attempt to make "the lone star of Cuba" "find its place" in "our national emblem" (*FC*, 191).

### **Cuba Libre**

Even as the Confederacy tried to incorporate Cuba as part of its slaveholding territory and the United States tried to distance itself from the Southern project to justify its own expansionist designs on Cuba, Cuban revolutionaries sought to create an independent nation founded upon antiracism. Between 1776 and 1825, as most of the colonies of North and South America gained independence, Cuba remained loyal to Spain; however, by 1868 Spanish rule had become sufficiently constricting that a handful of prosperous white men sought independence by freeing their slaves and encouraging former slaves to become soldiers. Indeed, the three rebellions leading up to circumscribed Cuban independence—the Ten Years War (1868–78), *la Guerra Chiquita* (1879–80), and the final War of Independence (1895–98)—were all waged by an army that was unique in the history of the Atlantic world because it not only was multiracial but integrated at all ranks. If an integrated army was one cornerstone of the revolution, the other was a powerful rhetoric of antiracism that became more pronounced in the years between the legal end of slavery in 1886 and the outbreak of the third and final war of 1895.

In essays, speeches, newspapers, and memoirs, white as well as nonwhite Cubans consistently claimed that the struggle against Spain had produced a new kind of citizen and a new kind of state. Arguing that war had forever united black and white, they imagined a new nation in which equality was ingrained and, thus, as mulatto General Antonio Maceo wrote, there were no whites nor blacks, but only Cubans.<sup>27</sup> Leaders such as José Martí, Juan Gualberto Gómez, and Rafael Serra y Montalvo wrote of the union of blacks and whites in anti-colonial war and located the symbolic and material birth of the new nation in the alliance between black and white men. Gomez and Maceo were "generals honored and loved" by the insurgents, according to

T. G. Steward of the Twenty-Fifth U.S. Infantry, because their fully integrated armies “experienced no color difficulties.”<sup>28</sup> By integrating their forces, declaring that there were no races, and asserting that racism was an infraction against the nation as a whole, they refuted Spanish assertions that Cuban nationhood was impossible because of the insurgents’ racial identity. As General Maceo wrote on 16 May 1876 to Tomás Estrada Palma, president of the rebel republic: “[T]his democratic Republic, which has established as its principle foundation liberty, equality, and fraternity, does not recognize racial hierarchies.”<sup>29</sup> Article 25 of the 1868 decree on abolition stated that all inhabitants of the Republic were free and all citizens of the republic would be considered soldiers of the liberating Army, which prompted slaves to join the Cuban forces by the thousands.<sup>30</sup> As one observer noted, they “marched in companies giving cries of long live Liberty and the whites of Cuba, who only yesterday had governed them with the harshness of the whip and who today treat them as brothers and grant them the title of free men.”<sup>31</sup> Rebel propaganda, likewise, declared that “all men are our brothers, whatever color their skin, whatever their race. . . . Liberty for all men, of all races, of all peoples, in all climates!”<sup>32</sup> A rebel periodical similarly proclaimed in December 1869: “[E]very Cuban (white or black for we are all equal). . . . Everyone without distinctions of color . . . can serve . . . their Patria and Liberty.” One rebel handbill directed at black manual laborers succinctly summed up the role that race played in founding the Cuban nation: “[T]he blacks are the same as the whites. . . . The Cubans want the blacks to be free. The Spaniards want the blacks to continue being slaves. The Cubans are fighting the Spaniards. The blacks who have any honor should go fight together with the Cubans. . . . Long live liberty!”<sup>33</sup> These claims were substantiated by daily interactions between blacks and whites, as Halstead observed when he described “[n]egro soldiers on guard” and “black workingmen . . . quickly admitted” into the highest echelons of Cuban rebel leadership. Thus General Weyler’s declaration that his policy toward blacks was, in Halstead’s words, “just the same as to others” and his decision to constitute his cavalry escort of black men reflected the extent to which he “esteemed them as soldiers.”<sup>34</sup>

Yet in the writings of Martí and black insurgents like Ricardo Batrell Oviedo, we can most clearly see the foundational importance of the ideal of racelessness to Cuban independent nationhood. Professing

that race was merely a tool used locally to divide the anticolonial effort and globally by men who invented “textbook races” in order to justify expansion and empire, Martí concluded that “to dwell on the divisions of race, the differences of race . . . [was] to hamper the public good.”<sup>35</sup> For Martí, the Ten Years War exemplified a Cuban history in which “the Cubans rose up in war, . . . broke the shackles of their slaves; [and] converted, at the cost of their lives, [a] Spanish indignity into a nation of free men.” As a result, “blacks and whites became brothers . . . facing death, barefoot all and naked all, blacks and whites became equal: they embraced and have not separated since . . . [T]he souls of whites and blacks [rise] together through the skies.”<sup>36</sup> According to Martí, “There will never be a race war in Cuba,” because the Cuban revolution “returned the black race to humanity, and made the dreadful fact [of slavery] disappear—by giving “life to the black man of Cuba, she was the one that lifted the black man from his ignominy and embraced him—she, the Cuban revolution.”<sup>37</sup> This utopian vision of an explicitly antiracist Cuban nationalism had a profound influence on independence efforts because, as Salah Hassan has pointed out, Martí’s political rhetoric captured the political and cultural forces driving an increasingly modern Cuban populace in the 1880s.<sup>38</sup> Oviedo’s memoir reflects the power of Martí’s political vision even as it seems to bear out Martí’s predictions that an antiracist Cuban republic was being born. The black insurgent recalled seeing two soldiers alternately carrying each other across a battlefield as each needed aid. This spectacle of black and white brotherhood, for Oviedo, epitomized “democracy, with all its beautiful attributes . . . [T]here existed ‘human reciprocity’—a reciprocity that all civilized peoples, nations, and men struggle to attain.” Representing the spirit of “the true ‘Cuban people’” where there were “no races,” such an idealized image offered a powerful motive for not only Oviedo but all Cuban revolutionaries to try to realize this model nation for which they fought.<sup>39</sup>

### The Color Line

As we have seen, Cuba’s rebel leaders denied the existence of race and a powerful multiracial army waged anticolonial war, but their independence efforts coincided with an international rise in racism and accelerating imperialism. Therefore, if W. E. B. DuBois’s declaration

that the “problem of the twentieth century [would be] the problem of the color-line” finally proved more accurate than Martí’s prediction that “this is not the century of struggle of races but rather the century of the affirmation of rights,” it was partially the result of the U.S. destruction of a conceptually powerful, if unrealized, vision of an antiracial and anticolonial Cuban nation.<sup>40</sup> Cuban rebels fought to create a raceless nation in the fifty-year period that began with Southern affirmation of racial inequality; however, European and North American thinking that linked biology to progress and divided the world into superior and inferior races ensured that American involvement in Cuba would work to uphold and extend U.S. racial principles rather than the idea of racelessness at the center of the Cuban revolution. Once a movement explicitly anticolonial, antislavery, and antiracist came under the influence of a nation then inventing Jim Crow segregation and acquiring a far-flung empire, U.S. soldiers, officers, journalists, and cartoonists propagated images of Cuba as a land of inferior indigenous racial others in order to assert the superiority of whites to rule. As General William Shafter declared in disgust when asked about Cubans’ capacity for independent nationhood, “Self-government! Why these people are no more fit for self-government than gunpowder is for hell.”<sup>41</sup> Therefore, just as Spanish leaders like provincial governor Camilo Polavieja had tried to make the rebellion imitate their interpretation of it, declaring “we must remove all white characteristics from the rebellion and reduce it to the colored element, that way it will count on less support and sympathy,”<sup>42</sup> so too did U.S. forces shape Cuban independence efforts to conform with the racial contours of U.S. imperial logic, despite the fact that, as Halstead observed, “[T]he black rebels were among the bravest of the fighters for freedom.”<sup>43</sup> Insurgent leaders such as General Calixto García unsuccessfully attempted to refute these rewritings of Cuban insurgency by reminding U.S. leaders that “my ragged, hungry soldiers have endured with the resolute sincerity of the American of Saratoga or Yorktown” the hardships of war and therefore deserve to be treated not as “a conquered people” but as partners in the struggle for independence.<sup>44</sup> However, despite the protestations by leaders of U.S. occupying forces that the United States was “giving the Cubans every chance to show what is in them, in order that they either demonstrate their fitness or their unfitness for self-government,” once the United States conquered Spain, American officers prohibited Cuban soldiers

from entering the city in which many of them had been born, despite the aid they had given to the capture of Santiago.<sup>45</sup>

Despite the fact that this exclusion, according to one Cuban, made soldiers “feel as the patriots under Washington would have felt had the allied armies captured New York, and the French prohibited the entry of the American and their flag,” U.S. commitment to racial inequality shaped rebuilding efforts that drew upon the “Native White Population,” as Horace Fisher observed, to establish an “orderly government.”<sup>46</sup> Distinguishing “our own American nation” (composed, according to Canini, of “the positive, practical and daring spirit of the Anglo-Saxon”) from Cuba, which combined Spanish blood with “large infusions of the blood of an ignorant and inferior race of the negro,” was central to the creation of such a government.<sup>47</sup> Influenced by political commentary that invoked white supremacy to argue for U.S. superiority, Theodore Roosevelt not only read *The Superiority of the Anglo-Saxons* on his way to Cuba but subsequently described how Demolins’s account of “the reasons why the English-speaking peoples are superior” influenced his attitude toward the Cuban population as a whole.<sup>48</sup> As Canini avers, the racial difference between the United States and Cuba proved for Roosevelt and other Anglo-Americans that Cuba could never “attain true liberty and establish sound and lasting republican institutions,” because “license and anarchy, not true liberty, is the state of things” in “the countries of Central and South America, which can hardly be called Republics but rather caricatures of a Republic.” By relying on the “Spanish race,” which exhibited “an individual initiative equal to our own,” rather than on the Cubans who had helped wrest Cuba from Spain’s control, U.S. administrators planned to form a government in Cuba that would subordinate “the mixed and colored races” to the “great races.”<sup>49</sup>

#### “A Policy of Honesty in Cuba”

As we have seen, U.S. involvement in Cuba deployed the same imperial racism that the United States identified solely with the Confederacy, but some advocates of Cuban intervention argued that black U.S. soldiers in Cuba would play a key role in overcoming Southern racism at home. Indeed, the writers of *Under Fire with the 10th U.S. Cavalry, A Purely Military History of the Negro* (1899) found in Cuba a powerful refutation of late-century Southern racism. Black soldiers

being transported to Cuba were the recipients of the benevolent “patriotism displayed by the liberty loving people of this county” until they reached “the South, where cool receptions told the tale of race prejudice even though these brave men were rushing to . . . defend the flag.”<sup>50</sup> The authors predicted, however, that “the same strong spirit and quickened conscience which took up the cause of Cuba will surely secure justice to the American Negro” (*UF*, 47). In their account of U.S. involvement in Cuba, “white regiments, black regiments, regulars and Rough Riders, representing the young manhood of the North and the South, fought shoulder to shoulder, unmindful of race or color, unmindful of whether commanded by an ex-Confederate or not, and mindful only of their common duty as Americans” (*UF*, 208). Declaring that “there was no North, no South, no black, no white,” they were “at once a compact national force.” Many soldiers agreed that “both white and colored soldiers had a brotherly affection for each other while on the way to Cuba, in Cuba and on our way back to the US,” but some black soldiers wondered “why can’t it be so at home?” (*UF*, 49). Yet through their military action in Cuba, according to President McKinley, African Americans were going far toward justifying Lincoln’s liberation of the black race for those who remain unconvinced of the black man’s patriotism: “If any vindication of that act was needed, it was found when these brave black men ascended the hill of San Juan Cuba, . . . vindicated their own title to liberty on that field and . . . gave the priceless fight of liberty to another suffering race.” The authors agreed that “it was in the memorable siege of Santiago and the never to be forgotten charge up San Juan Hill that [the black soldier] challenged the admiration of the American people and solicited the tumultuous applause of every liberty loving nation throughout the civilized world” (*UF*, 270). A few newspaper men and black activists even argued that “the timeliness and importance of this Afro-American military colonization of Cuba” had the potential to reshape U.S. race relations in the South. “If Cuba becomes a state of the American union,” according to the *Springfield Republican* (7 September 1900), “then no better place could be found in which to assert and establish the principles of free government.”<sup>51</sup> “Freedom . . . once being firmly established in Cuba, would then be asserted in South Carolina, Mississippi and Louisiana where liberty now ‘lies bleeding’ under the heel of a ferocious white minority rule race despotism.”<sup>52</sup> Asking readers to “get together and show the imperialists . . .

that the liberty ideals of 1776 are still a potential force in the world's affairs," the author of "Immortal Doctrines of Liberty Aply Set Out by a Colored Man" predicted that "Cuba is destined to become the one all embracing liberty issue around which Americans everywhere will have to fight finally for their own freedom rights."<sup>53</sup>

Yet even as some U.S. soldiers believed that their engagement in Cuba would help to reduce domestic racism, the black press remained skeptical about the political possibility of a transnational commerce in racial equality and was quick to identify the hypocrisy involved in fighting a war allegedly to free Cuba, when freedom was systematically denied to African Americans in the United States. With the quick victory of American arms in Cuba, black newspapers warned that the process of reconstruction on the island would copy reconstruction in the American South after the Civil War, with prejudice and Jim Crow substituting for freedom and independence. As an 1898 article in the *Richmond Planet* predicted, "[T]he treatment accorded the colored people soon after the war, the relegating of them to the tender mercies of those against whom they fought in the South is to be repeated in an intensified form upon the soil of the 'Pearl of the Antilles.'" Declaring that "all of the horrors of South Carolina, Mississippi, Louisiana, and Texas will be repeated" in Cuba, the *Planet* asked its readers to "hope that this dark-skinned race may be able to meet the issue more successfully than we have done in a country whose flag is a misnomer, and whose laws are openly defied."<sup>54</sup> Charles Baylor agreed that because "nearly all the leaders and fighters in the Cuban army of liberation are men, who if in South Carolina, Mississippi or Louisiana, would be made to ride in the 'Jim Crow Cars,'" the Cuban leaders who were fighting to achieve "those sublime liberty ideals proclaimed by the British-American colonists of 1776" were destined to be frustrated.<sup>55</sup> Recognizing that "the welfare of the negro race is vitally involved in the impending policy of imperialism" because "the whole trend of imperial aggression is antagonistic to the feebleness of the races," the author of "McKinley's Inconsistencies" declared that the National Afro-American Party for which he was an advocate recognized "in the spirit of Imperialism, inaugurated and fostered by the administration of President McKinley, the same violation of HUMAN RIGHTS which is being practiced by the Democratic Party in the recently re-constructed States, to wit: the wholesale disfranchisement of the Negro."<sup>56</sup> The "violation" in McKinley's policy was epitomized

by the President's behavior on his 1899 tour of the southern states. The *Washington Bee* addressed the president in an "Open Letter," pointing out that he "catered to Southern race prejudice [by] . . . receiv[ing] white men at the Capitol in Montgomery, Alabama, and black men afterward in a Negro church, . . . [by] preach[ing] patience, industry, moderation to your long-suffering black fellow-citizens, and patriotism, jingoism and imperialism to your white ones—in short, [by] win[n]ing the support of the South" for his "criminal aggression" in Cuba through "shut[ting] his eyes, ears, and lips to the 'criminal aggression' of that section against the Constitution."<sup>57</sup>

No one was more skeptical of U.S. influence on Cuba's struggle to achieve an antiracist nationhood than DuBois, African American political activist and father of the black rights movement. Admitting that "the McKinley campaign of '96" was pivotal to the evolution of his political thinking, DuBois described in detail how McKinley's presidency transformed him from a Harvard student whose "main thought was on my studies" into an active agent in "the midst of political controversy." He recalled that "[b]y the time McKinley got to work, I began to awaken" and "to realize" that I had been "wrong in most of my judgments."<sup>58</sup> DuBois's resulting judgments about U.S. past and present domestic racial policies consistently acknowledged the nation's failure to pursue "a policy of honesty in Cuba."<sup>59</sup> As he declared in an article for the *Horizon* in 1908, despite the fact that "Black men" "freed Cuba," Anglo-Americans "snatched the victory" away from them and "kicked the 'niggers' back to their places" while "conspiring to perpetuate 'white' rule." Therefore, "the rape of Cuba" was one of the "blackest things in recent American history—fit to be written down beside the Seminole 'wars' and the looting of Mexico."<sup>60</sup> In the lecture he delivered at the American Historical Association's annual meeting in 1891, for example, DuBois highlighted Havana's historical importance to mapping the U.S. slave trade,<sup>61</sup> while in "The Future of the Negro Race in America" (1904) he described "nineteenth-century efforts to civilize the heathen" in places such as Cuba.<sup>62</sup> Contemplating Cuba's renewed importance to advocating for racial equality "through the new imperial policy" of the United States, DuBois declared that "our protectorate of Cuba" and other geographic locales represented "for the nation the greatest event since the Civil War and demands attention and action on our part." Ask-

ing his readers to remember that “the twentieth century will find nearly twenty millions of brown and black people under the protection of the American flag, a third of the nation,” DuBois contended that once “Negro and . . . Cuban . . . stand united,” America will “kno[w] no color line in the freedom of its opportunities.”<sup>63</sup> Yet once U.S. policy in Cuba was in effect, DuBois descried “the spectacle of . . . Cuba . . . trying desperately and doggedly to be ‘white’ in spite of the fact that the majority of the white group is of Negro or Indian descent.”<sup>64</sup> Langston Hughes would subsequently agree that while “Cuban law recognizes no differences because of race or color” and “citizens of all colors meet and mingle,” “colored people in Cuba” have suffered since “white Americans [gained] control”; and those “colored visitors,” like himself, “looking anxiously for a country where they can say there is no color line,” are destined to be increasingly disappointed.<sup>65</sup> Like Booker T. Washington’s commentary on Cuba, these accounts, then, suggest that the “absence of that higher degree of race feeling” in Cuba that caused “the color line” in Cuba to be drawn only “in a few instances” was of vital conceptual importance to the black rights movement that was gaining momentum in the turn-of-the-century United States.<sup>66</sup>

### The Old World Order

As the preceding pages have suggested, throughout the nineteenth century Cuba served as a powerful site for imagining alternative models of race, nation, and empire, even as Cuba was integral to the creation of an explicitly racialized U.S. imperialism. The longstanding alliances between Cuba and the U.S. South that underpinned the turn-of-the-century U.S. empire reemerged yet again in the national imaginary a hundred years after the Confederacy’s demise—with the Civil War Centennial commemoration—in order to mitigate the threat that a now Soviet Cuba posed to a United States locked in a cold war struggle with Russia. A *New York Times* commentator noted that “if the South has lost the Civil War, it is determined to win the centennial,” and veteran black trade unionist Philip Randolph publicly declared that “there is no doubt that the whole Centennial commemoration is a stupendous brain-washing enterprise to make the Civil War leaders of the South heroes and to strike a blow against

men of color and human dignity.”<sup>67</sup> Yet if the Civil War Centennial seemed to reenergize Southerners opposed to civil rights by offering them the opportunity to deploy Confederate nostalgia for contemporary racial debates, it coincided with a new intensification of Cold War hostilities that the nation confronted globally. The same day as the anniversary of Fort Sumter, for example, the Soviet Union put the first man in space. A week later, when CIA-trained forces landed in Cuba at the Bay of Pigs, all fifteen hundred invaders were killed or captured in three days, making the operation the greatest defeat for the United States in the Cold War. Castro’s Cuban revolution—culminating in the Cuban Missile Crisis—posed the most serious challenge to U.S. regional hegemony in the previous hundred years. Coinciding with this crisis, the Civil War Centennial helped Americans make sense not only of the past but also of what one Civil War Centennial Commissioner described as “the poison of socialism, internationalism, and communism” that threatened the nation in the present. Seen as a high Cold War-era celebration, then, the Civil War Centennial, more than any other public ceremony, according to Richard Fried, mobilized the past and the Confederacy to counterbalance a present in which the nation’s global role was threatened by Soviet power.<sup>68</sup> *Look* magazine, for example, published a Civil War Centennial story by Pulitzer Prize winner McKinley Cantor, entitled “If the South Had Won the Civil War,” predicting that the Confederacy would not have been able to withstand the “somber threat of Communist domination that was spreading like a cold fog across the ocean and chilling the hearts of North Americans.”<sup>69</sup> Centennial imaginings of a present-day Confederacy thus helped twentieth-century Americans to rally behind national rather than regional supremacy and to see the outcome of the Cuban Missile Crisis as an unambiguous American victory.<sup>70</sup>

A hundred years after McKinley’s administration and fifty years after Kennedy’s, Cuba is still the site around which America’s dual conceptual commitments to liberty for all and empire converge. Indeed, as Morris Morley has recently commented, “[O]ver the last four decades American Presidents, whether Democrat or Republican, have exhibited a marked reluctance to accommodate themselves to the permanence of Cuba’s symbol of resistance to U.S. imperial ambitions.”<sup>71</sup> Yet all too often hidden at the center of that convergence, as the preceding pages have suggested, is a deep, abiding, unarticulated

commitment to a racial state. Projecting racial inequality onto the indigenous communities in which the United States seeks to establish democracy and protect the principles of social justice, government officials in U.S. administrations from McKinley to Bush have masked the nation's own enduring conceptual dependence on white supremacy to naturalize its imperial agendas. Indeed, this dependence on racial hierarchy has endured Civil Rights pressure largely through exportation to other geopolitical locations such as Cuba. Such a dependence and the constitutive place of Cuba within it (as the importance of the recent human-rights violations at the Guantánamo Bay prison during the U.S.-Iraq conflict suggests) must be acknowledged if we want to move toward, rather than away from, realizing social justice in a global era. By shifting the geographic and conceptual coordinates usually defining the boundaries of the United States to focus on Cuba, "the Pearl of the Antilles" emerges not so much as an object of U.S. outreach but, rather, as an agent of U.S. racialized nationalism. To analyze the nineteenth-century U.S. fascination with Cuba, in other words, reveals not that the subsequently ostracized Cuba is a high-level threat to U.S. liberal democratic identity, which the Bush administration's recent policies toward Cuba would have us believe but, rather, that Cuba has gradually been compelled to represent and enable the racial hierarchies that continue to naturalize the U.S. imperialist agenda. If "the current Bush administration is intent on returning us to a . . . geopolitics of empire reminiscent of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries," as María Josefina Saldaña-Portillo has recently contended,<sup>72</sup> then excavating the longstanding political significance of "banned" zones such as Cuba reveals how the alliance between race and empire that characterized "the old world order" continues to shape and determine what is too often identified as the new. We therefore must understand and acknowledge our own enduring national commitments to racial intolerance—by considering the possibility that race constitutes and upholds the very process of nation building, as Thomas Holt contends<sup>73</sup>—if we want to keep our "bizarre obsession" with race from becoming an ever more "dangerous diversion from reality."

Rice University

## Notes

- 1 Senator Max Baucus, quoted in Christopher Marquis, "Bush Proposes a Plan to Aid Opponents of Castro in Cuba," *New York Times*, 7 May 2004.
- 2 In 1901, Secretary of War Elihu Root drafted a set of articles as guidelines for future U.S.-Cuba relations, which came to be known as the Platt Amendment, after Senator Orville Platt of Connecticut, who presented the Amendment.
- 3 For commentary on the importance of race to national formations in Latin America, see *Race and Nation in Modern Latin America*, ed. Nancy P. Appelbaum, Anne S. Macpherson, and Karin Alejandro Roseblatt (Chapel Hill: Univ. of North Carolina Press, 2003).
- 4 See Immanuel Wallerstein, *The Modern World-system in the Longue Durée* (Boulder, Co.: Paradigm, 2004). See also Immanuel Wallerstein, *Alternatives: The U.S. Confronts the World* (Boulder, Co.: Paradigm, 2004).
- 5 For commentary on the interplay between foreign and domestic, see Amy Kaplan, *Anarchy of Empire in the Making of U.S. Culture* (Cambridge: Harvard Univ. Press, 2002).
- 6 For commentary on the enduring importance of the Cold War to American culture, see Walter Benn Michaels, *The Shape of the Signifier: 1967 to the End of History* (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton Univ. Press, 2004). For commentary on Cuba and U.S. cultural interaction, see, for example, Rodrigo Lazo, *Writing to Cuba: Filibustering and Cuban Exiles in the United States* (Chapel Hill: Univ. of North Carolina Press, 2005); Louis A. Pérez Jr., *On Becoming Cuban: Identity, Nationality, and Culture* (Chapel Hill: Univ. of North Carolina Press, 1999); and Damián Fernández and Madeline Cámara Betancourt, eds., *Cuba, the Elusive Nation: Interpretations of National Identity* (Gainesville: Univ. Press of Florida, 2000).
- 7 Martin Delany, "Annexation of Cuba," *North Star*, 27 April 1849, 2; reprinted in *Martin Delany: A Documentary Reader*, ed. Robert S. Levine (Chapel Hill: Univ. of North Carolina Press, 2003), 160.
- 8 Frederick Douglass, "Cuba and the United States," *Frederick Douglass's Paper*, 4 September 1851; reprinted in *The Life and Writings of Frederick Douglass*, ed. Philip Foner, 5 vols. (New York, International Publishing, 1950), 2:159.
- 9 Oliver Morton, *The Southern Empire: With Other Papers* (Boston: Houghton, Mifflin, 1892), 4, 9.
- 10 *Ibid.*, 9. In July 1845, John O'Sullivan, editor of the *Democratic Review* and the *New York Morning News*, wrote that it was the "manifest destiny" of the United States to overspread the whole of the North American continent. The term was first heard in Congress in January 1846 in connection with debates on Oregon, and it became the term explaining the annexation of Texas, as well as the acquisition of lands in Mexico and Central America; see Julius W. Pratt, "The Origin of 'Manifest Destiny,'"

- American Historical Review* 32 (July 1927), 795–98; John Carl Parish, *The Emergence of the Idea of Manifest Destiny* (Berkeley and Los Angeles: Univ. of California Press, 1932); and James B. McMillan, “Historical Notes on American Words,” *American Speech* 21 (1946): 180–81. See also Albert K. Weinberg, *Manifest Destiny: A Study of Nationalist Expansionism in American History* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Univ. Press, 1935).
- 11 John Elliott Cairnes, *The Slave Power: Its Character, Career, and Probable Designs*. . . (New York: Carleton, 1862); reprinted in *The Political Economy of Slavery*, ed. David M. Levy and Sandra J. Peart, 4 vols. (Bristol, Eng.: Thoemmes Continuum, 2004), 4:216–23.
  - 12 John Stuart Mill, *The Contest in America* (Boston: Little, Brown, 1862), 27, 29–30.
  - 13 Frederick Law Olmsted, introduction to *A Journey in the Seaboard Slave States in the Years 1853–1854 with Remarks on Their Economy*, 2 vols. (1856; reprint, New York: Knickerbocker Press, 1904), 1:201–8, 232–36; 2:275–77. See also Frederick Law Olmsted, introduction to *The Cotton Kingdom: A Traveller’s Observations on Cotton and Slavery in the American Slave States*. . . (1861; reprint, New York: Modern Library, 1969), xxv–xxvi.
  - 14 Lucy Holcombe Pickens, *The Free Flag of Cuba* (1854; reprint, Baton Rouge: Louisiana State Univ. Press, 2002), 68. Further references will be cited parenthetically as *FFC*.
  - 15 For commentary on the Confederacy as a separate nation, see for example, Emory Thomas, *The Confederate Nation, 1861–1865* (New York: Harper and Row, 1979). For commentary on filibustering and the South, as well as William Walker’s proclamation of 18 January 1854 establishing the independent Republic of Sonora, see Robert E. May, *Manifest Destiny’s Underworld: Filibustering in Antebellum America* (Chapel Hill: Univ. of North Carolina Press, 2002), 42.
  - 16 William Gilmore Simms, “The Invasion of Cuba,” *Southern Quarterly Review* 5 (January 1852): 1–47.
  - 17 Samuel R. Walker, “Cuba and the South,” *New Orleans*, 20 May 1854, 3.
  - 18 Loreta Janeta Velazquez, *The Woman in Battle: The Civil War Narrative of Loreta Velazquez, Cuban Woman, and Confederate Soldier* (1876; reprint, Madison: Univ. of Wisconsin Press, 2003), 502.
  - 19 For an excellent analysis of Velazquez’s writing, see Jesse Alemán, “Crossing the Mason-Dixon Line in Drag: The Narrative of Loreta Janeta Velazquez, Cuban Woman, and Confederate Soldier,” in *Look Away! The U.S. South in New World Studies*, ed. Jon Smith and Deborah Cohn (Durham, N.C.: Duke Univ. Press, 2004), 112–25.
  - 20 David Murray, “Richard Robert Madden: His Career as a Slavery Abolitionist,” *Studies* (spring 1972): 50. See also Juan Francisco Manzano, *The Life and Poems of A Cuban Slave: Juan Francisco Manzano, 1797–1854*, ed. Edward J. Mullen (1840; reprint, North Haven, Conn.: Archon, 1981).

842 American Literature

- 21 Ibid.
- 22 "The Proceedings of the General Anti-Slavery Convention Held in London in 1840," *Eclectic Review* 19, no. 3 (1841): 233. For commentary on the General Anti-Slavery Convention and Manzano's slave narrative, see William Luis, *Literary Bondage: Slavery in Cuban Narrative* (Austin: Univ. of Texas Press, 1990), 97.
- 23 For commentary on Madden's involvement with Manzano and Cuban anti-slavery, see *The Memoirs of Richard Robert Madden, Edited by His Son*, ed. Edward Madden (London: Ward and Downey, 1891).
- 24 Murat Halstead, *The Story of Cuba: Her Struggles for Liberty* (Akron, Ohio: Werner, 1896), 110.
- 25 Italo Emilio Canini, *Four Centuries of Spanish Rule in Cuba: Or Why We Went to War with Spain* (Chicago: Laird and Lee, 1898), 71. Further references will be cited parenthetically as FC.
- 26 Chaplain T. G. Steward, *The Colored Regulars in the United States Army: With a Sketch of the History of the Colored American, and an Account of His Services in the Wars of the Country, from the Period of the Revolutionary War to 1899* (Philadelphia: M. E. Book Concern, 1904), 115.
- 27 Antonio Maceo, quoted in Jorge Ibarra, *Ideología Mambisa (Mambisa Ideology)* (Havana: Instituto Cubano del Libro, 1967), 52.
- 28 Steward, *The Colored Regulars*, 115.
- 29 Antonio Maceo to Tomás Estrada Palma, 16 May 1876, in *Antonio Maceo: Ideológica política: cartas y otros documentos. . . . (Antonio Maceo: Political Ideology: Letters and Other Documents. . . .)*, 4 vols. (Habana: Sociedad Cubana de estudios históricos internacionales, 1950), 1:64–65; cited and trans. in Ada Ferrer, *Insurgent Cuba: Race, Nation, and Revolution, 1868–1898* (Chapel Hill: Univ. of North Carolina Press, 1999), 27.
- 30 From his plantation, La Demajagua, Carlos Manuel de Cespedes proclaimed Cuban independence in the historic "Grito de Yara," or Call to Rebellion. Joined by thirty-seven other planters, he liberated his slaves and incorporated them into a rebel army.
- 31 Carlos de Manuel Céspedes, 3 January 1869, "Diplomatic Communication," in *Letters*, ed. Fernando Portuondo and Hortensia Picardo, 2 vols. (Havana: Social Science Editorial, 1982), 1:142–46; cited and trans. in Ferrer, *Insurgent Cuba*, 38.
- 32 "October 10," in *La Revolución*, National Historical Archive, Madrid; cited and trans. in Ferrer, *Insurgent Cuba*, 39.
- 33 Unnamed periodical, cited and trans. in Ferrer, *Insurgent Cuba*, 39.
- 34 Halstead, *The Story of Cuba*, 110.
- 35 José Martí, "Mi Raza" ("My Race"), *Patria*, 16 April 1893, trans. and reprinted in *José Martí: Selected Writings*, ed. and trans. Esther Allen (New York: Penguin, 2002), 318–20.
- 36 José Martí, "Plato de Lentejas," *Patria*, 6 January 1894, 24; translated and

- reprinted as "Plate of Lentils," in *José Martí: Selected Writings*, 489; and "My Race," in *Jose Marti: Selected Writings*, 319.
- 37 Martí, "Plate of Lentils"; and "My Race"; translated and reprinted in *José Martí: Selected Writings*, 489, 319, respectively.
- 38 See Salah D. Hassan, "The Figuration of Martí: Before and after the Revolution," *Radical History Review* 89 (summer 2004): 191–205. See also Susan Rotker, *The American Chronicles of José Martí: Journalism and Modernity in Spanish America*, trans. Jennifer French and Katherine Semler (Hanover: University Press of New England, 2000).
- 39 Ricardo Batrell Oviedo, *Para la Historia (For History)* (Havana: Seoane and Alvarez, 1912), 3–4, 166.
- 40 W. E. B. Du Bois, *The Souls of Black Folk* (New York: Signet, 1995), 78; and José Martí, "A Vindication of Cuba" ("*Vindicacion a Cuba*"), in *José Martí: Selected Writings*, trans. and ed. Allen, 266–67.
- 41 General William Shafter, *The State*, 19 December 1898; quoted in Philip Foner, *Spanish-Cuban-American War and the Birth of American Imperialism, 1895–1902*, 2 vols. (New York: Monthly Review Press, 1972), 2:394–95.
- 42 Camilo Polavieja, quoted and trans. in Ferrer, *Insurgent Cuba*, 78.
- 43 Halstead, *The Story of Cuba*, 110.
- 44 General Calixto García, quoted and trans. in George Clarke Musgrave, *Under Three Flags in Cuba: A Personal Account of the Cuban Insurrection and Spanish-American War* (Boston: Little, Brown, 1899), 358.
- 45 Leonard Wood to William McKinley, President of the United States, 27 November 1898, in Leonard Wood Papers, Library of Congress, MSS Box 26; cited in Musgrave, *Under Three Flags*, 355.
- 46 Quoted in Musgrave, *Under Three Flags*, 365; Horace Fisher, *Principles of Colonial Government Adopted to the present Needs of Cuba and Porto Rico and the Philippines* (Boston: L. C. Page, 1899), 28.
- 47 Canini, *Four Centuries of Spanish Rule*, 189.
- 48 Theodore Roosevelt, *The Rough Riders* (New York: Scribner's, 1905), 10.
- 49 Canini, *Four Centuries of Spanish Rule*, 189–90, 50.
- 50 General Joseph Wheeler, Herschel V. Cashin, Charles Alexander, William T. Anderson, Arthur M. Brown, and Horace W. Bivins, *Under Fire with the 10th U.S. Cavalry, A Purely Military History of the Negro* (New York: F. Tennyson Neely, 1899), 120–21. Further references will be cited parenthetically as *UF*.
- 51 "Slavery Question in Another Form," *Springfield Republican* 7 September 1900; reprinted in *The Anti-Imperialist Reader: A Documentary History of Anti-Imperialism in the United States*, ed. Philip Foner and Richard Winchester, 2 vols. (New York: Homes and Meier, 1984): 1:168.
- 52 Charles Baylor, "Hanna, Irelandism, and the Color Line in Cuba," *Richmond Planet*, 30 July 1898; reprinted in *The Anti-Imperialist Reader*, 1:149.

844 American Literature

- 53 "Immortal Doctrines of Liberty Aply Set Out by a Colored Man: The Effect of Imperialism upon the Negro Race," *Springfield Republican*, 7 September 1900; reprinted in *The Anti-Imperialist Reader*, 1:177–80.
- 54 "The Insurgents and the Government," *Richmond Planet*, 10 May 1898.
- 55 Baylor, "Hanna, Irelandism," in *The Anti-Imperialist Reader*, 1:147.
- 56 "McKinley's Inconsistencies," *Richmond Planet*, 22 July 1899; reprinted in *The Anti-Imperialist Reader*, 1:163.
- 57 "Open Letter to President McKinley," *Washington Bee*, 23 October 1899; reprinted in *The Anti-Imperialist Reader*, 124.
- 58 "From McKinley to Wallace: My Fifty Years as an Independent," in *W. E. B. Du Bois: A Reader*, ed. David Levering Lewis (New York: Henry Holt, 1995), 483.
- 59 "New York City, 3 August 1915, To the President of the United States," in *Selections, 1877–1934*, volume 1 of *The Correspondence of W. E. B. Du Bois*, ed. Herbert Aptheker (Boston: Univ. of Massachusetts Press, 1973), 211.
- 60 W. E. B. Du Bois, "The Negro Voter," *Horizon: A Journal of the Color Line* 4 (July 1908): 6.
- 61 "The Enforcement of the Slave Trade Laws," speech to the American Historical Association, December 1891, in *Writings by W. E. B. Du Bois in Periodicals Edited by Others*, vol. 1 of *The Complete Published Works of W. E. B. Du Bois*, ed. Herbert Aptheker (Millwood, New York: Kraus-Thomson, 1982), 24.
- 62 W. E. B. Du Bois, "The Future of the Negro Race in America," in *The East and the West* (London, 1904); reprinted in *Writings by W. E. B. Du Bois in Periodicals Edited by Others*, vol. 1 of *The Complete Published Works of W. E. B. Du Bois*, ed. Herbert Aptheker (Millwood, New York: Kraus-Thomson, 1982), 186–190.
- 63 "The Present Outlook for the Dark Races of Mankind," *Church Review*, 17 October 1900, 95–110; reprinted in *Writings by W. E. B. Du Bois in Periodicals Edited by Others*, vol. 1 of *The Complete Published Works of W. E. B. Du Bois*, ed. Herbert Aptheker (Millwood, New York: Kraus-Thomson, 1982), 77.
- 64 W. E. B. Du Bois to Edward Weeks, 2 October 1941, *Selections, 1935–1944*, in vol. 2 of *The Correspondence of W. E. B. Du Bois*, ed. Herbert Aptheker (Boston: Univ. of Massachusetts Press, 1976), 304.
- 65 Langston Hughes, *I Wonder as I Wander: An Autobiographical Journey* (New York: Farrar, Straus, and Giroux, 1984), 11, 14.
- 66 Booker T. Washington, "Signs of Progress among the Negroes," *Century*, March 1900, 476.
- 67 "War Centennial Critic," *New York Times*, 1 May 1961; reprinted in Jon Wiener, "Civil War, Cold War, Civil Rights: The Civil War Centennial in Context, 1960–1965," in *The Memory of the Civil War in American Culture*, ed. Alice Fahs and Joan Waugh (Chapel Hill: Univ. of North Carolina Press, 2004), 237; Philip Randolph, quoted in Robert Cook, "Unfinished

- Business: African Americans and the Civil War Centennial,” in *Legacy of Disunion: The Enduring Significance of the American Civil War*, ed. Susan Mary Grant and Peter Parish, Louisiana State Univ. Press, 2003), 58.
- 68 Richard Fried, *The Russians Are Coming! The Russians Are Coming! Pageantry and Patriotism in Cold-War America* (New York: Oxford Univ. Press, 1998), 127.
- 69 See Wiener, “Civil War, Cold War,” 246.
- 70 For additional information on the Centennial, see William Price, *The Civil War Centennial Handbook* (Arlington, Va.: Prince Lithograph, 1961; Maurice Isserman and Michael Kazin, *America Divided: The Civil War of the 1960s* (New York: Oxford Univ. Press, 2000); *The Civil War Centennial: A Report to Congress*, U.S. Civil War Centennial Commission (Washington, D.C., 1968); and Robert Cook, “Unfinished Business: African Americans and the Civil War Centennial,” in *Legacy of Disunion*, 47–60.
- 71 Morris Morley, *Unfinished Business: America and Cuba after the Cold War, 1989–2001* (New York: Cambridge Univ. Press, 2002), 1. Morley further asserts that the “Bush and Clinton policy had to do with getting rid of the institutional structures of the Cuban revolution” (5). Thus, when George W. Bush became president in 2001, “few issues more starkly revealed the degree to which U.S. policymakers” embraced a foreign policy committed to global imposition of the United States as a single superpower than U.S. policy in Cuba (9).
- 72 María Josefina Saldaña-Portillo, “‘Wavering on the Horizon of Social Being’: The Treaty of Guadalupe-Hidalgo and The Legacy of Its Racial Character in Americo Paredes’s *George Washington Gómez*,” *Radical History Review* 89 (summer 2004): 136.
- 73 Thomas Holt, “The First New Nations,” introduction to *Race and Nation in Modern Latin America*, xi.

**PROOF**  
Duke University Press/Journals