

ANTONIO MACEO: HEROES, HISTORY, AND HISTORIOGRAPHY*

Patricia Weiss Fagen
San José State University

On 7 December 1897, on the outskirts of Havana in San Pedro, a small party of Cuban rebels led by Lieutenant General Antonio Maceo y Grajales was ambushed by a Spanish patrol. General Maceo was killed; at his side, Panchito Gómez Toro, son of the Cuban Commander-in-Chief Máximo Gómez, also died. The surviving Cuban soldiers buried the two bodies in a secret grave to protect them from desecration by the Spanish forces.¹ Several days later in Havana, the Spanish commander-in-chief, General Valeriano Weyler, learned of Maceo's death and celebrated. Weyler, whose cruelties had earned him the enduring title of "the butcher," gathered his officers and supporters around him; they feasted, drank, and prematurely toasted Spanish victory. They could not imagine that the rebels would continue to fight once they had lost the superhuman figure of Maceo.²

Maceo was possibly the best known Cuban of his time, and the news of his death brought reactions from afar. Newspapers throughout the United States reported it in headlines; black Americans, in particular, mourned. Contributions to the war effort began pouring into Cuba from the United States, Europe, and Latin America in honor of Maceo. Much of that money represented the meager savings of poor working people.³ In Cuba, many refused to believe that the hero was dead; others, learning of the tragedy, fought yet harder for the cause of independence to which he had given his life. After the war, his officers and followers published memoirs full of praise for the bravery, leadership, and humanity of their leader.

Antonio Maceo was a man of modest origins from a family of free mulatto farmers. Although later in life he was welcomed into the highest social and political circles—but not always fully accepted—he always

*I was greatly aided in the preparation of this article by discussions with Cuban historians, in particular, Sergio Aguirre, José Luciano Franco, and José Antonio Portuondo. Other Cubans associated with the Ministry of Foreign Relations and the Academy of Sciences were also extremely helpful, as were the editorial comments and criticisms of Richard Fagen.

identified himself as a representative of the poor and humble. Eulogized in death and in subsequent writings, he is claimed by Cubans of all social sectors as “their” hero. Today he continues to be commemorated in Miami as well as in Havana, in scholarly works as well as in popular art and literature. But underlying this seeming consensus are widely divergent understandings of the meanings of his life. It is to these (and often conflicting) understandings that I shall turn after presenting a brief biography.⁴

Born in Santiago, Cuba, on 14 July 1846, Antonio Maceo might have led a relatively simple isolated life as a farmer had it not been for the outbreak of the first Cuban war of independence (the Ten Years’ War) against Spain in 1868. From the first battle that he joined, until his death on the battlefield on 7 December 1896, Maceo’s life quite literally belonged to his country. His sense of commitment, however, reflected the general position of the people among whom he lived. In Oriente, the eastern part of the island where he was born, slavery was less entrenched than in any other section of Cuba. Most people—like the Maceo family—were small independent farmers—whites, mulattoes, and blacks. In contrast to the wealthier western provinces, increasingly dominated by large sugar plantations, society in Oriente was relatively fluid and interaction between the races frequent and natural.⁵ The Maceo family in 1868 viewed Spanish domination as the cause of existing economic hardship, racism, and slavery on the island, and the entire family was committed to the cause of independence. Eight of the Maceo men died in the long struggle and the family as a whole sacrificed everything it owned.

Maceo is still called the “Bronze Titan.” His military instincts, personal bravery, and qualities of leadership were legendary. Having volunteered to fight in the Army of Liberation as a simple soldier, he seemed incapable of losing a battle or misdirecting a military adventure. He rose rapidly and eventually became the major military official next to Commander-in-Chief Máximo Gómez. The two worked closely together, during both the Ten Years’ War and the War of 1895, and frequently found themselves at odds with the more conservative political leaders of the rebel “Republic.” Political leaders tended to oppose Gómez because of his unwavering insistence on the need to extend the war from the East to the economic heartland of the island in the western provinces. They opposed Maceo not only because of his close cooperation with Gómez, but also because many of them felt threatened by his popularity among blacks, mulattoes, and the poor in general.

Maceo’s race was constantly treated as a political issue. During both wars, the Spaniards capitalized on existing racist attitudes among white Cubans and spread malicious rumors about secret ambitions, al-

legedly held by black leaders such as Maceo, to establish a black republic. While these rumors were consistently denied by all who fought with and knew Maceo, they were widely believed and were a factor in undermining the unity of the Cuban insurgents. For his part, Maceo usually maintained silence when informed of slanders against him. He considered racism incompatible with the goals for which he was fighting—a republic based on equality and fraternity—and he deeply regretted the division among Cuban fighters.⁶ Nevertheless, he believed that the acquisition of equal rights for blacks would have to await political independence. Hence he fought on, while others tried to undermine his position.

Of all Maceo's achievements, one act in particular made him an enduring hero to all generations of Cuban patriots: The Protest of Baraguá in February 1878. When virtually all the political leaders of the republic-in-arms and most of the commanders were ready to agree to a peace, the Treaty of Zanjón, Maceo alone refused to surrender. Rejecting the minor political concessions the Spaniards were willing to make, he openly defied the Spanish general, Martínez Campos. Although he was soon obliged to cease fighting and to join the other leaders in exile, Maceo's defiance had two important consequences: First, Zanjón, which would have been a peace treaty, came to be understood as no more than a truce; second, Maceo's act strengthened the determination of his countrymen to renew the war as soon as possible.

Maceo's next occasion to fight did not come for seventeen years. Maceo spent those years going from one to another Caribbean country and to the United States. With others in exile, he devoted his energies to the task of reorganizing the rebel forces. Apparently, to judge from his own writing, Maceo grew intellectually and politically during the time spent in exile traveling, working, and reading. He was able to develop his own distinctive social vision that went well beyond his patriotic passion at the time of Baraguá. By the time he fought again in Cuba, Maceo saw his goals in terms of well-defined concepts of antiimperialism, social justice, and human responsibility.⁷

Maceo was among the first to return to Cuba when hostilities broke out again in 1895. He, his former commander-in-chief, Máximo Gómez, and the writer, poet, political theorist, and organizer, José Martí, at once met in La Mejorana to undertake the task of setting out the political objectives of the future republic. Martí, however, was killed shortly thereafter, and Maceo and Gómez soon found themselves in precisely the same position as in the previous war: Again, despite their efforts, power remained in the hands of the ambitious, competing politicians; again their military plans were the object of constant political interference; and again Maceo was accused of having racist ambitions.

At the end of October 1895, Maceo's armies began a long march westward, which represented the realization of Gómez's long-time insistence on bringing the revolution to the inhabitants of the rich agricultural lands in the provinces beyond Camagüey. The Cuban insurgents fought their way from the eastern end of the island to Pinar del Río, over eight hundred miles away. The unexpected success of the invasion galvanized the Spanish to greater action. On 11 February 1896, a new commander-in-chief of the Spanish forces, General Valeriano Weyler, arrived in Cuba. Weyler devoted his first efforts to destroying Maceo. Maceo fought, evaded, and frustrated him for nearly a year. Ordered by Gómez, in October 1896, to march east from Pinar del Río, primarily because of recurring serious political problems, Maceo miraculously crossed the heavily armed Spanish lines (La Trocha). Ironically, the hero met his death near Havana in a skirmish that was more an unplanned ambush than a battle. The Spanish did not know at first whom they were attacking. Characteristically, the last words Maceo was heard to utter as he fought the unexpected Spanish intruders were, "Esto va bien."

The independence wars lasted essentially thirty years—actively fought from 1868 to 1878, 1879 to 1880, and 1895 to 1898. They were among the bloodiest and most destructive struggles for independence in the Americas, and the small island republic emerged from them politically weak and in economic ruin. Its subsequent history and development were shaped by its association with the United States, which had entered the war against Spain shortly before its conclusion—and in time to dictate the terms of peace. Those Cubans among the elite—including many intellectuals—who approved of the North American involvement, were frequently accused by their fellow Cubans of having sold out the national interest. Opposition to the republican government increased dramatically, especially during the ruthless U.S.-supported dictatorship of Gerardo Machado (1924–33). The opposition culminated in a new movement, based principally among intellectual, professional, and university circles, called "the generation of 1930." This movement worked successfully to bring down the Machado dictatorship and, after a brief interval, its participants renewed their political involvement in opposition to Fulgencio Batista (1934–44).

Between 1944 and 1952, Cuba was ruled by presidents who claimed to represent the antiimperialist, nationalist, and reformist policies of the "generation of 1930." However, the unimpressive economic and social records of the governments of Grau San Martín and Carlos Prío Socarrás, and the continuing high level of official corruption, disillusioned those who had supported them. When a Batista coup overthrew the Prío

government in 1952, a new group, again largely centered in intellectual circles, arose to oppose the dictator. This "generation of 1953" claimed a more revolutionary posture than their 1930 predecessors and criticized the latter for having allowed Batista to come to power. Many in the generation of 1953 joined the Student Directorate, the Civic Resistance, the Popular Socialist Party, or Fidel Castro's 26th of July Movement. The latter, organized militarily and politically, gained considerable popular support and finally defeated Batista in 1959. Fidel Castro and the 26th of July Movement went on to establish in Cuba the first socialist regime in the Western Hemisphere.⁸

Intellectually there was considerable continuity between the generation of 1930, the generation of 1953, and the Revolution of 1959 itself. By no means all of the intellectuals who opposed Machado and/or Batista went on to support Fidel Castro. Nevertheless, the leaders of the 26th of July Movement were nourished by the continuing intellectual movement of protest against national corruption, degradation, imperialism, and exploitation. Increasingly during the 1930s and 1940s Cubans turned to their past, especially to the writings of José Martí, for a vision of the just, humane, and independent republic for which so many Cubans had died—seemingly in vain. Considerable energy and skill over a long period of time were devoted to documenting and analyzing the manner in which economic and political power had been placed in the hands of a tiny national minority and a relatively large number of North Americans. And, not unexpectedly, those intellectuals who did make common cause with the revolutionary leaders after 1959 have gone on with their work in postrevolutionary Cuba and have been responsible for training the new generation of historians writing today.

The writing and interpreting of history has thus had an important role in the politically charged environment of twentieth-century Cuba. Historians and essayists of international reputation, such as Ramiro Guerra y Sánchez, Fernando Ortiz, Herminio Portell Vilá, were intensely involved in the political and social struggles and controversies of their epochs. Their writings were intended to shed light on the historical roots of these struggles and controversies. It is thus not a distortion of either the spirit or intent of Cuban historians to examine the political and ideological content of their interpretations of the independence struggles and the role of Maceo. To the contrary, consideration of the relationships between the historical treatments of Antonio Maceo and the political, economic, and social attitudes of the historians can deepen our understanding of the meaning of the age.

MACEO IN HISTORY

Maceo lives on as Cuba's greatest nineteenth-century warrior-hero. To my knowledge, no Cubans have seriously questioned his heroic qualities, or tried to disassociate themselves from the goals for which he fought. Yet, despite his popularity, Maceo was not an object of serious historical research until many years after his death. Prior to the 1940s, most of the published work consisted of first-hand accounts of episodes in his life written by those who knew him,⁹ or of patriotic rhetoric pronounced annually to commemorate his death.¹⁰ After that, however, Maceo began to receive a great deal of attention from the scholarly community—second only to that accorded to José Martí—and his life has continued to be widely studied ever since.

The historians who chose to study Maceo in the 1940s were not responding to new sources of documentation or information that made the subject more attractive from a scholarly point of view. Rather, their interest was rooted in the prevailing political climate and in the increasing disillusionment with respect to Cuba's international and social relations. Historians and pedagogues turned to the life of Antonio Maceo because they wished to draw lessons for their own times from this heroic life of the past. These, however, have varied as much as the political opinions of the writers.

Although universally acclaimed, in another sense Maceo has been one of Cuba's most controversial figures. Any serious study of his life raises fundamental questions about the social origins of the Cuban republic. It is clear, moreover, that those who have chosen to write about him have tended to be people who *want* to raise questions about problems such as race relations, social justice, and the meaning of patriotic duty. Thus, while the historiography of Maceo is somewhat selective and not representative of Cuban history-writing in general, it does enhance our understanding of important ideological and political currents in twentieth-century Cuba.

In this study, Cuban historians are divided into three groups:¹¹ The first group, referred to as the "traditional historians," are those whose works chronicled and narrated the past but rarely questioned, criticized, or analyzed its outcomes or contradictions. Insofar as these writers drew lessons from Maceo's heroism, these consisted in reinforcements of the virtues of good citizenship and loyalty. Whatever the personal views of the traditional historians vis-à-vis one or another government, they did not express either approval or dissatisfaction. We may suppose that in general they supported the postindependence status quo, for their narrations of the past seem to lead directly and without contradiction to the present in

which they lived. In fact, the historical themes that most interested traditional historians were not those that led them to write in detail about Maceo. Cuba, however, was a young republic, and, like all such “new nations,” required heroes. Because of Maceo’s importance to Cuban independence, traditional historians could not ignore him. But Maceo tends to appear in their works frozen in the image of the “man on horseback.” Praising his moral stature and devotion to country, they treated him solely as a “man of action” and rarely gave him credit for his (or any) ideas.

Traditional historians were to be found writing throughout the postindependence period until the Revolution precipitated many of them into exile. Some of Cuba’s most productive and prestigious historians can be identified as members of this group, for example, Herminio Portell Vilá, Luis Rolando Cabrera, Gerardo Castellanos García, Rafael Marquina, Fermín Peraza, Gerardo Rodríguez Morejón, and Emeterio Santovenia.¹²

By the mid-1930s, the importance of the traditional historians was largely eclipsed by the emergence, in the Academy of History,¹³ of the revisionist school and the organization of major historical work around controversial themes and critical analyses. In this second group were several individuals who were not only in political disagreement with existing Cuban governments, but were also profoundly opposed to the bases on which Cuban society was organized. The founders and intellectual leaders of this varied group were Ramiro Guerra y Sánchez, Fernando Ortiz (both of whom began writing in the 1920s), and Emilio Roig de Leuschsenring, who was the city historian of Havana from the early 1940s until his death in 1963. Their influence dominated Cuban historiography during the prerevolutionary period, and much of their work continues to be read and respected in Cuba today. Many of those identified with the revisionist school were Marxists; others, Roig for example, were sympathetic to some Marxist concepts, particularly those derived from an historical materialist approach. All were concerned with the question of how Cuba had come to be a country dominated economically and politically by the United States, and why the social order was characterized by profound inequality and intense racism. Included as revisionist historians here are those principally concerned with basic social problems, such as Fernando Ortiz, José Luciano Franco, Leonardo Griñan Peralta, and Leopoldo Horrego Estuch; those primarily concerned with economic questions and imperialism, such as Ramiro Guerra, Emilio Roig, and Raúl Cepero y Bonilla; and those who brought a Marxist perspective to their historical considerations, such as Julio Le Riverend, Oscar Pino Santos, José Antonio Portuondo, Salvador Aguirre, and Carlos Rafael Rodríguez.¹⁴

For the revisionists—opponents and critics of the republic—Maceo was the personification of what might have been but had gone wrong.

The more they learned about the hero's life, the more ammunition they had to continue condemning postindependence society. Maceo had died in battle before the end of the wars—thus facilitating his adoption for some as a hero of the status quo—but his biographers often suggested that, had he lived, he would have been as opposed to what he saw in post-1900 Cuba as he had been to Spanish rule.

The postrevolutionary generation comprises the third group. While one cannot define a single postrevolutionary historical "line," it is possible to describe the evolution of tendencies and concerns over the past sixteen years. Obviously, not all historians in this category were either trained after 1959 or began their careers with the triumph of the Revolution. Thus, the revisionists in general and the Marxists among them in particular were and continue to be important to the transitional period. The Revolution not only found its justification in their earlier work, but they have, for the most part, continued to write and to train new historians since 1959. More than ever before, their work has been encouraged by the government.

Once in power, however, the revolutionary process has had little need for simple historical protest and demystification, useful as that may once have been. What was still lacking in the early years after 1959 was a framework for the study of history, a framework that would both conform to the theories of historical materialism and allow and encourage Cuban citizens to draw inspiration, courage, and understanding from the events of the past. Historians writing since 1960 have not so much sought a history whose content is different from the "bourgeois" history that preceded as they have sought an overall ideological conceptualization to express the working-out of Cuban history—with all its contradictions, advances, and retreats—from the first struggles for liberation to the present realization of those struggles.¹⁵

Since the triumph of the Revolution, Maceo's stature in Cuban history has increased. No longer representing and justifying a movement of protest, he has been viewed since 1960 as a precursor to the revolutionary process, along with José Martí, Carlos Manuel de Céspedes, and later martyrs of the struggle. Maceo's commitments and battles have been seen as part of an organic historical process that culminated in the victory of the 26th of July Movement and the transition to socialism.

Every interpretation of the role of Maceo in the independence struggle has contained within it political and ideological elements that are as relevant to twentieth-century Cuba as they were to the century in which he lived. The three schools of history outlined above will be further compared here in terms of their treatment of the most fundamental issues

or themes raised by Maceo's life—his race, his class, and the implications of his patriotic commitment. Although all historical treatments consider all three themes in some way, it is fair to say that only one of the themes has been chosen by each category as fundamental. The traditional historians have tended to tell the story of Maceo in terms of his heroism and patriotic devotion to country. The revisionists have recounted his greatness and virtues largely in order to emphasize and expose the racism that had poisoned Cuban society. The revolutionary writers have considered Maceo as an outstanding representative of that social class which, throughout Cuban history, has been the backbone of the revolutionary struggle.

PATRIOTISM AND CONSCIOUSNESS

The patriotic themes in writing about Maceo on the one hand uphold the hero as an example and inspiration to future generations, and on the other hand undertake to explain the development of his "patriotic" or "revolutionary" consciousness. Consistently presented as one of Cuba's most admired figures, his character and accomplishments have been used by historians to exemplify quite different concepts of patriotism.

Maceo was one of the most important national symbols in traditional histories. Not only were his heroic attainments celebrated, but he was credited as the virtual author of Cuban nationhood. His greatest moment was considered to have been on the occasion of his intransigence at Baraguá, when "Cuba was born as a nation."¹⁶ "General Maceo . . . more than anybody else incarnated the rebellion because of his refusal to accept the Zanjón Pact in 1878, and for having continued to struggle against Spain."¹⁷

In the more traditional works, there is also a strong emphasis on Maceo's sense of duty, his respect and service to family as well as to fatherland. In his family, and particularly through his mother, Mariana Grajales ("the essential Cuban woman"¹⁸), he is seen to have acquired his moral education. Fermín Peraza, for example, explained the importance of recounting Maceo's family life "so that the hero descends from the realm of anecdote to his process of becoming. This makes it easy for Cuban children and young people to understand his moral values."¹⁹ And what were the values to be understood? "The Maceo family in its entirety is the exaltation of duty."²⁰

In general, traditional writings avoided coming to grips with the divisiveness and discord that pervaded the period from 1868 to 1898. All rebels were treated as patriots in a common war against Spain. The persistent conflicts between the military leadership (e.g., Gómez and

Maceo) and the political leadership (e.g., Salvador Cisneros Betancourt), are passed over, and Maceo's actions appear to be the consequences of responsible, harmonious leadership—occasionally marred by “misunderstandings.” Thus Maceo's sense of duty becomes an abstract virtue in these writings. It is a duty that is neither rooted in an ideological framework nor guided by specific goals.

Likewise, Maceo's patriotic idealism is portrayed as inborn, rather than as the product of political and intellectual growth. Although the traditionalists acknowledged that he had a strong sense of justice, they did not attempt to explore the content of his ideas. On the contrary, his sense of justice was sometimes taken to be no more than the natural consequence of his humility and political innocence. “Maceo was fundamentally a man of action, but nestled in his heart were those feelings of freedom and justice which one usually finds in the innermost heart of men who are lacking in selfishness and do not hunger for power.”²¹ In his opposition to slavery and his commitment to the fight for national freedom, Maceo's ideas were seen as representative of, but not ahead of all progressive thinking at that time. Although his traditional biographers applauded his character and urged other Cubans to emulate his sense of duty, neither his virtues nor his ideas accounted for his real historical importance in their eyes.

Maceo's greatness for them lay in his role as an epic hero and legendary military genius. In this context his heroism is almost exclusively military: He never lost a battle until the day he died; he stood up alone to the Spaniards on behalf of the fatherland; and he inspired all Cubans to fight harder and better. Had Maceo taken a more active role in the political controversies of the time, one wonders, would his heroic image have remained so pure? As it is, the traditionalists rarely mentioned the political stands he did take. And, had Maceo lived to challenge the authority of the early republican leadership (he surely would have opposed it!), would he still have been a heroic model for Cuban youth? Historians consistently praised his lack of political ambition, which they viewed as part of his sense of duty. And in the end, by combining his dutiful virtues with his courage and strength, the traditional historians portrayed an apolitical hero whose sword was always raised to defend a *patria* he took no personal role in defining.

The Cuban revisionist historians devoted themselves to two primary tasks: First, to show how the country had been sold out to imperialism, and second to describe how the social justice and racial equality for which the Cuban people had fought so long had been betrayed by those who inherited power in the republic. With respect to the second task, the revisionists scrupulously researched the available material related to the

independence wars in order to document the origins of the betrayal. As already noted, many writers chose to explore the events of Maceo's life precisely because they so dramatically illustrated the strength of the popular idealism on the one hand and the force of class privilege and racism on the other.

Without abandoning the theme of Maceo's sense of duty, revisionist historians contrasted his broad humanistic political commitment with the short-sighted selfishness of those who opposed him. When Maceo and Gómez urged extending the Ten Years' War, they did so because only by making the war costly for Spain could the rebels win. The political leaders refused to allow the extension of the war because of the threat that extending the battle lines might present to their western properties. Although Maceo finally did lead the Cuban *mambises* across the entire island to Pinar del Río, in a brilliant military campaign in 1895, he was denied men and supplies by the political leaders in Havana—who also took advantage of his absence to relieve his brother José of the Oriente command.

In the view of the revisionists, Maceo never lost confidence in himself or in the rightness of his goals. He inspired the same confidence in everyone he met, save those who felt threatened by him because of his great popularity. He worked endlessly and uncompromisingly for unity, and he never let the insults, disappointments, or discrimination he encountered from a few men of power deter him from his principal task. The point was always to contrast the actions of Maceo and the true patriots around him with the actions of the false patriots—to show how the former worked for unity while the latter sowed the seeds of disunity.

Like traditional writers, the revisionists turned to Maceo's family, and especially to his mother, to explain the force of his will and the strength of his character. The entire family was profoundly opposed to slavery and utterly devoted to the independence cause, which they saw as an essential prerequisite to a better society. In general, less emphasis was given to the "virtues" of hero and family, and more to Maceo's daily awareness of the racism and injustice with which he was surrounded.

Although Maceo continued to be presented principally as a "man of action"—as opposed to Martí, who was principally a man of thought—both are shown to have understood equally well what was best for their country and what had to be done. Although they disagreed at times, as at La Mejorana,²² their underlying social and political vision was the same. Maceo, who could inspire the very best effort from his soldiers in war, could also, like Martí, inspire commitment and unity from his fellow Cubans in exile; and both understood that Cuban independence must not depend on the aid and intervention of the United States.

Early in the war, both José Martí and Antonio Maceo were killed, the former in 1895, the latter in 1896. Máximo Gómez, the commander-in-chief who had always shared their ideas, did not raise his voice strongly against the leaders of the new republic (probably because he was of foreign birth and not considered fully Cuban despite long years of service). Others, who felt betrayed by the Republican leadership, lacked the power and popularity to oppose it. The revisionist literature clearly implies that with the death of these two principal heroes, the promise of patriotism also died. Had they lived, Cuba might have been a more just country and one free of the United States; had they lived, the poor and oppressed would have had leadership:

With the death of Maceo one of the elements which would have contributed to the perfect integration of the Cuban nationality and the creation of indispensable unity, was lost. And with Maceo, the illusions of the majority of Negroes died; nor has there been another Cuban capable of reviving them. From that ill fated day, pessimism overcame the Negro mass . . . which many have contributed to accentuating. This pessimism is one of the factors adding to the maintenance of the distressing situation in which our country finds itself and which we all lament.²³

Maceo remained a model of patriotism for Cuban youth in the eyes of the revisionists. He represented what was most important and valuable in the Cuban people—their capacity for unity and struggle. To study his life and accomplishments was to learn what might have been had the popular struggle in Cuba not been sold out and betrayed. Therefore, to follow the example of Maceo was to reject the kind of unquestioning patriotism asked by the government. To work for the popular unity that Maceo represented meant, rather, to oppose the unjust domination of Cuba by existing leaders.

The revolutionary generation was educated in the history of their country by the revisionists. Once in power, the new leaders paid homage to those historians and political essayists who had exposed the imperialist past and demonstrated who the true Cuban heroes had been. Among those heroes, the two most important, after 1959, were José Martí and Antonio Maceo. It is worth noting that the formal address traditionally presented to commemorate the anniversary of Antonio Maceo's death was given in 1959 by Raúl Castro. He described how much the example of Maceo had inspired the revolutionaries in the Sierra Maestra, and how truly the hero had represented the still strong spirit of the Cuban people. It was now the responsibility of the Revolution to complete what they had fought for: "What will we do about the men and women of dark skin for whom Maceo fought? . . . We know what to do because we take as our own the promises of José Martí and Antonio Maceo."²⁴ Raúl Castro also suggested that too much emphasis had been placed on Maceo's role in

war; the hero was both warrior *and* statesman. He fought not only with his machete, but also with his pen, which “although simple—as Maceo was simple—faithfully interpreted his revolutionary thought.”²⁵

The most evident shift in emphasis in contemporary analyses of Maceo is the importance given to his political development. It is no longer deemed essential to stress the contrast between his greatness and the shortsightedness of others. What is essential is to demonstrate how Maceo was able to evolve from a simple soldier, strongly committed to a cause, to a man of understanding with a well defined social vision. Maceo is seen at the onset of his career as a popular leader whose personal strength and selfless determination inspired those who followed him. His incomparable skill in battle—which seemed to come naturally—was supplemented by a growing awareness of the goals for which Cubans should be fighting. Maceo succeeded where others failed. The better educated, more articulate politicians too often surrendered their ideals. Maceo never did; hence his moral force survived as an inspiration to future generations.

The analogy to the revolutionary present is clear: Few of the major contemporary leaders were fully formed politically when they attacked the Moncada barracks in 1953. Like Maceo, they developed their consciousness through exile and battles. They became revolutionaries through study and revolutionary experience.

RACE AND RACISM

In Cuban history, the issue of race has been both constant and controversial. Before turning to the historiography of these differing interpretations as reflected in writings on Maceo, it is useful to review some of the relevant background. The wealth of colonial Cuba was based on a sugar economy and a slave society. Cuba was the next-to-last country in the Americas to abolish slavery (in 1880; Brazil’s emancipation followed in 1888). Even after abolition, the dominant sugar economy continued to depend on the exploitation of principally black and mulatto labor. In the urban centers, the underclass also was disproportionately black and mulatto.

In the first Cuban war of independence (the Ten Years’ War, 1868–78), abolition of slavery was a major demand of the rebel forces. The first act of Carlos Manuel de Céspedes, who initiated the struggle in the famous Grito de Yara on 10 October 1868, was to free his own slaves. Other landholders who supported the rebel cause followed his example. As already noted, the sentiment among small landholders in Oriente province, where the Maceos were born and the wars begun, was virtually

unanimously opposed to slavery. Families like the Maceos, who were mulattoes of modest means, had particularly strong reasons to oppose slavery. Moreover, although free themselves, they suffered numerous restrictions. People of color, for example, were rarely permitted in the island's schools. The antislavery sentiment was not, however, shared by the wealthier landholders—either Cuban or Spaniard—in the western part of the island. Although many Cubans supported the idea of independence, they opposed extending the war effort into the West, principally because they feared that the invading armies would free their slaves and destroy their property. The fact that Maceo consistently went out of his way to free slaves wherever he encountered them and to include them in his armies further exacerbated their well-grounded fears.

The Ten Years' War ended, resolving neither the question of independence nor slavery. The latter was abolished, however, two years after the war, and seventeen years later the independence wars were renewed. Racial inequalities were by no means eliminated with the emancipation of the slaves. As noted above, Maceo himself was the victim of racism from both Spaniards and his fellow insurgents throughout his career. It is clear that for many Cubans, including Maceo, Máximo Gómez, and José Martí, the fight for independence after 1895 was also a fight for racial equality, the accomplishment of the latter depending on victory in the former. Hopes for racial equality motivated thousands of blacks and mulattoes to join the mambi forces. The men who ultimately inherited Cuban political leadership, however, were not prepared to work vigorously for the goal of racial equality. On the contrary, the Cuban republic seemed to take its cues on racial attitudes increasingly from the United States—on which it depended economically and culturally.

Given the prevailing attitudes and the continued low social and economic status of the majority of Cuban blacks, it is not surprising that the traditional historians wrote little about the roots of Cuban racism. Unwilling to deal critically with the problem of race, few chose even to write seriously about Antonio Maceo. Those who did tended to minimize the importance of the fact that the hero was a man of color. The typical view of Maceo, regarding color as a factor in his life or historical role, is expressed by Luis Rolando Cabrera in 1945. After thirty laudatory pages, in which the author never mentions the hero's race or class, Cabrera concludes: "[Maceo was] mulatto and poor, a mixture of the two races which the Spanish regime divided and the Republic united. Born in the soul of the people, he is thus a true representative of Cuban nationhood, which sees in him the highest expression of the national consciousness."²⁶

In fact, for many Cubans writing after the hard-won independence struggle, Maceo's popularity both before and after his death was seen as

an indication of the “national integration” of the Cuban people.²⁷ His ability to lead both blacks and whites demonstrated for them the absence of racism. And in a similar vein, the overwhelming enthusiasm of Cuba’s black and mulatto population for the independence cause (the Maceo family was the most prominent example) was treated as proof of the consistent patriotism of blacks and mulattoes for their homeland. The implications of this view were that blacks should continue to uphold the tradition of service to country, and that to follow the example of Maceo was to support the republic.

On the other hand, Cuban historians of the revisionist school, dedicated to uncovering the economic and social ills of the republic, exposed the racism that was at the core of existing social relations. Liberals and leftists in general, and blacks and mulattoes in particular, explored the race question from its roots in Cuban history. Their objectives were to show the importance of the black and mulatto contribution to national history and culture and to analyze and expose the injustices to which Cuba’s black citizens had been subjected since the time of slavery. Biographies and essays about Antonio Maceo proved excellent vehicles to accomplish this.

The works of the revisionists give as much attention to the racial incidents and problems in which Maceo was involved as to his heroism in battle or his famous stand at Baraguá. Differing from the traditionalists’ assertion that Maceo was a symbol of Cuban unity and nationhood, the revisionists describe and document the many occasions on which Maceo, and by extension the popular forces he represented, were sacrificed to the selfishness and racial fears of political leaders. Those who held power during the wars of independence, and those like them who inherited it later, feared Maceo because of his race and his popularity. It was logical that the same leaders should also turn their backs on the Cuban people, open their arms to the North American imperialists, and reinforce a Cuban society based on exploitation of class and race. All biographies note his dignity in the face of difficult situations and the maturity of his views—his total evenhandedness in dealing with both blacks and whites. All speak admiringly of his priorities; for example, when asked in 1890 what he thought the situation of the blacks would be after the war, he is said to have replied, “First independence, then we will see.”

Maceo, in this context, could no longer be treated as a hero representing national integration. He spoke for the popular sectors *against* the class interests of the upper class leaders. What attracted the revisionist historians to write about Maceo was the way in which his career demonstrated the *lack* of integration in Cuban society and the extent of class and race conflict. Thus, José Luciano Franco wrote about the death of Antonio

Maceo's brother, José, blaming the event on the politicians' racism and their resentment of Maceo's accomplishments: "[José Maceo was] an unsullied figure, an exemplary Cuban. He was the victim of the filthy trap set by a group of men who did not—nor did they want—to disassociate themselves from the legacy of prejudice and preoccupations of the slavist society which was being plowed under by the national unity . . . of the Cuban people."²⁸

Had the ideas of Maceo and Martí survived, many revisionists assert, Cuban society might have been based on justice and national autonomy. All agreed that Cuba could never be a united nation until its social problems were solved. And for a number of the writers in this group, Cuba's twentieth-century social problems—including racism—could only be solved by means of fundamental economic and social structural change.

For the the Marxists and those sympathetic to the ideas of historical materialism (Cepero Bonilla, Roig de Leuchsenring, Aguirre, García Aguero, and to a lesser extent, Franco), Maceo expressed the aspirations of the popular sectors, and the racist actions against him were, in fact, reflections of the landholders' fears of a strong popular movement. That is, what the landholders feared was not so much a "race war" or even the ascent of Cubans of color; rather they feared the loss of their own class privileges. Thus, while in some of the biographies the race factor stands out as the major evil in republican Cuba (Horrego Estuch, Fernando Ortiz, Griñan Peralta), in other works, racism is viewed as the symptom of a distorted social and economic system, accentuated rather than ameliorated after independence.

The latter view is the prevailing orientation of Cuban histories written since the Revolution, especially those written by historians whose careers began in the postrevolutionary period. In the first place, there has been less emphasis on the problems of race in general, and far more on the economic factors in Cuban history. "The materialist conception of history begins with the assumption that economic factors form the bases of historical events, but historical materialism does not rely exclusively on economic analysis."²⁹ Secondly, the postrevolutionary writers are less condemnatory toward the racial attitudes of some nineteenth-century leaders than were the revisionists. Since these attitudes are viewed as a normal concomitant of the then existing economic structures and social relations, rather than as individual defects, it is also considered normal that racism should have been a major problem in the long independence struggle. On the other hand, what is seen to have distinguished the true heroes of that struggle, and the precursors of the revolutionary process, were the advanced ideas held by a few. Thus, the recent writings about

Maceo have stressed the correctness of the hero's attitudes toward race. Maceo is presented as a man whose ideas were ahead of his own times, hence an example not only to his own contemporaries but to Cubans of today as well. These perspectives are present in José Antonio Portuondo's introduction to a volume of Maceo's letters published in 1971:

The war carried on by the large eastern landholders contained within it the seeds of division. More than a few of the white leaders resented the rapid rise of the *caudillo* who belonged to the "colored class," and some accused him of favoring the men of his own race. With the same rapidity as he attacked the external enemies on the battlefield, Maceo charged against those whose crude racist campaigns were gnawing at the heart of the war of liberation.³⁰

The present revolutionary leaders, like Maceo, have been struggling against the racism still present in Cuban society. As socialists, these leaders predicted that racism would eventually disappear once it was no longer reinforced by the economic and social inequalities of capitalism. To a large degree, their predictions have proven correct—at least for younger Cubans educated in the revolutionary process. Yet, to the extent that blacks are still underrepresented in the political and administrative hierarchies, and to the extent that some whites still view blacks in ways that reflect the old stereotypes and prejudices, it remains important to remind Cubans that one of their most admirable leaders was a man of color.

SOCIAL CLASS AND SOCIAL MOBILITY

Questions of social class and problems of race are closely related in nineteenth- and early twentieth-century Cuban history since Cubans of color, including Maceo, tended to be of humble origins, and historical interpretations have differed in stressing either racism or class conflict as the basis of social relations. Maceo rose from modest farmer-turned-soldier to lieutenant general. He was enormously popular with the masses throughout his career, but among some upper-class political leaders of the independence wars, he was clearly distrusted. Was this based on his race or his class origins and popular following? Was Maceo's rise to prominence a manifestation of his own exceptional talents and abilities in a situation that facilitated social mobility for worthy individuals? Or did his prominence signify a general reorientation—albeit temporary—of the power structure, in which control of the independence effort shifted from the landowners to the popular sectors? The traditional, revisionist, and revolutionary historians divide on these as they do on other questions according to their political orientations and assumptions about the historical process.

Maceo achieved a degree of social mobility almost unique in Cuban society for a man of his social origins. Among the officers in the indepen-

dence wars, there were many blacks (e.g., José Maceo, Flor Crombet, Guillermo Moncada, Quintín Banderas, Cecilio González, etc.), but none of them attained Maceo's fame or popularity. Nor did any acquire the international reputation that Maceo won during his travels through the countries of the Caribbean and the United States.³¹

Traditional historians usually dealt with Maceo's social role and attainments in two ways: First, they considered him the principal historical representative of national integration because he emerged from the common people; second, they considered him to have been physically and morally a superior man. With respect to the first theme, it is stressed that Maceo, and virtually all those who surrounded him, were ready to fight for independence because of their innate love of liberty and moral revulsion against slavery: "There existed . . . a burning and vague aspiration for liberty, a tortured consciousness which cried out for the abolition of slavery."³² The common people of Oriente were prepared to make common cause with the landowners who initiated and led the Ten Years' War, and they continued to fight for the patria thereafter. The integration of the Cuban people was seen to be proven by the willingness of "everybody, rich and poor, black and white"³³ to follow their leaders, to do their duty, and to remain faithful to the independence cause until the republic was finally free.

Maceo, like the others of his class, arose to fight as a simple soldier; eventually he became a great military leader. He did so, as virtually all the authors make clear, because of his personal qualities: fearlessness, bravery, leadership ability, and sense of commitment. So laudatory are the terms in which Maceo is described in these works that he appears in a realm totally apart from the rank and file who followed him. His admirers might be inspired by his example, but they could hardly expect to match his abilities or to rise to his status.

The majority of those in the revisionist school continued to paint Maceo in heroic colors as a man superior to most of his contemporaries and worthy of the greatest admiration history could accord. Nevertheless, the revisionists had very strong ideas, which differed from those of their predecessors, about his social role. The issues of race, racism, and class were inextricably associated in revisionist histories. Although, as noted, the non-Marxists tended to emphasize race, racism in turn was associated with the upper classes; the Ten Years' War had ended in a stalemate because the landowners would not allow their economic and class interests to be threatened either by the total abolition of slavery or by the westward extension of the war. Moreover, their leadership was marred by an inherent distrust of the lower classes on whom they depended to fight. By the time the second war of independence broke out, Cuban

liberation was threatened not only by the self interest of the upper class, but by the growing ties between this class and North American imperialism.³⁴

Like the traditionalists, the revisionist historians drew attention to the fact that the poor—both black and white—were consistently and almost unanimously on the side of the rebels throughout both wars. The revisionists, however, insisted that only the popular classes and very few of those in the upper class who pretended to be their leaders were fighting for real independence. They further insisted that in general the two classes were not fighting for the same goals. For the poor and the people of color, the independence movement contained strong egalitarian overtones that the upper class was unwilling to realize.³⁵

Within this general framework, the revisionists emphasized different aspects of Maceo's social role. For example, Guerra y Sánchez singled him out as one of the many blacks and mulattoes who had dedicated themselves to fight for the republic and their own demands—and who rose to deservedly high positions: "And from these ranks came some of the most valiant and hardened leaders of the war: Maceo, his brother José, Flor Crombet, Guillermo Moncada, Francisco Borrero, Jesus Rabí, Agustín Cebreco . . . representing free men of color. . . . In Cuban history, the Maceo family is a highly typical example. All its members . . . placed themselves in the cause of Independence."³⁶ José Luciano Franco reflects extensively on Maceo's special qualities, both military and moral. Griñan Peralta and Horrego Estuch, more than Franco, emphasize his heroic dimensions, differentiating him from others of his class. For Griñan Peralta and Franco, Maceo's rise provided much needed leadership for the lower classes and especially for people of color. The interests of the people are seen to have found expression through the leadership—unfortunately brief—of Maceo, Gómez, and Martí.³⁷ In the Marxist perspective of Sergio Aguirre, the rise of Maceo is not considered a fortuitous event that accrued to the temporary benefit of the popular classes, but rather a reflection of changing power relations among the classes involved in the wars. When the overall leadership of the wars became more *popular*, Maceo, Gómez, and Martí could speak more effectively for the broader issues of popular liberation—issues for which most Cubans had always been fighting.³⁸

Writers in the postrevolutionary period draw from the traditionalists the theme of Maceo as a figure of national integration, and from the revisionists the theme of Maceo as the best representative of the aspirations and commitment of the lower classes.³⁹ These writers show how the class interests of the former leaders inevitably stood in the way of the national integration for which they claimed to be fighting. On the other

hand, Antonio Maceo, Máximo Gómez, and José Martí, all of whom understood that unity had to be based on egalitarian principles, prepared the way for others to continue their struggle. Maceo, in particular, symbolizes the historical emergence of the masses whose revolutionary determination culminated in the victory of 1959: "And finally . . . there emerged a mulatto of modest birth, Antonio Maceo, who led the protest of Baraguá. From Céspedes to Maceo: such was the curve of revolutionary profundity in the Revolution of '68."⁴⁰ He thus forms part of that history in which contemporary Cubans have found the continuity of their struggle. As Fidel Castro noted in a speech commemorating the hundredth anniversary of the beginning of the Ten Years' War: "Nothing could better teach us . . . to understand what the term 'Revolution' means than an analysis of the history of our country, a study of the history of our people, of our people's revolutionary roots."⁴¹

However, it is not just Maceo-as-symbol who is of interest to postrevolutionary writers; increasing attention is being paid to the clarity of his ideas.⁴² This clarity is attributed in part to Maceo's personal intelligence and political development, and, more importantly, it is now seen to have been rooted in his social class origin. Writers stress that Maceo's ideas emerged from and were shared by his family, fellow soldiers, and the common people of Oriente.⁴³ In fact, Cubans are now told that Maceo's greatness lay as much in his class-based perceptions and judgments as in his skill as a warrior. The best example is probably the famous Act of Baraguá: Maceo sought to keep the independence struggle alive at a time when the bourgeoisie had abandoned it. All of the traditional historians and most of the revisionists applauded Maceo's intransigence, but accepted the view that the continuation of the war was hopeless. Contemporary writers, assessing the available information, judge that Maceo was correct in his determination to continue fighting toward victory. The bourgeoisie had abandoned the struggle because they realized that their own class was being destroyed by the war, and the class represented by Antonio Maceo was daily growing more assertive. Maceo, therefore, having no class status to lose and fighting for popular liberation, was quite correctly unwilling to surrender.⁴⁴

Maceo is shown to have had the same perceptiveness in his attitude toward the United States. He always advocated that Cubans achieve their own independence on the battlefield without North American aid, while the wealthier political leaders and exiles dedicated their energies to currying support from the North American government. A currently favorite quote from Maceo, which appears in biographies and textbooks alike, is his answer to a young man who asked him, in 1890, whether he favored annexation to the United States: "I think, young man," he is said to have

answered, "that although it seems impossible to me, this would be the only instance in which perhaps I would be on the side of the Spaniards."⁴⁵ Because he understood that for the majority of Cubans, North American influence would be ultimately negative rather than positive—a position understood by too few of those who fought for independence and at the same time welcomed the United States—Maceo is deemed a major precursor in the century-long, antiimperialist struggle.

The new essays, although derived from the old, thus reveal a changing ideological emphasis. Cuban Marxist historians now tend to explain Maceo's greatness in relation to his family, environment, and the historical moment in which he lived, rather than in terms of unique individual capacities. Maceo is considered an extraordinary individual and a hero not because he was so different from his compatriots, but because he represented the best of his class. From this perspective, the countryside of Oriente, from which Maceo emerged, was potentially full of Maceos—although none of them in fact matched his historical achievements.

The above discussion of the historical treatment of Antonio Maceo is not intended to break new ground in identifying "the real Maceo." Nor has a specific historian or historical school whose writing best approximates "the truth" been suggested, although it has been shown that some historians—wishing to avoid raising controversial issues—have omitted important parts of the story. Rather, what has been emphasized is that intellectuals in general and historians in particular have played central roles in the "consciousness raising" of generations of Cubans.

It is also apparent, however, that few historians would have sought "the real Maceo" had it not been for concomitant, widespread dissatisfaction with existing political and social arrangements—and a subsequent commitment to national construction and reconstruction. After all, Cuban history could have been written—and for many years was in fact written—with no more than a ritualistic mention of Maceo. But once historians, for reasons of racial identification (many have been black or mulatto) or because of ideological and political concerns, set themselves the task of analyzing the economic and social history of their country critically, what better vehicle than Antonio Maceo to carry the several messages thought most relevant? History provided a man whose race, class, and personal convictions made him a legitimate representative of those who suffered most under the old regime and stood to benefit most under the new. Out of the fragments of the past, a new perspective on the present could be forged, and the outlines of a better future could be foreseen. And ultimately, even though not all who contributed to these perspectives under-

stood the hero in such terms, to show that Maceo was a major figure in Cuban history was also to assert that the social groups he represented—the blacks, the poor, the peasants, and the humble people in general—have been and once again were to be a motor force in the history of the nation.

NOTES

1. A detailed account of Maceo's death and burial appears in the memoir of his chief of staff, José Miró Argenter, *Crónicas de la guerra* 2:299–312. The reference was taken from the fourth edition (La Habana, 1945; reprinted, 1970).
2. *Ibid.*, pp. 351–52.
3. See Philip Foner, *The Spanish-Cuban-American War and the Birth of American Imperialism* 1 (New York, 1972), pp. 96–97, 108. Maceo was called the greatest fighter against colonialism since Toussaint L'Ouverture. World reaction to Maceo's death is also described in José Luciano Franco, *Antonio Maceo, Apuntes para una historia de su vida* 3 (La Habana, 1954; reprinted, 1973).
4. Since this account of Maceo's life represents a consensus summary of material found in virtually all the works consulted for this essay, no specific sources will be cited.
5. This sector of small farmers in Oriente has always given Cuba its dedicated revolutionaries—in the Ten Years' War, in the subsequent War of Independence of 1895, and in the Revolution of 1959. Regional differences in slavery and race relations are discussed in Franklin W. Knight, *Slave Society in Cuba during the Nineteenth Century* (Madison, Wisconsin, 1970), pp. 154–58.
6. On one occasion Maceo expressed his views on the problem of race and racism in a letter he wrote to the then President Salvador Cisneros Betancourt, 16 May 1876. In this letter, he reviewed his service to the rebel republic and noted that the racist insinuations that a few fellow insurgents had been making about him were both unjust and divisive. Speaking of himself he said: "And since this writer is a person of color, who does not believe that he is worth less than other men for this reason, he cannot and will not consent to what is not the case, nor allow [the rumors] to continue being spread." In Hortensia Pichardo, *Documentos para la historia de Cuba* 1 (La Habana, 1971), pp. 394–95.
7. Before returning to do battle, Maceo made one important visit to Cuba in 1890. On that occasion, he was greeted with enormous enthusiasm throughout the island. In fact, so great was his popularity that he had to cut short his stay for fear of assassination by the Spaniards. The events of 1890 demonstrated the readiness of the Cuban people to renew the struggle, and they also indicated that Maceo himself had been endowed with the status of hero. It is unlikely that any other nonwhite would have been so warmly welcomed by white high society; nor is it likely that any but he could have so inspired Cuban youth who barely remembered the Ten Years' War.
8. I have much simplified the very complex political history of postindependence Cuba in order to give the reader not familiar with Cuba a basic idea of the forces at play. There are many works in English in which a more adequate coverage of this period may be found, e.g.: Edward González, *Cuba under Castro: The Limits of Charisma* (Boston, 1974), pp. 25–52; Ramón Eduardo Ruiz, *Cuba, the Making of a Revolution* (Amherst, Mass., 1968), pp. 76–140; Jaime Suchlicki, *Cuba, from Columbus to Castro* (New York, 1973), pp. 103–74; and Hugh Thomas, *Cuba: The Pursuit of Freedom* (New York, 1971), pp. 605–1034.
9. These first-hand works began appearing soon after the establishment of the Republic and continued appearing into the 1940s. Some have been republished since the Revolution. Among those related to this essay are: Fernando Figueredo, *La revolución de Yara* (La Habana, 1902; republished, 1968); Manuel J. de Granda, *La paz de Manganeso*

- (La Habana, 1913); Enrique José Varona, *De la colonia a la República, selección de trabajos políticos* (La Habana, 1919); Enrique Collazo, *La guerra en Cuba* (La Habana, 1926); Juan Gualberto Gómez, *Por Cuba libre* (La Habana, 1926); Máximo Gómez, *Diario de campaña* (La Habana, 1941); José Miró Argenter, *Cuba, crónicas de la guerra, las campañas de invasión y de Occidente, 1895–1896* (La Habana, 1945; republished, 1970); Manuel Piedra Martel, *Campañas de Maceo en la última Guerra de Independencia* (La Habana, 1946). Maceo also appears prominently in the works of José Martí.
10. Prior to the Revolution, every year on the anniversary of Maceo's death, an historian, politician, or soldier was invited to make a presentation on the hero to Congress. Biographies were commissioned on the centenary of his birth, but these works were intended more as patriotic pronouncements than as historical analyses. Maceo has continued to be commemorated in the popular press since the Revolution.
 11. The groups are not logically exclusive. Some traditional historians' works are considered revisionist. Many revisionists later joined the postrevolutionary group.
 12. It is not possible in this short space to include all the major works that represent this group called "traditional historians." I will therefore note only a sample of the works that have some relevance to this essay: Herminio Portell Vilá, *Historia de Cuba en sus relaciones con los Estados Unidos y España* 2 (1853–1878), 3 (1878–1899) (La Habana, 1939); Luis Roland Cabrera, *El centenario de Maceo, 1845–14 junio 1945* (La Habana, 1945); Gerardo Castellanos García, *Francisco Gómez Toro, en el surco del generalísimo* (La Habana, 1932); *Los últimos días de Martí* (La Habana, 1937); Rafael Marquina, *Antonio Maceo, héroe epónimo* (La Habana, 1943); Fermín Peraza Sarausa, *Infancia ejemplar en la vida heroica de Antonio Maceo* (La Habana, 1945); Gerardo Rodríguez Morejón, *Maceo, homenaje que rinde el Ministerio de Defensa Nacional al Lugarteniente General Antonio Maceo y Grajales* (La Habana, 1946); Emeterio Santovenia y Echaide, *Raíz y altura de Antonio Maceo* (La Habana, 1943); *Huellas de gloria, frases históricas cubanas* (La Habana, 1944). I have not included in this list the authors of the annual speeches presented in congress on the anniversary of Maceo's death.
 13. The Academy of History was founded in 1910.
 14. Fernando Ortiz Fernández, *El engaño de las razas* (La Habana, 1946); *Contrapunteo cubano del tabaco y el azúcar* (1940); José Luciano Franco, *Antonio Maceo, apuntes para una historia de su vida*, 3 vols. (La Habana, 1951–54; reprinted, 1973); Leonardo Griñan Peralta, *Maceo, análisis caracterológico* (La Habana, 1940); Leopoldo Horrego Estuch, *Maceo, héroe y carácter* (La Habana, 1944); Ramiro Guerra y Sánchez, *Guerra de los Diez Años, 1868–1878*, 2 vols. (La Habana, 1950); *Azúcar y población en las Antillas* (La Habana, 1927); Emilio Roig de Leuchsenring, *La guerra liberadora de los treinta años, razon de su victoria*, 2nd ed. (La Habana, 1958); *Males y vicios de Cuba republicana, sus causas y sus remedios*, 2nd ed., (La Habana, 1961); Raúl Cepero y Bonilla, *Azúcar y abolición, apuntes para una historia crítica del abolicionismo* (La Habana, 1960); Julio Le Riverend, *Reseña histórica de la economía cubana y sus problemas* (México, 1956); Oscar Pino Santos, *La estructura económica de Cuba y la reforma agraria* (La Habana, 1959); José Antonio Portuondo, *El heroísmo intelectual, ensayo* (México, 1955); *La historia y las generaciones* (Santiago de Cuba, 1958); Carlos Rafael Rodríguez, *Las bases del desarrollo económico de Cuba* (La Habana, 1956); *José Martí and Cuban Liberation* (New York, 1953); Sergio Aguirre, "Esclavitud y abolicionismo," *Dialéctica* 18 (March-June 1946); "En torno a la Revolución de 1868," *Hoy* (1945, Año del Centenario Maceico, en el Magazine Especial de Primero de Mayo); "La Protesta de Baraguá," *ibid.*

Other historiographical studies have counted Herminio Portell Vilá among the revisionist historians. No one writing in Cuba today would so count him. Portell Vilá was indeed critical of certain aspects of Cuban reality, but he generally approved the existing political and social order. His work was useful to the revisionists in providing much information on which they based their more critical studies of North American imperialism. I have not limited the list of revisionist literature to works dealing solely with Maceo, because I felt it important to include a representation of the work of the major historians of the time. The treatments of Maceo reflect the broader social and economic concerns of the period.

15. The works published since the Revolution dealing specifically with Maceo are those by Raúl Aparicio, *Hombradía de Antonio Maceo* (La Habana, 1967); José Antonio Portuondo, *El pensamiento vivo de Maceo* (La Habana, 1971); Jorge Ibarra, *Ideología Mambisa* (La Habana, 1972); Nydia Sarabia, *Historia de una familia mambisa: Mariana Grajales* (La Habana, 1975). Works such as the Maceo biography by José Luciana Franco have been republished, as have the first-hand accounts by Miró Argenter, Fernando Figueredo, and, of course, José Martí. In the journals, *Cuba Socialista* and *Islas* (of the University of Las Villas), there are interesting historiographical articles. For the most part, the books written since the Revolution are those of Cubans trained prior to the Revolution, many of which are noted above. New books are often published on the basis of prizes awarded to younger historians such as Aparicio and Sarabia.
16. Rafael Marquina, *Antonio Maceo*, p. 139.
17. Herminio Portell Vilá, *Historia de Cuba* 3:68. The author goes on to describe the homage accorded the hero on his return to Cuba in 1890, "despite the fact that he was a mulatto."
18. Rafael Marquina, *Antonio Maceo*, p. 136.
19. Fermín Peraza, *Infancia ejemplar*, p. 7.
20. *Ibid.*, p. 8.
21. Rodríguez Morejón, *Maceo*, pp. 38–39.
22. La Mejorana was the scene of the first meeting of Martí, Gómez, and Maceo once the War of 1895 had begun. In that meeting, Martí insisted that military operations must be directed by political considerations. Maceo and Gómez, recalling the constant political restraints on their actions during the Ten Years' War, opposed Martí. They advocated minimal political structures and a free hand for military commanders. A compromise was reached, giving Martí political direction and the two generals military command. Martí died and political power came to be exercised by the governing council which, as Maceo feared, created the same problems for the military command as had existed in the Ten Years' War.
23. Leonardo Griñan Peralta, *Maceo, Análisis caracterológico*, p. 305.
24. Commandante Raúl Castro Ruz, "El ejemplo de los héroes nunca muere," speech given on 7 December 1959 (La Habana, Department of Public Relations of the Ministry of State), p. 15.
25. *Ibid.*, p. 9.
26. Luis Rolando Cabrera, *El centenario de Maceo*, p. 30. Cabrera was himself a mulatto.
27. Portell Vilá is the strongest exponent of this view; see *Historia de Cuba* 3:68.
28. José Luciano Franco, *Maceo, apuntes* 3:175.
29. Ministerio de Educación, Viceministerio de Educación General y Especial, *Historia de Cuba* 1 (La Habana, 1973), p. 7 (text used for teacher training).
30. José Antonio Portuondo, *El pensamiento vivo de Maceo*, p. 3.
31. Maceo's reputation and fame were spread wherever he traveled. An indication of the admiration that he engendered in the United States may be found in Philip Foner's article, "A Tribute to Antonio Maceo," *Journal of Negro History* 55, no. 1 (January 1970):65–71.
32. Rafael Marquina, *Antonio Maceo*, p. 109.
33. G. Rodríguez Morejón, *Maceo*, p. 27. The quotation is taken from the author's description of how the common people rallied to de Céspedes after his *Grito de Yara* initiated the war.
34. Ramiro Guerra draws a distinction between the position of the Oriente leaders such as de Céspedes, whose economic situation and high level of consciousness led them to take fairly egalitarian and strongly antislavery positions, as opposed to the landowners of the western provinces, who never went beyond demanding gradual indemnified abolition, *Guerra de los Diez Años* 1:48–49. Cepero Bonilla, on the other hand, condemns the entire landholding class, including, at first, de Céspedes, as aristocratic, antiabolitionist, and open to imperialism, *Azúcar y abolición*, pp. 9, 121, 205. José Luciano Franco insisted that the Spaniards were able to rule because of the complicity of the

- landholders, whose momentary economic benefits depended on a regime of human servitude, *Antonio Maceo, apuntes*, 2:7.
35. The exceptions to this condemnation include de Céspedes and Ignacio Agramonte.
 36. Ramiro Guerra y Sánchez, *Guerra de los Diez Años* 1:31.
 37. Leopoldo Griñan Peralta, *Maceo, análisis caracterológico*, see esp. pp. 304–09; Leopoldo Horrego Estuch, *Maceo, héroe y carácter*; José Luciano Franco, *Maceo, apuntes*.
 38. “La protesta de Baraguá,” in *Eco de caminos* (La Habana, 1974), pp. 203, 205–6.
 39. Race, as noted above, is subordinated to class in the analyses of recent writers.
 40. Sergio Aguirre, “Frustración y reconquista del 24 de febrero,” *Cuba Socialista*, no. 6, Año 2 (February 1962), p. 3. Article reprinted in *Eco de caminos*, pp. 257–73.
 41. *Granma Weekly Review*, 13 October, 1968, p. 2.
 42. The exploration of Maceo’s thought is the theme of José Antonio Portuondo’s edition of Maceo’s letters, *El pensamiento vivo de Maceo*, and a major element in Jorge Ibarra’s *Ideología Mambisa*.
 43. Raúl Aparicio, in *Hombradía de Antonio Maceo*, insisted that a man such as Maceo could not easily have emerged from any other family or any other socioeconomic background, p. 28.
 44. This interpretation appears in *Historia de Cuba*, 2nd ed. (Dirección Política de las Fuerzas Armadas Revolucionarias, 1968), pp. 294–99; also in Jorge Ibarra, *Ideología Mambisa*, pp. 101, 115.
 45. *Ibid.*, p. 437, and Raúl Aparicio, *Hombradía*, pp. 337–38. According to Jorge Ibarra, the two issues were linked, since the upper-class leaders who sought peace with Spain at Zanjón were at the same time working for annexation to the United States. Popular opinion rejected both these alternatives, *Ideología Mambisa*, pp. 95–101.

INSTITUTO INTERNACIONAL DE LITERATURA IBEROAMERICANA

Se anuncia el XVIII Congreso del Instituto Internacional de Literatura Iberoamericana, patrocinado por el Centro de Estudios Latinoamericanos con la colaboración del Departamento de Lenguas Romances de la Universidad de Florida en Gainesville, Florida, 27 marzo al 1 de abril de 1977. El tema es El Modernismo (de la América española y España).

Los temas selectos de algunas sesiones incluyen: modernismo y modernidad; la novela modernista; modernismo e ideología; modernismo y vanguardismo; la crítica modernista; el modernismo y el ensayo; función social de la literatura modernista; Rubén Darío; y José Martí. Los que desean presentar ponencias sobre éstos y temas afines, deben comunicarse con el Presidente del Instituto:

Dr. Ivan A. Schulman
Grinter Hall, Box 314
University of Florida
Gainesville, FL 32611

Fecha límite para la entrega de manuscritos es el 15 de diciembre de 1976. En enero de 1977 se enviara un segundo anuncio con más detalles sobre el programa, alojamiento y viajes.