The Falsification of History in Gutiérrez Alea's and Moreno Fraginals' *La última cena*

Jorge Camacho
University of South Carolina-Columbia
Cuban. Resident of the United States

In 1975, fourteen years after Fidel Castro pronounced his "words to the intellectuals,"and only four after the Final Declaration of the First Congress for Education and Culture (1971), Gutiérrez Alea filmed one of the most talked about movies in the history of Cuban film: *La última cena* [The Last Supper] (1976).[1] Everyone who has written about this film has pointed to its depiction of Catholicism's complicity with slavery. Yet, they tend to ignore the context in which the film was made: the State's campaign against the Catholic Church, and the use of art and history as "weapons." In this context, the declarations made at that Congress are illustrative of the change in Cuban politics that happened in 1971, with the incorporation of children to the productive workforce, and explicit condemnation of homosexuality as an example of "social pathology."[2] These and other measures when put in practice meant greater limitations on freedoms, and an intense campaign against those who opposed the State. Another thing that was agreed upon at the Congress was that "[the attitude of revolutionaries] towards counterrevolutionaries and obscurantists [should be] to unmask and combat them"and use "scientific education in school to combat counterrevolutionary lies, fraud and shams."[3]

It is useful, then, to rethink the way slavery and religion are perceived by Gutiérrez Alea and Moreno Fraginals, and the role of ideology in the representation of the historical events they narrate. Despite the fact Gutiérrez Alea used history as a background in his feature-length films, it does not have the same role in all of them. If one compares *La última cena* with *Memorias del subdesarrollo* [Memories of Underdevelopment] (1968), one finds that the latter was conceived to represent an ideological counterpoint between Sergio (a member of the bourgeoisie and, thus, a counterrevolutionary) and the people, Party and Revolution. Sergio ends up losing that

The Count surrounded by his slaves during the supper

battle; in the end, he ends up being trapped in a sort of "rat trap."Some critics have even suggested that in the end he commits suicide. In *La última cena*, however, one is presented with that counterpoint through the ideology of both the master and his slaves, which reveals their different ideas and perceptions of reality. The events are historical, as the film states, and Gutiérrez Alea confirm in numerous interviews. It is based on an anecdote shared by Manuel Moreno Fraginals in his book *El Ingenio* [The Sugarmill] (1964):

"The very excellent lord, the Count of Casa Bayona, in an act of deepest Christian fervor, decided to humiliate himself before his slaves. On Holy Thursday, and imitating Christ, he washed the feet of twelve slaves, sat them at his table, and served them on his dishes. Yet, instead of behaving like the apostles, what these slaves did, because their knowledge of theology was not too deep, was to later rebel, bolstered by the prestige they had garnered before the rest of the slave population. They ended up burning down the sugarmill. This extremely Christian act was put to an end by slave hunters who chased down the escaped blacks, and stuck on twelve lances the heads of those slaves before whom his very excellent lord Count of Casa Bayona had humiliated himself."[4]

This quote serves as a summary of the story the film tells, and shows a context that explains the relationship between the Catholic Church and the slave-owners at the end of the eighteenth century. According to Moreno Fraginals, it was sometimes complicit, other times conflictive, which is corroborated in *Explicación de la doctrina cristiana acomodada a la capacidad de los negros bozales* [Explanation of Christian Doctrine Adjusted for *Bozal* Blacks] (1797), by Father Antonio Nicolás, the Duke of Estrada, in Havana. According to Moreno Fraginals, towards the end of the eighteenth century, a time by which sugar

production was becoming big business, the Church found itself in conflict with sugar mill owners who resisted respecting certain traditional demands, like tithing, not making slaves work on Sunday, and even paying chaplains to teach their slaves religion and officiating at burials.

Moreno Fraginals writes: "modern sugar barons, in their obsessive struggle to increase production and lower costs, begin to eliminate costs that do not contribute directly to the production of marketable goods."[5] In the end, the plantation owners won, and the Church slowly began to lose its power. The chaplains had to abandon the sugarmills, but at the film's historical moment the ties that bound the slave-owners and chaplains were still quite strong. Even so, the greater problem that would eventually break this tie was already looming. During one of the film's earliest scenes, the Count questions the foreman about a slave, Sebastián, who had run away to the scrubland:

Master: The chaplain is complaining that not all the blacks were at church.

Foreman: The press required urgent repairs.

Master: But it was Sunday, and not just any Sunday. It was Holy Week, and it was Palm Sunday. The chaplain is right.

Foreman: Yes, but it is not the chaplain who has to guarantee 138 tons of sugar this year.

Master: Well, but we must respect Holy Week.[6]

This brief exchange helps us understand the master's dilemma, which increases as the film goes on. It is the foreman who refuses (and the master, indirectly) to let the slaves take off on Good Friday, even when the master, himself, had promised them just that. The Count, of course, understands this dilemma, but pretends as though it does not matter to him, because deep, down inside—as Alea suggests—the only thing that really interests him is money. Shortly after, there is a very clear example of this, when the foreman confirms he will have to increase the number of lashes given to the slaves, and put many of them in stocks in order to get the 138 tons out of them. The Count, who is visibly upset by this, says that there was no need to inform of that, because that was "his business."[7] This criticism of the master, who deep down inside accepts the foreman's violent methods for getting the most out of the slaves, connects to the idea of "history as a weapon," not only because it criticizes the alliance between the Church and the bourgeoisie, but also because it represents both the old, colonial power and, indirectly, the system against which the Cuban revolution struggled. The fact there was special emphasis made on the role of the audiovisual arts in revolutionary struggle and "new man's" education in the Final Declaration of the First National Congress for Education and Culture was not a coincidence:

"The Congress insisted upon the need to consider radio and television not only as media for entertainment and fun, but also, fundamentally, as wonderfully efficient instruments in the formation of the new man's conscience…As a form of mass media communication, film 'is *the* art of our century." Lenin said "that of all the arts, it was the most important'…This is why the Congress calls for more Cuban films and documentaries about history, as a way to link the present with the past."[8]

In Gerardo Chijona's interview with Gutiérrez Alea for *Cine cubano* (1978), Alea talks about the confrontation of the Church and government at the beginning of the revolution, and confirms that the anecdote about

the Count of Casa Bayona's slave uprising caught his attention because it happened at a time when the position of "our *criollo* bourgeoisie, began to consolidate, especially in sugar production."[9] In this sense, his film ended up rewriting history from a "classist, scientific, historical point of view" and "putting things in their place."[10] In the same interview, Gutiérrez Alea connects the film with "how recent events in Angola have resonated with us,"[11] something he repeats in the book *Tomás Gutiérrez Alea: los filmes que no filmé* [Tomás Gutiérrez Alea: The Films I Didn't Film] (1989). He adds here that they heard about the participation of Cuban troops in the African wars while filming *La última cena*. What is important here is that time and time again Gutiérrez Alea tries to link something that happened in the eighteenth century with what was going in Cuba, in the 1970s. In his attempt to connect the film "with contemporary reality" in Africa and Latin America, he explains that it is not only in Spain that "these things are seen more clearly. Such is the case anywhere in the world that has been marked by the deforming spirit of that Christian spirit, the moment it was embodied by the bourgeoisie, and served it as an instrument of domination."[12] It was important for Gutiérrez Alea to point out that his picture had to contribute to "the struggle we [were] engaged in at an ideological level."[13] These arguments are consistent with the idea of "cinema as a *productive* social function,"[14] which in the Cuban revolution's context meant "inciting the spectator to actively participate in social life" (emphasis in the original). In other words, these types of stories derive their substance from the fact that "the existing view of the past has been distorted systematically by bourgeois history" and that the new State's artists and intellectuals were proposing to change, erase and erect in its place a new monument."[15] This explains why it was necessary "to reconstruct" and establish a crystal clear, "correct" interpretation of the facts for present and future generations. So, how much of *La última cena* is true?

Moreno Fraginals says that the uprising happened at the end of the eighteenth century, in Quiebrahacha, at the Count of Casa Bayona's spread. Gutiérrez Alea takes this date as gospel, and has it coincide with the Haitian revolution. According to Don Gaspar's testimony, the sugar technician at the sugar mill in *La última cena*, who the master always calls by his French name, Monsieur Duclé, and with whom he has brief exchanges in the language,[16] lived in Saint Domingue till the revolution's outbreak, when he left for Cuba. Thus, Don Gaspar is filled with a terrible fear that he tries to communite to the slaveowner and foreman time and time again—but they don't listen. This is really strange if we know that the *criollos* and Spaniards were living in fear that something similar might happen in Cuba every since the Haitian revolution broke out.

The first time the subject comes up is when the foreman, master, chaplain and Gaspar chat in the mill's sugar purification building. The master asked Don Gaspar if he thought the horizontal press was going to improve production, to which the mulatto answers: "you may end up using the horizontal press, exclusively, but…a press like that is surely going to need more cane." To this, the foreman answers: "don't worry, Don Gaspar. You'll have more cane," to which Gaspar responds: "there is nothing new, nothing but blacks to cut it." The master emerged from almost total absorption unable to understand where the sugar technician was going with so many insinuations, and retorted: "Just what

do you mean by that?" Don Gaspar explains: "That we will need to bring in more blacks…" At this point, the music starts, and accentuates the drama, boosting the import of the foreman's comment: "it will be necessary to bring more blacks." Gaspar warns that "there will come a time when there will be more blacks than whites," to which the master answers: "do not worry, Monsieur Duclé. [In Cuba] we know how to deal with blacks." No sooner has he said this, we hear the slave hunters' voices and dogs barking. They have with them the slave Sebastián all tied up.[17]

The problem the master doesn't understand—that Gaspar understands perfectly—is that they have no time, and the worry was that the same thing that happened in Saint Domingue might happen in Cuba. This explains why further on, after the master washes the slaves' feet at the church, and the foreman goes to Don Gaspar's home to complain, the sugar technician thinks out loud: "drink, drink, drink while you can. I know very well what happened when blacks get out of control in Saint Domingue…" The foreman interrupts: "Ah. You always talk about the same thing…Saint Domingue"; and Don Gaspar explains: "Because I know what I'm talking about. There were more blacks than whites in Saint Domingue…and now only blacks [laughing nervously]. I would not like to see my head used to be kicked around by some blacks [he laughs again, and serves the foreman another drink]."[18] This shows us that Gutiérrez Alea situates the film's story sometime after the Haitian revolution, concomitant with the "sugar elite's" rise and the introduction of new machinery, techonology that brought with it a dizzying increase in sugarmill production, and an increase in the number of slaves that were imported.

Yet, in a later essay published in *La Historia como arma* [History as Weapon] (1982), Moreno Fraginals confirms something altogether different from what he said in *El Ingenio*—that the uprising at Quiebrahacha happened in 1740, almost 60 years prior to his original date. The date comes up when he tells the story of the black slave Manuel de Angola, who was baptized in Cuba around 1685, when sugarmills were being established and expanded on lands near Havana. For Moreno Fraginals, the story of this slave was "valuable as a symbol"[19] because he represented one of at least two million Angolan men that "Portuguese colonialism" had brought to America. He adds: "Even if it is true that we cannot accurately know the exact number of "Angolan" blacks that had come to Cuba, their deep cultural imprint on Cuba is undeniable. During the 1740s, Havana regent Bernardo de Urrutia y Matos speaks of them indignantly because of their extreme "lack of docility," and accuses them of practicing mass suicide. His observation is very interesting because the famous "Quiebrahacha" uprising at the Count of Casa Bayona's sugarmill takes place precisely in 1740. Its slave population was predominantly composed of Angolan blacks, and we know that when the rebellion's participants saw they were surrounded by slave hunters, they opted for suicide instead of giving in."[20]

This fact speaks for itself, for Moreno Fraginals not only offers a different date for the uprising, but also ties the story of Manuel and the Angolan slaves in Cuba with the Quiebrahacha uprising. He says that the slave population at the Count of Bayona's plantation was made up "primarily of slaves from Angola."[21] but this fact is not supported by any historical document, and is difficult to accept. This is because the vast majority of slaves that came to Cuba from Africa were

from Nigeria, Ivory Coast, and the Congo. The closest thing to an acceptable bibliographic reference is the allusion of the spokesman of the Real Compañía de Comercio de La Habana, Dr. Bernardo de Urrutia Matos, who "speaks of them" (the Angolan slaves) in a report in which he says they were not "too docile." The report to which Moreno Fraginals refers is *Cuba: Fomento de la Isla* (1749). In effect, Urrutia and Matos is referring to a need to import more slaves, and to choose the nations from which to bring them, since he criticizes the English for "the bad and expensive way they take care of their blacks."[22] Yet, nowhere in that report does Urrutia y Matos mention the Angolan slave population. Instead, he talks about the English "bringing us [by way of a Contract] Congolese blacks, with all their corrupted vices, and Calabar slaves, the kind that split themselves into two groups, those who either hang themselves or run away, and those who produce less than the Mandingas and Bambaras. In addition, they price them in a way that does not correspond to the work they do, which means we eventually have to totally abandon them to active and passive commercial work."[23] Levi Marrero quotes part of this excerpt, but there is no testimony about the origin of the slave workforce either in this excerpt or the one about the founding of the Santa María del Rosario by the Count of Casa Bayona. It limits itself to reporting that the African slaves had come to Cuba in English ships (English ships were responsible for supplying "all the Spanish Indies, from Florida and the North American southeast, to the southern cone of South America" between 1714 and 1750).[24]

How is it possible that Moreno Fraginals was careless with those facts, and did not stick to documentation? The answer is that it was simply more important to highlight the "symbolic value" of Manuel's story and Cuba's current participation in the Angolan war. *The Sugarmill*'s author thought that history was at its best when it served as a "weapon" against imperialism, not when it reproduced the bourgeois "lies" in all the history written before. For Moreno Fraginals, "bourgeois" history established the laws and "lies" that they supposed contemporary historians would repeat. According to him, one was expected to be dispassionate, and not judge the past by present-day criteria; thus, "the average American historian" was a bureaucrat, a history professor. Their mission was something more than "accumulating facts, scratching at sources to write their books." He was not comfortable with the whirlwind of modern life, and was always looking for an opportunity to go back to his study.

There is more. Moreno Fraginals wrote this essay about the undeniable political situation the war in Angola represented, a war in which the State's participation, and that of Cuban troops, were decisive. The Marxist historian never directly alluded to this fact in Manuel's narration. Yet, this context ceases imposing its "symbolic" weight. Through the document that substantiates the slave's baptism, Fraginals manages to connect his story to the Quiebrahacha rebellion, and indirectly, with the revolutionary and anticolonial present on both continents. By doing this, he justifies the incursion of Cuban troops in Angola, the same way Fidel Castro does in his speech on the fifteenth anniversary of the victory at Playa Girón [Bay of Pigs] (April 19 1976), that is, by appealing to the historical and racial ties between both peoples:

"African blood was spilled at Girón, that of the selfless descendants of a people that was enslaved before they became workers, and were exploited workers before being masters

of their own country. Cuban blood, too, was spilled along with that of Angola's heroic warriors, that of the sons of Martí, Maceo and Agramonte, that of those who inherited the internationalist blood of Gómez and Che Guevara (prolonged applause). Those who once enslaved man and sent him to America, perhaps did not ever imagine that one of those peoples who received slaves, would send its soldiers to fight for the freedom of Africa."[26]

This declaration's only goal was to highlight the ethnic composition that both countries shared, and the history of rebellion against Spanish and U.S. colonialism. For Fidel Castro, Cuba's independence wars were echoed in the revolutionary struggle against the United States; they were the origin of a history that could be summed up in the idea of "100 Years of Struggle." Historians in and outside Cuba have acknowledged the centrality of Castro's speeches in the creation of that historiographical framework. In the words of Oscar Zanetti Lecuona, that conceptualization operated like "a sort of divalent legitimation that anointed the current revolutionaries with the glory of past tradition, on the one hand; and preserved and saved the founding fathers from possible iconoclasm, on the other."[27] Outside Cuba, Rafael Rojas has insisted on the simplistic, Manichean and teleological nature of the Cuban revolution's official rhetoric."[28]

My purpose with this essay is to unveil the mechanism through with official rhetoric masks its message, hides information, and justifies the State's repressive practices against the Church or in favor of its anti-colonial policies in African. In this sense, officialist intellectuals at that time, like Gutiérrez Alea and Moreno Fraginals, would impose their perspective of the State, and revise history to turn it into an instrument of their own political interests—not those of blacks. Much less were they in search of historiographic truth. The recurring tropes of this view of history would be *mimesis,* mirror games with which Castro reproduced José Martí, and the Manichean dynamics of the U.S. versus Cuba, Slaves versus Masters, and counterrevolutionaries versus revolutionaries' struggles. He also reproduced the dynamic of the *nemesis* or imposition of a revolutionary perspective against the perverse influence of foreign regimes on the economy and Catholic religion in Cuban society. It is not strange that in Moreno Fraginals "history as weapon" move he resorted to the story of the Count of Casa Bayona to bolster his argument, and once again speak of the Church's crisis at the end of eighteenth century. The only problem is that he was once again wrong—from a historiographic point of view—or was manipulating the historical data for his own purposes.

In *El Ingenio,* Fraginals quotes a document in support of the Count of Casa Bayona's narration. According to Gutiérrez Alea, neither he nor his research team was able to locate it in Cuba's National Archive. A year after *La última cena*'s debut, Gutiérrez Alea confessed to Chijona: "We were not able to gain access to the original document, "Representación extendida por don Diego Miguel de Mora y firmada por casi todos los dueños de ingenios de la jurisdicción, en enero 19 (sic) de 1700" [Extended testimony by Don Diego Miguel de Mora and signed by almost all sugar mill owners in the jurisdiction, on January 10, 1700], in which this event is narrated, because said document did not exist in Cuba, not even a facsimile of it."[29]

Moreno Fraginals had written that the document could be found in the "ANC [National Archive], Royal Consulate, 150/7405."[30] How is it possible that it could

not be found when they were going to make the film? Did it really exist? Gutiérrez Alea does not ask himself so awkward a question, and emphasizes that "the paragraph, given the context in which it was situated, seemed sufficiently suggestive to us to demonstrate the hypocrisy hidden behind that "Christian spirit," despite the fact they were unable to find it. This was an important factor in the formation of our nationality."[31] By now, it was no longer necessary to ensure that the events happened on any specific date or in any particular way. The history of slavery and representation of slaves now took second place. Neither was it important that the Haitian revolution (1791) had not begun till a year after the supposed uprising, and it was only then that sugar mill owners, sugar technicians, and coffee plantation owners began to arrive from Saint Domingue to Cuba. Given the document in question was dated "January 19, 1790", had Gutiérrez Alea or Moreno Fraginals wanted to be "true" to the only supposedly historic fact they knew, neither of them would have allowed the sugar technician, played by José Antonio Ramírez, to recount his "experience" with the revolution in Saint Domingue, or say how dangerous it was for white plantation owners to let the black slave population grow. The only thing that mattered at that point was to use the topic of slavery as an excuse for criticizing the bourgeoisie, imperialism and religion. The First National Congress for Education and Culture stated it quite clearly: "art is a weapon of the revolution."[32]

So, when exactly did the uprising at the Conde de Bayona's house take place? 1790 or 1740? The answer is 'neither.' The slave uprising at Quiebrahacha happened in 1727, way before Africans were brought in great numbers to the island, or the beginning of the Haitian revolution.[33] In *Cuba: Economía y sociedad* (1969-77), Levi Marrero recounts the story of the Cuba's earliest settlements, among them the "noble city of Santa María del Rosario," founded in 1733 by the Count de Casa Bayona, Don Joseph de Bayona y Chacón, who requested the King's permission to do so after a "bloody slave rebellion, in 1727." In his letter to the King, Bayona attributed the uprising to the presence in Cuba of English admiral Hossier's squadron, whose agents could have instigated it. This hypothesis had been advanced by Jacobo de la Pezuela in *Historia de la isla de Cuba* (1868), and is upheld by Marrero: "the slaves had been taken to Havana because of the English Contract [and] the possibility that the enemy could use those slaves who were against their masters to find support in Cuba, a topic considered by Havana's citizens since the Six Hundreds."[34] Havana would be invaded by the English (1762) and occupied for one year, but the English had much earlier shown interest in acquiring the island, which explains the persistent fear the Spanish (at war with the them) had of English ships being near Cuba. Marrero quotes a scribe who wrote to the King that the Count complained of "the suffering and setback of having had part of his slave workforce at the… sugar mill rise up using firearms and *machetes* they…stole [from him] and the commotion this caused among all the other blacks at the other sugar mills in the area; and that because they were well-armed, they committed many and grave insults, deaths, and sacrileges; pilfering sacred vestiments and vessels; putting this city [Havana] and its inhabitants in grave danger."[3] A royal charter dated April 4, 1732, authorizes the creation of the dominion of the city of Santa María del Rosario, and reports the uprising that took place there:

"From what the Count of Casa Bayona told me in a letter dated March 3, 1728,

he had experienced at the sugar mill called Quiebrahacha, which he owned, a commotion by a large number of slaves he had there for his production, who in alliance with others, from other sugar mills and plantations in the area, stole from him and carried out among the workers great hostilities and dangers… and since the aforementioned sugar mill was his, and it was central in position to the other surrounding ones, the founding of the new city that he was requesting might keep the danger of such boldness from happening there, because there were so many blacks on the island."[36]

These documents approve the creation of a town around the sugar mill, as a cautionary measure, and to discourage slaves from running away. The town would be a sort of fortress to protect against neighboring uprisings.[37] To achieve this, the Count was willing to provide the land on which to construct the homes of each one of thirty, select neighbors, and sell them up to 100 acres of land for farming. The King agreed to the request, and the Villa of Santa María del Rosario was founded with 30 families, a total of 145 people. The mass the Count supposedly had celebrated, and served Gutiérrez Alea as a pretext for the film, was mentioned nowhere in the texts Marrero quotes, nor in the King's answer. Pezuela attributes the uprising "to certain excesses by white workers and, perhaps, carelessness and neglect on the part of their lord."[38] Neither does Marrero attribute the uprising to not having given the slaves the Sunday off, or to the conflict between the Church and foreman. In fact, Pezuela did not think it proper to attribute the sedition to an effect of the English abolitionist campaign because "when they monopolized the business of bringing Africans to America, there is no way the English would have considered destroying a business they were working so hard to grow then. Those thoughts could not be further from their minds."[39]

Nevertheless, the tension generated by the owners' ambition, and the Church's jealous zeal, can be found all over Spanish America by the end of the eighteenth century, not just in Cuba. A 1711 royal charter demands that "everything possible be done so that blacks don't have to work on Sundays." It is directed at the Bishop of Popayán, in what is today modern-day Colombia, where mine owners forced their slaves to work on Sunday and feast days, and priests who owned mines went along with it. The King orders that priests be entirely prohibited from the administration, ownership and possession of mines, and that they should instead fulfill their "pastoral duties."[40] Of course, there was still complicity between the Church and landowners, but it had been somewhat different after that.

The story that Moreno Fraginals and Gutiérrez Alea tell belongs to the wrong historical period, not because by that time the Church was more or less complicit with the slave system, but because the rebellion of African slaves never happened on that date. Far from being seen as the product of carelessness, the error should be seen as a conscious manipulation whose purpose it was to use history to criticize religion, and show the concordance between the slaves' anti-colonial ideas (as the exploited, then) and those of the new working class (the revolutionaries). In their attempt to destroy earlier historiography, these intellectuals constructed another myth and distorted the dates so they would serve their own interests. The way in which power uses black culture and history to support class interests against their enemies, imperialism, and the bourgeoisie, leaves us with continuity more than it does rupture.

Notes:

1- Aside from numerous reviews of the film, there are academic essays that examine the subject of religion in it, as well as the typology of its characters, and even the metaphor of food. My focus here is on the use of history as a mechanism for political propaganda and indoctrination.

2-"Declaración del Primer congreso Nacional de Educación y Cultura,"in *Revista Casa de las Américas* 65-66 (marzo-junio 1971): 13.

3- Ibid,12.

4- Moreno Fraginals, Manuel. *El Ingenio.* Barcelona: Editorial Crítica, 2001: 99.

5- Ibid, 97.

6- Gutiérrez Alea, Tomás. *La última cena* (1976) 110 minutos [07:57].

7- Ibid [08:13].

8-"Declaración…,"loc. cit., 14-15.

9- Chijona, Gerardo. "*La última cena*, entrevista a Tomás Gutiérrez Alea,"in *Cine cubano* 93 (1977): 82.

10- Ibid, 82.

11- Ibid, 83.

12- Ibid, 84.

13- Ibid, 84.

14- Ibid, 87.

15- Ibid, 87.

16- Gutiérrez Alea, Tomás. *La última cena* [4:23]; [9:30].

17- Ibid, [2:39]; [12:40].

18- Ibid, [26:00].

19- Moreno Fraginals, Manuel. *La Historia como arma*. Barcelona: Editorial Crítica, 1983: 173.

20- Ibid, 173-174.

21- Ibid, 174.

22- Urrutia y Matos, Bernardo Joseph. "Cuba: fomento de la isla,"in Leví Marrero (ed.), San Juan: Moran Editores, 1993: 40.

23- Ibid, 41.

24- Marrero, Leví. *Cuba: economía y sociedad.* Madrid: Editorial Playor, 1978: 16.

25- Moreno Fraginals, Manuel. *La Historia como arma*. Ed. cit., 13-15.

26- Castro, Fidel. *Discursos* 3. La Habana: Ciencias Sociales, 1979: 180.

27- Zanetti Lecuona, Oscar. "Medio siglo de historiografía en Cuba: La impronta de la revolución,"in *Cuban Studies* 40 (2009): 80.

28- Rojas, Rafael. *La máquina del olvido. Mito, historia y poder en Cuba*. México: Taurus, 2012.

29- Chijona, Gerardo. Op. cit., 82.

30- Fraginals Moreno, Manuel. *El Ingenio.* Ed. cit., 99.

31- Chijona, Gerardo. Op. cit., 82.

32-"Declaración…"Loc. cit., 18.

33- I thank my colleague Matt Childs for the information about the rebellion at Quiebrahacha. See: *The 1812 Aponte Rebellion in Cuba and the struggle against Atlantic slavery.* Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 2006.

34- Marrero, Leví. *Cuba: economía y sociedad*. Ed. cit., 50.

35- Ibid, 50.

36- Ibid.

37- Konetzke, Richard (ed.). *Colección de documentos para la historia de la formación social de Hispanoamérica 1493-1810* III. Madrid: Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Científicas, 1962: 205-9.

38- In *Cuba: Tierra indefensa* (1945), Alberto Arredondo gives the date for the founding of Santa María del Rosario by the Count de Casa Bayona as 1727, due to a need to create a "ring to defend his valuable lands"from uprisings. I use the date given by Marrero.

39- Pezuela, Jacobo de la. *Historia de la isla de Cuba* II. Madrid: Carlos Bailly-Baillière, 1868: 360.

40- Konetzke, Richard (ed.). Op. cit., 382-3.