

## HAVANA HUB: CUBAN ANARCHISM, RADICAL MEDIA AND THE TRANS-CARIBBEAN ANARCHIST NETWORK, 1902-1915

*Kirwin R. Shaffer*

### ABSTRACT

Rooted in theories of radical media and social movements, this article explores the role of the Havana-based weekly anarchist newspaper *iTierra!* in forging both a Cuban-wide and larger Caribbean-wide anarchist network from 1902-1915. Between 1898 and 1915, Cuban anarchists published no fewer than 15 newspapers, but *iTierra!* was the longest-lived and most widely distributed. Besides distributing news and propaganda to workers in small towns, cities and mining communities across Cuba, these workers became key correspondents back to the Havana readership. Consequently, the paper became a crucial venue for readers across Cuba to communicate with one another and share tales of repression, compare conditions, and heighten awareness of the complexities of the island-wide struggle. In addition, a review of the newspaper finances reveals that the rural readership regularly provided between 35 and 60% of the urban paper's income. Also, the paper played a larger role as the journalistic hub for anarchists throughout the Caribbean. In particular, anarchist correspondents from Florida, Puerto Rico and the Panama Canal Zone contributed money and analyses about the status of the movements in those lands, providing readers throughout the distribution areas a means to compare their situations and develop a larger international consciousness.

**Keywords:** Cuba, anarchism, transnationalism, journalism, Puerto Rico, Panama

### RESUMEN

Basado en las teorías de medios de comunicación radicales y los movimientos sociales, este artículo explora el papel de *iTierra!* —un periódico semanal anarquista de La Habana— para forjar una red anarquista a través de Cuba y el Caribe desde 1902-1915. Entre 1898 y 1915, los anarquistas cubanos publicaron no menos de 15 periódicos, pero *iTierra!* fue publicado más que los otros y fue más ampliamente distribuido. Además de distribuir noticias y propaganda a los trabajadores en pueblos, pequeñas ciudades y las comunidades mineras en Cuba, estos trabajadores se convirtieron en corresponsales importantes para los lectores de La Habana. En consecuencia, el periódico se convirtió

en una herramienta fundamental para los lectores a través de Cuba para comunicarse entre sí y compartir historias de represión, comparar condiciones y concienciar sobre las complejidades de la lucha en toda la isla. Además, un examen de las finanzas del periódico revela que los lectores rurales proporcionaban regularmente entre 35 y 60% de los ingresos del periódico urbano. También, *iTierra!* tenía un papel más grande como el centro periodístico para anarquistas en todo el Caribe. En particular, corresponsales anarquistas de la Florida, Puerto Rico y la zona del canal de Panamá contribuyeron con dinero y análisis sobre el estado de los movimientos en esas tierras. Éstos ayudaron a los lectores a través de las áreas de distribución para comparar su situación y desarrollar una mayor conciencia internacional.

**Palabras clave:** Cuba, anarquismo, transnacionalismo, periodismo, Puerto Rico, Panamá

#### RÉSUMÉ

Enraciné dans les théories des médias radicaux et des mouvements sociaux, cet article explore le rôle de l'hebdomadaire anarchiste *iTierra!* publié à la Havane, dans la construction d'un réseau anarchiste cubain, voire caraïbéen, de 1902 à 1915. Entre 1898 et 1915, les anarchistes cubains publièrent au moins 15 journaux, mais celui qui a été le plus publié et le plus longtemps distribué fut sans doute *iTierra!* Ce journal assurait la diffusion d'informations et de propagande aux travailleurs des villages, des villes et des collectivités minières à Cuba, permettant à ces travailleurs de devenir des correspondants clé pour le public habitant à la Havane. Le journal était alors un espace privilégié pour que les lecteurs cubains communiquent entre eux, partagent leurs témoignages sur la repression, comparent leurs conditions de travail et créent conscience des complexités inhérentes au processus de lutte à travers l'île. Au fait, une analyse des rapports financiers du journal révèle que le lectorat rural fournissait régulièrement entre 35 et 60% du revenu de cet hebdomadaire urbain. De même, le journal a joué un rôle très important en tant que plate-forme de correspondance journalistique pour les anarchistes tout au long de la Caraïbe, notamment les correspondants de la Floride, Porto Rico et le Canal de Panama. Ceux-ci ont contribué financièrement et fourni des analyses concernant le statut des mouvements dans ces terres, offrant ainsi aux lecteurs de toute la région des moyens de comparer leur situations et de développer une plus grande conscience internationale.

**Mots-clés:** Cuba, anarchisme, transnationlisme, journalisme, Porto Rico, Panama

Received: 24 March 2008 Revision received: 28 September 2009 Accepted: 30 September 2009

## INTRODUCTION

During the first decades following Cuban independence from Spain in 1898, anarchists migrated to the island, merging with Cuban-born anarchists, to develop the largest and most prolific movement in the Caribbean Basin. The hub for this growing movement rested in the capital city of Havana. Until World War I, anarchists published no fewer than 15 newspapers—most short-lived, but all in Metropolitan Havana. The most important and long-lived of these was the weekly *iTierra!*, published by an anarcho-communist group by the same name from 1902 to 1915. Not only was this newspaper the central organ of the anarchist movement in Cuba but also the paper linked anarchists across the island by distributing news and propaganda to workers in ports, towns, small cities, and expanding sugar zones in central Cuba. These workers in turn were key correspondents back to the Havana readership. Consequently, the paper became a crucial venue for rural and urban anarchists to communicate with one another while also sharing tales of repression, comparing conditions, and heightening awareness of complexities in the island-wide struggle. Furthermore, a review of the paper finances reveals that the non-Havana readership provided between 35 and 60% of the urban newspaper's average weekly income, thus making this readership a crucial component in *iTierra!*'s longevity.

The newspaper played a larger role than just linking the island's anarchist groups. It also became the journalistic hub for anarchists throughout the Caribbean, serving a key communicative and financial role that linked a far-flung, fledgling regional network. In particular, anarchist correspondents from Florida, Puerto Rico and the Panama Canal Zone contributed regular features about the status of the movements in those locations, providing readers throughout the distribution areas a means to compare their situations and develop a larger international consciousness. As will be shown, anarchists throughout the network also contributed heavily to *iTierra!*'s income and thus its sustained efforts to unify the region's radicals.

The emergence and development of a Caribbean anarchist network was linked to three particular historical developments. First, Spanish immigration into Cuba was surpassed only by Spanish immigration into Argentina in the early twentieth century. Between 1902 and 1915 (the time span of this article), 369,466 Spaniards legally immigrated to Cuba. They made up anywhere from 70 to 94% of the total annual immigration to the island at this time. Over three-fourths were day laborers, peasants, farm laborers or had no stated occupation—the very populations from which anarchists emerged and whom anarchists targeted (Shaffer

2005:73; González 1988:105; Naranjo Orovio 1992:790).

Many of these working-class migrants were either committed anarchists or had been exposed to a long tradition of anarchist activity in Spain. These Spanish (as well as Cuban) anarchists did not necessarily stay in Cuba as many migrated throughout the Caribbean in search of work and activism. The earliest destination for Spaniards and Cubans was the tobacco factories of Florida. In 1890, 233 Spaniards and 1,313 Cubans were officially registered as working in Tampa alone. By 1900, nearly 1,000 Spaniards joined 3,533 Cubans in Tampa's workforce. These numbers grew so that by 1910 some 2,337 Spaniards and 3,859 Cubans worked in the city (Mormino and Pozzetta 1986:177). Meanwhile, equally large numbers of Spaniards migrated to the Panama Canal Zone. Between 1904 and 1912, only 87 Cubans and 41 Puerto Ricans officially migrated to the zone, but 4,012 Spaniards traveled to the engineering marvel as mainly construction workers (Greene 2009:396-399). Migrant anarchists traveled in these flows of humanity, sometimes dominating embryonic anarchist movements as in Panama and other times supplementing Caribbean-born anarchists as in Cuba, Florida and Puerto Rico.

Second, the development of this anarchist network was linked to the spread of US military and economic influence throughout the Caribbean Basin in the early twentieth century. The strong US military and political presence in Cuba and Puerto Rico provided an anti-imperialist foil for these anarchists. The expansion of the US-based American Federation of Labor and the growing proletarianization of the cigar industry by US-dominated tobacco entities were points around which anarchists lamented and rallied against in Florida and Puerto Rico. The creation of the Panama Canal Zone by the United States in 1904 and the subsequent ten-year project to build the canal provided a new locale for anarchists to migrate and in which to agitate.

Third, while Spanish migration and US political, military and economic influence were keys to understanding the rise of the anarchist network, it was the development of a strong anarchist presence in Havana that created the possibility for such a network. Havana was not only the location for most of the anarchist press, but also was where most anarchist schools were founded. In addition, Havana's anarchists led health campaigns in the region by helping to launch their own health care facilities and vegetarian restaurants (Shaffer 2005). Thus, in the Caribbean Basin, Havana was the political and cultural hub of the regional anarchist movement.

Havana's role as both an island and regional hub in these networks suffered a major blow with widespread Cuban government crackdowns against radicals beginning in 1914. With government repression in rural

sugar zones, less money flowed into the newspaper's coffers. Repression and less money caused the closure of *Tierra!* and with it the decline in region-wide communication. However, for over a decade, this newspaper, its editors, and writers from throughout the Caribbean epitomized how radical media shaped, configured and framed the anarchist cause throughout the region.

### ANARCHO-JOURNALISM, RADICAL MEDIA, AND SOCIAL MOVEMENTS

Students of anarchist movements long have utilized anarcho-journalism (newspapers and magazines published by anarchist groups) to understand those movements. As a source, scholars reference these newspapers and magazines in association with police reports, surveillance records, speeches, pamphlets, and other historical records. However, when studying late-nineteenth and early-twentieth century anarchism—anywhere, not just in Latin America or the Caribbean—scholars tend to ignore the anarchist press itself as a subject of (not just a source for) study. Understanding these radical media not only can tell us about the movements but just as importantly they can help us understand how anarchists coordinated networks that reached beyond their immediate local concerns. *Tierra!* reflected and disseminated anarchist ideas, became the main vehicle for framing an anarchist vision and interpretation of Cuba and the Caribbean, and—based on its organization and distribution—reflected the anarchist notions of decentralized organization, participatory democracy, and encouragement of readers to communicate as equals with movement intellectuals. This role for the newspaper can be understood in theoretical terms as they relate to how media scholars understand the relationship between radical media and social movements.

#### Radical Media and Social Movements

Social movements both generate and are stimulated by radical media, reflecting what John Downing calls an “acute interdependence” between a movement and its media (Downing 2001:23). Radical media are almost always small-scale, often haphazard and frequently short-lived forms “that express an alternative vision to hegemonic policies, priorities, and perspectives” (Downing 2001:v). In this sense, social movements develop radical media as part of their oppositional culture and everyday resistance. At the same time they are crucial tools used to unite groups into a network that underpins a developing and evolving social movement. Thus, as Downing argues, radical media both “express opposition

vertically from subordinate quarters directly at the power structure and against its behavior” while building “support, solidarity, and networking laterally against policies or even against the very survival of the power structure” (Downing 2001:xi).

Downing’s first point on the oppositional nature of radical media is explored further by Chris Atton. Atton suggests that “radical media may be characterized by their attempts to free themselves from the power of government, the state and other dominant institutions and practices.” In this sense, the core goal of radical media is to transform “social relations, roles and responsibilities” of journalistic practices. Consequently, radical media practitioners provide a forum for protest groups outside of the mainstream media. This forum allows such groups to “make their own news, whether by appearing in it as significant actors or by creating news themselves that is relevant to their situation” (Atton 2002:493-495).

Atton goes further and argues that we can consider radical media as “free spaces” that allow counter-hegemonic groups areas to create their own version and interpretation of political and social reality. These alternative visions counter the mainstream press which serves as the voice of the hegemonic institutions in a given locale. Within this space one finds radical media that is also organized in ways that counter the professional, mainstream press. These are “loose internal structures” that eschew hierarchy and authoritarianism. Such organization privileges the practice of non-professional journalists. In that sense, everyday movement followers and readers of radical media become not just consumers of the radical agenda but also help to create it through their own columns and correspondence. They can read about themselves in the struggles waged against the powers that be while also creating the news themselves. As Atton concludes, radical media provide spaces for the voiceless to have a voice and where average people “might present accounts of their own experiences and struggles”—a process of “native reporting” and “witness activism” (Atton 2002:495-497).

Downing’s second point on the role of radical media as a key networking tool within social movements further informs the study that follows. Social movements utilize their radical media to create communication networks, the primary utility of which is to get “away from the notion of audiences as atomized, composed simply of individuals or households” (Downing 2001:93-94). Thus, the media link disparate members who exist either alone or in small groups across a geographic expanse. Just as importantly is radical media’s international networking dimension. People of like-minded ideas and goals exist, of course, across political frontiers. This was especially true of anarchist movements whose followers frequently migrated between countries. As a result,

anarchist newspapers could be transnational sources of communication and financing for migrant radicals in what Downing calls a “cross-frontier migrant media” linking different locales into an international network. Radical media, then, is more than just a phenomenon of a local or national movement. As Downing concludes, “the common image of radical media as local needs correcting”—which is this article’s goal (Downing 2001:83-84).

Ultimately, as Atton notes, the media are “activators of that network [and] assume a key position” (Atton 1999:31, Atton 2002/2005:82-83, Melucci 1996:75). Here, one can consider the social movement theories of Doug McAdam and David Snow. Both examine how social movements “frame” their actions and agendas. Movements thus assign meaning to and interpret themselves, their actions, and the worlds in which they operate and seek to make change. Consequently, how a social movement frames itself and its larger social context is vital to understanding the vision that movement operatives have of the present and their sought-after future (McAdam 1996:339-341).

Previous work on Cuban anarchism has shown how anarchist intellectuals served as important “Collective Action Framers” to construct an anarchist-interpreted reality in the island’s anarchist culture (Shaffer 2005:33). While Cuban anarchist intellectuals like Adrián del Valle and Antonio Penichet helped to forge this collective ideal in their columns, short stories, plays and novels, this article illustrates how average people who did basic organizing and writing used Cuban anarchist media to help frame not only Cuban but also Caribbean anarchism in networks that stretched across the island of Cuba, north to Florida, west to the Panama Canal Zone and east to Puerto Rico. The writers representing small anarchist groups formed part of a larger regional network, utilizing anarcho-journalism—mainly *¡Tierra!*—to write their own histories, frame a vision of the region that challenged local and regional hegemonic elite, and forge a transnational social movement designed to create an anarchist future for the Caribbean.

### “Follow the Money...and the Message”

From the late 1880s to the early 1920s, Caribbean-based anarchists published over forty anarchist newspapers. The vast majority of these came from Havana.<sup>1</sup> Most of the region’s newspapers were short-lived efforts, often lasting no more than a few issues. In addition, few of these newspapers were distributed outside of their local areas. For instance, *El Único* (1911-1912) from the Panama Canal Zone stayed within the zone. Puerto Rican papers like *Nuevo Horizonte* (1908) and *El Eco de Torcedor* (1909), as well as Cuban papers like *Germinal* (1904) and *El Libertario*

(1905) were not distributed beyond Havana. Even a Cuban paper like *Rebelión!* (1908-10), while longer lived, still had limited circulation on the island.

Meanwhile, a handful of newspapers did have a larger regional reach. Tampa's *El Esclavo* (1894-98) was the most important newspaper for not only Florida-based anarchists but also those throughout Cuba during Cuba's struggle for independence from Spain. Likewise, from 1920-21, with anarchist movements repressed in Florida and Cuba, Puerto Rico's *El Comunista*—published in the small city of Bayamón—became not only the voice of anarchism on that island, but was distributed throughout Cuba, Florida and even New York, effectively making it the newspaper of the regional movement for that brief time period.<sup>2</sup>

However, when one examines the history of anarchist journalism in the Caribbean region, the Havana-based *¡Tierra!* was unique in both its reach and duration. *¡Tierra!* served multiple interlocking functions that help us understand its role as the central newspaper in the Cuban and Caribbean anarchist networks in the early 1900s. First, the paper provided a space for movement intellectuals and rank-and-file activists to report news, agitate, and frame their struggle against the elite. Second, because of *¡Tierra!*'s central importance and long-running status, the newspaper became the main channel by which anarchists could follow develops around Cuba and the broader Caribbean, collect money for publishing purposes, and raise funds for distribution to various political activities important to local, national and regional groups. As historian Ámparo Sánchez Cobos concludes, *¡Tierra!* was the backbone of the island's anarchist groups and their key island-wide organizing tool (Sánchez Cobos 2008:191-192).

Consequently, in examining the role of *¡Tierra!* in Caribbean anarchism, I focus on writers' correspondence from throughout the networks and their important financial contributions. The correspondence helped to inform readers everywhere of events taking place throughout the network. In this way, everyday people who were politically active wrote to the paper to describe their concerns and local issues. In so doing, they framed the larger movement to reflect local concerns while readers gained important national and international consciousness by reading these columns. In addition, when writers from outside Havana published in the newspaper, they could expect those published columns to be read in the areas of creation when the next issue of *¡Tierra!* arrived for distribution in small towns, port cities, sugar mills, and construction sites. Thus, anarchists from Cienfuegos, Cuba or Caguas, Puerto Rico or Gatún, Panama wrote about Cuban, Puerto Rican and Panamanian issues. Their articles were published in Havana one week and read by their comrades around Cuba, Puerto Rico, Panama and back home the next week.

These journalistic contributions often included monetary contributions. Most of these contributions were published on page four of *iTierra!*. By following the money that came with the writings, we can trace how the movement media was financed from throughout Cuba and abroad. Frequently, those financial contributions were collected by one person, often in the name of a local anarchist group, and the names of individual contributors were published. The published names allow us to trace movements of anarchists across the region as well. The names and money listed also provide insight into the numbers of people willing to forsake a bit of their already small wages to finance a newspaper with whose ideals they agreed. Ultimately, anarcho-journalism provided a space for average people to have a voice but just as importantly it should be noted that not everyone could voice with their pen; sometimes the money they sent to the newspaper's editors spoke just as loudly for them.

## ***!TIERRA!* AND THE ANARCHIST MOVEMENT IN CUBA**

### **The Origins of *iTierra!***

From its first issue in October 1902, *iTierra!*'s editors published weekly editions out of small offices in the heart of Havana's working-class center. In the first years, the editors focused heavily on issues important to tobacco workers, reflecting these editors' membership in the Cigar Rollers Society (Cabrera 1985:60).<sup>3</sup> Soon, the editors moved beyond this working-class focus to promote broader anarchist critiques and initiatives in education, the arts, and health care. For instance, following the 1909 execution of rationalist school founder Francisco Ferrer Guardia in Spain, *iTierra!* became the key media beacon to generate support to build rationalist schools in Cuba. The paper's editors collected money for school supplies and construction. The paper fueled outrage at Ferrer's execution as a means to gain moral and material support for expanding educational initiatives while at the same time publishing articles critical of Cuba's religious schools and its US-reformed public school system (Shaffer 2003:151-183).

In the arts, *iTierra!* published articles that criticized the elite—and by anarchist terms, immoral—culture of the island. They attacked state-sanctioned celebrations and statues of military figures. *iTierra!* critiqued other cultural events like theater and carnival. Columns and letters frequently condemned popular theater for its low-brow use of titillation, rather than inspiration. Anarchists dismissed carnival, believing that it denigrated workers who would wear the trappings of “royalty” by choosing a carnival queen and “playing” at monarchism. Meanwhile, the bourgeoisie made money from workers who threw away their wages

on drink and other waste. In its place, *iTierra!* published anarchist plays, songs and short stories that celebrated an anarchist interpretation of history and the future (Shaffer 2005:62-71, 195-207).

Anarchists frequently attacked the state of the island's health care. While other anarchist-oriented newspapers in Havana like *Pro-Vida* and *La Voz del Dependiente* also critiqued Cuba's health environment, *iTierra!* regularly drew attention to poor housing and working conditions around the island. The paper criticized the official, state-sanctioned medical community with its licensing procedures and forced vaccination campaigns. Instead, *iTierra!* praised alternative medicine and supported natural health practitioners, who had been victimized by the health care system and official government licensing bureaucracy (Shaffer 2005:107-143).

In all, *iTierra!* and its evolving groups of editors waged a decade-and-a-half long countercultural struggle against the Cuban elite. However, these Havana-based editors sought to be the voice for the island as a whole. That meant coverage of issues affecting the whole island, but editors were also workers and could not readily take off from their jobs to travel the island as reporters. Thus, the newspaper relied on correspondents from throughout Cuba. These "native reporters" became central links in the evolving island-wide network. The resulting correspondence regularly appeared in the newspaper, reflecting how *iTierra!* became a key tool for the editors in their attempts to bring an island-wide consciousness on the political and economic turmoil of the countryside to urban-based readers in Havana. Once this correspondence was published, it was sent back to its point of origin as copies of *iTierra!* made their way to subscribers and readers outside of the capital city.

### **"Native Reporters" Link the Island**

Following the end of Cuba's war for independence in 1898, international investment poured onto the island as foreign sugar corporations resurrected sugar estates in the west and expanded to new lands in the central and eastern parts of the island. Anarchists could be found throughout these areas and became important distributors of *iTierra!* in the island's rural interior and port cities as well as reporters of events in those locales. These "native reporters" wrote about working and pay conditions, strike activities, and the political chicaneries of local politicians. José García was a long-time correspondent and early face of rural native reporting from central Cuba. In 1903, García kept island readers abreast of the Cuban anarchist movement's first post-independence cause célèbre: the assassination of two labor leaders in Santa Clara. García accused the local police of the murders and cover-ups. García

and the Havana-based editors used the events in central Cuba to frame an image of incompetence, deception, and brutality characterizing the Cuban government and the rural police.<sup>4</sup> When workers in nearby Cruces formed their own "Investigation Committee," they charged local authorities with planting a spy in the committee and attempting to undermine the workers' efforts. When laborers in the small town of Ranchuelo protested the authorities' actions, police shut down the meeting and arrested four people, despite, as García described it, merely practicing their "freedom of thought that the Constitution grants all citizens." This, he concluded, was how the new government treated four veterans of the independence wars.<sup>5</sup> For his efforts, García was arrested and ultimately sentenced to jail.

Meanwhile, the industrialization of urban labor in Cuba was mirrored in the industrialization of agriculture and decreased living standards for rural workers. In 1904, García described the conditions that ever increasing numbers of workers faced in the new sugar estates, including underemployment, seasonal jobs, and poor pay. On top of that, owners threatened to withhold food supplies that workers could buy as a way to keep workers from rebelling against workplace conditions. Living arrangements were equally bad with no owner-supplied housing, forcing many workers to sleep on the ground around the sugar mill machinery. García concluded that such conditions were actually worse than during the era of African chattel slavery—a condition that had ended only in the previous generation.<sup>6</sup> For workers in Cuban cities contemplating a move to the rural economy—or for migrants from Spain considering traveling to Cuba for work in the sugar mills—García's columns proved to be more than just warnings. They helped workers in Cuba and beyond to understand the effects of industrialization on rural Cuba. For the reader who might have thought rural conditions improved by the early 1910s, an anonymous 1913 column laid forth virtually the same critique as García nearly a decade earlier.<sup>7</sup>

While urban workers were well aware of their own poor conditions and limited medical care options, writers from beyond the capital illustrated that these were larger island-wide issues. In March 1912, a letter from Santa Clara described in horrific detail how a ten-year-old boy, who had been loading cut sugarcane into a train car for mill processing, screamed in agony as the car rolled on top of him, crushing his leg and arm. While examples of child labor were nothing new to *iTierra's* readership, what followed was: workers rushed the boy to a doctor in nearby San Juan de los Yeras, but because workers were unable to pay, doctors there refused to treat the boy. With the child in shock and nearly passed out, workers rushed him to a hospital in Santa Clara where he was finally treated. The point was obvious: "here, you have in the first place this

leprosy of doctors” who refused to treat workers and their families. Such doctors—reflective in the anarchist mind of all state-licensed doctors and, in fact, everyone associated with the state—were no better than the clergy or the military since all used their power to repress the poor.<sup>8</sup>

Besides reporting on the economic and social dilemmas confronting workers outside the cities, García and others sent columns critiquing Cuba’s post-independence political environment. Anarchists always had a deep suspicion of politics and hated centralized government. In 1906, civil war erupted on the island after the country’s two political parties took up arms against each other—a move that ushered in a new US military occupation that lasted until 1909. Anarchists had long-charged Cuba’s post-1902 rulers with abandoning the social reforms promised to the working class for their support during the war for independence. Anarchists regularly took to the press, leveling charges of “deception” against the political elite and reminding readers how Cuba’s political leaders had sold out the island’s economic, military and political independence to the US. As S. Martínez wrote in November 1906 from the central Cuban town of Sancti-Spíritus, the civil war and US occupation perfectly reflected what anarchists had said for several years.<sup>9</sup>

The civil war temporarily suspended one of *iTierra!*’s efforts to unify the island’s anarchists: a propaganda tour throughout Cuba. In 1906, the paper began raising money to support a few anarchists who would travel around Cuba, serving as keynote speakers and organizers for small anarchist groups dotting the island. The civil war’s eruption postponed the tour until 1907. The tour was a truly transnational event. From May through June, the recently arrived Spanish anarchists Marcial Lores and Abelardo Saavedra traveled with anarchists from Havana and throughout the island—including José García. They regularly sent reports to *iTierra!* describing the island’s beauty, the large receptions in city and town alike, the audiences full of both working and middle-class Cubans curious to evaluate for themselves the government’s description of anarchists as wild-eyed, crazy devil-worshippers, and the occasional hostility they met from mayors and priests who would leap on stage to decry the infidels and escort speakers to the town limits under armed guard. Reports from the tour stops also offered verbatim the talks of local anarchists who analyzed local and rural conditions from anarchist perspectives. Such analyses were well-received by, for instance, the 4,000 people who attended a four-hour meeting in the central Cuban town of Cruces. The analyses in these reports educated urban readers and readers beyond Cuba about the rural reality. But urban readers were also bolstered by the fact that such a meeting as occurred in Cruces could draw such heavy support.<sup>10</sup> In all, the propaganda tour helped to unite small groups in the island’s interior with larger groups in Havana. Thus,

if one purpose of the excursion was to raise the consciousness of workers throughout the island, just as importantly the tour aimed to invigorate Havana's anarchists. Coverage in *iTierra!* facilitated both goals.

By the 1910s, anarchist organization in central Cuba's sugar zones had surged as more workers arrived in the newly expanding sugar estates. As a result, in 1912 anarchists led efforts to organize an island-wide conference in Cruces, and *iTierra!* urged workers for the first time to consider organizing themselves into a revolutionary party. At the same time, the paper became the organ through which female revolutionary anarchists outside Havana found a voice. While men dominated the Cuban movement, women from around the island increasingly wrote columns on anarchism, roles of women in society, and education. These included works from the sugar zones by Adelaida López in Matanzas, Emilia Rodríguez in Yabucito and Justina Gómez in Caibarién as well as Sabina Alcalde in the western tobacco city of Pinar del Río.<sup>11</sup>

Besides these correspondent columns, rural areas and cities beyond Havana often played a vital role in sustaining the newspaper's finances. Between 1902 and 1913, anarchist groups spread throughout the island. During this time, nearly half of those groups—irrespective of how long they existed—were created outside of Havana Province. The majority of these arose in the sugar and mining zones of central and eastern Cuba (Sánchez Cobos 2008:178). Regularly, native reporters from throughout the island were leading activists in those zones. As such, they not only wrote and organized local events but also collected money and sold copies of *iTierra!* to fellow workers. By examining the financial columns published on page four of *iTierra!* from 1903 to 1914, one discovers that frequently when a column arrived from outside Havana and was published, there was a corresponding financial contribution arriving from that same location.<sup>12</sup> This money was dedicated to purchasing more copies of the newspaper, purchasing copies of Spanish and New York anarchist papers, and underwriting *iTierra!*'s constant debt.

A review of the newspaper finances and contributors reveal that readers outside of Havana and its immediate suburbs regularly contributed more money to the paper than did Havana-area readers, as reflected in the following tables.

**Table 1: Cuban Contributions to *iTierra!* from Beyond Metropolitan Havana, 1903-1914<sup>13</sup>**

	Highest Weekly Percentage	Lowest Weekly Percentage
1903	82	0
1904	93	5
1905	81	4
1906	67	0
1907	74	25
1908	73	28
1909	78	22
1910	79	28
1911	81	26
1912	80	23
1913	81	15
1914	84	13

Source: *iTierra!*, April 1903 to December 1914. All percentages are rounded to the nearest whole percent.

The table notes the annual range of anarchist contributions from throughout the island. Rarely was there a week in any given year when money from outside Havana represented less than ten percent of the newspaper's income. For all but three years, at least one issue annually saw over 75% of a week's income arrive from outside the metropolitan area.

The following table more directly compares percentages of *iTierra!*'s income between Metropolitan Havana and the rest of Cuba.

**Table II: Cuban Contributions to *iTierra!* from Beyond Metro Havana and Metro Havana, 1903-1914  
(Average Weekly Percentages of the Newspaper's Income by Year)**

	Beyond Metro Havana	Metro Havana
1903	35	38
1904	43	35
1905	35	43
1906	38	49
1907	48	37

	Beyond Metro Havana	Metro Havana
1908	53	39
1909	48	39
1910	55	29
1911	58	30
1912	52	29
1913	56	19
1914	60	23

Source: *¡Tierra!*, April 1903 to December 1914. All percentages are rounded to the nearest whole percent. Percentages may not equal 100% due to contributions arriving from outside Cuba that are not reflected in these percentages.

Non-Havana money did not always arrive, nor arrive in large amounts to the newspaper's offices. However, when looking at figures over the years, when money arrived, average weekly percentages for each year ranged between 35 and 60% of the paper's total weekly revenues from sales and subscriptions. Thus, in 1903, anarchists outside of Havana contributed an average of 35% of *¡Tierra!*'s weekly income throughout the year. Over the next eleven years, these anarchists' contributions generally ticked upward so that their contributions averaged 60% of the newspaper's weekly income in 1914. Meanwhile, the percentage of Havana anarchists' contributions fell at a comparable rate.

The shift reflects economic development of central and eastern Cuba during these years as more and more Cuban and Spanish immigrant laborers made their way from Havana to other port cities and to the emerging sugar plantations springing up across the island. While considerable amounts of money came from working-class cities like Cárdenas, Matanzas, Camagüey, Cienfuegos, and Santiago de Cuba—all cities lacking their own anarchist press—*¡Tierra!* also reached into small towns around the island where anarchist sympathizers sent money from places like Firmeza, Guamo and Niquero in southeastern Cuba, Macurijes in western Cuba, and Jatibonico and Remedios in central Cuba. These small anarchist cells received the newspaper and distributed its anarchist message to fellow workers. Just as important, their money played a vital role in keeping the newspaper alive so that it could be distributed regionally, spreading anarchist ideas to workers throughout the Caribbean while also helping readers around Cuba understand conditions island-wide.<sup>14</sup> While true that anarchists in Metropolitan Havana were the single largest contributors, what the tables illustrate is that the paper could not have thrived as long and regularly as it did without such large

proportions of income coming from the ports, mines and mills scattered beyond Metropolitan Havana.

But these contributions included more than just money for the newspaper. Outlying areas—urban, small town, and rural—relied on *iTierra!*'s offices for other anarchist propaganda initiatives. For instance, after the launch of the 1910 Mexican Revolution, the paper began collecting money to support anarchist revolutionaries throughout Mexico and the southwestern US. Anarchist agitators around the island played important roles in gathering contributions and mailing them to Havana. For example, in April 1911, the paper collected \$32.20 pesos for the Mexican cause; \$24.99 pesos of this amount came from outside Metropolitan Havana.<sup>15</sup>

The growing island-wide network fueled demand for copies of the newspaper, leading to increased circulation of the newspaper. In 1905, the editors regularly printed 2,000 copies of *iTierra!*. But as contributions from the network poured into Havana, circulation exploded. In 1910, 3,500 weekly copies were printed. This rose to 4,250 copies by early 1912 and peaked at 5,500 weekly copies in mid 1913.<sup>16</sup> The growing demand for *iTierra!*, coupled with the emergence of groups around the island, led to the creation of the Havana-based Federación Anarquista de Cuba in 1914. While money continued to arrive for copies of the newspaper, now anarchists throughout Cuba were sending money to fund the first island-wide attempt to coordinate anarchist activities via more than just a weekly paper.<sup>17</sup> However, in late 1914, the government grew increasingly wary of anarchist activities and the growth of the movement. Officials launched a wave of repression against anarchists through deportations and arrests. As a result, anarchist money began drying up. The newspaper's weekly average income fell from \$62.79 pesos in the first six months of 1914 to a weekly average of just \$38.09 pesos in the second six months of the year.<sup>18</sup> In January 1915, *iTierra!* ceased publication due to repression and financial ruin.

### ***!TIERRA!*, NATIVE REPORTING AND THE CARIBBEAN ANARCHIST NETWORK**

The anarchist movement in Cuba that dated from the 1870s found renewed inspiration in the heady days of the early post-independence period. It was at this time that *iTierra!* rose to prominence and became the central anarchist voice to challenge the island's elite and their vision of what a newly independent Cuba should look like. Of course, Cuban anarchism did not arise solely from the island and its conditions. Rather, the movement's leaders, especially *iTierra!*'s editorial groups, adapted the international anarchist agenda to fit Cuban reality. They did this in

a number of ways, including printing the anarchist interpretations of Cuban reality from both Havana and throughout the island, as well as publishing anarchist works in Spanish for a Cuban audience. Finally, the editors published cultural works by Cuban anarchists that clearly adapted the international movement's agenda to fit the island's reality as a way of linking anarchist groups to each other and the larger international movement.<sup>19</sup>

However, *iTierra!* was more than just a "Cuban" anarchist newspaper. In fact over the course of its run, anarchists throughout the Caribbean made *iTierra!* their newspaper too. Native reporters in the region cooperated with the paper's editors—both through journalistic and financial contributions—to make the newspaper a key tool that linked the far-flung anarchist groups into a loose network. This network—rooted in Havana and heavily financed by Cuban anarchists outside of Havana—had linkages with Florida in the United States, the US possession of Puerto Rico and the US-controlled Panama Canal Zone.

### **Florida, *iTierra!*, and the Caribbean Anarchist Network**

The rise of the anarchist movement in Havana during the 1880s and 1890s coincided with the symbiotic rise of anarchism across the Florida Straits in the southern US state of Florida. Beginning in the 1880s, tobacco workers traveled for jobs between Havana, Tampa, Key West and St. Augustine after large cigar companies relocated to Florida in order to escape the growing anarchist-led labor movement in Cuba. Of course, anarchists followed the factories and workers north. During Cuba's war for independence, Florida-based workers became key financiers of and soldiers for the Cuban rebel army. Several prominent anarchists based in Tampa wrote in support of the war for the Spanish-language anarchist press in Florida, while others joined (and sometimes died—like Enrique Creci) in the struggle to liberate the island from Spanish rule.<sup>20</sup>

After the war, US-based reformist labor unions like the American Federation of Labor challenged the Spanish-speaking anarchist movement in Florida. As a result of such union inroads, after 1902 anarchists in South Florida could not sustain a newspaper of their own, thus hindering anarchist organizing efforts. By 1903, though, Tampa's anarchists found a new communication outlet when they again linked themselves to the anarchist movement in Havana via *iTierra!*. Until it folded in January 1915, *iTierra!* collected money and published regular correspondent columns from throughout Florida. In effect, this Havana newspaper became the voice of Florida's anarchist community, linking this outpost of the Caribbean anarchist network to the revolutionary hub in Cuba.

Florida-based anarchists played a crucial financial role in the early

years of *iTierra!*. To get an idea of this financial support, Florida's anarchists sent over \$658 pesos to the newspaper from April 1903 to November 1907. Most of this money went for donations or subscriptions, as well as to help write down the paper's ever-present debt. The majority of the funds came from Tampa, though frequently large contributions came from Key West and St. Augustine. The St. Augustine contributions were always collected and sent by Luis Barcia—a former editor of *El Nuevo Ideal*, the first anarchist newspaper published in Havana after the war in early 1899, and a man with considerable connections to Havana's anarchist community (Shaffer 2005:45-47).

These Florida funds arrived to finance 66 of 135 issues (49%) of *iTierra!* between April 1903 and November 1907. During this four-and-a-half year span, Florida's contributions regularly represented the majority of international subscription income received by the paper for any given issue. In addition, Florida contributions ranged from a low of 4% of a week's total income to a high of 100%. In weeks when Florida money did arrive at the newspaper's offices, it averaged 22% of all income received by the paper for that week during this period. In a sense, while Havana played the role of "anarchist hub" with its new waves of anarchists arriving from Spain and its publication of the weekly *iTierra!*, the strong network "node" of Florida played a fundamental role in financing this hub during the newspaper's first years, complementing the equally significant role of Cuban anarchists outside of Metropolitan Havana.<sup>21</sup>

While Florida was financially important for *iTierra!*, the paper became a tool for Florida anarchists to frame the issues facing workers there. Florida workers were one audience for this as copies of *iTierra!* returned to be sold in Florida. An equally important audience was Cuban workers and anarchists who had a long history with Florida and who circularly migrated across the Florida Straits for work. Native reporting to *iTierra!*, then, became a guide for Cuban workers on what to expect when they arrived in Florida and to be prepared to confront an ongoing barrage of problems that anarchists faced. Among these problems were ethnic rivalries, vigilantism from the Anglo community, worker apathy, challenges from rival working-class organizations, and efforts to prevent the reading of *iTierra!* in the city's cigar factories.

Spanish and Cuban workers intermixed with Italian, Anglo and African American workers in Florida's tobacco communities. In the years following Cuban independence, some Cuban workers in Florida wanted to exclude Italians and Spaniards from the labor force. For instance, in the summer of 1903, the mainstream Havana newspaper *La Discusión* fed into this nationalist rant by publishing letters from Cubans living in Tampa. The letters criticized Tampa's Italian community for taking jobs that belonged to Cubans. Florida-based Italian anarchists Vicente

Antinori and Filippo Di Bona responded in the pages of *iTierra!*, attacking the writer for undermining worker unity in Tampa. Italians had come to Tampa to learn a trade, and often their wives had to work either in the factories or at home—just like Cuban workers and their families. The Italians urged workers not to define their lives in nationalistic terms. They then reminded readers of the principles of internationalism and that “as anarchists we protest against the kind of privilege that the writer exalts: that of propriety of an industry for Cubans.” After all, continued the Italians, “in this country [the United States] Italians are no less foreign than Cubans or Spaniards, so based on what right does the letter writer want Cuban privilege?”<sup>22</sup>

While anarchists dealt with ethnic divides and infighting, they likewise found themselves dealing with a timid workforce in Tampa who seemed resigned to sit back while Anglo politicians controlled them. As one correspondent put it in late August 1903, “Tampa is, undoubtedly, the city of criminals.” The writer then listed a series of recent actions perpetrated by the city’s white Citizens Committee, including the “suicide” by five gunshots of Salvador Torres, the deportation of activist Ramón Piquero, and the castration of two black workers found cavorting with two white women, their testicles hung on display in local taverns. Yet, workers did nothing. What had the city’s workers been reduced to: men or eunuchs?, asked one correspondent.<sup>23</sup> As a result, anarchists quickly faulted these workers for their shallow or non-existent working-class consciousness and unwillingness to stand up to local repression.

This was further complicated by the two different “labor days” that international anarchists found in Florida: May Day and the US Labor Day in September. Anarchists firmly supported May Day celebrations in their home countries and sought to replicate the May Day atmosphere of meetings, speeches and marches in Tampa’s immigrant enclaves. They also hoped to do the same in September, but quickly encountered a very different idea of what it meant to “commemorate” a worker’s day in the US. Rather than the speeches and attempts to raise working-class consciousness, a correspondent complained that workers in the US had reduced the day to “mere diversion and patriotic propaganda.”<sup>24</sup> Thus, such correspondence to *iTierra!*—directed at Floridian and Cuban readers—profiled a Florida environment that could challenge even the most dedicated anarchist’s drive and determination while noting the kinds of pitfalls that awaited Cuban-based workers thinking of migrating to US factories.

With their main organizations and newspapers decimated by 1903, Florida anarchists not only turned to *iTierra!* as their propaganda organ but also tentatively began to join the American Federation of Labor and its Latin International Union. Throughout the early 1900s, the AFL’s

International organized mostly Spanish- and Italian-speaking immigrant workers. The International followed the AFL's reformist strategies that were designed to use union organization as a means to achieve improved workplace conditions and wage increases, rather than larger social reconstruction as anarchists would have preferred. Unlike anarcho-syndicalists who sought worker-control of industry, the International was content to be a voice for workers within capitalist industry. Anarchists were uncomfortable with this working-class alliance but in their letters to *iTierra!*, they noted that few alternatives existed. As one put it, a new anarchist organization in Tampa was impossible. He urged anarchists to organize within the International, concluding that the fate of Tampa's workers was simple: "either organized or unemployed."<sup>25</sup>

Nevertheless, while the independent unions voted to join the reformist (and generally anti-anarchist) International, anarchists continued to dedicate money to *iTierra!*. It is impossible to tell how many anarchists joined strikes called by the International; yet, it is notable that calls from anarchists to support strikes—and thus help subsidize the International's activities—came as steady streams of money continued to flow out of Tampa to the Havana newspaper. Consequently, anarchists found themselves increasingly dedicating their scarce resources to the international anarchist cause rooted regionally in Cuba while at the same time plotting to work in cross-sectarian, working-class alliances with non-anarchist labor reformers in Florida.

As the International grew to dominate the Tampa labor movement, the lingering anarchist presence in Florida did what it could to keep the anarchist ideal alive. While 1906-12 were years of growth and expansion of anarchism in Cuba, the Florida-based activists struggled to be heard, having lost much of the influence they waged in the labor movement and as a counter-cultural Latin presence during the previous decade. Nevertheless, anarchists fought to keep *iTierra!* for sale in the city and to keep *lectores* reading *iTierra!* in the cigar rolling factories.

While *iTierra!* could be purchased at various shops in Tampa, most workers' exposure to anarchist journalism remained on the shop floor where the *lectores* read aloud to cigar rollers. Occasionally, *lectores* refused to read this sole anarchist voice in the factories. For instance, in 1906, anarchists protested that efforts were afoot to impede the reading of the newspaper both in Tampa and Key West. Some *lectores* feared losing their positions if they read *iTierra!*. Other *lectores* simply rejected anarchism and refused to be associated with it. According to one correspondent, *lectores* spent too much time reading bourgeois Cuban newspapers that focused on trivial items like a dance at Havana's presidential palace for President Roosevelt's visiting daughter and too little on labor actions or anarchist theory. However, if a worker did bring in a

copy of *iTierra!* for the *lector*, only one or two articles were read before dropping it and changing to something else. Anarchists refused to blame owners for this since the *lector* only worked at the discretion of the factory laborers and workers paid his or her salary. In theory, the *lector* was to read whatever the workers asked. Instead, anarchists repeated their long charges of worker apathy: “The saddest thing of all is that hardly does a *lector* say *iTierra!*, for example, than the unthinking (those that without knowing it are complicit with the bourgeoisie) yawn and shout” protests about hearing more regarding anarchy while the worker who wants to hear it read “remains silent in order not to bring conflict into the factory.”<sup>26</sup>

At times anarchists blamed certain Florida workers for trying to undermine the anarchist agenda by purposefully preventing *iTierra!*'s reading. In 1912, Ambrosio Martínez wrote how some workers in the Gato cigar rolling factory were preventing the *lector* from reading the newspaper. As he described it, when a reader picked up the newspaper, some workers, “forgetting their highest class interests, were embarrassing as they leveled stupid scorn, with coarse and grotesque demonstrations against the reader. What began as a simple murmur increased to such a deplorable level by shameful men that it soon sounded like a roar from a coming thunderstorm.” As a result, the *lector* dropped the newspaper and read something else.<sup>27</sup>

These attempts to silence the anarchist voice—by no less than workers themselves—troubled anarchists, who suspected that such efforts actually were driven by anti-anarchist elements within the International. Beyond this assumed sectarian conflict, though, the reading of *iTierra!* was vital, not just as a method of communication, agitation and consciousness raising but also as a means to continue raising money. For instance, in January 1909 Tampa cigar workers raised money for “victims of social questions” in Spain and Cuba. In essence, whenever radicals were arrested, local anarchist newspapers published articles on those concerned and then opened fundraising campaigns to support legal efforts to free the men and to support any family members who found themselves with no income.<sup>28</sup> The 1909 effort to raise money for the “victims of social questions” was launched in Tampa after cigar rollers had heard a *lector* read about their cases in the pages of *iTierra!* Consequently, any effort to silence the reading of the newspaper was seen as more than simply a free speech issue or an attempt to silence the anarchist message. To prevent the newspaper's reading was to restrict the communication across the network, and thus restrict the ability of anarchists to raise money for common causes.

## Puerto Rico, *¡Tierra!*, and the Caribbean Anarchist Network

A small anarchist movement developed in Puerto Rico in the late 1800s, heavily influencing the labor movement by the 1890s. However, in the years immediately following independence from Spain and growing control by the United States, labor leaders like Ramón Romero Rosa and Santiago Iglesias Pantín abandoned their anarchist praxis in favor of socialist electoral politics and reformist unionism linked to the AFL. The *Federación Libre de Trabajadores* (Free Federation of Workers, or FLT) was the largest union on the island and had been since the beginning of the century when Iglesias and other labor leaders decided to link the FLT with the AFL. By doing so, they hoped to ride the coattails of the largest union in the United States, believing that this strategy would best help workers improve their immediate material conditions. In essence, the FLT became the island's version of Florida's AFL-linked International (Iglesias Pantín 1929/1958:17-295; García and Quintero Rivera 1982:15-48; Dávila Santiago 1985:164-165; Dávila Santiago 1983:4-16).

Nevertheless, small pockets of dedicated anarchists continued to agitate within Puerto Rico's fields and factories. In 1905, after a lull following independence from Spain, Puerto Rican anarchists again began to make their presence heard as a small, yet distinct voice within the FLT and throughout the island. In the central-eastern town of Caguas, a group of anarchists led by José Ferrer y Ferrer and Pablo Vega Santos dominated the FLT local. As in Havana and Tampa, tobacco workers were important to this movement. Juan Vilar and other Caguas-based tobacco-workers organized *Grupo "Solidaridad"* in early 1905. These Caguas anarchists were the first to communicate with *¡Tierra!* when seventeen men sent money to the newspaper in January 1905.<sup>29</sup> This organization held meetings, wrote columns to their comrades in Cuba, founded an educational center, and on May 22, 1905 began publishing their own short-lived newspaper *Voz Humana*.<sup>30</sup>

Puerto Rican anarchists faced some of the same hurdles as their colleagues in Tampa, including their concern over worker apathy, the related attention to diversions that distracted workers from developing working-class consciousness, and the appropriate relationship between anarchist groups and the reformist FLT. While anarchists published short-lived newspapers on the island and published columns in the FLT newspapers *Justicia* from San Juan and *Unión Obrera* from Mayagüez, they generally lacked their own anarchist press. As a result, Puerto Rican anarchists made *¡Tierra!* a vital communication vehicle as their Tampa-based and rural Cuban comrades were doing, sending money and columns to Havana for publication and receiving copies of the paper for distribution in Puerto Rico. In fact, Puerto Rican anarchists frequently

bought subscriptions to *iTierra!* for distribution around the island. Averaging two *centavos* per copy, anarchists in Caguas, Río Grande, San Juan, Cayey, Guayama, Utuado, Arecibo, Bayamón, Ponce, Juncos, and Mayagüez regularly bought lots of five to twenty-five copies of an issue. From early 1905 to late 1910, subscription requests arrived to the Havana offices on average every two weeks from different Puerto Rican towns and cities.<sup>31</sup>

On a daily basis, workers' activities caught the ire of anarchists. Taverns—a frequent anarchist target around the world—fell victim to anarchist critique. Repeatedly, anarchist correspondents like José G. Osorio in Caguas in 1905 or an anonymous writer in 1908 lamented the poor pay and desperation, but still many workers refused to join the movement. For instance, Osorio claimed that Puerto Rican workers were quick to lament their low wages that didn't provide enough food for the family but once Saturday evening rolled around they chose to forget these problems by going to taverns to concentrate on the appropriate billiards posture or to carouse with loose women.<sup>32</sup>

Puerto Rican anarchists challenged workers to look beyond these issues to consider the status of their overall working-class consciousness—or lack thereof for far too many workers. In 1905 in the midst of strike activities in Caguas, Río Grande, Carolina and Arecibo, Vega Santos criticized other workers for joining carnival celebrations, wasting their time, money and efforts for a bourgeois celebration. Such festivities, he asserted, illustrated workers' indifference to the need for a larger social revolution. Fellow workers needed their support more than the elite needed them for carnival parades and drunken revelries.<sup>33</sup> Undoubtedly, such moralistic stances led many average men and women to reject anarchism, but not necessarily working-class affiliation. In fact, workers from different industries joined the FLT, believing that being linked to a US union would provide them with better material benefits. Still, FLT membership was small—only about 8,000 members in 1909 (Iglesias Pantín 1929/1958:376).

While many anarchists also joined the union, they nevertheless felt free to challenge and even denigrate the AFL and FLT leadership while often working with and within the FLT. The epitome of this love-hate relationship between reformist AFL-linked organizations and Puerto Rico's revolutionary anarchists can be seen in a three-month span in mid-1909 that was reported to *iTierra!*. In April, a Puerto Rican correspondent attacked the AFL's main representative in Puerto Rico—the former anarchist Santiago Iglesias. Iglesias called anarchists “rogues,” prompting the *iTierra!* writer to label Iglesias a sell-out and a hypocrite: “you were one of them [an anarchist, which he had been in the 1890s], with the difference that you lost your old work shoes while we, with

dignity, kept ours.” The writer reinforced his charge of Iglesias having sold out and become part of the labor aristocracy. Building off of Iglesias’ history of meetings with Washington politicians, the correspondent accused Iglesias of “aspiring to suck the Washington dairy from [President] Taft’s teat.”<sup>34</sup>

Yet, while such animosity could flourish, anarchists still worked among the FLT rank-and-file. For instance, just months after the charges against Iglesias appeared, anarchists were working intimately with the FLT’s “*Cruzada del Ideal*”—a 1909-11 propaganda campaign designed to agitate among and organize workers. New among FLT strategies was the incorporation of important working-class intellectuals to speak at public meetings and demonstrations. In Mayagüez, for instance, the famous Puerto Rican anarcho-feminist Luisa Capetillo ran into Alfonso Torres and other anarchists—suitcases in hand—heading out to mobilize the workers on behalf of the FLT in July 1909 (Ramos 1992:34-35, 75-78).

Besides conflicts over working-class culture and the relationship between anarchism and the FLT, the island’s political elite, political status and elections played prominently in anarchist communication to *iTierra!*. Vega Santos noted how the elite criticized labor actions by calling strikers bamboozlers, uneducated, ignorant and led by destructive anarchist doctrines, while also suppressing labor leaders. Such a situation raised the question of how officials on an island now ruled by the “democratic” United States could so openly throw strikers in jail, break up peaceful public meetings, and ban demonstrations.<sup>35</sup>

This anarchist critique of “democracy” and the United States found frequent expression in the international correspondence to *iTierra!* from 1905 to 1910. As police actions mounted against striking workers in 1905, the Caguas anarchists documented these abuses against the democratic process. As one correspondent put it—anonymous possibly due to a growing fear of police retribution—the island’s police had become no better than Russian Cossacks and San Juan looked no different than Moscow, Odessa and St. Petersburg where Russian police and military had butchered workers rising up in the 1905 Revolution. All of this occurred, noted the writer, while the US-appointed governor Beekman Winthrop—a 29-year-old friend of President Roosevelt—promised to bring peace. Winthrop was a “miserable hypocrite” who sat by and let the police do their work for the interests of capital and state, concluded the reporter.<sup>36</sup>

Writing from Mayagüez a month later, the female anarchist Paca Escabí echoed a theme that anarchists in Cuba were espousing at the same time: what had really changed since the US invasions in 1898 and the removal of Spanish rule? She charged that since the US invasion all that had really changed was that the North Americans, who led people

to dream of a better life, had actually crushed peoples' hopes. "The American invasion of Puerto Rico only means division among workers, scandals in the administration, moral disorder, and hunger, exodus and grief for the people." Crime and disorder seemed to be the growing characteristics marking Puerto Rican life, Escabí added. In a sense, what had changed since the colonial era was not good since "the government is incompetent, and the people's political representatives have done nothing but foolishly approve laws acting against the interests of the Puerto Rican people and the working class in particular." Meanwhile, the people sat helplessly, "deceived into being victims of the tenacious, free, progressive and avaricious descendants of Webster and Grant."<sup>37</sup> Thus, anarchists increasingly criticized the impact of US dominance in Puerto Rico—a position that Cuban anarchists well understood for their own island.

Always distrusting of parliamentary politics and political campaigns, anarchists rejected the idea that workers should partake in elections—a position that put them at odds with the FLT leadership which encouraged workers to vote and frequently backed worker and socialist political parties. To anarchists in Puerto Rico—like their comrades in Cuba—such political activities were little more than promises to workers to get their vote one day, only to turn around and ignore workers' interests once in office. As elections neared in 1906, Puerto Rican anarchists (mirroring the same sentiments as Cuban anarchists in the midst of Cuba's 1906 election season) expressed ever-increasing concerns about the influence of party politics upon the working class. Writers across the island picked up the pen to express fears that workers were abandoning even the smallest amount of working-class consciousness in order to join with one political party or another. From Cayey, "Diógenes" wrote to *iTierra!*, lamenting that "here, politics invades everything; workers struggle and fight against workers, each one defending their bosses and what they believe are their redeeming and saintly causes." In Caguas, an anonymous writer described the "wave of politics invading everything" as politicians arrive in every town, village and hamlet "telling the residents that the *country* needs the force of the young to be great and prosperous, and that the only way they can express this patriotic sentiment is by giving the candidate their votes."<sup>38</sup> Alfonso Torres in San Juan summarized anarchist sentiment in an August 1906 column titled "*La farsa electoral en Puerto Rico*" (Electoral Sham in Puerto Rico):

But voter registration drives begin six or seven months before and as a result the salaried classes of the politico-bourgeois press, charged with agitating popular passions, light the flame of hate and discord, where the working people—eternal conscience-lacking beast!—like the innocent butterflies, flying crazily around the flame and stupidly burn

their own wings of freedom and fraternity only to fall and roll around in the dust of their own desperation and misery. Oh, voluntary slaves of the twentieth century!<sup>39</sup>

While it was one thing to replicate the traditional anarchist anti-politics doctrine around election time, the uniqueness of Puerto Rico's larger political status as an "unincorporated territory" linked to the United States but with no US citizenship rights until 1917 placed the island's anarchists in the position of attacking both Puerto Rican and US politics. Thus, while Cuban anarchists periodically challenged the military occupation governments of 1899-1902 and 1906-09, and occasionally lamented the threat of US intervention as guaranteed by the Platt Amendment to the Cuban Constitution, Cuba was at least—technically—an independent country. Puerto Rico's status was clouded by US refusal to grant complete independence or incorporate the island as a state. Because the governor was a US presidential appointee, anarchists easily extended their anti-politics rhetoric into an anti-imperialist attack. Alfonso Torres addressed this specifically: "Here in Puerto Rico, where we cannot count on our own government . . . here where no power exists other than that of the North Americans, here where the governor and the executive council are the same rulers, what they order, oppresses the people, so that the struggles of the political parties are not really about power because power is in foreign hands."<sup>40</sup>

Consequently, while largely lacking their own press, Puerto Rican anarchists made the most of Cuba's *iTierra!* to inform Cuban anarchists (and other readers) of the political, cultural and economic issues confronting radicals on the island. The issues they raised helped Cuban readers develop an international anarchist consciousness by illustrating how their dilemmas were similar to those of their Puerto Rican comrades. At the same time, anarchists in Puerto Rico received copies of *iTierra!* with the correspondence from their own native reporters. The distribution of the paper with the Puerto Rican columns to Puerto Rican readers helped this small group of activists portray the island's issues from an anarchist perspective while enabling Puerto Rican readers to compare their lives with workers in Cuba and throughout the Caribbean.

### **The Panama Canal Zone, *iTierra!*, and the Caribbean Anarchist Network**

When the United States began construction of the Panama Canal in 1904, thousands of workers migrated to the isthmus from the US, Spain and the Caribbean. Most Spanish-speaking workers arrived from Spain. Between 1904 and 1912, over 4,000 Spaniards moved to the Canal Zone (Greene 2009:396-399).<sup>41</sup> Despite a 1904 law banning the entrance

of anarchists into the zone, Spanish-speaking anarchists nevertheless arrived and set out to organize workers, bringing with them to the isthmus the “seeds of class consciousness and anarcho-syndicalism” (Viñas 1983:99; Turner 1982:22). Except for the short-lived newspaper *El Único* from 1911-1912, Canal Zone anarchists relied largely on *¡Tierra!* as a source of news and propaganda, as an outlet for correspondence, and as a destination for money to support international anarchism just as their colleagues in Florida and Puerto Rico did.

In July 1905, Panama-based anarchists made their first contact with Havana when the migrant worker Luis Prats sent \$1.30 *pesos* to *¡Tierra!*.<sup>42</sup> Despite Prats’ contribution, significant monetary and communication flows between Panama and Cuba were almost non-existent until late summer 1907. After that, Canal Zone-based anarchists such as A. Córdoba, A. Sans, R. Fernández, and Serafín González began collecting money to purchase copies of *¡Tierra!* from Havana and distribute them among their fellow workers. With the monetary donations came the occasional letter outlining labor issues in Panama. The first published communication from Panama to Havana occurred in September 1907 when one writer described a recent meeting urging workers to demand the eight-hour, ten-dollar day, with \$16 for work on holidays. Just as important was the writer’s denunciation of US control and working conditions. As he put it, canal employment recruiters lied to workers in Spain by painting scenarios of excellent working conditions in order to lure cheap workers whose arrival would drive down wages. Besides charging recruiters with deception, the writer also described police abuses directed at workers who were arrested and fined for doing nothing more than being suspected of “disturbing order or throwing an orange peel into the street.” Signed by 37 men, the letter urged *¡Tierra!*’s editors to send this notice to Spanish anarchist papers in order to spread the word to those “still in Spain with illusions of coming” to Panama that if they still wanted to come, then they had better expect poor conditions and abuse from the North American police and foremen.<sup>43</sup>

From 1907 to 1911, the anarchist network between Cuba and Panama could be described as tenuous at best. Occasionally, though, columns to *¡Tierra!* arrived, coupled with money that ranged from 55 *centavos* to \$24.75 *pesos* for subscriptions and political causes. The funds came from laborers in Emperador, Ancón, Pedro Miguel and elsewhere as well as from the bookseller J.V. Beverhoudt who ran stores in various towns at various times. Still, money arrived from Panama infrequently—only for 38 weeks over a four year period.<sup>44</sup>

However, that changed rapidly in 1911 and 1912. In Cuba, the movement began to diversify and even fracture as anarchists in Havana began publishing three newspapers. Part of this fracturing rested on a series of

personality and ideological disputes that pitted groups linked to either *iTierra!* or *La Voz del Dependiente*, the anarchist newspaper of Havana's restaurant and café workers (Shaffer 2005:179-182). In mid-1911, Aquilino López, a rising figure in the Havana anarchist movement, left Cuba for Panama just as labor militancy once again surged in the Canal Zone. In July 1911, worker unrest spread throughout the infamous Culebra Cut—a dangerous section of the canal project that was susceptible to rock slides. Sympathy strikes emerged in other parts of the zone, especially among Spanish workers who became targets of increased anarchist propaganda from a growing number of anarchist clubs that arose in towns across the canal. Into this mix emerged Aquilino López. He linked himself with the emerging clubs and especially Bernardo Pérez, editor of the Colón-based anarchist newspaper *El Único* and a man who had raised money for *iTierra!* (Greene 2004:90-92 and 2009:175-177).<sup>45</sup>

While Pérez was an important anarchist agitator in the zone, López played the key role in bolstering the regional anarchist network by utilizing his Havana connections to link the two movements. However, the anarchists' internal problems in Havana had resulted in a temporary shifting of this network. While *iTierra!* and the anarchist groups who published it had been early recipients of Panamanian money and correspondence, López was one of those Cuban anarchists who split from *iTierra!*. In mid-1911, some of those dissenters who stayed in Cuba began to publish the anarchist newspaper *Vía Libre*, to which López sent regular columns.<sup>46</sup>

By August 1911, anarchist militancy had spread to such an extent throughout the Canal Zone that anarchists organized the *Federación de Agrupaciones e Individuos Libres del Istmo de Panamá* (Federation of Free Groups and Individuals of the Panamanian Isthmus). The federation claimed groups with names like *Los Egoistas* in Gatún, *Gente Nueva* in Punta del Toro, *Los Deseos* in Corozal, *Los Invencibles* in Culebra and *Los Seditos* in Balboa, including nearly 120 individuals willing to place their names on a communiqué to be published in *iTierra!*. López collected money from these groups and sent it to Havana to support anarchist causes and *Vía Libre*. In fact, Panamanian-based anarchists became crucial financial backers of *Vía Libre* in its early issues. For instance, in August 1911, the paper published the names of all paying members of the isthmus' anarchist groups as well as subscriptions and donations from Panama to Cuba. While Cubans in Havana and Manzanillo contributed \$7.54 pesos to the paper, groups and individuals in Panama contributed nearly \$27 pesos. López's position as a transnational intermediary in this network explains the strong linkage.<sup>47</sup>

While the links between Panama and *iTierra!* were limited in the summer of 1911, by late summer internal conflicts within Cuba had

been resolved and once again anarchists representing different groups and newspapers began to speak with one voice (Shaffer 2005:178-183). This reunified movement—made possible by the Cuban government's deportation of some of the divisive anarchists in Havana—saw *¡Tierra!* re-emerge as an important venue for Panama's anarchists. From 1912-13, anarchist activities centered around *Grupo "Los Nada"* in Pedro Miguel and *Grupo "Libre Pensamiento"* in Gatún, while smaller groups operated in Miraflores (*Grupo "Los Libertarios"*), Culebra (*Grupo "Germinal"*), and Punta del Toro (*Grupo "Solidaridad"*). These groups expanded their financing of movement efforts in Cuba. From January 1912 to December 1913, Canal Zone anarchists sent money to Havana, averaging \$8.11 pesos per week. These funds accounted for between 3 and 40% of the newspaper's weekly income for those weeks that money arrived, with average weekly percentages over the two years topping out at nearly 12%.<sup>48</sup>

By late 1912, Canal-based anarchists turned their attention to political and social issues in the Panamanian Republic. Writing from Pedro Miguel, Braulio Hurtado critiqued Panamanian politics as well as the presidential campaign and election of Liberal Party candidate Belisario Porras in 1912. Hurtado launched into a series of columns from September 1912 to May 1913. In his reporting to *¡Tierra!* he used the traditional anarchist anti-politics approach that declared all politicians to be deceivers and only out to benefit themselves. For instance, just before Porras' inauguration in October 1912, he asked just what the Panamanian government had done with the \$10 million dollars given it by the US in exchange for the Canal Zone territory. The government had promised agricultural colonies, roads, and communication systems. But they were practically non-existent almost ten years after independence from Colombia. Why, he asked, should Panamanian workers get excited about a new president? Yet, they had, he added, describing how Panamanians working in the Canal Zone—some barefoot and living on a diet of coffee, bread, water and canned sardines—had boarded special election-day trains to flood into Panama and vote for their new "*caciques*." At least, he concluded "we foreigners [and thus non-voters] won't be participants in such cultural and moral stooping."<sup>49</sup>

In the midst of this politics-as-usual critique, José Carrasco urged anarchists across the isthmus to go beyond their local anarchist clubs and organize workers centers. Seeing a rise in the "spirit of rebellion" around him, thanks to the rise of new groups, he urged workers to build "a Workers Center, that is, a resistance society" where workers could take the little money they earned and instead of buying "liquor to numb the brain" use it for education, culture and science "that guides man to be free and to have good health to combat the many evils that continually

threaten their existence.” In addition, a Workers Center in the heart of US territory would show North American officials that workers were willing to stand up to them.<sup>50</sup> Through their efforts—efforts coordinated through native reporting to *iTierra!*—a new Workers Center in Gatún emerged in late 1912, gathering money, ordering more newspapers out of Havana, and offering funds for causes in Cuba and the United States.<sup>51</sup>

However, by 1914, hopes for increasing the anarchist movement dwindled. Only small amounts of money arrived in *iTierra!*'s offices through 1914—thirteen weeks all together and at sums averaging only a few *pesos*. The scarcity of funds and correspondence reflected the ending of construction, the abandonment of the canal by workers returning home, and consequently the diminishing anarchist presence in the Canal Zone. Smaller anarchist groups continued to operate in Ancón, Pedro Miguel, Culebra and Balboa throughout 1914, sending small sums of money but no correspondence to Cuba. On August 15, 1914, navigation on the Panama Canal formally commenced. Unfortunately for the Caribbean anarchist network, *iTierra!*, the principal periodical linking the network, ceased publication less than five months later. While anarchist groups continued to operate on the island and in the Canal Zone, *iTierra!*'s demise undermined any hope for resurrecting the transnational linkages between Cuba and the isthmus.

## CONCLUSION

Scholars have traditionally studied anarchism within the confines of one country. In the Caribbean region, most research on anarchism since the 1980s has focused on anarchist actions in Cuba, in Florida, in Puerto Rico and in Panama. Within these territorial confines, anarchists mostly have been studied as part of a country's labor movement. In Cuba after 1959, this approach, coupled with Marxist historiography of the island's labor movement, tended to dismiss anarchists in Cuba as backward dupes at best, counter-revolutionaries who undermined Cuban labor at worst. Beginning in the 1990s, anarchists were rediscovered on their own terms as key contributors to the island's leftist traditions that Marxists would first cooperate with and in some ways adopt and adapt later in the twentieth century (Casanovas 1998, Shaffer 2005).

Yet, anarchists at the beginning of the twentieth century were “internationalists,” both in how they envisioned the movement and in how they migrated between countries whether across the Atlantic or throughout the Americas. As anarchists migrated, they merged into established local and national movements, creating networks of flesh, ideas and money. The focus on national anarchist movements has tended to obscure these migrating radicals and the transnational networks they helped to

establish. Only a few scholars have examined this fundamental reality. Gerald Poyo and Joan Casanovas examined Florida-Cuba interactions at the time of Cuba's war for independence. Amparo Sánchez Cobos focused on the migration of Spanish anarchists to Cuba and their roles in the island's movement. Julie Greene noted—as part of a larger work on labor in the Panama Canal Zone—the roles of Spanish anarchists in the zone. Yet, these works only scratch the surface of transnational anarchism in the Caribbean. Their two-country focus is important, but what this article suggests is that anarchists went beyond these two-node movements to create a multinational network. Uncovering this network requires focusing on the linkages that anarchists themselves created and nurtured within the Caribbean region. By doing so, we come to understand the anarchist project in terms of how anarchists saw their work: locally, nationally, and transnationally.

While migrating anarchists are part of the story for how networks emerged and functioned, the anarchist press also played a central role. Havana was the hub for both the Cuban national and the Caribbean transnational movements, linking far-flung groups together into a network that facilitated flows of people, news reports, and financial contributions. The key to Havana's role in this network was the city's weekly newspaper *¡Tierra!*, published by a revolving group of anarcho-communist editors from late 1902 to early 1915. *¡Tierra!* exemplifies for the early twentieth century what theorists and scholars who study modern social movements have explored: first, the role of radical media providing a space for activists to report on their own actions while challenging the hegemonic elite vertically in their various locales, and, second, the role of radical media in linking groups horizontally into networks.

For the better part of its long run, *¡Tierra!* took issues of international anarchism and Cubanized them for a Cuban readership. At the same time, the paper regularly relied on native reporters throughout Cuba to send regional correspondence and money to the Havana-based paper. That correspondence was then printed in new editions of the newspaper and sent across the island. The paper, then, linked far-flung anarchist groups and helped these groups develop an island-wide consciousness of dilemmas and actions facing Cuba's anarchists. Concurrently, native reporters in Florida, Puerto Rico and the Panama Canal Zone relied on *¡Tierra!*. Lacking resources to support their own long-term radical media, these anarchists—often with personal links to Havana—sent correspondence and money to Cuba and in return received fresh copies of the newspaper. Both Cuban and Caribbean readers and contributors also sent money to the newspaper for other radical causes. The paper became the main receiver of these funds and then distributed them to Mexican revolutionaries, families of political prisoners, or to the United

States and Spain to purchase anarchist newspapers from those countries that would then be sent to Puerto Rico, Panama and Florida. In these ways, readers from throughout the Caribbean were able to report on local developments, keep abreast of anarchist actions and government measures against their comrades, and develop a regional anarchist consciousness by comparing their struggles with comrades throughout the Caribbean.

Thus, this study has explored how anarchist movements in the Caribbean were more than just part of their local and national labor movements. Rather, they were also social movements designed to challenge a broad array of labor, economic, social, cultural and political conditions in the region, and in so doing counter the hegemonic social, political and economic elite in the Caribbean. In addition, activists in the network coordinated a unified critique of North American political and economic expansionism in the Caribbean. These challengers from the far left of the political spectrum and by people from the bottom of society put forth their own visions of Cuban, Floridian, Puerto Rican and Panamanian reality while offering alternative visions for those locales' futures. These radical activists used anarchist journalism to coordinate attacks on the elite and generate not just national but also regional awareness when they portrayed similar dilemmas facing activists in each of the network's locales. As such, these Caribbean radicals framed an anarchist interpretation of their realities that was consistent across national borders.

In the final analysis, by exploring the correspondence of non-Havana anarchists as well as tracking the flows of money from outside Havana to that city's anarchist press, a previously unrecognized network of transnational anarchists that existed within the Caribbean Basin begins to emerge. By investigating that network's radical media, this article has shed light on a new aspect of Caribbean migration and Caribbean radicalism in the early twentieth century. At the same time, this article will hopefully encourage further research into the relationship between radical media, social movements and transnational networks both in the Caribbean and beyond.

### Notes

- <sup>1</sup> These include twenty-nine papers from Cuba, five from South Florida, four from the Panama Canal Zone, and seven from Puerto Rico.
- <sup>2</sup> These newspapers are in archives and collections in Amsterdam, Havana, Gainesville, Washington, and San Juan.

- <sup>3</sup> See, for instance, *¡Tierra!*, December 19, 1903, p. 1.
- <sup>4</sup> *¡Tierra!*, August 15, 1903, p. 1; August 22, 1903, pp. 1, 3; August 29, 1903, pp. 2-4; September 5, 1903, p. 1; September 12, 1903, pp. 1 and 3.
- <sup>5</sup> *¡Tierra!*, September 12, 1903, p. 1; September 19, 1903, p. 1.
- <sup>6</sup> *¡Tierra!*, October 29, 1904, p. 2.
- <sup>7</sup> *¡Tierra!*, August 8, 1913, p. 1.
- <sup>8</sup> *¡Tierra!*, March 14, 1912, p. 2.
- <sup>9</sup> *¡Tierra!*, November 10, 1906, p. 3.
- <sup>10</sup> *¡Tierra!*, April 30, 1907, p. 1; May 25, 1907, p. 2; June 1, 1907, pp. 3-4; June 12, 1907, p. 2; June 22, 1907, p. 3; July 7, 1907, p. 3; August 10, 1907, p. 2.
- <sup>11</sup> *¡Tierra!*, February 17, 1912, p. 2; July 6, 1912, pp. 1-2; December 14, 1912, p. 3; March 11, 1913, p. 2.
- <sup>12</sup> See for instance, *¡Tierra!*, May 14, 1904, p. 4; June 12, 1907, p. 4; October 8, 1910, pgs. 3-4; January 18, 1913, p. 4; February 21, 1913, p. 4; and, May 7, 1914, p. 4.
- <sup>13</sup> The data is culled from 436 issues out of 583 issues published from 1902-1915, or 75% of all issues. The percentages are derived from subscriptions and sales reported on extant copies of page four. Not every issue of the paper from 1902-1915 has been preserved; thus, the percentages may be skewed. In addition, not every issue published this financial information. "Metropolitan Havana" includes Havana and its immediate suburbs of Regla, Casa Blanca, and Guanabacoa across Havana Bay as well as Cerro, Marianao, Vedado, Cubanacan, Miramar, and Jesús del Monte.
- <sup>14</sup> These small towns and many others can be found in issue after issue. See for instance, *¡Tierra!*: 1903–July 11, July 25, October 24; 1904–April 23, May 14, May 21, June 11; 1905–January 14, March 14, April 8, July 8; 1906–June 2, July 21; 1907–February 2, April 6; June 12; 1909–July 31; 1910–February 26, March 26, April 23, May 7, October 1, October 8; 1912–April 13, May 11, May 18, September 7, October 12, October 19, November 2.
- <sup>15</sup> *¡Tierra!*, April 29, 1911, p. 4.
- <sup>16</sup> *¡Tierra!*, April 8, 1905, p. 4; March 19, 1910, p. 4; February 17, 1912, p. 4; August 8, 1913, p. 4.

- <sup>17</sup> *¡Tierra!*, October 1, 1914, p. 4.
- <sup>18</sup> Figures calculated from 42 extant copies of *¡Tierra!* from 1914.
- <sup>19</sup> See, for example, articles by the author on anarchist culture in Cuba listed in References.
- <sup>20</sup> On the relationship between Havana and Tampa, see Kirwin Shaffer (2009), Nancy Hewitt (2001), Joan Casanovas (1998), Gary R. Mormino and George E. Pozzetta (1986), Gerald Poyo (1985), and Durward Long (1971). Also see the Tampa-based anarchist newspaper *El Esclavo* from 1894 to 1898.
- <sup>21</sup> These conclusions are based on the published weekly finances of *¡Tierra!* from 1903 to 1907.
- <sup>22</sup> *¡Tierra!*, July 25, 1903, pp. 3-4.
- <sup>23</sup> *¡Tierra!*, August 29, 1903, pp. 3-4.
- <sup>24</sup> *¡Tierra!*, September 26, 1903, p. 4.
- <sup>25</sup> *¡Tierra!*, April 2, 1904, p. 3. See a similar half-hearted support for International membership in the April 23, 1904 issue, p. 4 and the May 21, 1904 issue, p. 4.
- <sup>26</sup> *¡Tierra!*, March 9, 1906, p. 3.
- <sup>27</sup> *¡Tierra!*, July 20, 1912, p. 3.
- <sup>28</sup> *¡Tierra!*, January 3, 1909, p. 3.
- <sup>29</sup> *¡Tierra!*, January 14, 1905, p. 4.
- <sup>30</sup> *¡Tierra!*, June 24, 1905, p. 3 and *Cultura Obrera* (New York), May 22, 1915.
- <sup>31</sup> See *¡Tierra!* from March 4, 1905 to December 24, 1910.
- <sup>32</sup> *¡Tierra!*, April 8, 1905, p. 2 and June 13, 1908, p. 3.
- <sup>33</sup> *¡Tierra!*, March 4, 1905, pp. 3-4 and March 28, 1905, p. 1.
- <sup>34</sup> *¡Tierra!*, April 14, 1909, p. 2.
- <sup>35</sup> *¡Tierra!*, May 20, 1905, pp. 2-3.
- <sup>36</sup> *¡Tierra!*, September 2, 1905, p. 2.
- <sup>37</sup> *¡Tierra!*, October 7, 1905, p. 2.
- <sup>38</sup> *¡Tierra!*, June 2, 1906, pp. 3-4 and July 21, 1906, p. 4. Italics in the original.

- <sup>39</sup> *¡Tierra!*, August 4, 1906, p. 2.
- <sup>40</sup> *¡Tierra!*, August 4, 1906, p. 2.
- <sup>41</sup> Yolanda Marco Serra claims that 8,298 Spaniards were in the canal 1904-14. See Marco Serra 1997:3.
- <sup>42</sup> *¡Tierra!*, July 8, 1905, p. 4.
- <sup>43</sup> *¡Tierra!*, September 7, 1907, p. 3.
- <sup>44</sup> *¡Tierra!*, January 1, 1910 and July 16, 1910 reflect the high and low figures.
- <sup>45</sup> *¡Tierra!*, April 9, 1910, p. 4.
- <sup>46</sup> *Via Libre*, July 1, 1911, p. 3.
- <sup>47</sup> *Via Libre*, August 5, 1911, p. 4.
- <sup>48</sup> *¡Tierra!*, March 5, 1912 and December 15, 1913 represent the high and low figures respectively.
- <sup>49</sup> *¡Tierra!*, September 7, 1912, p. 4. Italics in the original.
- <sup>50</sup> *¡Tierra!*, October 19, 1912, p. 4.
- <sup>51</sup> *¡Tierra!*, November 23, 1912, p. 3.

## References

- Atton, Chris. 1999. "Green Anarchist: A Case Study of Collective Action in the Radical Media." *Anarchist Studies* 7:25-49.
- . 2002. "News Cultures and New Social Movements." *Journalism Studies* 3(4):493-495.
- . 2002/2005. *Alternative Media*. London: Sage Publications.
- Cabrera, Olga. 1985. *Los que viven por sus manos*. Havana: Editorial de Ciencias Sociales.
- Casanovas Codina, Joan. 1998. *Bread, or Bullets! Urban Labor and Spanish Colonialism in Cuba, 1850-1898*. Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press.
- Dávila Santiago, Rubén. 1983. *El derribo de las murallas y "El Porvenir de Borinquen" (Los centros de estudios sociales obreros a principios del siglo XX)*. San Juan: CEREP.
- . 1985. "El pensamiento social obrero a comienzos del siglo XX en Puerto Rico." *Revista Historia* (San Juan) 1(2):149-167.
- Downing, John D. H. 2001. *Radical Media: Rebellious Communication and Social Movements*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.
- García, Gervasio L. and A.G. Quintero Rivera. 1982. *Desafío y solidaridad: breve*

- historia del movimiento obrero puertorriqueño*. Río Piedras, Puerto Rico: Ediciones Huracán.
- González, Dominga. 1988. "La inmigración española en Cuba." *Economía y Desarrollo* 1:92-107.
- Greene, Julie. 2004. "Spaniards on the Silver Roll: Labor Troubles and Liminality in the Panama Canal Zone, 1904-1914." *International Labor and Working Class History* 66:78-98.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 2009. *The Canal Builders: Making America's Empire at the Panama Canal*. New York: Penguin Press.
- Hewitt, Nancy. 2001. *Southern Discomfort: Women's Activism in Tampa, Florida, 1880s-1920s*. Urbana: University of Illinois Press.
- Hoerder, Dirk, ed. 1986. "*Struggle a Hard Battle*": *Essays on Working-Class Immigrants*. DeKalb, IL: Northern Illinois University Press.
- Iglesias Pantín, Santiago. 1929/1958. *Luchas emancipadoras (Crónicas de Puerto Rico)*. Vol. I. San Juan: Imprenta Venezuela.
- Long, Durward. 1971. "The Historical Beginnings of Ybor City." *Florida Historical Quarterly* 59:31-44.
- Marco Serra, Yolanda. 1997. *Los obreros españoles en la construcción del canal de Panamá. La emigración española hacia Panamá vista a través de la prensa española*. Panama: Editorial Portobelo.
- McAdam, Doug, John D. McCarthy, and Mayer N. Zald, eds. 1996. *Comparative Perspectives on Social Movements: Political Opportunities, Mobilizing Structures, and Cultural Framings*. London: Cambridge University Press.
- McAdam, Doug. 1996. "The Framing Function of Movement Tactics: Strategic Dramaturgy in the American Civil Rights Movement." Pp. 338-356 in *Comparative Perspectives on Social Movements: Political Opportunities, Mobilizing Structures, and Cultural Framings*, edited by Doug McAdam, John D. McCarthy, and Mayer N. Zald. London: Cambridge University Press.
- Melucci, Alberto. 1996. *Challenging Codes: Collective Action in the Information Age*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Mormino, Gary R. and George E. Pozzetta. 1986. "Spanish Anarchism in Tampa, Florida, 1886-1931." Pp. 170-198 in "*Struggle a Hard Battle*": *Essays on Working-Class Immigrants*, edited by Dirk Hoerder. DeKalb, IL: Northern Illinois University Press.
- Naranjo Orovio, Consuelo. 1996. "Trabajo libre e inmigración española en Cuba, 1880-1930." *Revista de Indias* 52(195/196):749-794.
- Navas, Luis. 1979. *El movimiento obrero en Panamá (1880-1914)*. San José, Costa Rica: Editorial Universitaria Centroamericana.
- Poyo, Gerald. 1985. "The Anarchist Challenge to the Cuban Independence Movement, 1885-1890." *Cuban Studies* 15(1):29-42.
- Ramos, Julio, ed. 1992. *Amor y anarquía: Los escritos de Luisa Capetillo*. San Juan: Ediciones Huracán.

- Sánchez Cobos, Amparo. 2008. *Sembrando ideales. Anarquistas españoles en Cuba (1902-1925)*. Madrid: Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Científicas.
- Shaffer, Kirwin. 1999. "Prostitutes, Bad Seeds, and Revolutionary Mothers in Cuban Anarchism: Imagining Women in the Fiction of Adrián del Valle and Antonio Penichet, 1898-1930." *Studies in Latin American Popular Culture* 18:1-17.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 2000. "Cuba para todos: Anarchist Internationalism and the Cultural Politics of Cuban Independence, 1898-1925." *Cuban Studies* 31:45-75.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 2003a. "Freedom Teaching: Anarchism and Education in Early Republican Cuba, 1898-1925." *The Americas* 60(2):151-183.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 2003b. "The Radical Muse: Anarchism and Women in Early Twentieth Century Cuba." *Cuban Studies* 34:130-153.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 2005. *Anarchism and Countercultural Politics in Early Twentieth-Century Cuba*. Gainesville: University Press of Florida.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 2009. "By Dynamite, Sabotage, Revolution, and the Pen: Violence in Caribbean Anarchist Fiction, 1890s-1920s." *New West Indian Guide/Nieuwe West-Indische Gids* 83(1-2):5-38.
- Turner, Jorge. 1982. *Raíz, historia y perspectivas del movimiento obrero panameño*. México, D.F.: Editorial Signos.
- Viñas, David. 1983. *Anarquistas en América Latina*. México, D.F.: Editorial Katun.