In the summer of 1967, black freedom movement activist Stokely Carmichael and Cuban leader Fidel Castro captured worldwide attention as they denounced racism from the shores of Cuba. “Because our color has been used as a weapon to oppress us, we must use our color as a weapon of liberation,” Carmichael declared during the Organization of Latin American Solidarity (OLAS) conference in Havana. Castro, in turn, suggested, “We must reject—as injurious and slanderous—that attempt to present the Negro movement of the United States as a racial problem.” While both men criticized racism and lauded struggles against it, their conceptions of the centrality of race itself diverged. Yet Castro affirmed, “Our people admire Stokely for the courageous statements he has made in the OLAS Conference,” while Carmichael described his three weeks in Cuba as “eye-opening, inspiring, and mind-blowing.” Carmichael’s visit to Cuba contained contradictions in both form and content. The potential of this alliance rested on visions of freedom for those oppressed by imperialism, capitalism and racism; its limitations pointed to the lived realities of race and the hegemony of top-down leadership structures in Cuba and the United States. While Carmichael’s trip received an extraordinary amount of attention, his visit to Cuba encapsulated the possibilities and shortcomings that have characterized solidarity between African Americans and the Cuban Revolution for more than fifty years.

Castro and Carmichael formed a dramatic alliance that prioritized their personal connection and ideological commonalities over their substantive differences. Carmichael followed in the footsteps of other African American activists who looked to Cuba as a model for defying U.S. power, enacting fundamental societal change, and abolishing racism. The Cuban government, in turn, regarded African Americans such as Carmichael as allies against U.S. imperialism and as advocates of Cuba’s egalitarian program. Carmichael’s trip to Cuba to attend the OLAS conference solidified the convergence of African American and Cuban internationalist politics through a shared anti-imperialist, anti-capitalist, anti-racist
“tricontinental” ideology. Tricontinentalism, with its emphasis on anti-imperialism, espousal of anti-racism, and its goal of cultivating a vanguard of Third World leaders, served as an effective vehicle of solidarity for Carmichael and Castro. Differences regarding the centrality of racial consciousness to the struggle against racism and exploitation, however, limited their solidarity. Carmichael came away from Cuba “deeply impressed” and “inspired by the humanistic idealism of their revolution,” yet ambivalent about the veracity of Cuba’s racial democracy. Further, incongruity between Carmichael’s roots in the anti-hierarchical Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee (SNCC) and his welcome by Fidel Castro as a fellow world leader resulted in a personal affinity less fruitful for their respective mass movements. Carmichael and Castro's shared charisma rendered their connection in spectacular yet narrow terms. Despite their many intersections, the African American freedom struggle and the Cuban Revolution occupied distinct spaces.

Solidarity between African American activists and post-1959 Cuba occupies a pivotal yet under-explored nexus in the transnational routes integral to both black radicalism and the Cuban Revolution. Examination of Carmichael’s trip to Cuba adds to the growing emphasis on African American internationalism during the “long civil rights” movement. Likewise, scholars have increasingly placed Cuba and the 1959 Revolution in transnational contexts. The spate of recent works by Cuban scholars of race in post-1959 Cuba demonstrates increased governmental acceptance of dialogue about continuing racism. While Fidel Castro abolished segregation and other forms of legalized racial discrimination by decree in 1959, the government subsequently discouraged discussions of racism, prohibited demonstrations of racial consciousness, and banned organizations based on race. Recent Cuban texts have helped to weaken the silence on race and racism in revolutionary Cuba, and have facilitated further scholarship in the United States. Yet neither Cuban nor U.S. scholarship examines Carmichael’s trip to Cuba in depth. Works exploring the long history of African American and Cuban interactions tend to focus on the first half of the twentieth century or the initial years of the Revolution. Moreover, literature on Cuban and African American convergences is often either explicitly celebratory or deeply critical. Acknowledging the ambivalence that characterized African American and Cuban connections deepens our understanding of Cuba’s revolutionary project and the African American postwar struggle for change.

**SNCC, the Cuban Revolution, and the Tricontinental**

A shared tricontinental ideology facilitated solidarity between Stokely Carmichael and Cuba. A political construct akin to Third Worldism, Cuba’s concept of tricontinentalism emphasized unity across Latin America, Africa, and Asia against racism, capitalism, and in particular, western imperialism spearheaded by the United States. The Cuban revolutionary government’s abolition of racial discrimination in 1959, its identification as socialist in 1961, and above all its definition of the 1959
Revolution as a triumph against U.S. imperialism laid the basis for tricontinentalism’s tenets. Inspired by a long line of anti-colonial gatherings such as the Afro-Asian alliance’s meeting in Bandung in 1955, the Cuban government had pursued the idea of a three-continent conference since the early years of the Revolution. The resulting Tricontinental Conference in January 1966 drew over five hundred delegates from eighty-two countries in Africa, Asia and Latin America to Havana. Tricontinentalism defined Cuba’s foreign policies supporting insurgent groups in Latin America, opposing the war in Vietnam, and intervening in Africa in the 1960s. It also doubled as a nationalist project intended to unify the Cuban people. African Americans did not travel from the U.S. to participate in the Tricontinental Conference, but the documents, organizations and publications that emerged from the meeting demonstrated pronounced solidarity with the black freedom struggle. In turn, tricontinentalism’s emphasis on anti-imperialism and its inclusion of a critique of racism elicited the interest of African American internationally. Carmichael called the conference’s permanent organization, the Organization of Solidarity with the Peoples of Africa, Asia and Latin America (OSPAAAL), “one of the most important organizations for the development of the struggle of the Negroes in the United States,” and years later dubbed the Tricontinental magazine “a bible in revolutionary circles.” The conference served as a model for future international conferences in Havana attended by at least nine members of the Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee, including Carmichael. African Americans represented a core constituency of Cuba’s tricontinental vision.

Carmichael embodied and promoted black internationalism. Born in Trinidad in 1941 to a pan-Caribbean family, Carmichael immigrated to New York at age eleven and moved to Guinea in 1969. He spent the better part of the 1960s with SNCC, joining as a student at Howard University and participating in the Freedom Rides in 1961, the Freedom Summer project in Mississippi in 1964, the independent voting project in Lowndes County, Alabama, in 1965, and other projects that sought to empower local African Americans to dictate the terms of their lives. As SNCC Chairman beginning in spring 1966, Carmichael reiterated the group’s position against the war in Vietnam and traveled to Puerto Rico to establish an alliance with the Movement for Puerto Rican Independence in 1967. While Carmichael’s popularization of the term “Black Power” made him a household name, he was also a main proponent of conceptualizing black communities in the United States as internal colonies. He attended the Dialectics of Liberation Conference in London in July 1967, where he joined Herbert Marcuse, C.L.R. James, and other critical theorists, political activists, and countercultural figures to discuss “new ways in which intellectuals might act to change the world” and create a revolutionary consciousness. Declaring at the London conference that “Black Power, to us, means that black people see themselves as part of a new force, sometimes called the Third World,” Carmichael tied the struggle of the Global South to the very definition of Black Power. Carmichael resigned as SNCC Chairman before his global
crisscrossing took him to London, Havana, Moscow, China, Hanoi, and the African continent. Yet his international renown caused discomfort within the non-hierarchical SNCC, and perhaps contributed to his expulsion from the deteriorating organization in 1968. SNCC’s internationalist outlook increased throughout the 1960s and endeared the group to Cuba. SNCC emerged from the Southern sit-in movement in 1960 as a fiercely autonomous, grassroots organization as seventeen African countries proudly became independent nations. The gains and continuing violence that comprised the “Year of Africa” inspired SNCC to declare at its founding conference “that we identify ourselves with the African struggle as a concern of all mankind.” SNCC never characterized itself as a socialist organization and exhibited suspicion of centralized leadership. Yet SNCC maintained a policy of open association at home and abroad, individual members such as Carmichael demonstrated a vacillating interest in Marxism, and critics accused it of communist ties. After 1964, SNCC workers traveled across the African continent and visited Vietnam, Japan, and the Soviet Union. SNCC also protested apartheid throughout the decade, declared its opposition to the Vietnam War in January 1966—long before other civil rights groups—and generated controversy for supporting Palestine in its 1967 conflict with Israel. In turn, the organization drew visiting activists from around the world and inspired “Friends of SNCC” groups from Paris to Jamaica. In 1967 SNCC established an International Affairs Commission and affirmed its focus on human, not solely civil, rights.

By 1967, SNCC had further centralized its internationalist outlook, yet its programs no longer mobilized masses of people. The 1964 Mississippi Summer Project fulfilled its mission to attract widespread media attention to the poverty, racism, and violence in Mississippi at a high cost to SNCC’s internal cohesion. The limits of the 1964 Civil Rights Act and 1965 Voting Rights Act, along with the suppression of the Mississippi Freedom Democratic Party’s efforts to gain delegate seats at the 1964 Democratic National Convention, left the group convinced of the futility of working with the political establishment. Carmichael’s popularization of the phrase “Black Power” in 1966, which the media characterized as racist, separatist, and violent, led to persistent distortion and government surveillance. The decision to make SNCC an all-black organization the same year, and encourage white activists to combat racism in white communities, alienated many supporters. Carmichael and successor H. Rap Brown’s attempts to combat SNCC’s fundraising nosedive with speaking engagements resulted in the message—and messengers—overshadowing the program. What began as an avowedly anti-hierarchical organization became perceived as one dominated by individual personalities instead of programs. Rifts increasingly plagued SNCC’s familial closeness, and the vestiges of the organization that embodied the arc of the decade held its last meeting in 1969. SNCC workers who began traveling to Cuba in 1967 came less as members of a unified organization than as individuals affiliated with a culture that was fading away.
Despite SNCC’s increased emphasis on blackness as a category and Cuba’s aversion to it, Cuban institutions lauded SNCC at mid-decade. In July 1965 the Cuban Mission in New York invited John Lewis, SNCC chairman at the time, to visit Cuba during the annual July 26 commemoration of the origins of the Cuban Revolution. After the Watts rebellion in 1965, the Cuban media—as an arm of the state apparatus—shifted its emphasis from black victimization to black resistance. A special insert in a June 1967 issue of the Cuban daily newspaper Granma on “reformist, nationalist and black power” leaders suggested the Cuban state’s preferences for African American proponents of internationalism and Black Power. The Cuban press scorned both the NAACP’s legal efforts at integration and the Black Muslims’ separatist initiatives. Instead, Granma supported SNCC’s “militant stand in favor of the peoples of Asia, Africa and Latin America who are struggling for liberation” and lauded Carmichael as the organization’s “outstanding leader.” SNCC workers such as Carmichael shared critiques of imperialism, capitalism, and racism with Cuban leaders, even as they diverged on their commitments to Marxism, and, more notably, on fighting racism by focusing on race. When Carmichael arrived in Cuba in 1967, SNCC was the African American organization favored by the Cuban state.

Carmichael and Castro in Cuba

While Carmichael was one of four SNCC members in Cuba during the summer of 1967, his visit received a singular amount of attention. The OLAS invitation sent to SNCC specifically requested Carmichael’s presence at the conference. SNCC instead proffered singer, writer and photographer Julius Lester, who had already committed to travel to Cuba for the concurrent Canción Protesta folk festival. Meanwhile, Cuba proved to be an inevitable stop on Carmichael’s 1967 world tour. With SNCC campus organizer George Ware in tow, Carmichael traveled from London to Havana on July 25 upon the invitation of Cuban delegates to the Dialectics of Liberation Conference. There he joined Lester, along with Elizabeth Martinez—at the end of her time running SNCC’s New York office—and SNCC campus organizer George Ware. Carmichael’s recent tenure as SNCC chairman provided a high-profile platform that he utilized to criticize the United States, declare solidarity with Cuba, and interact with Fidel Castro. As unrest exploded in Detroit in July 1967, the war in Vietnam raged and Cuba encouraged revolution worldwide, attention to Carmichael’s visit reached a frenzied fever pitch. Although by all accounts Carmichael traveled to Cuba as an individual, Cubans considered him, however fleetingly, not only as the spokesman for SNCC but as “the leader of the North American Negro movement.”

The opportunity to witness each other’s allure firsthand solidified the bond between Carmichael and Castro. Carmichael had admired Castro since the latter’s trip to Harlem in 1960. As Carmichael recalled, “[d]uring my youth Castro was the most controversial—admired as well as demonized—political figure on the world stage.
And clearly the boldest and most charismatic.”\(^4^3\) Scholars have argued that Cuba’s political climate, Castro’s leadership skills, and his appropriation of the island’s Catholic and African-influenced religious symbols facilitated a messianic charisma.\(^4^4\) Mesmerized—despite his limited Spanish—by Castro’s speech commemorating the origins of the Cuban Revolution on July 26, Carmichael characterized Castro’s facility with the audience as palpable.\(^4^5\) Carmichael’s own ability to connect to a range of audiences had earned him the name “Starmichael” within SNCC. Castro introduced Carmichael to the crowds as “one of the most distinguished pro-civil rights leaders of the United States” when he spoke of his sympathy “most particularly with that sector of the population that is criminally discriminated against and oppressed, the black sector of the U.S. people.”\(^4^6\) Following the July 26 festivities in the eastern part of the island, SNCC members rode with Castro’s motorcade and Carmichael rode with Castro in his jeep.\(^4^7\) Carmichael and Castro were master performers who utilized their convergence for their respective goals, but their proximate interactions cemented their mutual admiration.

Carmichael and Castro further fortified their alliance through the tricontinentalism on display at the meeting of the OLAS. Like the Tricontinental Conference, the OLAS sought to bring revolutionary leaders together to create a vanguard organization. With the slogan “the duty of the revolutionary is to make revolution,” the OLAS conference convened in Havana on July 31, 1967, with the purpose of unifying Latin American leaders against imperialism and fomenting revolution in the hemisphere.\(^4^8\) Conceived at the Tricontinental Conference in Havana the previous year and reflective of tricontinental ideology, the OLAS was intended to serve as a Latin American complement to the Afro-Asian People’s Solidarity Organization and an alternative to the Organization of American States.\(^4^9\) The OLAS drew 150 delegates from political parties and insurgent groups in 27 Latin American countries, 100 guests and observers from additional organizations and governments and 150 international journalists to the Havana Libre hotel.\(^5^0\) International luminaries such as Ho Chi Minh and Bertrand Russell sent messages of support.\(^5^1\) Ernesto “Che” Guevara, the ultimate icon of the tricontinental revolutionary vanguard, presided over the meeting in absentia as president of honor.

Mobilization for the OLAS reflected the import the Cuban state placed on international conferences as sites for domestic and foreign policy. International conferences enabled the Cuban state to subvert the physical and intellectual blockades imposed by the United States and to advocate the Cuban Revolution as a model for change worldwide.\(^5^2\) While delegates from Uruguay, Guatemala, Venezuela, and the Dominican Republic formed the vice-presidency of the organization, Cuba retained unambiguous leadership of the OLAS.\(^5^3\) The conference’s staging immediately following the July 26 Cuban independence celebrations suggests that it doubled as a means to showcase and commemorate the ongoing Revolution. Constant press coverage, televised roundtables, and educational meetings led by neighborhood Committees for the Defense of the Revolution served to educate and
unite the Cuban population around the conference themes. In the opening address to the conference, Cuban President Osvaldo Dorticós Torrado characterized the meeting as a challenge to imperialism and thus a form of resistance unto itself.

Cuba used the OLAS to assert its support for armed revolution and to propagate a “Havana line” apart from Cold War powers. The OLAS treaded on slippery Cold War terrain when it called for a revolution in the Americas characterized by socialism in theory and fueled by guerilla warfare in practice. In accordance with the Kremlin’s stance of peaceful coexistence, Julius Lester described Soviet observers in Havana as espousing the “go-slow” approach to fomenting change. Cuba, on the other hand, stood “as a symbol of triumph of the armed revolutionary movement.” Although Cuba depended on the Soviet Union for material resources beginning in the early 1960s, its ideological similarities to China remained explicit until at least 1967. Tension also reportedly arose between Latin American delegations at the OLAS over the role of traditional Communist parties in Latin America, particularly the absent Venezuelan Communist Party deemed “rightist” by Castro. The OLAS affirmed Cuba’s attempt to assert its own geo-political importance and vanguard position while walking a political tightrope between the Soviet Union and nonalignment. Cuba’s increased closeness with Moscow, solidified by Che Guevara’s death in late 1967 and the failure of the 1970 sugarcane harvest to reach lofty production goals, ultimately limited the scope of its tricontinental project.

A key part of Cuba’s assertion of power was Castro’s emphasis on solidarity with African Americans. The OLAS agenda, approved in October 1966 by the conference’s organizing committee, affirmed OLAS solidarity with national liberation struggles and specifically cited “support of the Negro people of the United States in their struggle against racial segregation and in the defense of their right to equality and freedom.” The text of the final OLAS declaration proclaimed “that the Latin American struggle strengthens its ties of solidarity with the peoples of Asia and Africa and those of the socialist countries, the workers of the capitalist nations, and especially with the black population of the United States which suffers class exploitation, poverty, unemployment, racial discrimination and the denial of their most elementary human rights, and which constitutes an important force within the revolutionary struggle.” The attention paid to African Americans at the OLAS exceeded any other non-Latin American focus except the war in Vietnam. The State Department noted that a French government official found solidarity with African Americans the “most striking result” of the conference. Alliances with African Americans formed part of the institutional agenda of the Cuban-led OLAS and its long-range vision of hemispheric solidarity.

Carmichael’s persona and positions facilitated his prominence at the OLAS conference. On the meeting’s first day the OLAS organizing committee changed Carmichael’s status from observer to “delegate of honor”—a role afforded to no other individual. The following day Carmichael accepted the designation “in the name of the Negroes in the United States who are awaiting the revolutionary
movement for our liberation.” In his subsequent press conference with Lester and Ware, he purportedly excluded American journalists, threatened U.S. leaders, and lauded Cuba’s version of communism. He also defined Black Power as international, as both “the union of the Negro population of the U.S. with the oppressed peoples of the rest of the world” and “the struggle against capitalism and imperialism that oppress us from within and oppress you from without.”

In his speech to the OLAS, Carmichael urged African Americans to identify as “African-Americans of the Americas” and called for the coming of “a true United States of America . . . from Tierra del Fuego to Alaska.” His speech connected the African American liberation movement to tricontinental struggles against capitalism, imperialism, and racism: “We share a common struggle, it becomes increasingly clear; we have a common enemy. Our enemy is white Western imperialist society. Our struggle is to overthrow this system that feeds itself and expands itself through the economic and cultural exploitation of non-white, non-Western peoples—of the Third World.”

Carmichael’s statements caused an uproar in the U.S., where the media cast Carmichael as an arbiter of violence and hate during the “Summer of Love,” but in Cuba, Carmichael became the latest induction to its pantheon of political celebrities. Lester wrote in the Friends of SNCC newspaper, The Movement, that Carmichael’s presence at the conference “played no small role in the final resolutions.”

Castro’s concluding speech at the OLAS further exalted the laudatory dialogue with Carmichael reverberating across the globe. Castro decried U.S. racism and called African American and Latin American solidarity “the most natural thing in the world.” He read aloud and responded to specific criticism by the U.S. of this solidarity, in particular to a New York Daily News editorial entitled, “Stokely, Stay There,” which read, “We suggest that he remain in Havana, his spiritual home. . . . If Carmichael returns to the United States we think that the Department of Justice should throw the book at him.” Castro responded, “We would indeed be honored if he wishes to remain here . . . but he is the one who doesn’t want to stay here because he considers it his fundamental duty to fight. But he must know that whatever the circumstances, this country will always be his home.” Further, he called on others to support Carmichael: “We believe that the revolutionary movements all over the world must give Stokely their utmost support as protection against the repression of the imperialists, in such a way that everyone will know that any crime committed against this leader will have serious repercussions throughout the world. And our solidarity can help to protect Stokely’s life.” Castro’s speech solidified Carmichael’s standing in Cuba as a renowned leader, spokesman, and symbol.

Carmichael and Castro avoided dwelling publicly on their articulated differences regarding race. Castro demonstrated an understanding of the constructed nature of race when he explained in his OLAS speech that U.S. racism “does not arise from that sector because of race problems, but arises because of social problems, because of exploitation and oppression.” Castro also rejected the
idea that the black freedom struggle’s efforts to fight racism constituted racism in reverse. Yet he downplayed the category of race in relation to class by explaining that the struggle against racism was not a “racial problem,” a stance reflected in his own country’s policies toward racial discrimination. In his speech to the OLAS, on the other hand, Carmichael characterized racism as a distinct category. He rationalized that “even if we destroyed racism, we would not necessarily destroy exploitation; and if we destroyed exploitation, we would not necessarily end racism. They must both be destroyed; we must constantly launch a two-pronged attack.”

Julius Lester recalled that after discussing race while riding through the Sierra Maestra with Castro, “Stokely was unnaturally quiet when we reached a camp at the top of the mountain. He would only say that Fidel did not understand racism, but from Stokely’s sullenness, I had the distinct impression that the meeting had not gone well.”

Author Carlos Moore wrote that Carmichael had expressed doubts about Cuba’s overwhelmingly white leadership when they met in Paris the year following his visit, and Black Panther leader Eldridge Cleaver later maintained that Carmichael discouraged him from fleeing to Cuba as a political fugitive in 1968 because of ongoing racism on the island.

Carmichael’s statements on Cuba suggest that, despite more complex reactions and divergent views, he maintained a united stand with Cuba because he saw commonalities between the struggles of black Americans and the Cuban people against U.S. power and believed in the tricontinental goals of the Cuban Revolution. Carmichael accepted Castro’s assertion that Cuban racism resulted from colonialism and that “the government was ‘doing everything possible to fight it.’” In his memoir he wrote: “Nowhere did I see signs of racism or of extreme poverty. Be clear now, I did see signs of the lingering effects of racism and poverty. Those couldn’t be eliminated in eight years, but no signs of present racism.” In particular, Carmichael repeatedly expressed approbation for Cuba’s land expropriation and redistribution in the first years of the Revolution. Carmichael later suggested that his work with African Americans in the South who risked eviction or violence from landlords for acts such as voting made him understand the power of land:

> Castro had been giving people land. People had no land before. They took it, gave the land to the people. These things were very close to me because of my early organizing work in Mississippi with peasants there where the land did not belong to them. The people in Mississippi could be victimized in so many different ways, just kicked off the land at the whim of the landlord or plantation owner. So, what I saw in Cuba made a deep impression.

Carmichael’s support of the economic and anti-imperialist attributes of both tricontinentalism and the Cuban revolutionary project overrode his observations of
what he saw as vestigial racial inequality on the island. While local interests may have motivated Castro and Carmichael, overlapping ideologies facilitated their solidarity’s display.

Aftermath and Legacy

The dramatic show of support between Carmichael and Castro prompted a cacophony of voices to opine about the performative dimension of their interactions. James Reston of the New York Times, reporting from Havana, accused Carmichael of “playing a miserable game” and Castro of “obviously using” Carmichael. Reston argued that a desperate Carmichael, no longer part of the SNCC leadership, lacked support from African Americans and turned to Castro to the detriment of the black movement. Roy Wilkins of the NAACP emphasized performance when he compared Castro’s alliance with Carmichael to a blackface routine. SNCC veteran Ekwueme Michael Thelwell posited in Carmichael’s memoir that Castro, Guinea’s Sékou Touré, Ghana’s Kwame Nkrumah, and other “revolutionary elders” sought to mentor Carmichael and protect him from the violence that befell other black leaders, while SNCC’s James Forman opined that Carmichael, widely noted as a skilled speaker with a range of audiences, simply told Cuban audiences what they wanted to hear. While Castro rejected the claim that he and Carmichael were using each other in his OLAS speech, Carmichael himself acknowledged this element when he recalled his honorary delegate status: “Of course, they probably wished to mess with the US government, but that was secondary and I had no problem with it. What else could it have been? Of course, I understood clearly that this wasn’t about Stokely Carmichael, or even SNCC. I understood that I was there for one primary reason: the Cubans’ respect for the historic struggle of our people.” Despite Carmichael’s suggestion to the contrary, Castro’s show of support was about Stokely Carmichael, as well as the visibility the two leaders together engendered.

Widespread outrage in the U.S. government regarding Carmichael’s trip overseas reinforced his position that an international black consciousness threatened the United States “more than anything else.” The U.S. State Department admitted that Castro’s alliance with Carmichael against U.S. racism exposed “an obvious sore spot in his mortal enemy.” Carmichael’s equating mounting racial unrest to guerilla warfare and his rhetoric against Lyndon Johnson prompted letters to government agencies accusing him of inciting riots and sedition. Many Americans called for his deportation despite his U.S. citizenship. African American veterans critical of Carmichael’s foreign policy positions received prominent media coverage. Democratic and Republican congressmen introduced resolutions condemning Carmichael’s trip in defiance of legal restrictions barring U.S. travel to Cuba, and later subpoenaed and questioned him. Although Lyndon Johnson himself requested briefings on Carmichael and SNCC “at least several times a week” beginning in 1966, the FBI stepped up targeted coverage of Carmichael through its counterintelligence...
program (COINTELPRO). While Carmichael escaped significant retribution, he realized the import of civil rights leader Bayard Rustin’s advice years earlier that “the one thing you cannot do is criticize America from a foreign country.”

Carmichael’s presence in Cuba and participation in the OLAS fueled longstanding accusations of communism in the black freedom struggle. The nuances of Carmichael’s oscillating support for and criticism of socialism that would soon jeopardize his relationship with Castro mattered little. “To the liberals Stokely Carmichael had, once again, hurt the ‘cause’ of the Negro,” Julius Lester wrote, while “to the right-wing it was all the ‘proof’ they needed that SNCC, Black Power and the rebellions were Communist.” Syndicated columnists Robert Novak and Rowland Evans built on their longstanding accusations of communist elements in SNCC by characterizing its trajectory toward communism as “inevitable” and declaring that “there is no longer any doubt that SNCC today is Fidel Castro’s arm in the United States.” The National Review agreed: Carmichael’s new organizing project “most definitely came from Havana.” Both government agencies and media outlets suggested that SNCC received material aid, in the forms of guerilla training and funding, from Cuba. The State Department speculated that Castro made financial contributions to groups like SNCC, and U.S. News and World Report accused Castro of training SNCC members in guerrilla tactics. Cuba did aid insurgent groups in Latin America and Africa, but limited its financial assistance for African Americans to paying for travel or living expenses in Cuba. Carmichael and Castro forged a personal affinity through a shared tricontinental ideology rather than an institutional alliance through the apparatus of communism.

Carmichael’s trip also fomented existing tensions within SNCC. James Forman complained that Carmichael traveled to Cuba without SNCC permission and that he went beyond the group’s articulated position on the OLAS conference. While SNCC’s International Affairs Commission agreed that, “We see our struggle in the United States as closely related to struggles in Africa, Asia and Latin America,” it advocated further education about their distinct, respective struggles. To defeat racism, it suggested, “The best approach is a pragmatic approach based on the particular circumstances of a particular struggle and on a broad principle of political non-alignment.” Elizabeth Martinez also admitted to being “personally disturbed by certain aspects” of Carmichael’s visit, despite her agreement with his stated positions. Julius Lester recalled that they learned of the U.S. press attention Carmichael’s remarks had garnered when they “received an angry telephone call from the SNCC Central Committee demanding that Stokely keep his ‘damned mouth shut.’” Lester too remembered his time with Carmichael in Cuba with bitterness. Carmichael’s face time with Castro, his polemical rhetoric on the island, and his perceived status—as Lester put it—as “that strangest of anomalies, a revolutionary celebrity,” perpetuated the notion that SNCC embraced a top-down hierarchy at the expense of mass struggle.
Tension between Carmichael and SNCC was mutual; a letter from Carmichael sent shortly after leaving Cuba read: “I hope my trip and future trips will make things HOTTER for you all. . . . Those of us who are serious will carry on. I wish most of you would wake up and catch up with your people. They are ahead of you.”

Carmichael’s forced resignation from SNCC in July 1968 illustrated the increased conflict that marked the organization, specifically its perpetual grappling with questions concerning the nature of individual leadership in an avowedly mass struggle.

Regardless—or perhaps because—of conceptual differences with Castro regarding race, Carmichael’s visit had a significant impact on black Cubans. In the late 1960s Afro-Cubans were repressed by the Cuban state and harassed by other Cubans for an array of cultural and religious activities that demonstrated overt racial consciousness, ranging from wearing their hair in Afros to practicing forms of African religions.

Subjected to continuing economic disparities and racial prejudice, they held doubts about the tricontinental colorblind policies that the Cuban government espoused. “The Revolution says that Cubans and Vietnamese and black Americans are united in a common struggle. But we are not there yet,” a young Afro-Cuban told Elizabeth Martinez. Martinez observed how Carmichael’s visit to Cuba stirred racial consciousness among Cubans of African descent: “Black Cubans demonstrated a special response to his visit and concurrent events in Detroit and Newark. Never before, they said, had they had contact with a young fire-eating black leader like Stokely. . . . Blacks said they felt inspired by Stokely and sometimes torn, for he made them race-conscious and race-proud in a country where such attitudes were not encouraged.”

Despite potential ramifications, Afro-Cuban intellectuals convened to discuss issues of race in the 1960s, read Carmichael’s writings, and by some accounts met with Carmichael when he visited Cuba. Carmichael and subsequent visitors such as Angela Davis also motivated Afro-Cubans to wear their hair in natural styles and embrace other visual manifestations of Black Power and black pride, all of which caused uneasiness in the Cuban government. Carmichael’s visit thus reverberated through both formal government channels and among the Cuban population, including those that the Cuban government repressed.

Carmichael left Havana in mid-August 1967 to continue his travels, but his presence in Cuban society remained. Martinez described Carmichael’s continuing popularity at the rally for the second anniversary of Watts and the first Cuban “Day of Solidarity with the African American People” on August 18, 1967: “Carmichael had left by then, but some sixty thousand Cubans showed up on two or three days’ notice. They waved printed posters and also many homemade signs saying ‘Carmikel, we are with you!’ or ‘With our solidarity, we will protect Stokelis.’” Granma printed blurbs regarding his whereabouts in Asia and Africa while Cuban foreign correspondents recorded interviews with him abroad. The Cuban media continued to place Carmichael on equal footing with Cuba’s leaders when it distributed a letter he wrote after Che Guevara’s death in October 1967, where Carmichael penned: “I never met
Che Guevara in person but I do know him. I still know him now.”

His writings and speeches on Black Power helped initiate the *Tricontinental* magazine, were reviewed by the venerable journal *Casa de las Américas*, and appeared prominently in Cuban filmmaker Santiago Álvarez’s scathing documentary *LBJ*.

Ubiquitous press coverage of a sunglasses-clad Carmichael ensured his role as an icon and heartthrob. Jamaican writer Andrew Salkey recalled two Cuban girls asking if he knew Carmichael when attending the Havana Cultural Congress in January 1968, and journalist Arlene Eisen Bergman recounted in January 1969 that on a recent trip to Cuba she “met several Cuban girls, black and white, who carry his picture in their wallets.”

An ideological rupture limited, but did not terminate, Carmichael’s solidarity with Cuba. At an Oakland rally in February 1968 for imprisoned Black Panther Party leader Huey Newton, Carmichael characterized communism as an ideology not applicable to black people. “Communism is not an ideology suited for black people, period. Period. Socialism is not an ideology fitted for black people, period. Period,” he shouted. That African Americans were colonized rather than exploited as workers and that, “in their present form neither communism nor socialism speak to the problem of racism,” reflected Carmichael’s turn to black nationalism.

When in Cuba, Carmichael had not identified as a communist, but described Cuba as the socialist system “we like best.” Carmichael, who had interacted with socialists since high school in New York City and who considered the socialist Bayard Rustin a mentor from his days at Howard, consistently showed both an interest in socialist principles and a frustration with Marxist-Leninism. Yet his assertion was controversial enough to be omitted in the speech’s printing, and, coming six months after Castro’s public defense of him, to have allegedly disappointed the Cuban leader.

Eisen Bergman wrote of the subsequent frustration with Carmichael she encountered among Cubans, quoting one as explaining: “To say that communism isn’t relevant to black people is to say that black people ain’t human.” The *Casa de las Américas* journal illustrated Cuban intellectuals’ willingness to partake in the growing factionalism in the U.S. movement by translating a scathing letter written to Carmichael by Eldridge Cleaver in 1969.

Carmichael’s remarks, and rumors that he and his wife, South African singer Miriam Makeba, were CIA agents, hurt his relationship with Castro. Yet the conflict receded over time, leaving Carmichael’s personal connection to Cuba intact. In his memoir, he took pains to affirm that his support for the Cuban Revolution “has never wavered over the years. Never wavered.” In a 1976 letter reflecting upon his own aging, Carmichael mentioned Castro as a model of a leader who became more revolutionary with age. Carmichael later worked as a liaison to the Cuban embassy in Conakry; his assertion that “Africans have a lot to thank the Cubans for” demonstrated his support for Cuba’s policies in Africa. Likewise, Carmichael’s name has not been erased from Cuba’s historical memory like other onetime African American allies. Carmichael also traveled back to Cuba on more than one occasion, triumphal returns that he characterized as “the political expression of
our complete rapprochement, the final failure of the FBI’s campaign of slander and character assassination some years earlier.”126 He attended the thirtieth anniversary of the OLAS in Havana in 1997. He also spent time in Cuba receiving free medical treatment for what proved to be fatal cancer in the late 1990s. Carmichael’s trip to Cuba in 1967 helped chart his life’s course, and he never recanted his favorable opinion of the Cuban state.

The contradictions inherent in Carmichael’s trip abroad illuminated challenges in the U.S. and Cuba not only to create and maintain mass-led movements, but also to ally them. African American activists read, wrote, and spoke about the Cuban Revolution, traveled to the island, and lived there in exile over the next four decades. Six months after Carmichael’s Cuban sojourn, five additional members of SNCC attended the Havana Cultural Congress. While Castro and Carmichael established a connection that suggested the possibilities of an alliance forged through an anti-imperialist, anti-capitalist, and anti-racist tricontinental ideology, differences regarding the centrality of race in fighting oppression marked Carmichael and other black activists’ Cuban experiences. Carmichael’s personally transformative convergence with Castro did not lead to financial backing for U.S. black movements or the acceptance of racial consciousness in Cuba, but rather a space for Carmichael in a program of imagined, vanguard, tricontinental leadership that never fully blossomed. Their alliance ultimately remained more personal than institutional; their respective movements remained more separate than conjoined. Yet exploring Carmichael and Castro’s convergence illuminates the transnational routes of the black freedom struggle and the Cuban Revolution, conveying both the possibilities and the pitfalls of such well-worn paths.
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