Jim Crow Laws and the Spanish-American War

Posted on August 27, 2021

Introduction

The Jim Crow system and the Spanish-American War are often taught as separate topics: one concerns racial segregation within the United States, while the other concerns war, empire, and overseas expansion in 1898. Studied together, they reveal a central contradiction in the nation's development at the end of the nineteenth century. The United States expanded its power abroad while Black citizens in the South were being disfranchised, segregated, economically constrained, and subjected to racial violence. The original essay identifies the Fifteenth Amendment, *Plessy v. Ferguson*, the Cuban struggle against Spain, sensational journalism, the USS *Maine*, and the territorial results of the war. It also contains factual errors: the case was not "Ferguson v. Plessy," Jim Crow was not simply caused by abolition, and the cause of the *Maine* explosion was never conclusively established as a Spanish attack. This revised analysis first traces each history and then examines their intersection.

Part I: From Reconstruction to Jim Crow

The end of slavery did not automatically create equal citizenship. The Thirteenth Amendment abolished slavery except as criminal punishment, the Fourteenth established national citizenship and equal protection, and the Fifteenth prohibited denial of voting rights on account of race, color, or previous condition of servitude. During Reconstruction, Black men voted, served in government, organized schools and churches, and participated in biracial political coalitions. These gains threatened former slaveholders and other white Southerners who sought to restore control over labor and government. Jim Crow emerged from that counterrevolution. It was not a spontaneous cultural preference or an unintended effect of the Thirteenth Amendment. It was constructed through laws, administrative practices, economic pressure, violence, and judicial decisions that narrowed the practical meaning of Reconstruction.

Disfranchisement as the Foundation of Segregation

Voting rights were crucial because political power could protect schools, public services, jury participation, labor rights, and physical safety. White supremacist politicians used violence and fraud

during Reconstruction and later adopted poll taxes, literacy tests, complicated registration procedures, understanding clauses, white primaries, and grandfather clauses. These mechanisms were often written in formally race-neutral language but designed and administered to exclude Black citizens while preserving enough white participation to maintain legitimacy. Disfranchisement made other Jim Crow rules harder to challenge because the people most affected could not reliably select officials, serve on juries, or influence budgets. The system therefore cannot be understood only through “whites only” signs. Those signs were the visible surface of a political order built on restricted citizenship.

Segregation in Law and Daily Life

Jim Crow separated people in schools, trains, streetcars, hospitals, parks, libraries, restaurants, restrooms, neighborhoods, and many other settings. Facilities assigned to Black communities were typically inferior because segregation operated alongside unequal taxation, investment, and public authority. The rules also controlled etiquette. Black people could be punished socially or violently for challenging white precedence, addressing a white person incorrectly, or entering a space defined as white. Not every practice was written into a statute, but informal norms were enforced by employers, police, businesses, and mobs. This combination of state law and private coercion made racial hierarchy present in ordinary movement and interaction.

Plessy v. Ferguson and Constitutional Approval

In *Plessy v. Ferguson* (1896), the U.S. Supreme Court upheld Louisiana’s Separate Car Act after Homer Plessy challenged segregation on a railway. The majority concluded that legally separate facilities did not necessarily imply inequality, creating the constitutional doctrine later summarized as “separate but equal.” Justice John Marshall Harlan dissented, warning that the Constitution should not recognize racial caste. The decision did not invent segregation, but it gave state systems substantial constitutional protection. In practice, the equal part of the formula was rarely enforced. The Court’s approval showed how formal legal reasoning could treat imposed separation as neutral while ignoring power, stigma, and material inequality.

Racial Violence and Economic Control

Jim Crow relied on more than courts. Lynching, massacres, intimidation, convict leasing, debt peonage, and employment retaliation disciplined Black communities. Vague criminal laws and discriminatory enforcement supplied labor to state and private enterprises. Sharecropping and credit arrangements could trap families in debt, while exclusion from many jobs and unions limited mobility. Racial violence also punished economic success and political organization. The absence of federal anti-lynching law for much of the era demonstrated the limits of national commitment. A person could

possess constitutional rights on paper while facing local institutions that made exercising them dangerous.

Black Resistance and Institution Building

African Americans did not accept Jim Crow passively. They built schools, newspapers, businesses, mutual-aid societies, churches, legal organizations, and political movements. Ida B. Wells investigated and challenged lynching. Black lawyers and community groups litigated unequal education and voting restrictions. The Great Migration allowed millions to seek work and political opportunity outside the South, though segregation and discrimination also existed in northern and western cities. Strategies differed: some emphasized economic development and accommodation, others direct protest, federal enforcement, labor organizing, or Pan-Africanism. The later Civil Rights Movement emerged from decades of institution building rather than appearing suddenly after World War II.

The Long Dismantling of Legal Jim Crow

President Harry Truman ordered desegregation of the armed forces in 1948, and the Supreme Court's decision in *Brown v. Board of Education* (1954) rejected state-imposed segregation in public schools as inherently unequal. The Civil Rights Act of 1964 prohibited segregation and employment discrimination in major areas, while the Voting Rights Act of 1965 targeted barriers to voting. These achievements required sustained organizing, litigation, boycotts, journalism, and federal intervention. They dismantled much of the formal legal system but did not erase residential segregation, wealth inequality, unequal schooling, discriminatory enforcement, or voting conflict. Jim Crow is therefore both a historical regime and a warning about how formally neutral institutions can reproduce hierarchy.

Part II: Cuba and the Decline of Spanish Rule

The Spanish-American War grew from Cuba's long struggle against Spanish colonial rule. Cuban revolutionaries began a new war for independence in 1895 after earlier conflict had failed to secure sovereignty. Spain responded with military force and a reconcentration policy that moved rural civilians into controlled areas, contributing to disease, hunger, and death. Americans followed the conflict because Cuba was geographically close, U.S. businesses had economic interests there, and many citizens sympathized with anti-colonial rebellion. The United States was not the creator of Cuban independence aspirations. Any account that begins only with U.S. intervention erases the agency and sacrifice of Cuban revolutionaries.

Economic and Strategic Interests

U.S. policymakers and business leaders had interests in Cuban trade, sugar, property, and stability. Some also viewed Caribbean and Pacific expansion as a sign of national power and a way to support commerce and naval strategy. Alfred Thayer Mahan's arguments about sea power influenced elite thinking, while overseas markets attracted advocates of expansion. Economic interest alone does not fully explain the declaration of war, but it shaped which crisis received attention and what postwar arrangements became desirable. Humanitarian language, security concerns, commercial interest, and imperial ambition could coexist in the same policy. Historians therefore resist a single-cause explanation.

Yellow Journalism and Public Emotion

Newspapers associated with publishers such as William Randolph Hearst and Joseph Pulitzer used dramatic headlines, illustrations, and stories about Spanish brutality. The term "yellow journalism" describes sensational methods that could exaggerate, simplify, or publish weakly verified claims. Such coverage increased public attention and anger, but it did not mechanically force a reluctant government into war. Other newspapers were more cautious, and policymakers had strategic and political reasons of their own. The press is best understood as an amplifier that framed events, personalized suffering, and created pressure for action. It also shows how media competition can reward certainty and outrage during an unresolved crisis.

The de Lôme Letter and the USS Maine

In February 1898, a private letter written by Spanish minister Enrique Dupuy de Lôme was published in the United States and appeared to insult President William McKinley. Soon afterward, the battleship USS *Maine* exploded in Havana harbor, killing more than 260 U.S. sailors. Public suspicion quickly focused on Spain. Investigations over time have offered different explanations, including an external mine and an internal explosion, and the precise cause remains disputed. The slogan "Remember the Maine" transformed uncertainty into a mobilizing symbol. A careful history should not state that Spain was proven to have attacked the ship. The event's political effect was clear even though its technical cause was not.

From Intervention to War

McKinley sought concessions and an end to fighting, while Congress and public opinion moved toward intervention. In April 1898, Congress recognized Cuban independence, demanded Spanish withdrawal, and included the Teller Amendment, which disclaimed an intention to annex Cuba. Spain broke diplomatic relations, and war followed. The conflict occurred in both the Caribbean and the Pacific.

U.S. naval forces destroyed the Spanish fleet at Manila Bay, and U.S. and Cuban forces fought in Cuba. The war lasted only a few months, but the brevity of major combat should not obscure disease, logistical problems, and the role of local allies. More U.S. soldiers died from disease than combat, exposing weaknesses in military administration and public health.

Black Soldiers and the Domestic Racial Contradiction

African American regular Army units, including the soldiers later known as Buffalo Soldiers, served in Cuba and participated in major operations. Their service created a profound contradiction: Black troops fought under the U.S. flag in a war described as liberation while facing segregation, discrimination, and disfranchisement at home. Some Black newspapers and leaders hoped military service would strengthen claims to citizenship; others questioned an imperial project led by a government unwilling to protect its own Black citizens. White accounts sometimes minimized Black contributions or reproduced stereotypes. The war therefore became another arena in which patriotism, racial hierarchy, and demands for equality collided.

The Treaty of Paris and a New Imperial Position

The December 1898 Treaty of Paris ended Spanish rule in Cuba and transferred Puerto Rico, Guam, and the Philippines to the United States. Cuba became formally independent after U.S. occupation, but the Platt Amendment later allowed extensive U.S. influence and intervention. The annexation of the Philippines led to the Philippine-American War as Filipino nationalists resisted replacement of Spanish rule with U.S. sovereignty. These consequences make it misleading to describe the Spanish-American War only as a humanitarian liberation. It helped create an American overseas empire and prompted a major national debate between imperialists and anti-imperialists over consent, race, constitutional rights, and republican government.

The Insular Cases and Unequal Constitutional Space

After acquiring overseas territories, the Supreme Court decided a series of cases concerning whether the Constitution applied fully in those possessions. The Insular Cases developed a distinction between incorporated and unincorporated territories and allowed unequal constitutional treatment. The racial assumptions of the era influenced arguments that some populations were not ready for full self-government. This reasoning resembled domestic Jim Crow in an important respect: legal categories made political inequality appear administratively necessary. The histories are not identical—Black citizenship in the states and colonial status overseas involved different laws—but both were shaped

by debates over who was fit to exercise self-rule.

Synthesis: Expansion Abroad and Restriction at Home

The 1890s joined domestic racial consolidation with international expansion. In 1896, *Plessy* approved segregation; in 1898, the United States fought Spain and acquired territories; around the same period, southern states intensified disfranchisement. Political rhetoric celebrated liberty and civilization while law denied equal citizenship to Black Americans and limited self-determination overseas. Race influenced arguments about both problems. White supremacy justified Jim Crow by claiming Black political participation produced disorder, while imperialists sometimes claimed colonized peoples required Anglo-Saxon supervision. The shared logic was paternalism: power presented domination as protection or preparation.

Differences That Must Be Preserved

Connecting the histories should not collapse them into one event. Jim Crow was a domestic regime governing citizens and residents through racial caste, while the Spanish-American War arose from an international anti-colonial conflict and produced several different territorial outcomes. Cuban, Puerto Rican, Filipino, Spanish, and African American experiences cannot be treated as interchangeable. The analytical value lies in comparison: both histories reveal how legal ideals can coexist with unequal power, how media and violence shape policy, and how excluded people continue to assert agency. Preserving difference makes the connection more accurate rather than weaker.

Conclusion

Jim Crow developed as a deliberate counterrevolution against Reconstruction, using disfranchisement, segregation, economic coercion, judicial approval, and violence to restrict Black citizenship. *Plessy v. Ferguson* legitimized separate facilities, while Black resistance and the Civil Rights Movement eventually dismantled much of the formal system. The Spanish-American War arose from Cuba's independence struggle, U.S. humanitarian and strategic concerns, sensational press, economic interests, and the political impact of the USS *Maine* explosion. Spain's defeat ended much of its empire and made the United States an overseas imperial power. Studied together, the topics expose the contradiction of a nation claiming to liberate people abroad while enforcing racial hierarchy at home. They also demonstrate that constitutional promises depend on who possesses the power to interpret and enforce them.

Works Cited

Foner, Eric. *Reconstruction: America's Unfinished Revolution, 1863–1877*. Harper & Row, 1988.

Library of Congress. "Jim Crow and Segregation." *Primary Source Set*, https://www.loc.gov/classroom-materials/jim-crow-segregation/.

McCartney, Paul T. *Power and Progress: American National Identity, the War of 1898, and the Rise of American Imperialism*. Louisiana State UP, 2006.

Plessy v. Ferguson, 163 U.S. 537 (1896).

U.S. Department of State, Office of the Historian. "The Spanish-American War, 1898." *Milestones in the History of U.S. Foreign Relations*, https://history.state.gov/milestones/1866-1898/spanish-american-war.

Woodward, C. Vann. *The Strange Career of Jim Crow*. 3rd rev. ed., Oxford UP, 1974.