City University of New York (CUNY)
CUNY Academic Works

Publications and Research
College of Staten Island

2006

Buscando Ambiente: Hegemony and Subaltern Tactics of Survival in Puerto Rico’s Land Distribution Program

Ismael Garcia-Colon
CUNY College of Staten Island

How does access to this work benefit you? Let us know!

More information about this work at: https://academicworks.cuny.edu/si_pubs/215
Discover additional works at: https://academicworks.cuny.edu

This work is made publicly available by the City University of New York (CUNY).
Contact: AcademicWorks@cuny.edu

Buscando ambiente

Hegemony and Subaltern Tactics of Survival in Puerto Rico's Land Distribution Program

by
Ismael García-Colón,

A land distribution program in the community of Parcelas Gándaras in Cidra, Puerto Rico, transformed the lives of formerly landless workers. Examination of the working conditions and social relations of workers before the program (1890s–1945) and their economic strategies, migration, and networks after becoming small landholders (1945–1960s shows how they used their land to accommodate their practices of everyday life and their tactics of survival. Local ruling groups became hegemonic through the establishment of land distribution communities. The habitus of the new landholders expressed the ways in which they engaged in economic, social, and political activities shaped by the new urban space established by land distribution. In the process, recipients of land shaped the program to fit their everyday life, while the colonial state became hegemonic.

Keywords: *Land Reform, Urban Space, Habitus, Puerto Rico, Workers*

From the 1940s though the 1960s, the Puerto Rican population experienced the impact of development policies prompted by global, regional, and local processes, policies that profoundly changed the rural and agricultural character of the island's society. These policies transformed subaltern lives and the way in which working people managed to survive. Landless workers helped shape government strategies of development, labor systems, and economic structures. Studying their transformation into landholders in the course of land reform can contribute to an understanding of the ways in which ordinary people overcome difficult living conditions in order to survive or improve their status. It reveals both the impact of government devel-

Ismael García-Colón, the grandchild of landless workers, received his Ph.D. in anthropology from the University of Connecticut in 2002. He has worked for the Center for Puerto Rican Studies at Hunter College, CUNY, documenting the history of Puerto Ricans and Latinos in New York. He has also taught in the Department of Puerto Rican and Hispanic Caribbean Studies at Rutgers University. He is currently researching and writing on power, land reform, and urban space in Puerto Rico.

LATIN AMERICAN PERSPECTIVES, Issue XXX, Vol. 33 No. 1, January 2006 1-24
DOI: 10.1177/0094582X05283514
© 2006 Latin American Perspectives

opment policies on the lives of subalterns and the subalterns' ability to redefine and use those policies to their benefit, maneuvering within the established fields of power without necessarily threatening the state.

This article analyzes the transformation in the lives of landless workers (landless workers) who became *parceleras/os* (parcel holders), residents of a community established by the land distribution program of the insular government of Puerto Rico.[1] Landless workers who resided on the property of their employers and received wages in cash and/or goods or services became residents of a resettlement community such as Parcelas Gándaras, the community in which I grew up in the municipality of Cidra, in the east-central part of the island. I describe their lives before the land distribution program and after and attempt to show how they developed new tactics of survival and resisted and redefined government plans.[2] *Buscando ambiente* (looking for opportunities), a phrase used by both the landless and the parcel holders, expresses the desire to improve one's living conditions by looking for a place that offers better economic and social opportunities. Gándaras symbolized this new place, promising a better life.

The colonial state in Puerto Rico attempted to regulate, discipline, and maintain landless workers as an available labor force. From the nineteenth century through the 1930s, politicians, academics, and intellectuals perceived manifold social and economic problems and tried to solve them through new forms of state intervention in people's lives. Landlessness, lack of labor discipline, rural-to-urban migration, land concentration, and single-crop cultivation became pressing political issues that both the Spanish colonial government and the U.S. colonial government sought to address through experiments with land reform such as agricultural colonies, urban developments, and rural communities (Clark et al., 1975 [1930]; Fleagle, 1975 [1917]; López Tuero, 1891; Rodríguez Vera, 1929). In the 1930s the social conditions in the island had drastically changed with the Great Depression, and the authorities were also confronting a volatile situation because of the nationalist movement and labor strikes. In this political climate, land reform encountered strong support among U.S. government officials and liberal politicians. In the 1940s the Puerto Rican government, under the radical New Deal Governor Rexford G. Tugwell and the populist Partido Popular Democrático (Popular Democratic Party—PPD), began to implement a comprehensive plan of resettlement for the landless.[3]

Under Title V of the Land Law of 1941, the government of Puerto Rico established land distribution communities called *parcelas* for landless families. Those who qualified for the program were heads of households living on someone else's land whose only means of support was their wages. They were to receive free parcels for residential purposes and for subsistence

farming. Title V also stipulated that residents of the community hold only tax-free usufruct rights rather than ownership titles. Tenants could not transfer, sell, change, rent, give, or assign their rights of usufruct without losing rights to their parcels. Title V's intention was to "democratize" land tenure through land distributions, eliminate social relations of servitude, and settle Puerto Rico's highly mobile landless workers.[4]

COMMUNITIES UNBOUND: THEORETICAL CONSIDERATIONS

Recent studies of mid-twentieth-century Puerto Rico conclude that the land distribution program's goal was to gain the electoral support of landless workers for the PPD (González Díaz, 1999; Pantojas García, 1990). However, this literature overlooks the fact that landless workers were active participants in the deep transformation of their everyday life generated by the program. In addition, scholars have studied the migration of workers to the United States as a response to government policies and worsening economic conditions without recognizing that migration was a tactic of survival in the everyday life of landless workers and later of parcel holders.

While scholars of Latin America and the Caribbean have overlooked Puerto Rico's land distribution communities, leading anthropologists such as Sidney Mintz were studying them as part of "the Puerto Rico project" in the late 1940s. Sponsored by the Center for Social Research at the University of Puerto Rico, the Puerto Rico project was an ethnographic study directed by Julian Steward on the island in 1948 and 1949. Steward and his disciples (1956) studied Puerto Rico as a complex and heterogeneous society through case studies of different types of communities producing a specific agricultural export commodity. This was the first attempt to integrate community history into larger global historical processes—a break from traditional community studies in that it did not consider its subjects "isolated primitives" (Lauria-Perricelli, 1989; Wolf, 2002: 225; Roseberry, 1989: 146–153). This study draws on the efforts of that project and addresses Eric Wolf's criticism that it failed "to deal with the complex interplay of hegemonic and subaltern cultural stances in the Puerto Rican situation" (2002: 226).[5] It explains some of those "subaltern cultural stances" and their relationship to hegemonic processes in the land distribution program.

The Puerto Rican case is especially relevant in that U.S. government officials used the island as a model for foreign policy with regard to the South and the Third World. Thus, the industrialization program known as Operation Bootstrap became an example to be emulated by other countries, and Puerto Rican officials in the U.S. government showcased the land distribution

program as a model (Moscoso, 1961). Some of the more developed land distribution communities in Puerto Rico became model communities for foreign delegations visiting the island. However, the discourses of economic development underlying modernization theory do not show how landless families managed to settle those communities. Puerto Rico's land reform is one of a number of projects in the United States, Latin America, and the Caribbean in which the state attempted to expand and consolidate its power through the establishment of communities. The program is a model of urbanization to facilitate the development of a manufacture-oriented economy. This article addresses whether the government succeeded in asserting its power over landless workers and examines the role of the workers in that process. I situate my analysis of the everyday life of the landless and the parcel holders in the context of the anthropological literature on hegemony, subalternity, and state formation in Latin America.

Anthropologists use Gramsci's concept of hegemony—ruling groups' exercise of power through consent and coercion—to examine political practices. Struggle, conflict, and antagonism are integral to hegemonic processes. Subaltern political practice involves resistance, domination, and accommodation to changing social scenarios of struggle and livelihood. Subordinated groups continuously contest and re-create hegemony (Nugent, 1997: 11; Roseberry, 1993: 358–361; 1994: 359–361). James Scott (1985) and, more recently, Jon Beasley-Murray (2003) have challenged the concept of hegemony by equating it with ideology (Smith, 1999: 119–120). For example, Beasley-Murray notes that hegemony is "a theory about the social efficacy of ideology" (2003: 118). They hold that the values and understandings of subalterns are never in complete accord with the ideologies of dominant groups. In contrast, Gramscian reinterpretations of the concept have pointed out that hegemony is not and does not produce ideology. Instead, focusing on Pierre Bourdieu's concept of habitus, some scholars argue that hegemony produces a shared framework or habitus to be followed by ruling and subaltern groups in their everyday life. Bourdieu (1977) defines habitus as "durable dispositions," structures of thought that influence individuals to take certain paths of action. This shared framework or habitus shapes the tactics and understandings of subalterns but does not determine them; class, gender, ethnicity, and other social positions also influence practice. In other words, subalterns maneuver and choose tactics of survival influenced by these dominant dispositions, their experiences, and their positions within the structures of power. Thus, habitus contributes to an understanding of subalterns' struggles within fields of power without focusing on their support for ruling groups and dominant ideologies (Binford, 1998: 9–10; Bourdieu, 1977: 85–86; Roseberry, 1994: 361). Applying the concepts of hegemony and habitus to the case of

Puerto Rico points to the importance of examining the lives of landless workers before and after land reform to analyze how they used the government's program to enhance their tactics of survival and how the ruling groups that controlled the colonial state became hegemonic.

Another perspective that contributes to the understanding of the land distribution program is the analysis of urban space. In establishing land distribution communities, the Puerto Rican government intended to urbanize the countryside. These urban spaces created by the government's land reform program shaped the social relations and social practices of their residents. In turn, these social relations and social practices of residents shaped the social construction of land distribution communities. Subalterns' creative use of new spatial forms is part of their struggle to survive physically as well as culturally. Habitus structures social practice, creating opportunities to resist and redefine the hegemonic strategies implied in the social organization of space (Harvey, 1989: 233; Low, 1996: 861–863). Land distribution communities became the new social scenarios where ruling groups attempted to assert their power over working-class families and where workers resisted and shaped government policies of development.

I argue that local ruling groups became hegemonic through the establishment of land distribution communities, which in turn produced new forms of habitus. Before the land distribution program, the social relations of *agrego*—of hiring or being part of the landless labor force—dictated their habitus—tactics of economic survival such as migrating from one plantation to another looking for a place with better living conditions and engaging in various economic activities. After settling on their parcels, former landless families continued to use migration and other economic activities in order to accommodate to their new social condition of landholders and the hegemony of the ruling groups. Their new habitus consisted of the ways in which they engaged in economic, social, and political activities in the new communities (Bourdieu, 1977: 85–86; Gramsci, 1971: 52–55, 80 n. 19, 245, 260–264).

LIFE AS LANDLESS WORKERS BEFORE 1940

Subalterns constantly challenge and reaffirm the hegemony of elites. Hegemony produces habitus when subalterns accept the subordinated social relations and cultural boundaries established by hegemonic groups. Subalterns resist or accord legitimacy to their rulers through their everyday concerns, conversations, and other cultural expressions. Open rebellion and collective public defiance against the ruling groups are signs of counterhegemony. During the 1930s, the social, economic, and political

conditions on the island undermined and eventually ended the hegemony of local ruling groups, the U.S. sugar corporations, and their allies. The Great Depression, the New Deal, and World War II profoundly changed the situation, allowing a new sector of Puerto Rican society, the technocrats and liberal politicians grouped in the PPD, to gain strength and consolidate local rule.[6]

The lives of landless workers were characterized by exploitation and poverty. By the end of the nineteenth century, landless workers and small landowners had become increasingly dependent on an economy tied to foreign markets. After winning the Spanish-American War in 1898, the United States took possession of the island. Under the new sovereign power, Puerto Rico experienced the penetration of large U.S. corporate capital and the expansion of sugar and tobacco production.[7] In the municipality of Cidra and in the east-central region as a whole, tobacco production expanded dramatically during the first two decades of U.S. colonization. This boom transformed the livelihoods of small landowners and landless workers, who now worked almost exclusively in tobacco cultivation. The decline of tobacco prices at the end of the 1920s deeply influenced everyday life in Cidra and other tobacco regions (Baldrich, 1988).

Landless families endured not only material deprivation but also discrimination from ruling groups and had little protection. Usually, they woke up at 4 or 5 A.M., drank a cup of black coffee if they had a little money, walked sometimes for an hour to their jobs, and started working at 6 A.M. Exhausted by working all day, they came home merely to eat and sleep. When wives worked in the fields, the elderly would take care of the children and the housework. Men worked in the fields doing the heavy tasks such as lifting and cutting cane, while women worked in domestic service, needlework, and cigar making, as well as in the home. In some cases children as young as seven also worked in the fields or in commercial establishments. Juana, a former landless worker and parcela resident, remembers working conditions in the fields: “I lived in the land of Don Fructuoso Fernández. . . . We had to sow and clear the land, and if any part of the crop died, we wouldn’t be offered a job again. . . . We couldn’t stop sowing. We worked from sunrise to sunset.” Not surprisingly, conflicts between landowners and workers arose: “Once, Compai Cristino Falcón, who was a cane cutter, was working with a team of cutters. . . . He fell behind because a reed was obstructing his cutting. And Compai Tanas Santiago, who was the foreman, reprimanded him. Cristino complained. Another time, Eusebio Fernández arrived late, and the foreman scolded him. Eusebio answered him back, ‘I’ll work if I feel like it.146” As a result of these conflicts, workers often lost their jobs, which in the case of landless families meant losing their homes. In contrast to the situation in the

sugarcane regions, where the Socialist Party and the labor movement were active, workers lacked any formal organized protection on the coffee, tobacco, and fruit plantations. Without labor unions to defend them from unscrupulous employers, their alternative was to confront their bosses and supervisors or to abandon their jobs.

Wages were also a source of conflict. Most employers paid workers with vouchers or tokens to be redeemed only at their stores. A former landless worker recalls a conflict over this form of payment:

> The Gándara family had a store behind the church. . . . They paid with vouchers that were distributed at noon as payment for the previous afternoon and that morning. The foreman distributed the voucher with his signature. One day, I went to the store with the voucher. I remember that Don Ciso Gándara was the administrator. He only gave me a bit of flour, sugar, rice, and codfish. . . . My father was supposed to earn thirty cents. . . . When I arrived with the groceries, my stepmother didn't know what to do, since it was too little food to prepare lunch. At noon, when my father came from cutting cane to have lunch, he found that my stepmother had not made lunch. . . . Then she explained to him what happened. He said to me, "Come with me," and grabbed the bag with the little food in it. When we arrived at the store, he asked for Ciso. My father threw the bag at him and asked, "Ciso, why did you send me this worthless stuff? Do I work for this?" My father left the job, but because he was a fast cane cutter the Gándaras went to look for him right away. He used to work very hard, for which they paid him extra. That never happened again. Now, my father was well respected. Whenever a foreman pushed the workers too hard, he fought back, and that is why they respected him.

Authoritarian and exploitative treatment of workers also created conflict. Workers responded with verbal and physical violence and sabotage. Sometimes the only option for landless workers was to migrate to another plantation. Pastor, a former landless worker, told me that his father sometimes had to leave his job and move his family because the landowner pressured him excessively. He recalls moving from Comerío to Cidra, where they lived in the ward of Montellano for three years, then to the Finca La Julia in the sector of Miramonte, on to the municipality of Caguas, and finally back to Cidra. Pastor says that his father always found a new job.

At the same time, social relations of co-parenthood,[8] patronage, and friendship tied landless families to landowners. Landowners provided workers with personal favors, medical care, and food, and some also exercised their political power, offering workers access to government services such as health care, housing, and part-time jobs (Padilla, 1956: 275–276). These peaceful social relations, including loans, tokens, and better salaries, served as mechanisms for avoiding conflict and maintaining a captive labor force.

Ethnic identity played an important role in class relations between the landless and the elite. Landless workers constituted a social class in terms of their relationship to the process of production. While they did not distinguish themselves culturally from the small landowners, they did recognize their differences from the elite, identifying themselves as *jíbaros*or rural folk. In some cases ties of kinship or co-parenthood linked landless families and small landowners (Picó, 1983: 46–63). Small landowners could be former landless families and vice versa, and some families or individuals went back and forth between the two. Many families became landless because of their inability to pay taxes and mortgages. In other cases, the children of small landowners became landless after they married because of the scarcity of land to inherit, their parents' bankruptcy, or lack of financial resources. To a lesser degree, some landless workers succeeded in leasing land, accumulating money, and obtaining credit to acquire land.

In contrast, the elite—made up of landowners, colonial administrators, and merchants—were mostly of direct Spanish or European ancestry or from the United States. Social class and cultural boundaries between the elite and the jíbaros were visible and openly asserted by both sectors. Subalterns called members of the elite *blanquitos* (little whites), and the latter called themselves "good families." Until the first half of the twentieth century, people of Spanish and European ancestry and U.S. landowners and their direct descendants dominated the region of Cidra and controlled economic as well as cultural capital, which was articulated through European education and manners, clothing, language, and Hispanic identity or *hispanidad* (Hispanic heritage). Discord between classes was expressed through name-calling. For example, the elite used "jíbaro" as a synonym for "ignorant,"[9] while subalterns referred to dominant classes as *come-mierdas*.[10] Children experienced this friction in school, where teachers gave preferential treatment to blanquitos.

The Great Depression heightened the difficulties that landless workers were already confronting. U.S. intervention hastened the introduction of technological innovations in agriculture, monocrop export-oriented production, wage-earning relations, the growth of corporations, and the erosion of paternalistic social relations between landowners and workers. At the end of the 1930s, estimates place unemployment between 60 and 70 percent. Health, nutrition, housing, education, and working conditions remained precarious. Between 1932 and 1933 the cost of living increased approximately 30 percent. While the average weekly cost of an adequate diet per person was $3.19 per week, the average wage was approximately $3 per week. At the end of the 1930s food prices remained high because of Puerto Rico's dependence on food imports such as rice and codfish (Dietz, 1986: 139–142; Pons, 1941;

Quintero Rivera, 1985: 47–71). Declining salaries, inflation, hurricanes, population growth, and rising unemployment put the very survival of landless workers at risk.

The crisis of the 1930s caused strikes, social unrest, and radical political militancy. In Cidra, the unemployed protested by demanding work (Silvestrini, 1979: 87). Tobacco growers rebelled against the monopoly of large corporations (Baldrich, 1988), and strikes by dock and sugar workers and nationalist clashes with the police were prominent events (Dietz, 1986: 135–181). This decade was a period of social, cultural, and economic disruption that caused many landless workers to migrate both within the rural areas and to the cities and the United States. Increasing poverty and dissent were threatening the hegemony of the traditional ruling groups and U.S. colonialism. These transformations shifted political loyalties, realigned political factions, and allowed new groups with hegemonic aspirations to emerge.

CREATING OPPORTUNITIES: BUILDING COMMUNITIES

Poor living conditions for landless families remained unchanged throughout the early 1940s. The effects of World War II hit them the hardest, as they were the ones already suffering the worst scarcity. Wartime interrupted their food supply (Tugwell, 1975 [1945]: 78). Excluded from the spheres of power and wealth, they constituted approximately half of the island's population, and the ruling groups saw the need to improve these conditions for the sake of social order.

In this context, the PPD emerged in 1938 as a new political force under the broad banner of social justice. Led by Luis Muñoz Marín, it placed the distribution of land to landless agricultural workers on its platform. Its slogan was "Bread, Land, and Freedom." Its position on land and the new political practices of listening to the rural population and speaking in its language earned the PPD the landless workers' electoral support. Given that 70 percent of the population was rural and 80 percent of that was landless, land distribution was attractive to a large percentage of the population (Mejías, 1946: 27). The landless thus became the electoral base of the PPD.

In 1940 the PPD won the majority of seats in the Senate and achieved de facto control of the Chamber of Representatives. One of the first measures it adopted was the Land Law of 1941. Eliminating landlessness and improving living conditions for thousands were important for maintaining social peace, a matter of strategic concern during World War II. This made the PPD, a pro–New Deal party, more attractive not only to subalterns but also to the Roosevelt administration in Washington. As a gesture affirming the PPD's

legitimacy, President Franklin D. Roosevelt appointed Rexford G. Tugwell as governor of Puerto Rico. Tugwell and the PPD reorganized the government and generated the necessary support for the land distribution program. In Cidra, landless workers were enthusiastic about the PPD's promises and eagerly awaited the new program.

In 1942 the government began to establish the first communities. The first land distribution in the community of Parcelas Gándaras occurred in 1945. Corporations fiercely fought the expropriations in the courts. The landowning and Republican opposition interrupted ceremonies of land distribution and campaigned against the program, criticizing its potential negative effects on agricultural production. Some employers understood that the distribution would allow their workers to leave their jobs more freely. As Fundadora recalls:

> I told the Postmaster and Consuelo, "I am not going to work tomorrow because I want to go see if they can give me a parcel," and she responded, "You will not inquire about any parcels because you are not allowed to leave this place!" I said, "What do you mean I can't get out of here? I want to get a house for myself." Then she got even angrier and didn't want me to leave. She would say, "If this one leaves, who's going to do the housework for me as well as she does?" I used to do everything for her. I washed and ironed the clothes, cleaned, and cooked; that's why she didn't want me to leave.

Despite what her employer thought, Fundadora participated in the program and was the first to receive a plot of land in Parcelas Gándaras.

Throughout the 1940s and 1950s, the land distribution program reached more of the rural population than any other government program. With land expropriated from corporations and individual landowners, the government established communities as extension of towns and in areas far from urban centers. These communities consisted of plots ranging from one and a half to a quarter of an acre. The size of the communities varied from a handful to hundreds of families. By the mid-1940s it had allocated more than 14,000 plots of land, and by the late 1950s one-tenth of the population lived in land distribution communities. In 1970, the population living in land distribution communities represented 14 percent of the families on the island (Departamento de Agricultura y Comercio de Puerto Rico, 1971: 42; Edel, 1962: 48; 1963: 32, 46; United States Bureau of the Census, 1973: 695–696). Nevertheless, there was a wide gap between the government's rhetoric on land distribution and the funding provided for its implementation. The government had planned to provide residents with urban facilities, government services, and labor, but the first landless families settled in Parcelas Gándaras lacked electricity, potable water, proper sanitary facilities, garbage

collection, roads, and adequate sources of labor. Government agencies failed to provide them with the tools to build the communities.

Land distribution did not change the precarious housing conditions of the former landless workers in the Parcelas Gándaras. With limited access to cash and durable construction materials, they built their houses of thatch, pieces of wood, cans, and galvanized steel. Domingo, a parcela holder, described the process as follows:

> By that time, I was working in Santurce and had some money to build the house. I came for a weekend with the purpose of building it. When I decided to build the house back then, the whole property was full of bushes, but I did not care. I went to the house of Tutito Fernández Sariego to cut wood in the forest, and it cost me $3.00. I rented a truck to bring the wood for a bottle of rum: that cost me a quarter. Later, on Sunday, I went to Comerío to look for my father. I also brought my oldest son and found yet another person. In a week I built the house, adding cardboard and can metal. I continued fixing it little by little.

Other people with fewer resources built *bohíos* (thatched huts) as the island's indigenous people had built their houses centuries before. The majority of families could not afford to build durable houses. As a result, residents protested, demanding housing construction assistance, electricity, and water (Edel, 1962: 57; 1963: 33–34).

By organizing committees and contacting PPD leaders, residents pushed the government to improve living conditions in the communities. Unable to provide all the infrastructure and services needed, the government began to establish new programs that involved community cooperation. In 1948 the land distribution program became part of the Social Programs Administration (SPA), the goal of which was to improve the socioeconomic conditions of residents. Its Mutual Aid Program provided parcel holders with construction materials on credit while participants donated the work (Cuevas Cruz, 1990: 128, 153). In some cases residents paid others or sent relatives to cover their participation in other people's houses. While living and working in San Juan and the United States, some parcel holders were able to send money home in order to participate in the program. After migrating to San Juan, Domingo rebuilt his house by saving money to pay for the labor and the construction materials. Some parcel holders did not participate in the Mutual Aid Program because they could not pay the costs or provide the labor. Instead of building through that program, Ramón, who had immigrated to the United States leaving his wife María with a large family to feed, had to build a wooden house little by little. Residents who participated in the program continued rebuilding and expanding their houses. Although some houses were

made of concrete and provided a better safeguard against weather conditions, they were still small.

Programs such as Mutual Aid were compatible with the people's notions of self-help and work. Residents also held meetings, created committees, and went to government authorities with requests. According to Concepción, a parcel holder, when problems arose in the community, neighbors formed committees and went to the Municipal Hall to ask for assistance: "We used to meet either in my house or Calderón's. We would discuss our needs, and then we would head to the Mayor's Office. There they would tell us whether or not they could help us. If they couldn't help us, they would give us some help for the moment and tell us to continue forward doing the rest on our own." Monserrate, a resident, also recounts that neighbors went to protest at the Municipal Hall to ask for access to potable water and better roads so that the ambulance could pick up sick people.

The purpose of the land distribution program was to both urbanize the countryside and improve the living conditions of the rural population. The urbanization and government services of the early 1940s were intended to prevent massive migration from the countryside to the cities, but these initiatives failed to stop the migration. In the 1950s "tens of thousands of agregados moved directly to the cities, and those resettled on parcels often moved too" (Edel, 1963: 28–50). Land distribution communities offered a secure place from which workers could leave their families in order to venture to the cities and the United States.

Land distribution communities were urban spaces planned and designed by the government but built and defined by their residents. The hegemony of ruling groups dictated the use of space; residents created the infrastructure needed for their everyday life and utilized government programs to expand their opportunities for earning a living. For the state it was a struggle against the political opposition to transform the relations of power between landowners and landless workers. For the people it was a struggle to improve their living conditions. The communities created a new habitus, a new way to use resources for livelihood within the fields of power.

LIVELIHOOD IN THE LAND DISTRIBUTION COMMUNITIES

During the 1950s and 1960s, parcels provided residents with ways of finding new sources of income. At the same time, new development policies affected the sources of employment and economic activities of the parcel holders. Government planners and social scientists from Puerto Rico and the United States prescribed industrialization, migration to the United States,

and family planning as solutions to unemployment and poverty (Senior, 1953; Stycos and Hill, 1953). These policies shaped the lives of parcel holders, but they did not determine their tactics for survival. The development of land distribution in the Parcelas Gándaras was the product not only of government policies but also of the participation of residents. The hegemony of ruling groups depended on the success of the program in providing new ways of surviving rather than on the creation of highly developed government housing projects. The new habitus created by this new urban space had to provide residents with the necessary instruments and tactics for making a living. At the same time, it was through their everyday life and survival tactics that they influenced and shaped land reform.

The former landless workers' means of subsistence had changed drastically. Before the land distribution, their principal occupations were in tobacco, sugarcane, pineapple, citrus fruit, and minor crop cultivation, and some of the women were domestic workers. After the establishment of Parcelas Gándaras, sources of income included subsistence garden cultivation, jobs in government service, cigar production, textiles, construction, plumbing, maintenance, laundries, transportation, and the food industry, sewing, peddling, the gathering of herbs, fishing, and cooking (Padilla, 1956: 284–287). These jobs brought better living conditions, improved nutrition and housing.

Because agricultural workers spent two-thirds of their income on food, garden cultivation was an important supplement to residents' income (Packard, 1948: 99). They cultivated *batatas*, squashes, citrus, plantains, yautias, *malangas*, yucca, bananas, celery, beans, corn, and tomatoes. Pastor states that his family and neighbors fed themselves with the crops from his wife's parcel. He also worked in agriculture, while Fundadora continued to be a domestic worker to supplement their income. They had to work for cash in order to obtain other necessities such as lard, rice, codfish, meat, and clothes. They also cultivated crops, tobacco, and flowers for commercial purposes. A few households cultivated tobacco until the mid-1970s, when the crops no longer covered their expenses. In addition, people raised chickens, pigs, goats, cows, and horses and produced charcoal and *ron caña* (illegally distilled rum).

Moreover, possessing a parcel meant that residents could look for nonagricultural employment and migrate to the United States. Nonagricultural jobs offering higher pay were increasingly attractive as agriculture became a symbol of backwardness and a difficult and negative past. Residential stability made job mobility easier, allowing family members to migrate and leave their relatives living in a secure place without the risk of eviction. When I asked one parcel holder why he had migrated to San Juan in the 1950s, he replied,

"To earn 30 or 40 cents, one had to work from 6:00 A.M. to 6:00 P.M. without a lunch break." Underemployment was particularly high among residents who worked in the cultivation of their own parcels or in agriculture or were seasonal migrants to the United States.

In Parcelas Gándaras, residents struggled to improve their standard of living by moving to higher-paying jobs. Women found work in manufacturing and textiles. Monserrate, an agricultural worker cultivating her parcel, worked for Cayey's Consolidated Cigar Company from 1968 to 1983. Most of the emigrants were men who had left their wives behind to find work in manufacture and government service. Children worked in agriculture and in shops. Fundadora's twelve-year-old son earned $12 a month working in a cafeteria. An increasing number of men entered government and service-sector jobs. Juan, for example, followed in the footsteps of his foster father, Eduardo, and worked for 30 years with the Puerto Rico Department of Public Works. Félix worked as a fire fighter. Blas, a community leader actively involved in the PPD, worked in a government program for the control of cattle diseases. This reflects the expansion of government services that increased public administration jobs from 2.5 percent in 1940 to 15.5 percent in 1970 (Dietz, 1986: 258). Like Blas and Eduardo, most parcel holders had originally been agricultural workers. Not until the 1950s did residents of the Parcelas Gándaras begin to abandon agriculture as their primary source of income. Employment in the agricultural sector decreased from 44.7 percent in 1940 to 9.9 percent 1970, while the manufacturing sector experienced an increase from 10.9 percent to 19.2 percent (Dietz, 1986: 258). This shift from agricultural to manufacturing, public administration, and service-sector employment in large cities went hand in hand with Operation Bootstrap and the strength of the PPD's local rule through the establishment of the constitution of 1952.[11] Operation Bootstrap was the government strategy of industrialization and development that attracted U.S. capital through tax exceptions, training of workers, and infrastructure.

Migration contributed to the abandonment of agriculture. Operation Bootstrap pulled away many residents from land distribution communities, small towns, and rural areas to the metropolitan area of San Juan. Domingo first moved to Cayey and later to Santurce to work as a barber and later moved back to his town and opened his own barbershop with money saved in the cities. Others moved to San Juan to fill positions in hotels as handymen. Escribano migrated to San Juan in the 1950s, where he worked as a truck driver for the Department of Public Works and as a taxi driver for $122 monthly to keep his children in school. He also worked in catering to increase his income, sometimes moonlighting and working evenings and weekends. In 1972 he retired and came back to his parcel. Other parcel holders went to

the United States for seasonal agricultural work, mostly picking tomatoes, strawberries, and tobacco in Illinois, New Jersey, and Connecticut. The Migration Division of the Puerto Rico Department of Labor facilitated and promoted emigration, negotiating contracts for agricultural workers and organizing their transportation (Lapp, 1989). The emigration experiences of parcel holders are diverse. For example, Avelino immigrated to Illinois in the 1950s. Migration organizers told him that he was going to work on engineering, building irrigation systems for agricultural fields. He was misled and ended up working as an agricultural laborer. Other parcel holders such as Blanco spent two decades continuously working in New Jersey and Connecticut. Some of these migrants, such as Avelino, came back with money to invest in small shops. María recounts that her family worked with a local landowner until work became scarce and people began to emigrate in the 1950s. Although the migration of many Puerto Ricans to the United States occurred during this period, it was not a forced resettlement but a well-orchestrated plan sponsored by the government of Puerto Rico to get rid of surplus population. However, migration was not voluntary because of the economic constraint experienced by residents and landless families. For many parcel holders and landless workers it was the only option and hope of improving one's living conditions. Other parcel holders did not migrate, however, and it appears that it was because they had more stable sources of income. Some women supplemented their income by working for the government in school lunchrooms, factories, and domestic service.

Parcel holders were not mere recipients of government aid. They both resisted and accommodated to the economic changes sweeping the island. They took advantage of being landholders to develop new survival strategies such as emigration, farming, and the learning of new skills. The low salaries and the negative connotations associated with agriculture affected their decisions. Industrialization did not necessarily provide residents with the employment they needed. Instead, migration, an old alternative of resistance and survival against the domination of landowners, became an important means to higher income. Industrialization and migration reduced underemployment and stabilized the levels of unemployment. Creating a better place to live depended on the ability of residents to make use of their new social status.

COMMUNITY NETWORKS AND SOCIAL RELATIONS

Parcel holders created new and transformed old forms of social relations in their communities. Many people maintained old social ties even as they

extended their networks by creating new ones. Relations among community members continued to emphasize cooperation and mutual aid. Kinship, coparenthood, and community solidarity strengthened the sense of cohesion and maintained ties with members of other communities. In addition, industrial development altered gender relations. Land reform communities helped create the networks necessary for residents to obtain their livelihood and permitted the construction of a habitus that reinforced the legitimacy of the ruling groups.

Most people in the community knew each other through being related, coparents, friends, co-workers, or residents of the same landowner's estate. Several were former employees of Elmer Ellsworth, a PPD leader and U.S. landowner. Other residents were siblings. Even today, people refer to some community sectors by the last names of families that settled parcels in a given area, such as Los Escribanos and Los Ruizes. In some cases, the children of residents married, uniting families. Other residents established relations of co-parenthood with their closest neighbors. These relationships reinforced community cohesion by creating new networks of solidarity. These social relations allowed residents to solicit help from a wider range of relatives and friends inside and outside the community. Finding a job, beginning a business, sharing food, transporting a sick family member, migrating, and dealing with a family tragedy were some of the situations in which help from neighbors was essential.

Distribution of products from their smallholdings was another way in which residents assisted their neighbors and relatives. Santiago, Pastor, and Monserrate remember that they cultivated the land, enjoyed their harvest, and still had food left for their neighbors and relatives to share. A traditional practice for the landless, sharing food continued to be valuable for cementing social relations and ensuring one's physical survival. Residents also provided help to relatives and neighbors through cash and labor. Concepción Rivera Santiago bought the improvements and house from the original holders of his parcel with money lent to him by relatives and friends. Organizing *juntas* was another mechanism brought to the community from the traditional customs of small landowners. A *junta* was a meeting of neighbors and relatives to help in the cultivation or harvest of beans, corn, tobacco, or garden produce. In the highlands of Cidra, small landowners practiced this form of collective labor. In Parcelas Gándaras, Monserrate says, "People lived at the same level. Everyone treated each other equally. My husband sowed, and the neighbors used to come and peel the ears of corn and the beans."

Residents enjoyed a more stable economic and social position than their landless relatives. In the 1960s when the government approved the subdivision of parcels, this situation prompted some residents to share their land

with landless relatives. Other residents settled in the community following siblings who were already living there. Monserrate recounts how her husband helped a brother who was living in poverty as a landless worker:

> My husband came home really sad one day and didn't even want to eat lunch. He said, "I ran into my brother, and it tore me up inside . . . because he has a small house made of wood that has a dirt floor, and since he lives as an agregado, he is not living well and the animals even sleep on the beds." And I told him, "Well, what do you want to do?" And he said, "I would like them to come with me . . . to live with us." The best thing they can do is to build a house over there. A small house won't make us richer or poorer, since we live with what we have.

In this case, helping a brother meant making personal arrangements and providing land and moral support. Parcel holders felt a moral obligation to help their relatives and shared their land and food.

During the 1960s, women began to work in nontraditional agricultural and industrial jobs. In Parcelas Gándaras, the first women employed in manufacturing worked in the cigar industry, principally in the Cayey's Consolidated Cigar Company. Other women worked in the textile industry or for the government. These jobs transformed their lives and those of their families. Working outside the home offered new networks and knowledge. Monserrate, who worked at Consolidated at the end of the 1960s, was her family's sole breadwinner because her husband was sick. She met many people and had the opportunity to share experiences with people from different backgrounds. New work roles did not substantially change gender relations in the home, however, since women continued to defer to their husbands. For example, one woman told me that when her husband asked her about subdividing their parcel, she replied, "But I don't have to give you the authorization, because you are the boss in this house, not me." When men migrated to San Juan or the United States, women worked outside the home and at the same time became heads of households. María became a government employee in a school lunchroom when her husband, Ramón, went to the United States and she had to raise her children on her own. Women with more permanent nonagricultural jobs improved their living conditions by receiving higher and more stable salaries. Women's role in the home thus slowly gained importance.

The establishment of land distribution communities changed social relations between landowners, politicians, and workers drastically. Because the PPD became a hegemonic party, some landowners reaffirmed their power by becoming PPD leaders or active supporters. The opportunity to become party bosses and government officials emerged for members of the middle sectors

such as government employees and teachers. This power had an economic as well as a political dimension, because government service jobs became one of the principal sources of employment in the area. The government also provided jobs in public works, garbage collection, and as ambulance drivers, police officers, or fire fighters. The party and its local bosses largely replaced the patronage of large landowners. Although landowners remained influential, PPD membership was essential for them to maintain legitimacy and prestige. For parcel holders, PPD membership meant gaining access to government services and patronage; without it they were excluded from jobs, promotions, free medical prescriptions, or construction materials.

Their experiences as landless workers had prepared the parcel holders for building a new way of life in the land distribution communities. At the same time, the communities established new terms of engagement with new situations and social groups. They provided the context in which parcel holders re-created and expanded kinship and co-parenthood relationships, social relations that helped sustain the struggle for survival. Networks of solidarity and new gender relations created opportunities for economic and social improvement. In other words, land distribution communities facilitated the aspirations of residents to *buscar ambiente* through social networks of solidarity.

LEAVING THE COMMUNITIES

The land distribution program was initially aimed at liberating the landless from coercive social relations and stopping the migration to the cities from the rural areas. Giving parcels to landless workers gave them the necessary autonomy to engage in diverse economic activities outside their communities and sometimes even to abandon their land and housing. By distributing land, the government usurped the power of the landowners, and this allowed those workers who chose to be outside of the sphere of local politicians' power to escape to the cities or the United States. Because not all residents chose to stay on their parcels, informal land transfers began to take place, and these transactions forced the government to allow the transfer of possession. Parcel holders frequently sold or exchanged their plots with or without consulting the government agencies in charge (Padilla, 1956: 271). Individuals could sell the improvements made to their parcels to others who qualified as landless workers. Leaving the parcels became more common when the government began to grant titles to residents in 1969 under Luis A. Ferré of the Partido Nuevo Progresista (New Progressive Party—PNP). Ownership titles gave residents the power to sell their parcels, transforming the original

intentions of the Land Law of 1941 to avoid further landlessness. The PPD had lost the elections of 1968 because of internal divisions. The PNP knew that the PPD still had substantial support among parcel holders and that the best way to undermine PPD support was by granting those titles(Departamento de la Vivienda de Puerto Rico, n.d.: 25).

Residents moved out of the communities for economic, personal, or health reasons, or lack of infrastructure and government services (Junta de Planificación de Puerto Rico, 1948: 19–20). In Parcelas Gándaras, some residents sold their rights because of personal problems with neighbors or alcoholism. One former parcel holder recalls a problem between a neighbor's child and her child that was taken up by adults and escalated until one day the neighbor came to her home drunk, insulted her and her husband, and challenged her husband to a fight. She and her husband decided to sell their improvements and move to another part of town. Parcel #115 changed possession from Serafín García to Ismael Blanco-Ortiz when the former died. Ramón Maldonado gave up his parcel when he immigrated to the United States to seek medical treatment. Because of the scarcity of the land distributed in the 1950s, landless and other workers began to save money to buy the improvements of former parcel holders who wanted to give up their usufruct rights. Many of the new parcel holders were veterans. Concepción Rivera Santiago, for example, sent money to his wife from Korea in 1952 to buy improvements to the parcel and the house left by his neighbors, Fundadora and Pastor, and his relatives and friends lent him money for the purpose. These transfers indicate the continuous high mobility of this population.

Other people who left the community never came back, and some returned only as visitors. Monserrate told of a former parcel holder who came to visit from the United States during the 1990s and was amazed that the community had all the comfort, infrastructure, and services that she had migrated to obtain. Whereas in the 1940s people living in the rural areas generally lacked access to health care, schools, water, electricity, telephones, and transportation, by the 1970s these services were widely available in the land distribution communities. Parcelas Gándaras is no longer a settlement of former landless workers who once lived from agriculture but an urban community with infrastructure and services available to all residents. Original residents are aware of their own participation in building their community, and they realize that these struggles were central to the establishment of the community. As one resident stated, "It was the people working. The government didn't help at all. People built houses. Little by little, the use of electricity and running water expanded. People paid for the light posts . . . whatever I have, I made it myself."

CONCLUSION

Parcel holders used the land distribution program as an instrument to better their life conditions and gain autonomy in their lives. They transformed their everyday lives, and their new status as smallholders fostered new economic activities and forms of survival. Residential rights facilitated mobility in search of employment by providing a guarantee against eviction. Their new social status allowed emigration to the United States and the employment of women in nonagricultural employment, which provided better working conditions, stability, and higher incomes. Residents reproduced social relations of kinship and co-parenthood as means of solidarity, mutual aid, and survival. Practices of solidarity and cooperation and stable housing eased their struggle for survival.

The PPD's hegemony constructed a habitus through land distribution that facilitated new economic activities (income from migration), generated new and transformed old social relations (friendship and kinship relations), and fostered political participation (political and community meetings). At the same time, the ruling groups modified their development policies because of the resistance they confronted from subalterns. Residents of the land distribution communities perceived parcels as progress and incorporated themselves into the political, social, and economic transformation that the PPD was promoting. The U.S. decision to support the PPD and to grant neither statehood nor independence to the island ensured both U.S. colonial rule and the PPD's local hegemony. The habitus constructed allowed accommodation, resistance, and transformation of the government policies without substantially challenging the status quo and U.S. colonial rule in Puerto Rico. The social organization of space in the form of land distribution communities consolidated the hegemony of the PPD and the colonial relationship with the United States.

NOTES

1. The investigation consisted of ethnographic research and 41 interviews with residents of Parcelas Gándaras and the municipality of Cidra. Archival research at the Archivo General de Puerto Rico, the Archivo Muñoz Marín, and the Archivo del Departamento de la Vivienda provided valuable historical documents about the land distribution program and landless workers. The research was conducted in different periods between 1993 and 1999.

2. Most parcel holders were agricultural workers who after the 1950s became employed in manufacturing, construction, government, the service sector, or seasonal migration to the United States.

3. Although land reform was a top-down process and not the direct result of peasant and rural workers' militancy, they played an active role in shaping the enactment of the reform and the outcome of government programs and regulation.

4. The Land Law of 1941 stipulated the creation of the Land Authority, an agency within the Puerto Rico Department of Agriculture and Commerce. The agency constituted a public corporation with powers to acquire land, implement a 500-acre limitation law, promote agriculture among small landowners, and resettle landless families. The insular government and the sale of bonds financed land distributions. The law created the Individuals Farms, Landless Worker Resettlement, and Proportional Profit Farms programs. The Individual Farms program attempted to transform landless workers into small farmers by distributing land for agricultural purposes, but the lack of funds and land made it very limited. With the Proportional Profit Farms program, the government sought to maintain efficiency in agricultural production by providing for cooperative stake-holding and centralized government ownership and management of large farms. The idea was that these farms would fairly distribute the profits among the workers. Nevertheless, the distribution of parcels to landless workers became the core of the land reform because it was less expensive, reached more of the population, and provided land for housing and garden cultivation (Land Authority, [1948?]: 17–79; Edel, 1962: 38; Cuevas Cruz, 1990: 65–71).

5. The results of the Puerto Rico project were later published as *The People of Puerto Rico: A Study in Social Anthropology* (Steward et al., 1956).

6. From the 1900s to the 1930s, U.S. corporations and government officials, their local political allies, merchants, and local individual landowners had constituted the ruling sectors of society. During the Great Depression, labor leaders belonging to the Socialist party allied themselves with U.S. corporations and their managers represented by the Puerto Rican Republican party. Individual local landowners and professionals, affected by the Depression and the expansion of U.S. companies, comprised the opposition in the Liberal party and the Nationalist party.

7. César J. Ayala and Laird W. Bergad (2002) state that scholars have overemphasized the impact of the U.S. sugar companies on the concentration and monopoly of land after 1898. They argue that landownership was not widespread before 1898 and that U.S. corporations did not cause much land dispossession after 1898. Ayala and Bergad also suggest that the invasion brought better living conditions for the rural population and cite land deconcentration in the first decade of the twentieth century as an example.

8. Co-parenthood or *compadrazgo* reinforces or creates social relationships by having a friend, relative, employer, coworker, or person of status in the community be the godparent of one's child (see Mintz and Wolf, 1950: 341–368).

9. By practicing subsistence agriculture and migrating from one plantation to another, jíbaros sought to evade the social, political, cultural, and economic control of the state and the landowner class. Because of this resistance, ruling groups called them lazy, ignorant, and uncivilized (Gómez Acevedo, 1970: 61–72).

10. The literal translation of *come-mierdas* is "shit-eaters" and implies being a snob.

11. In 1950, Public Law 600, approved by U.S. Congress and signed by President Truman, allowed Puerto Ricans to draft a constitution. This constitution did not alter the economic, social, and political relations between Puerto Rico and the United States. It only clarified certain aspects of local rule (Dietz, 1986: 237; see Trías Monge, 1997: 107–118 for an account of the approval process and details about the constitution).

REFERENCES

Ayala, César J. and Laird W. Bergad
2002 "Rural Puerto Rico during the early twentieth century reconsidered: land and society, 1899–1915." *Latin American Research Review* 37 (2): 65–99.

Baldrich, Juan José
1988 *Sembraron la no siembra*. Río Piedras: Ediciones Huracán.

Beasley-Murray, Jon
2003 "On posthegemony." *Bulletin of Latin American Research* 22 (1): 117–125.

Binford, Arthur L.
1998 "Hegemony in the interior of the Salvadoran Revolution: the ERP in northern Morazán." *Journal of Latin American Anthropology* 4 (1): 2–45.

Bourdieu, Pierre
1977 *Outline of a Theory of Practice*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Clark, Victor S., et al.
1975 (1930) *Porto Rico and Its Problems*. New York: Arno Press.

Cuevas Cruz, René J.
1990 "La política agraria de la autoridad de tierras en Puerto Rico, 1941–1955." Master's thesis, University of Puerto Rico.

Departamento de Agricultura y Comercio de Puerto Rico
1971 *Informe anual*. N.p.

Departamento de la Vivienda de Puerto Rico
n.d. *Manual de normas y procedimientos*. N.p.: Administración de Vivienda Rural.

Dietz, James
1986 *Economic History of Puerto Rico: Institutional Change and Capitalist Development*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Edel, Mathew O.
1962 "Part I: Land reform in Puerto Rico, 1940–1959." *Caribbean Studies* 2 (3): 26–60.
1963 "Part II: Land reform in Puerto Rico, 1940–1959." *Caribbean Studies* 2 (4): 28–50.

Fleagle, Fred K.
1975 (1917) *Social Problems in Porto Rico*. New York: Arno Press.

Gómez Acevedo, Labor
1970 *Organización del trabajo en el Puerto Rico del siglo XIX*. San Juan: Instituto de Cultura Puertorriqueña.

González Díaz, Emilio
1999 *El Partido Popular Democrático y el fin de siglo: ¿Qué queda del populismo?* Río Piedras: Centro de Investigaciones Sociales, Universidad de Puerto Rico.

Gramsci, Antonio
1971 *Selections from the Prison Notebooks*. Edited and translated by Quintin Hoare and Geoffrey Nowell-Smith. New York: International Publishers.

Harvey, David
1989 *The Condition of Postmodernity*. Cambridge: Basil Blackwell.

Junta de Planificación de Puerto Rico
1948 *Estudio de 233 familias reinstaladas por la Autoridad de Tierras*. San Juan: Puerto Rico Planning Board.

Land Authority
1948 *Land Law of Puerto Rico*. San Juan: Government of Puerto Rico.

Lapp, Michael
1989 "Managing migration: the Migration Division of Puerto Rico and Puerto Ricans in New York City, 1948–1968." Ph.D. diss., Johns Hopkins University.
Lauria-Perricelli, Antonio
1989 "A study in historical and critical anthropology: the making of *The People of Puerto Rico.* Ph.D. diss., New School for Social Research.
López Tuero, Fernando
1891 *Isla de Puerto Rico: La reforma agrícola*. San Juan: Boletín Mercantil.
Low, Setha
1996 "Spatializing culture: the social production and social construction of public space in Costa Rica." *American Ethnologist* 23 (November): 861–879.
Mejías, Félix
1946 *Condiciones de vida de las clases jornaleras de Puerto Rico*. Río Piedras: Junta Editora de la Universidad de Puerto Rico.
Mintz, Sidney W. and Eric Wolf
1950 "An analysis of ritual co-parenthood (compadrazgo)." *Southwestern Journal of Anthropology* 6: 341–368.
Moscoso, Teodoro
1961 Correspondence, Teodoro Moscoso Papers: Box 4, File 10/61. John F. Kennedy Presidential Library, National Archives and Records Administration, Boston, MA.
Nugent, David
1997 *Modernity at the Edge of Empire: State, Individual, and Nation in the Northern Peruvian Andes, 1885–1935.* Stanford: Stanford University Press.
Packard, Walter E.
1948 "The Land Authority and democratic processes in Puerto Rico." *Inter American Economic Affairs* 2 (1): 49–101.
Padilla, Elena
1956 "Nocorá: An agrarian reform sugar community in Puerto Rico," pp. 265-313 in Julian H. Steward et al., *The People of Puerto Rico: A Study in Social Anthropology.* Urbana: University of Illinois Press.
Pantojas García, Emilio
1990 *Development Strategies as Ideology: Puerto Rico's Export-Led Industrialization Experience*. Boulder: Lynne Rienner.
Picó, Fernando
1983 *Libertad y servidumbre en el Puerto Rico del siglo XIX*. Río Piedras: Ediciones Huracán.
Pons, Miguel A.
1941 "Cost of Living" Memorandum, Autoridad de Tierras, Box 10. Archivo General de Puerto Rico, San Juan, Puerto Rico.
Quintero Rivera, Ángel G.
1985 "La base social de la transformación ideológica del Partido Popular Democrático," pp. 35–120 in Gerardo Navas Dávila (ed.), *Cambio y desarrollo en Puerto Rico: La transformación ideológica del Partido Popular Democrático*. Río Piedras: Editorial de la Universidad de Puerto Rico.
Rodríguez Vera, A.
1929 *Agrarismo colonial y trabajo a domicilio.* San Juan: La Democracia, Inc.
Roseberry, William
1989 *Anthropologies and Histories: Essays in Culture, History, and Political Economy.* New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press.

1993 "Beyond the agrarian question in Latin America," pp. 318–368 in Frederick Cooper et al., *Confronting Historical Paradigms: Peasants, Labor, and the Capitalist World System in Africa and Latin America.* Madison: University of Wisconsin Press.

1994 "Hegemony and the language of contention," pp. 355–366 in Gilbert M. Joseph and Daniel Nugent (eds.), *Everyday Forms of State Formation*. Durham: Duke University Press.

Scott, James C.

1985 *Weapons of the Weak: Everyday Forms of Peasant Resistance*. New Haven: Yale University Press.

Senior, Clarence

1953 "Migration and Puerto Rico's population problem." *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* 285 (January): 130–136.

Silvestrini, Blanca

1979 *Los trabajadores puertorriqueños y el Partido Socialista, 1932–1940.* Río Piedras: Editorial Universitaria.

Smith, Gavin

1999 *Confronting the Present: Towards a Politically Engaged Anthropology.* Oxford and New York: Berg.

Steward, Julian H., Elena Padilla, Robert A. Manners, Eric R. Wolf, Sidney W. Mintz, and Raymond Scheele

1956 *The People of Puerto Rico: A Study in Social Anthropology.* Urbana: University of Illinois Press.

Stycos, J. Mayone and Reuben Hill

1953 "The prospects of birth control in Puerto Rico." *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* 285 (January): 137–144.

Trías Monge, José

1997 *Puerto Rico: The Trials of the Oldest Colony in the World.* New Haven: Yale University Press.

Tugwell, Rexford G.

1975 (1945) *Puerto Rican Public Papers of R. G. Tugwell Governor.* New York: Arno Press.

United States Bureau of the Census

1973 *1970 Census of Population, Detailed Characteristics: Puerto Rico*. Washington, DC: Bureau of the Census.

Wolf, Eric R.

2002 "Facing power—old insights, new questions," pp. 222–233 in Joan Vincent (ed.), *The Anthropology of Politics: A Reader in Ethnography, Theory, and Critique*. Malden: Blackwell.