Cigar Workers and the History of the Labor Movement in Puerto Rico, 1890-1920

by

Amílcar Tirado

A dissertation submitted to the Graduate Faculty in History
In partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of
Doctor of Philosophy, The City University of New York

2012

This manuscript has been read and accepted for the
Graduate Faculty in History in satisfaction of the
Dissertation requirement of the degree of Doctor of Philosophy

DR. ALFONSO QUIROZ

DATE CHAIR OF EXAMINING COMMITTEE

DR. HELENA ROSENBLATT

DATE EXECUTIVE OFFICER

Dr. Joshua Freeman

Dr. Hobart A. Spalding

Dr. Gerald Markowitz

Dr. Carlos Sanabria

Supervisory Committee

THE CITY UNIVERSITY OF NEW YORK

ABSTRACT

CIGAR WORKERS AND THE HISTORY OF THE LABOR MOVEMENT IN PUERTO RICO, 1890-1920

by
AmílcarTirado

Adviser: Dr. Alfonso Quiroz

During the first two decades of the twentieth century cigar production became a major industry in Puerto Rico. This was a predominantly urban industry in an economy dominated by the agricultural sector, whose product was exported as a complete and final product. The cigar industry was characterized by the employment of a relatively large number of workers. Its growth provided the opportunity for those workers interested in organizing unions to expand their incipient labor unions and also became the principal space for the incorporation of women into the labor market. This dissertation explores the role played by cigar workers in the development of the organized labor movement in Puerto Rico during the early years of the twentieth century. The discussion deals with the influence of this group of workers in the development of a working class ideology, as well as in organizing strategies to be used in the defense of workers interests, such as strikes. Cigar workers promoted a culture and a way of working which gave them control over time, production, and working conditions.

This work examines the customs and traditions of cigar workers as a source for their ideological interpretation of who should be in control of the work produced by them, and to explain the reasons for collective actions taken in the factory or workshop; as a source of conflict between workers and employers; and as a source for the conflict between male and female workers as to how each group interpreted the best way to

follow cigar workers' customs and tradition. Gender relations in the world of cigar making are analyzed in terms of contrasting male and female aspirations and interpretations, highlighted by moments of solidarity as well as moments of disagreement. The work is framed by the premise that the study of Puerto Rican cigar workers should be incorporated and related to the changes and transformations occurring in the larger cigar industry beyond the insular limits of Puerto Rico.

The study shows that cigar workers grappled with two main contradictions that impacted their goal of creating and maintaining a strong labor organization, which would preserve and enhance their work methods and worldview. The first was an external contradiction represented by the way they related to employers, particularly the Puerto Rican American Tobacco Company. This was represented as a class confrontation against a strong enemy that eventually contributed greatly to cigar workers' loss of control of their workplaces resulting in less workers input in labor organization in factories controlled or influenced by PRATCO. The second was an internal contradiction between female and male cigar workers, a gender confrontation that nevertheless allowed space for mutual solidarity as workers.

Anarchist ideology and accompanying work customs and traditions, as presented in this study, were influential factors enabling cigar workers to confront managers over work rules, wages, union recognition, and their opposing views on how society should be organized. However, internal contradictions over gender developed in their work culture as the number of women working in the industry dramatically increased. While masculinity represented for cigar workers' culture a notion of manhood closely related to skill, respectability, and autonomy, it was not the same for women cigar workers.

Therefore, work culture should be explained in terms of the practices and meaning for male and female workers.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The long road to complete this dissertation has been filled with people who have provided to me the necessary guidance, recommendations and encouragement to complete this work. In this vein I would like to express my gratitude for those persons who provided support in the process of completing this dissertation. First, Dr. Alfonso W. Quiroz, my dissertation adviser, and Dr. Hobart Spalding, the First Reader, have both shown support and respect for my work. My gratitude to Dr. Joshua Freeman, who provided the space and the opportunity to complete my work. Thanks to Dr. Gerald Markowitz and to Dr. Carlos Sanabria, whose guidelines and recommendations have improved the quality of this dissertation. In the same manner I recognize the work of Dr. Laird W. Bergad whose suggestions helped me to be clearer and sharper in my observations.

There have been four persons, three of them women, who made possible the completion of this dissertation. My respect and appreciation for their efforts and support during my studies at the Graduate Center to Betty Einerman, Assistant Program Officer of the History Department; to Dulce Juarbe and Eulogio Villanueva, and to Blanca Vázquez.

The Library System at the University of Puerto Rico, Río Piedras Campus, provided me complete support to complete this dissertation. In particular I thank the director Dr. Snejanka Penkova, who understood my need for time to work and study. I also wish to acknowledge Iris Cortés, Jeanette Plá, and Annie Flores, whose assistance was instrumental in dealing with the technicalities of computer programs. Professor Marisa Ordoñez, head librarian of the Puerto Rican Collection, Miguel Vega and the

other members of the staff that facilitated my research for materials from early twentieth century Puerto Rico. The personnel of the General Archives of Puerto Rico, in particular José Flores, provided me with advice and recommendations on what resources I should initially consult. I extend my appreciation to Dr. Angel Quintero Rivera, Dr. Humberto García, and Dr. Juan José Baldrich, professors at the University of Puerto Rico who provided support and encouragement to complete the work.

For the people at *El Mesón* who provided coffee and space to do my work my sincere thanks.

Finally, my appreciation to my family, and particularly to Angélica and Amílcar A., who served as an inspiration to complete this dissertation.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Pages

LIST OF TABLES

Pages

ACRONYMS

ACC: American Cigar Company

AFL: American Federation of Labor

AMFC: American Machine and Foundry Company

ATC: American Tobacco Company

CMIU: Cigar Makers International Union

FLTPR: Federación Libre de los Trabajadores de Puerto Rico

FRTPR: Federación Regional de los Trabajadores de Puerto Rico

FFL: Free Federation of Labor

IWA: International Workingmen's Association

PRATCO: Puerto Rican American Tobacco Company

SLP: Socialist Labor Party

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION
WHY CIGAR WORKERS

> "Under any circumstances we won't allow reductions in the salaries of men and women working as cigar makers or in any other cigar industry department in Puerto Rico. We won't agree to go back to the period previous to the war, because those conditions and salaries never were fair and never represented the fair value of our work…"
>
> Prudencio Rivera Martínez, President of the Cigar Workers Union, 1920[1]

Prudencio Rivera Martínez, as the quote above demonstrates, made clear the position of Puerto Rican cigar workers at the closing of the second decade of the twentieth century. He ended his statement by expressing that past experiences had taught the people of Puerto Rico, and especially the Tobacco Trust, what they as cigar workers were capable of undertaking in defense of their union and in the struggles to improve their salaries.

To contextualize the issues inherent in Rivera Martínez's declaration, it is necessary to understand the world of cigar production as it developed in Puerto Rico during the early years of the twentieth century, as well as cigar workers' responses to the transformation occurring in the workplace, and how their responses represented the first collective challenge to any employer in Puerto Rico. Rivera Martínez summarized four important issues for cigar workers: 1) fair wages; 2) improvement of their working conditions; 3) the role played by the tobacco trust and other employers who were accused by cigar workers of appropriating a share of what they considered a fair value of their work, and, 4) the need to organize workers in unions.

---

[1] Unión Obrera, "Actitud resuelta, así deben hacer todos los oficios" 14 diciembre 1920, 1.

This dissertation explores the role played by cigar workers in the history of the labor movement in Puerto Rico between the 1890s and 1920. The organization of cigar workers into unions represented at that moment a major step toward the organization of all workers. The main argument is that cigar workers were at the forefront of the early struggles of the Puerto Rican working class and were key players in promoting the organization of both urban and rural workers. In addition to undertaking their own organizing drives in the early twentieth century, cigar workers willingly contributed funds for the salaries of organizers who could then in turn advocate for unionism and socialism among rural workers. This interpretation assign a protagonist role to an industry that was based mainly in an urban environment and which by the end of the nineteenth century was neither the most important in the country nor did it employ the largest number of workers. This is an important factor because during the period under study the sugar cane industry became the main industry and the main employer of rural workers in the country. However, the initial steps in the process of promoting workers' organization were undertaken not by sugar workers in the agricultural sector, but by cigar workers in a predominant urban setting. While the sugar cane industry employed the largest number of workers in comparison to the cigar industry, sugar cane workers did not play this pivotal role because they lacked the experience, ideology, and work culture that characterized cigar workers.

From the Real Cédula de Gracia of 1815 to the Treaty of Paris of 1898

Although the context of the research falls within the first two decades of the twentieth century, it is important to provide a background of the economy during the nineteenth century to explain the role played by tobacco in the economic life of Puerto

Rico, and how tobacco moved from an industry predominantly of leaf production to the development of the cigar industry. The Real Cédula de Gracia, approved in 1815, allowed the free entry of foreigners willing to bring their wealth and slaves to Puerto Rico. In addition, the decree promoted the development of industry and agriculture, as well as promoting direct trade with Spain. Finally, it promoted a change in the type of agriculture practiced in the Island, moving from a local and self-sufficient mode of production into one of commercial and export-oriented agriculture. Since then and for the entire nineteenth century, sugar, coffee, and tobacco dominated the economy, the first two becoming the most important export crops.[2]

The initial decades of this century marked a period of expansion whereby the number of *cuerdas* utilized to cultivate sugar cane increased from 5,765 in 1812 to 11,103 in 1830, with an increase in production from 838 tons to 14,126 tons during this period.[3] In the case of coffee, in 1812 a total of 9,493 *cuerdas* were cultivated rendering 3,905 tons of coffee, while in 1830 the *cuerdas* cultivated were 14,000 with a production of 6,569 tons of coffee.[4] The pattern of continuously increasing the proportion of cultivated land area dedicated to export crops held steady for the rest of this century, indicating an economic orientation toward an external market. As described by Dietz, the proportion of land devoted to subsistence crops went from the 70 percent in 1830 to less than 50 percent in 1862, and went down again to about 30 percent by 1899.[5]

---

[2] María Asunción García Ochoa, La política española en Puerto Rico durante el siglo xix (Río Piedras, PR: Editorial Universidad de Puerto Rico, 1982), 56.

[3] A cuerda is an agrarian unit of measurement slightly under one acre or 0.97 acre. James L. Dietz, Economic History of Puerto Rico (Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1986), 17; Laird W. Bergad, Coffee and the Growth of Agrarian Capitalism in Nineteenth-Century Puerto Rico (Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1983), 228; and Francisco A. Scarano, Sugar and Slavery in Puerto Rico (Madison, Wisconsin: University of Wisconsin Press, 1984), xv.

[4] Dietz, Economic History of Puerto Rico, 17-18.

[5] Ibid., 19.

Problems in the expansion of sugar production increased by the mid-nineteenth century as sugar prices in the international market declined, and the industry faced increasing competition from beet-sugar production. Other contributing factors were the lack of capital to expand production and difficulties in obtaining prime sugar land at good prices. Finally there were shortages in the labor force needed for production as the supply of slaves decreased while their prices increased, a situation complicated by a shortage of free or waged labor needed for large-scale agricultural production.[6]

In the case of tobacco, the main role of this product until the end of the nineteenth century was as an export agricultural product, whose progress and contribution to the economy of the island lagged behind sugar and coffee, and suffered from a lack of capital and technology. In addition, the production of tobacco suffered a series of setbacks as a result of Spain's protectionist policy and Cuban interference with the development of the industry in Puerto Rico. During the first seven decades of the nineteenth century, the main tobacco markets were Great Britain, Germany, Spain, and Cuba. As shown in the table of the principal markets for tobacco during the period of mid 1840s to mid 1870s, Germany and Great Britain represented the major buyers of tobacco produced in Puerto Rico while Cuba and Spain were minor markets (see Table 1).

[6]Ibid., 216.

TABLE 1: DESTINATION OF TOBACCO EXPORTS 1845 TO 1874 (in percentages)

YEARS	GERMANY	GR. BRITAIN	SPAIN	CUBA
1845-49	52.8	31.1	2.7	0
1850-54	74.7	21.7	1.4	0
1855-59	67.9	29.1	0.1	0
1860-64	55.5	39.2	0.5	0
1865-69	67.8	27.8	0.9	0
1870-74	41.6	24.8	11.9	17.9

Source: Birgit Sonesson, Puerto Rico's Commerce: From Regional to World Wide Market Relations (New York: New York University Press, 1985), 264.

On August 14, 1851, the Spanish Cabinet approved an order to promote the consumption of Puerto Rican tobacco in Spain. The order requested the governor of Puerto Rico to acquire and send annually to Cadiz one thousand quintales of tobacco (a quintal is equivalent to 100 pounds). The order also specified that the tobacco would be acquired only from the municipalities of Guayama, Juana Díaz, Coamo, Ponce, Cabo Rojo, Aguadilla, Caguas and Fajardo. This was considered as a first step toward the improvement of the quality of Puerto Rican tobacco so that it could succeed in gaining better prices in international markets. However, this project was never executed and Puerto Rico remained an exporter of poor quality tobacco known as "boliche."[7]

It was not until 1868, when tobacco production in Cuba decreased due to its first war of independence there, that Cuban and Spanish markets were opened for Puerto Rican tobacco. It was also during this period that several reports were published and petitions were presented to the Spanish parliament with the purpose of improving the quality of the tobacco produced in the island and promoting its production as an export agricultural crop in order to compete in the international market. José Ramón Abad, for example, in 1883 promoted the idea of free trade with minimal intervention by the

[7] Lidio Cruz Monclova, Historia de Puerto Rico (Río Piedras, PR: Editorial Universidad de Puerto Rico, 1962), vol. 1, 408.

Spanish Crown based on four points: the end of the state monopoly on tobacco in Spain; reforms in the ultramarine provinces of Cuba and Puerto Rico so that tobacco production and profits could be shared more equally between the islands and the Peninsula; the declaration of duty-free status for the tobacco trade between Cuba, Puerto Rico, and the Philippines; and approval of new legislation promoting tobacco export for an open market.[8]

The effort to promote tobacco production in Puerto Rico, however, did not find strong support in the Metropolis. At the beginning of 1871, for example, the Spanish government invalidated an 1866 law that allowed the free entrance of the tobacco produced in Puerto Rico to Spain. Spanish Parliament, however, decided in 1876 to reopen the Cuban market to Puerto Rican tobacco in order to relieve poor economic conditions in the island exacerbated by the difficulties other agricultural products were experiencing in the international markets, particularly sugar cane. This decision had a positive impact on tobacco production, which increased to 8,714,855 pounds in 1879, representing an increase of 3,000,000 pounds over 1878 production levels. By 1882, a new law was enacted allowing free trade of Puerto Rican products in the Spanish market but excluding sugar and tobacco. This action represented another protective measure in favor of peninsular interests in sugar and tobacco products.

Two years later, on July 25, 1884, the Spanish Cortés authorized the government to take measures to protect the production of tobacco and cigar industry in Cuba and Puerto Rico.[9] However, this policy on tobacco kept changing during the 1890s. On July

[8] José Ramón Abad, La exposición agrícola e industrial del tabaco realizada en Ponce, durante el mes de diciembre de 1883 (San Juan, PR: El Vapor, 1884); Rafael C. Aguayo pointed in the same direction with the publication of these conditions on his Manual del cultivo del tabaco (Ponce, PR, 1884).
[9] Cruz Monclova, Historia de Puerto Rico vol. 1, 500, 501, 528.

30, 1891, the Spanish government approved an act prohibiting the exportation of tobacco to Cuba, the main market for Puerto Rican tobacco. Island tobacco growers protested because the prohibition represented an economic disaster for them. However, this prohibition was lifted a year later. [10] Still, in 1898, tobacco remained a trade issue for Cuba and Puerto Rico. Manuel Macías Casado, military governor of Puerto Rico, approved a decree charging one peso for each kilogram of tobacco and fifty cents for tobacco leaves coming from Cuba. This measure was in response to an act approved by the autonomous government of Cuba prohibiting the introduction of Puerto Rican tobacco to that country.[11]

On November 25, 1897, the Spanish government conceded an autonomous status to Cuba and Puerto Rico. This action was a response to the pressure exerted by the United States government, by the Cubans fighting for independence, and by liberal forces in Spain. In fact, the concession of autonomy was enacted as a decree by Spanish prime-minister Práxedes Mateo Sagasta, without waiting for the legislative process. The urgency was due to the need to pacify Cuba. Under the new political status both colonial possessions became legally part of the Spanish political system, with a local government and representation in the Spanish parliament. However, according to Sagasta, the new political status did not represent a loss of political power for the metropolitan government. He stated that "nothing of what is essential has been forgotten; in nothing is diminished the power of the central authority (Spain)."[12] Autonomy had a short life span in both islands due to Cuban insurrectionists' rejection of the new political status and

[10]Ibid., 290.
[11]Ibid., vol. 3, 273.
[12] Manuel Fraga Iribarne, Las constituciones de Puerto Rico (Madrid: Ediciones Cultural Hispánicas, 1953), 228.

decision to continue the fight, and by the U. S. government's demands for further reforms for Cuba. However, one issue that showed the lack of consensus between Cuban and Puerto Rican autonomists was the exportation of tobacco to Cuba.

In conclusion, the Spanish government in Puerto Rico during the nineteenth century did not respond to the claims, petitions, and suggestions made by representatives of local economic interests to enact the legislation needed to develop the tobacco industry in the island. What the petitioners sought was an industry that not only concentrated in exporting tobacco leaf but that also added a strong component of cigar production in order to compete in the international market. Ironically not until 1898, could tobacco producers begin to exploit the industry's full potential.

In addition to not having free trade with Spain, another factor that delayed the development of the tobacco industry in Puerto Rico was the issue of the tariff wars between the United States and Spain, a situation that impacted Puerto Rico indirectly. These countries signed a commercial treaty in 1891, allowing free entry of their products to each other's ports. This treaty represented a relief for Puerto Rico in that prices for food and goods coming from the United States were cheaper than those coming from Spain; in addition, local merchants and farmers would have the opportunity to sell their products in what they considered to be their main market; and duties on tools needed for agriculture and manufacture were reduced. However, the U.S. Congress enacted the Wilson-Gorman law in 1894, legislation which was rejected by the Spanish government because the tariff terms established by the new law were no longer reciprocal, leaving without effect the 1891 reciprocity treaty. Now Spanish products had to pay more for entry to the U.S. market while American products had preferential status in Cuba and

Puerto Rico. Spanish authorities therefore nullified this treaty because it gave United States imports the largest share of Puerto Rico's trade.[13] In fact, the U.S. consul in Puerto Rico declared in 1896 that "the natural tendency and gravitation of the island trade was for the United States.[14]

This decision represented a setback for tobacco interests and for the economy of Puerto Rico, because the United States constituted a better market for island products than Spain, and it reflected contradictions and conflict between the interests of the metropolis and those of the colony. On the one hand, Spain was not willing to share its Puerto Rican market with United States. On the other hand, Spain did not open metropolitan markets to tobacco from Puerto Rico in order to protect the tobacco industry in the Peninsula. This contradiction continued until 1898, when Spain approved the free entrance of Puerto Rican products in Spanish ports. However, tobacco was excluded from this legal decree.

In terms of the development of a cigar industry in Puerto Rico, efforts began before 1898, when some tobacco was processed in the Island mainly for local consumption. Most of the tobacco production, particularly after 1870, was exported to Cuba to be used in the elaboration of cigars and cigarettes or sold on the Cuban market to be sent to other countries, particularly to the United States. Therefore, Puerto Rican tobacco represented a contributing factor to the Cuban tobacco economy in two ways: first, as a raw product to be mixed with Cuban tobacco, and secondly, Puerto Rico became a profitable market for Cuban tobacco products. Other contributing factors for

[13] César Ayala, American Sugar Kingdom: The Plantation Economy of the Spanish Caribbean, 1898-1934 (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1999), 51-58.
[14] United States, Congress, House, Commercial Relations of the United States with Foreign Countries during the years 1896 and 1897, 55th Congress, 2nd. Session,189, 722.

the delay in the development of the tobacco industry in Puerto Rico were the lack of capital, a low quality of the tobacco plant, and legal and governmental obstacles. By 1899, there were 108 cigar and 27 cigarette manufacturing centers operating in the Island, whose production was mainly sold locally. However, most of production took place in "chinchales" or small shops and could not compare to factories that employed large numbers of workers as those established in Cuba or the United States.[15]

In summary, under Spanish rule the role of tobacco as an export product was minimal and never developed its potential. In addition, producing tobacco for local consumption had no future because Puerto Rico lacked an industrial component to locally process the leaf. The conundrum for Puerto Rico was that Spain preferred to protect its industry in the national territory, while Cuba opposed the development of the tobacco industry development in Puerto Rico because it represented a threat to *its* tobacco industry. Puerto Rico was consuming Cuban cigars and cigarettes but the profits and revenues of this market were mainly for Peninsular and Cuban interests, with little benefits in the form of employment and taxes for the Puerto Rican economy. Therefore, the advancement of the tobacco industry was limited under Spanish control. Most of the progress was concentrated in the growth and exportation of tobacco leaf to European and Cuban markets. Under these circumstances the development of a cigar and cigarette industry in the island had little opportunity for success. By the 1870's, Puerto Rico began exporting large quantities of the best tobacco to Cuba, which became the main market for Puerto Rican tobacco until 1898. At the same time, the increased exportation of tobacco from the island meant less was available for the development of a local cigar industry. In fact, by mid-1889, the Revista de Agricultura, Industria y Comercio,

[15] Henry K. Carroll, Report on the Island of Porto Rico (Washington, D.C.: GPO, 1900), 142.

published in San Juan between 1885 and 1893 by a group of Puerto Rican liberals, urged tobacco farmers and industrialists to join forces in order to free tobacco from Cuban tutelage and to promote the development of the kind of industry that was needed in the country. They made this suggestion based on the quantity of tobacco being exported from Puerto Rico.[16] The principal collaborators of the journal were Federico Asenjo (administrator), José Julián Acosta (science), Agustín Stahl (medicine), Santiago MacCormick (farmer), and Tulio Larrinaga (engineer). Some of these liberal thinkers had studied in Spain and Germany, and supported the modernization of Puerto Rico.

The tobacco exported to Cuba was not only used in Cuban cigar production, but was also re-exported to Key West and Tampa, areas with developing cigar industries. The Revista de Agricultura, Industria y Comercio condemned this situation expressing that "everybody takes advantage of our plant, except the country that produces it."[17] The journal opined that Puerto Rican tobacco should no longer stop in Cuba before it arrived in the United States. Furthermore, considering that Puerto Rico formed a market for Cuban tobacco products, its natural interest was to prevent the growth or development of the tobacco industry in Puerto Rico.

Socio-economic and Political changes after 1898

Puerto Rico export figures for 1897 show that while Spain represented the main market for the Island's coffee production, the United States and Cuba were the principal markets for sugar and tobacco. The export of coffee to Spain in 1897 amounted to 6,853,694 kilograms, with a value of 3,563,921 *pesos*; while the coffee exported to Cuba represented a total of 4,008,775 kilograms, with a value of 2,084,563 *pesos*; the United

[16] Revista de Agricultura, Industria y Comercio, May1889, 160.
[17] Revista de Agricultura, Industria y Comercio, June 1889, 202.

States imported only 47,995 kilograms of coffee, with a value of 24,957 *pesos*. In terms of sugar cane, United States was the main market importing 34,966,838 kilograms of sugar, with a value of 2,418,938 *pesos*; while Spain ranked second importing 18,020,119 kilograms, with a value of 1,272,885 *pesos*. The quantity of sugar exported to Cuba was minimal, amounting to 78,399 kilograms, with a value of 5,662 *pesos*. Although tobacco as an export product was at a distant third position from coffee and sugar, the same three countries were its principal markets. However, the leading market for tobacco was Cuba with 2,359,068 kilograms, with a value of 990,808 *pesos*; followed by Spain with 337,451 kilograms, with a value of 141,729 *pesos.* The United States was the third major market, importing 80,729 kilograms, with a value of 33,906 *pesos*.[18]

The situation changed after 1898, a period when coffee lost its role as the principal export product, while sugarcane became Puerto Rico's main agricultural and industrial product, and tobacco was established as an export product as well as becoming the base for the development of a cigar industry. In this respect, the early absorption of the island's production into the United States economy was reflected in the trade between both countries and in the quick control gained over sugar and tobacco by American interests. There was a steady and increasing trade that prompted the North American governor of Puerto Rico in 1909 to state that the significance of the trade could be better appreciated "when we realize that Puerto Rico now ranks as the thirteenth customer of the United States among all the nations of the world, its purchases being only a small amount less than those of the entire Chinese Empire."[19] By 1916, the absorption was almost total, the United States, representing 92% of all external trade with a value of

[18]Ibid., 154.
[19] Puerto Rico, Governor Annual Report, 1909, (Washington, D.C.: GPO, 1909), 7.

$96,845,283 out of a grand total of $105,682,729.[20] In this respect, the main difference between the United States and Spain in their relationship with Puerto Rico was that the first included both sugar and tobacco industries and the second excluded them.

Commissioner Henry Carroll's 1899 report captured and summarized the principal issues when he stated that:

> …the condition of the laboring classes cannot be greatly improved unless agriculture becomes prosperous and minor industries are developed. This means practically a revolution in the methods of raising and marketing crops, and it cannot be accomplished without the influx of new capital. How this shall be attracted is one of the problems of those interested in the regeneration of Porto Rico.[21]

On February 13, 1900, a group of tobacco merchants, growers, and manufacturers presented a petition to George W. Davis, military governor of Puerto Rico, requesting him to ask the United States government to allow free trade for tobacco exports to the United States. Tobacco producers needed to find markets for their surplus crops of 1898 and 1899 and maturing crop of 1900. General Davis seemed to be concerned with the situation when he wrote to Elihu Root, Secretary of War, stating that:

> I cannot …overstate the urgency and gravity of the industrial paralysis now existing in Puerto Rico….The only available remedy for the industrial condition I can suggest is the opening of markets of accumulated surplus of productions and the establishment of such trade conditions, by Congressional legislation.[22]

Davis recognized that there were few manufacturers in Puerto Rico and considered that cigars and cigarettes made by local workers from the native leaf were of greater value than all other manufactures combined. Furthermore, for him the development of the tobacco industry in Puerto Rico was a matter of the utilization of

---

[20] Puerto Rico, Governor Annual Report, 1916,(Washington, D.C.: GPO, 1916), 3.
[21] Carroll, Report, 51.
[22]United States, Congress, Senate, Free Trade Between the United States and Puerto Rico. Letter from the Secretary of War, 56th Congress, 1st session, 1900, Senate Document 195, 1.

Puerto Rico's cheap labor, so that manufactured articles could be exported. In this case, domestic cigars of a quality costing $80.00 per thousand in the United States could be made in Puerto Rico and sold in the United States for $60.00.[23] Another report of the period found that cigar making was one of the most important, if not the most important, industry in Puerto Rico. This industry had grown very rapidly since the United States government's occupation of Puerto Rico. Furthermore, after 1900, when the island was included in the legislation allowing the importation of cigars into the U. S. tobacco market, Puerto Rican cigars were able to compete on favorable terms with U.S. and Cuban elaborated cigars.[24]

The United States government responded to Carroll's call and to other economic interests by enacting the Foraker Act in 1900. This law provided the legal framework that opened the doors for American companies to invest in Puerto Rico. Sugar cane and tobacco were the two main beneficiaries of the Act. In the case of tobacco, cigar production and exportation of tobacco leaves were two areas of the tobacco industry that increased rapidly during the period. For the cigar industry, the expansion of production due to market demand opened the doors for increasing the number of cigar workers needed for production. North American investors provided the necessary capital for the prosperous development of agriculture and for an industry based mainly on sugar and tobacco products that generated large profits for employers and good revenues from taxes for the government.

Sugar cane became the main Puerto Rican agricultural and industrial product during the first decades of the twentieth century. In 1899 only 15 percent of the

[23] United States, Congress, Report of the Military Government of Porto Rico, 56th Congress, 2nd Session, 1900, 193.
[24] Walter E. Weyl, Labor Conditions in Porto Rico (Washington, D.C.: GOP, 1905), 758-759.

cultivated land was dedicated to sugar cane; by 1930 it rose to 44 percent.[25] Tobacco producers also increased cultivation. The total land under tobacco cultivation in 1899 was close to 6,000 acres, however, by the 1920s it had reached 30,000 acres.[26] In the process, transformations in the pattern of sugar and tobacco cultivation, marketing, and landownership occurred. The method of manufacturing sugar, for example, moved from sugar mills to large factories known as "centrales." In addition, the sugar industry was characterized by a high level of land concentration and by the consolidation of the industry into the hands of a small group of local and foreign companies.

Statistics of the period show that sugar cane became the major employer in the agricultural and manufacturing sectors. A total of 75,814 persons were identified in the census of 1910 as sugar laborers, followed by coffee with 29,307 workers. The next most important group was represented by the tobacco sector with 6,188 workers.[27] These numbers show that continuity prevailed in the order of importance of workers in the agricultural sector, in this case sugar. Tobacco remained in third place as had occurred since the nineteenth century. In the case of manufacturing, in 1909, a change occurred in this order with tobacco workers becoming the first on the list with 7,025 workers, followed by sugar and molasses with 5,062 workers and in a distant third place was coffee cleaning and polishing with 120 employees. By 1919, tobacco and sugar changed positions, with sugar becoming the most important with 7,490 workers, while the tobacco workforce was fell to 5, 098, while and coffee retained third place with 578 workers.

[25] Bailey, Diffie, and Justine Diffie, Porto Rico: A Broken Pledge (New York: Vanguard Press, 1931), 45.
[26] Ibid., 89.
[27] United States, Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census, Thirteenth Census of the of the United States Taken in the Year 1910, Statistics for Porto Rico (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing), 236.

A factor explaining the advances taking place in the tobacco sector was the introduction of the American Tobacco Company, a U.S. tobacco monopoly that entered the local economy in 1899. This company changed the mode of cigar production, transforming the industry from predominantly small venture to large-scale production for an international market. The cigar industry became an important space for workers in the process of developing an organized labor movement in Puerto Rico. Although sugar cane workers represented the backbone of the organized labor movement, the initial leadership came from the urban sector. The organization of the Regional Federation of Labor in 1898 and the Free Federation of Labor in 1899 were undertakings accomplished by carpenters, painters, typographers, dockworkers, and cigar makers but not rural workers.

Why the Period

The period under study represents the years when the initial steps were taken by a group of artisans interested in organizing workers, among them typographers, painters, bakers, dock and cigar workers. These efforts represent the first steps taken to organize workers into unions during the initial period of economic transformation and capitalist expansion at the end of the nineteenth century in Puerto Rico. They culminated in the formation of the Free Federation of Labor (FFL), in 1899, which together with the cigar workers union, affiliated to the Cigar Makers International Union (CMIU), became the two most important labor organizations during the first two decades of the twentieth century. In fact, the FFL represented a majority of the organized urban and rural workers in Puerto Rico in the period. The cigar workers union responded to the FFL and represented its most important and combative union.

The reason for taking the research up to 1920 is based on the idea that this phase of the confrontation between employers and cigar workers ended early in the 1920s as employers gained control over cigar production in the workplace. There were several factors that by 1919 contributed or influenced the relationship between employers and workers. The most important factors to note were the changes taking place in the structure of the cigar industry, the use of machinery in cigar production, and the establishment of new branches in small towns and places as a measure for reducing production costs and to circumvent the influence of the union over workers and prevent strikes in workplaces. These factors effectively promoted the development of a new labor force drawn heavily from the ranks of women, and were essential in bringing about a change in the balance of power within the cigar industry. Furthermore, during this period changes in consumption occurred which had repercussions for Puerto Rico. The growing public taste for cigarettes over cigars in the United States resulted in the cigar industry beginning to lose its share of the market. The per capita consumption of tobacco in cigar and cigarettes in the United States during the period of 1900 and 1930, as shown in Table 1.2, declined as cigarettes were favored over cigars. The annual production of cigarettes kept increasing while cigar production went in the opposite direction. What was happening in the United States impacted the industry in Puerto Rico. For the local tobacco industry, whose main market was the United States, it represented a fatal blow because they were exporting cigars not cigarettes, and a decrease in the consumption of tobacco in the United States provoked a steady decline in the fortunes of island leaf tobacco. As a consequence the manufactured product and the raw material exported declined in importance in the American market. In the particular case of PRATCO,

according to Cox, the company suffered a steady decline in cigar and cigarette production due to a decrease in demand for Puerto Rican products after 1925.[28]

TABLE 1.2: PER CAPITA CONSUMPTION OF TOBACCO IN CIGARS AND CIGARETTES IN THE CONTINENTAL UNITED STATES, 1900-1930

Year	Cigars	Cigarettes
1900	1.30	0.11
1910	1.49	0.28
1920	1.66	1.29
1930	1.18	2.73

Source: Harvey S. Perloff, Puerto Rico: Economic Future (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1950), 93.

Bernardo Vega, a Puerto Rican cigar maker, who also lived and worked in New York, considered the 1920s as the period when the cigar makers' culture came to an end.[29] What Vega experienced in his personal life spoke to a process of internal changes in the cigar industry that affected cigar workers as a group. As their work culture lost ground and therefore its effectiveness, cigar workers also lost their central place in the labor movement.

Despite cigar workers' prominent role in the Puerto Rican labor movement, a comprehensive interpretation of their actions and recognition of their specific contributions still awaits a thorough interpretation. Several works were published during the 1970s and early 1980s in which workers played a leading role. This renewed interest on workers, however, did not produce a large number of monographs exploring, for example, the role of workers in the history of Puerto Rico or histories on particular groups of workers and how they interrelated in the island's labor movement. In

[28]Reavis Cox, Competition in the American Tobacco Industries, 1911-1912. A Study of the Effects of the Partition of the American Tobacco Company by the United States Supreme Court (New York: AMS Press, 1970), 88-89.
[29] Bernardo Vega, Memoirs 115.

particular, works exploring the role of tobacco and cigar workers in the history of Puerto Rico, or in the history of the organized labor movement are scant. Since that period, works by Juan José Baldrich, Mariano Negrón Portillo, and Angel G. Quintero are the only ones dealing partially or entirely with tobacco issues.[30] In recent years only four dissertations have been completed on issues related to cigar workers and tobacco cultivation, despite the importance of this industry to the Puerto Rican economy of the period. The authors of these dissertations are Carlos Sanabria, Arturo Bird-Cardona, Ivette Marie Rivera-Giusti, and Teresita Levy.[31]

From what has been published, the two most pertinent works for the study of cigar makers and the cigar industry are Angel Quintero Rivera's essay, "Socialist and Cigarmaker," and Juan José Baldrich's essay "Gender and the Decomposition of the Cigar-Making Industry." Quintero Rivera's essay, originally published in 1983, has become one of the most important contributions to the study of the development of the working-class in Puerto Rico. He explores the process by which urban workers were transformed from artisans into proletarians, identifying this process with the development

[30] Juan José Baldrich, Sembraron la no siembra (Río Piedras, PR: Ediciones Huracán, 1988); and "Gender and the Decomposition of the Cigar-Making Craft in Puerto Rico, 1899-1934" in Puerto Rican Women's History: New Perspectives, edited by Félix V. Matos Rodríguez and Linda C. Delgado (Armonk, New York: M.E. Sharpe, 1999), 105-125; Mariano Negrón Portillo, Las turbas republicanas, 1900-1904 (Río Piedras, PR: Ediciones Huracán, 1990); Angel Quintero Rivera, Patricios y plebeyos (Río Piedras, PR: EdicionesHuracán, 1988); Socialist and Cigarrmaker: Proletarianization in the Making of the Puerto Rican Working Class" Latin American Perspectives 10, 2-3 (Spring-Summer 1983): 19-38; and Workers' Struggle in Puerto Rico: A Documentary History (New York: Monthly Review Press, 1976) .

[31] Carlos Sanabria, "The Puerto Rican Organized Workers' Movement and the American Federation of Labor, 1901 to 1934," (Ph.D. Diss. City University of New York, 2000), Arturo Bird-Cardona, "Between the Insular Road and San Juan Bay: The Cigar World of Puerta de Tierra," (Ph.D. Diss. Iowa State University, 1999); Teresita Levy, "The History of Tobacco Cultivation in Puerto Rico, 1898-1940," (Ph. D. Diss. City University of New York, 2007); Ivette Marie Rivera-Giusti, "Gender, Labor, and the Working-Class Activism in the Puerto Rican Tobacco Industry," (Ph. D. Diss. State University of New York at Binghamton, 2004).

of the cigar industry in Puerto Rico during the end of the Spanish government in the island and the early years of the twentieth century.

Cigar makers are the primary protagonists in Quintero-Rivera's essay, in what he considers a mayor example of the proletarianization process occurring in Puerto Rico at that time. This group of workers was militant and struggled to maintain control of their production. In addition, they believed that society should be organized around workers and their inter-related needs. I agree with Quintero-Rivera on the role he assigns to cigarmakers as key players in the development of the cigar industry in the country. However, the view explored in this dissertation considers other workers employed in the industry, such as strippers, as active participants in the events that took place in this industry. All of them are considered as cigar workers.

Another contribution of this essay is that it establishes that the initial participation of a large group of women in the productive process in Puerto Rico began in the cigar industry. The growth of the cigar industry in Puerto Rico produced an increase in the participation of women in the labor force. Quintero-Rivera argues that female workers developed their conception of women as comrades as a result of their participation in the economic life of the country and their common struggles with male workers against employers.

Juan José Baldrich's essay "Gender and the Decomposition of the Cigar-Making Craft," represents another important contribution to the study of the cigar industry and cigar workers during the first three decades of the twentieth century in Puerto Rico. Baldrich considers that the expansion of tobacco manufacture provoked changes in this industry as well as in labor organizations. Cigars workers, according to him, played a

major role in organizing unions, as well as participating in socialist and anarchist groups. Its research emphasizes changes in the labor process and technology to explain how male cigarmakers lost control in the workshop and to explain gender relations in the cigar industry. According to Baldrich, the expansion of the cigar industry in Puerto Rico after 1898 promoted the participation of women, mainly as steamers and strippers. I agree with Baldrich in terms of defining this participation in the cigar industry, as "their first contact with capitalist relation of production".[32] I also agree with Baldrich when he states that while their class experience united male and female workers in common opposition against employers, gender kept them apart. Chapter 4 and Chapter 5 explore class and gender issues.

It is important to briefly mention the four dissertations cited earlier because they represent the most recent works dealing with topics related to the labor movement, the cigar industry, the cigar makers and the impact of gender in this industry. Arturo Bird-Cardona's dissertation "Between the Insular Road and San Juan Bay: The Cigar World of Puerta de Tierra," deals with changes that occurred in the cigar industry in Puerto Rico early in the twentieth century, and how these changes impacted cigar workers and helped to forge the image of cigarmakers as labor agitators. He also incorporated the study of gender in the proletarianization process of cigarmakers, exploring the reasons for male cigarmakers' perception that women were a threat to their work and to their masculinity.

Bird-Cardona also explains the process by which the American Tobacco Company and its affiliates in the island, the Puerto Rican American Tobacco Company (PRATCO), the Industrial Company of Porto Rico, and the Puerto Rico Leaf Tobacco Company came to control leaf production, factories, and machinery. Control of large

[32]Juan José Baldrich, "Gender and the Decomposition of the Cigar-Making Craft in Puerto Rico," 108.

tobacco supply and the support of the ATC, for example, gave PRATCO an advantage over the competition.

I agree with Bird-Cardona in his analysis of how the Tobacco Trust reshaped the production process in the cigar industry in Puerto Rico, by dividing the cigarmaking tasks into several components, most of which could be completed by easily replaceable unskilled workers, and effectively taking control of cigar manufacturing. However, as Bird-Cardona argues, the trust was able to change the production process, but cigarmakers preserved a piece of the artisan world inside the new factories until the 1930s. This is a point explored in chapter 3 of my dissertation, particularly through the role played by the Reader in the cigar factories. According to Bird-Cardona, writings generated by the workers promoted three basic elements or themes: solidarity, unionism, and social revolution.

In addition, Bird-Cardona explores the role or influence of anarchism on Puerto Rican workers. However most of his interpretation is based mainly on El derrumbe de las murallas de San Juan book published by Rubén Dávila Santiago in 1983. Bird-Cardona is correct in his interpretation that although anarchists were never a majority in the Puerto Rican labor movement, their militancy, prolific literary production and constant denounciation of the injustices of the system gained them prestige and leadership. Furthermore, while the FFL's principal leaders spoke a trade unionist language most of the time, other members such as Eugenio Sánchez López, Angel María Dieppa, Eduardo Conde, Venacio Cruz, and Juan Vilá, associated it with socialist or anarchist language. In this sense, the FFL represented a big umbrella for socialists,

anarchists, and trade unionists, all sharing some portions of their goals but advocating different ways of achieving them and envisioning different destinies.

Ivette Marie Rivera-Giusti's dissertation, "Gender, Labor, and the Working-Class Activism in the Puerto Rican Tobacco Industry," concentrates on the study of female workers in the cigar industry between 1898 and 1924. She argues that during this period female workers in the cigar industry developed their own ideas on gender and class and both became central to their labor activism in their workplaces. In addition, Rivera-Giusti defines as ambivalent the response given by male workers to women's presence in the cigar industry. While some male workers accepted female workers as comrades, others opposed their presence in workplaces. In concurrence with Quintero Rivera and Bird Cardona, Rivera-Giusti views cigarmakers' institutions and traditions, such as the reader, as playing an important role in developing a culture of labor activism expressed in the ideas of solidarity, loyalty and militancy. According to Rivera-Giusti, because of their activism, employers' perceived women workers to be a threat in their factories and shops. This perception led employers to attempt to establish a system of labor discipline based on intimidation and violence. According to Rivera-Guisti, the dependency of the cigar industry on the labor of female workers provided the rationale for employers resorting to violence against women in the workplace. However, the same intimidation and violence was also attempted against male workers. In addition, the statement that the cigar industry depended on female workers is not totally correct for the first two decades of the twentieth century. There were phases of the work which mainly utilized female workers, while other activities were concentrated in the hands in male workers.

Rivera-Giusti concludes that many leaders of the FFL viewed women as invading the industry but found it necessary to organize them because women were weak and could be used to lower wages paid to cigarmakers. At the same time, some cigarmakers promoted the organization of female workers based on the abuses women suffered and the need to provide protection to their honor. The author characterizes this situation as ambivalence where opposition to women in the cigar industry was present as well as solidarity with their plight at work.

I consider Rivera-Giusti correct in her interpretation that male cigar makers and female strippers were the main protagonists in the workers' struggle in the cigar industry. As she explains, both were involved in the restructuring process of the tobacco industry, and their strikes came in response to the new work regulations. According to Rivera-Giusti, female tobacco workers challenged the tobacco trust in the battle for control over the production process, demanding improvement in their working conditions, recognition of the Reader, and the establishment of a factory workers' commission. Furthermore, she argues that these women had a leading role in some of the most important strikes movements in Puerto Rican labor history. In my opinion, although female workers played an important role in the strikes, their actions were not unique because the same conclusion can be applied to male workers. Gender represents an important factor in the analysis and understanding of the changes that occurred in the cigar industry and how the cigar makers union and the organized labor movement perceived and reacted to the incorporation of women into the wage labor force.

There are two dissertations related to the labor movement and tobacco production that should be mentioned. The first is Carlos Sanabria's dissertation, "The

Puerto Rican Organized Workers' Movement and the American Federation of Labor," which makes general references to cigar workers, but does not situate this group as playing a key role in the development of labor movement in Puerto Rico. His main objective is the study of the relationship of the Puerto Rican organized labor movement and the American Federation of Labor during the first three decades of the twentieth century. Therefore, he studies the development of the labor movement at the level of artisans' participation without concentrating on any particular group of artisans. He argues that although the FFL developed as a labor organization influenced by socialist and anarchist ideology, under the influence of the AFL this movement grew as a predominantly trade unionist and reformist organization. In terms of what the FFL represented for cigar workers, it can be said that for them this labor organization was a big umbrella where workers did not necessarily agree or follow the directives established by the leadership of the FFL.

The most recent dissertation related to tobacco in Puerto Rico is the work by Teresita Levy, "The History of Tobacco Cultivation in Puerto Rico, 1898-1940." Different from the previous works discussed, Levy did not explore the world of cigar workers, the impact of technology in the cigar industry or the development of labor organizations. Levy concentrates in studying the history of the eastern and western highland tobacco growing regions and the role played by small-scale tobacco growers in the political and economic events that occurred during the period under study. According to Levy, these growers were neither victims of United States imperialism, nor passive players in the socio-economic and political events that impacted their lives during the period under study. An issue not explored in her dissertation is the presence

and participation of rural tobacco workers in these tobacco regions, including their labor relations with tobacco growers.

If, as expressed by Levy, the cultivation of tobacco for the United States market represented the most important economic activity for the farmers in the highland regions in Puerto Rico, then a similar role was played by the cigar production as the most important urban economic activity whose production was exported as a final product. Contrary to what occurred with workers in the agricultural phase of tobacco, workers in the cigar industry played a major role in the development of the labor movement. In addition, the cigar industry became the main place for women who began working outside the house for a salary.

According to Levy, the tobacco regions studied by her produced 91 percent of all tobacco leaf in Puerto Rico between 1910 and 1940, however, she did not explore if that production was enough to supply the cigar industry developing in Puerto Rico, or if during the period under study there was a need to import tobacco leaf to satisfy the industry needs.

This study represents a contribution to the research of tobacco production and the cigar industry in Puerto Rico, as well as a contribution to the history of the labor movement in Puerto Rico. It argues that cigar workers and their employers, particularly the Porto Rican American Tobacco Company (PRATCO), a subsidiary of the American Tobacco Company (ATC), were in constant confrontation over workers' demands to organize unions and to defend their work practices. Workers were confronting employers, who perceived the need to take total control over production, and who

promoted the destruction of the cigar workers' culture as essential for protecting their investments and profits.

The two main factors that influenced the activities and actions of cigar workers were their anarchist ideology and the particular work culture that they defended and sought to impose at the workplace. They incorporated an ideology in their struggles and promoted both short and long-range goals. As immediate demands they asked for better wages and working conditions. The need to replace the foundation of their society by establishing some kind of socialist society was a major long-term goal**.**

The study of the cigar industry in Puerto Rico is important because it represents the first case of urban workers, in this case cigar workers, who during the first two decades of the twentieth century confronted their employers over the control of the productive process in workplaces. The division of tasks and the incorporation of technology in the production process represented for cigar makers a reduction of wages due to the large number of workers able to substitute those already working. The need for an organization under these circumstances seemed vital for their survival as a group.

This dissertation also argues that cigar workers cannot be studied in isolation or evaluated as a singular group of workers in a small Caribbean island. The case of the cigar industry in Puerto Rico was part and parcel of an international movement of capital and a concomitant reorganization of world labor markets and modes of production. The experiences of Puerto Rican cigar workers are correlated to the changes and transformations occurring in other countries with cigar industries involved in production for the international market or trying to organize a labor force. In other words, this research argues the case of Puerto Rico as one that has to be incorporated into the

international world of the tobacco industry and market, particularly in the United States. The cigar industry that was developed in Puerto Rico during the first two decades of the twentieth century followed similar patterns as those found in other areas of the United States (particularly Florida, New York, and Chicago), as well as in the Philippines, and Cuba. These countries experienced the impact of factory production in the cigar market that provoked changes in the life and organization of workers. Among the factors that made possible their common experiences are: the work culture of cigar workers; the incorporation of women into the labor force, with similar practices in the cigar industry; strikes as an instrument of pressure and defense; the solidarity of cigar workers; and the influence of anarchist ideology among workers.

Yoshihiro Chiba, for example, found that, during the early years of the twentieth century, the three main reasons for cigar maker strikes in Manila were wage rates, relations with supervisors, and employer attitudes toward their unions. Other similarities with Puerto Rico were that after 1909 the United States became the main market for cigars exported from Manila. The cigar industry employed more workers in the Philippines than any other industry in that country. Women in the cigar industry were mainly employed in the least skilled and lowest paid occupations such as leaf-strippers; while men worked on high quality cigars, women were assigned to the lower quality cigars. In terms of working hours, Chiba makes reference to the cigar makers' high degree of discretion in arranging their work schedule. He also acknowledges that this group of workers had strong bargaining power when confronting employers.[33] In another study about hiring female workers for Manila cigar industry, John E. Murray and Kristen

[33] Yoshihiro Chiba, "Cigar-Makers in American Colonial Manila: Survival During Structural Depression in the 1920s" Journal of Southeast Asian Studies: 36, 3 (October 2004) : 372-384.

Keith found that during the early years of the twentieth century the cigar and cigarette industries were among the best paying industries in the Philippines. Women's wages, however, were about 30 percent less than men for the same type of work. Lastly, working conditions could be humiliating because twice a day women were searched to ensure that they did not take home any cigar product.[34]

The cigar industry in Cuba during the nineteenth century and early twentieth century reflected a similar pattern of development as those found in the case of Puerto Rico. The entrance of United States tobacco companies into the Cuban market promoted innovations reflected in the mode of production, in the technology and organization of work, and the increasing employment of female workers. At that point, cigar employers were divided in three groups: factory producers (large number of employees producing quality cigars in large buildings), small-shops (small groups of employees producing less-quality cigars), and *chinchalitos* or small places (with two or three employees) producing cheap cigars. By 1903, major cigar and tobacco factories in Havana were under British and United States control. In the case of the later, the American Tobacco Company controlled the *Havana Cigar and Tobacco Company* (39 tobacco brands and 18 cigar brands), the *Havana Commercial Company* (161 tobacco brands and 36 cigar brands), and the *Hija de Cabañas y Carvajal Company* (11 tobacco brands and 4 cigar brands). According to Rivero Muñiz, by the 1890s a large number of cigar workers, began supporting anarchist ideology. As a final point, Cuban cigar workers used strikes as an instrument of pressure in situations where employers decided to reduce the number of employees in their factories. In May 1907, for example, workers promoted the *Huelga de*

[34] John E. Murray and Kristen Keith, "Male-Female Earnings Differentials in Early 20thCentury Manila" Explorations in Economic History 41(2004): 361-362.

No-Rebaja demanding employers not to dismiss workers and proposed the redistribution of work in such a way that no worker would be left out.[35]

At the same time, the cigar industry represented the main work place whose production characteristics, such as grouping a number of workers in the same building, allowed workers to expand their incipient labor organizations. The artisan mode of production gave way to a production based on a division of tasks where a large number of workers began laboring in factories employing hundreds of workers.[36] In fact, cigar and cigarette companies were the only industries during the period under study able to employ more than one thousand workers in factories. By 1920, close to 80 percent of cigar production occurred in places employing 500 workers or more.[37] It was here where a group of workers initially promoted and articulated an organized response against the employers, which also functioned as a space for the incorporation of women into the labor market.

A central topic of this dissertation refers to the role played by women workers in the development of the cigar industry and the impact of their incorporation into the organized labor movement. The growing number of women in the cigar industry was a major factor in influencing the male leadership of cigar unions. They based their organizing propaganda on common class interests, explaining that female workers were exploited in a similar way as male workers. There was another major reason for promoting the organization of women: as an act of self-preservation, thwarting

[35] José Rivero Muñiz, Tabaco: su historia en Cuba (La Habana: Instituto de Historia, 1965), vol. 2, 284-335.
[36] "Una hermosa fábrica de cigarros y cigarrillos que hace honor a Puerto Rico, es una rama de la Porto Rican American Tobacco Co cerca de mil mujeres libran la subsistencia en ella," El Tiempo, November 12 1917, 1.
[37] Quintero Rivera, "Socialist and Cigarmaker," 31-33.

employers' goal of training women in different phases of producing cigars in order to substitute male workers, and of paying lower wages for women doing the same work as men.

Exploring the world of the cigar industry and their workers also promotes the discussion of the incorporation of women into the labor market at the moment when women were moving out of the house to work in factories for a salary. I argue in this study that cigar industry was responsible for opening a space and integrating women into the Puerto Rican labor force. This position challenges the argument that it was not until 1914 that woman began working outside the home for a salary in the garment industry, or that the integration occurred during Operation Bootstrap in the 1940s, when the economy changed from agriculture to industrialization, and women had more opportunities to work in factories. Rather, the process began early in the twentieth century in the cigar industry which incorporated women in significant numbers. Between 1899 and 1920 the cigar industry registered the highest increase of female participation in non-agricultural employment in Puerto Rico. In 1899, there were only 60 female workers employed in the cigar industry; by 1910, the number had increased to 3,204; and by 1920, women constituted the majority of workers in this industry with 8,573.[38] The cigar industry represented a place where women workers gained consciousness about their exploitation as workers and understood the need to confront employers. They were willing to participate in union activities and strike movements. However, women's aspirations and goals entered in conflict with the male work culture, creating a situation of both solidarity and exclusionism.

[38] Yamila Azize, La mujer en la lucha (Rio Piedras, PR: Editorial Cultural, 1985), 58.

The struggle between cigar workers and employers had a significant impact on Puerto Rican working women. It brought into public view the role of female workers in Puerto Rican society. On the one hand, male cigar workers were interested in gaining women's solidarity and commitment to the labor organization. On the other hand, employers were interested in hiring women as a new and cheaper labor force at a time when employers in the cigar industry in the United States were making efforts to control or eliminate certain practices promoted by male cigar workers.

Furthermore, the role played by women in the cigar industry during the period under study was different than women working in factories during the 1940s and the 1950's in Puerto Rico. Some of the most important differences were that women cigar workers participated more in the discussion of issues concerning the union at the local level, and showed a higher level of participation in solidarity strikes. In addition, during the 1940s and 1950s, there was not a similar institution able to play the role previously played by the Reader. Patricia A. Cooper argues in her book that organized labor in the United States made little effort to organize female workers in the tobacco industry.[39] This research explores if this was the pattern followed by cigar unions in Puerto Rico, including a discussion of how male and female workers reacted to issues of solidarity and exclusivity. In this way the study becomes a contribution to the discussion of the role of woman workers in the labor movement in Puerto Rico and a comparison with women workers in the U.S.

Puerto Rican cigar workers were aware of socialist ideas and informed about workers' struggles occurring in the Americas and Europe. This dissertation explores the

[39] Patricia A. Cooper, Once a Cigar Maker (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1987).

role that anarchist ideology played in the actions and reactions of cigar workers. How anarchist ideas were introduced in Puerto Rico and why this ideology found acceptance among Puerto Rican workers are issues that have not been clearly delineated in previous research. By the 1890s, urban workers were reading and identifying with anarchist ideas, particularly with those related to the construction of a new society organized around work and rejection of capitalism, the state and religion. Instances of how anarchism was a factor within the triangle of Spain, Cuba, and Puerto Rico are: the role of Santiago Iglesias Pantín, a Spaniard who played a key role in the organization of the Free Federation of Workers in Puerto Rico); workers traveling and working in Spain, as was the case of Eduardo Conde (a Puerto Rican worker and declared anarchist); and workers employed in cigar and other industries in the United States, as mentioned by Bernardo Vega. The process of radicalization among urban workers was fueled in part by an anarchist ideology that provided the basis for the establishment of their aspirations and view of society, and which did not necessarily coincide with those expressed by those in favor or against independence or statehood, first in Spain and later in the United States.[40]

A central theme in the struggles of cigar workers is the use of strikes to pressure employers. However, no comprehensive research has been done on this topic. While there are a few publications dealing with individual strikes in the 1930s, none center on cigar workers.[41] This study covers the main issues involved in cigar workers' strikes and their consequences during the first two decades of the twentieth century. Most of the

[40] Santiago Iglesias Pantín, Luchas emancipadoras (San Juan, PR: Cantero Fernández, 1929); Rafael Alonso Torres, Cuarenta años de lucha proletaria (San Juan, PR: Imprenta Baldrich, 1939); and Vega, Memoirs.

[41] Among these publications can be mentioned: Juan Antonio Corretjer, Albizu Campos y las huelgas en los años '30 (Guaynabo, PR: Liga Socialista, 1969); Taller de Formación Política, Huelga en la caña, 1933-34 (Río Piedras, PR: Ediciones Huracán, 1982), and No estamos pidiendo el cielo: huelga portuaria de 1938 (Río Piedras, PR: Ediciones Huracán, 1988).

cigar workers' gains after strikes were of short duration or of a temporary nature. Although salary and better working conditions were frequent demands, this study will show that the main issue behind strikes was the struggle between employers and workers for control of production and of the workplace. In the worldview of these workers society should respond to them and not to employers. Therefore their activities represented a collective action taken against members of the other class. In addition, strikes reflected the fragile situation of cigar workers, particularly cigar makers, as they faced new technology and work organization that challenged their autonomy. The cigar companies implanted the factory system in Puerto Rico and a division of labor that reduced workers' freedom and negatively impacted their autonomy and work culture.

As documented in cases of the United States and Cuba, cigar workers in Puerto Rico promoted a culture and a way of working which gave them control over time, production, and working conditions. This culture was in direct conflict with the investment strategies and goals of employers, who considered workers' culture as an obstacle to profit accumulation and as an infringement of their right to conduct business in a manner most convenient for them. This situation created a series of confrontations that frequently ended in strikes and lockouts.

The use of relatively unknown or rarely consulted sources dealing with cigar workers in this research is a contribution to the discussion of the development of the labor history of Puerto Rico. These sources include workers' publications such as Unión Obrera (1904-1935), Justicia (1914-1925), El Eco del Torcedor (1908-1909), and La Huelga (1911). Other newspapers of general circulation responding to upper class interests, such as La Democracia (1890-1940), El Tiempo (1907-1930), and La

Correspondencia de Puerto Rico (1893-1943), were examined in relation to issues dealing with the cigar industry, cigar workers, and the labor movement. In addition, leaflets and flyers used to promote organizational drives and strike movements were consulted. Because of the richness of the material and its relationship to Puerto Rico, I make use of documents from the American Federation of Labor, the Cigar Makers International Union, and the U.S. Bureau of Insular Affairs, Record Group 350. These sources help to overcome limitations that have hindered interpretations of the development of the Puerto Rican organized labor movement.[42] Finally, I made use of secondary sources related to the development of the labor movement in the United States, such as books by David Montgomery, Patricia Cooper, and David Dubinsky, which are relevant for my research.

These sources add insight into the ideas that influenced cigar workers' strategies and responses, revealing their perspectives on how transformation in production impacted the world of workers in Puerto Rico. Furthermore, these primary sources represent an aid to overcoming limitations that hindered previous interpretations of the history of the labor movement in Puerto Rico. Finally, the information obtained from these sources contributed to tracing the role played by cigar workers in the development of organized labor as well as providing information about their internal contradictions.

The dissertation is divided into an introductory chapter, four additional chapters and a conclusion, plus appendices and bibliography. The purpose of Chapter I, the introduction, is to present the main ideas that will be developed in the body of the text. Chapter II presents a review of the secondary literature related to cigar workers and to the

[42] For example, the book by Gervasio L. García and Angel G. Quintero Rivera, Desafío y solidaridad, (San Juan, PR: Ediciones Huracán, 1982) a history of the Puerto Rican labor movement, is a case in point because it makes limited use of primary sources from U.S. archives.

development of the labor movement in Puerto Rico. In addition, I examine the literature related to the socio-economic and political factors that influenced the development of the cigar industry in Puerto Rico and the struggles of cigar workers during the period of the 1890s to 1920. This chapter is structured thematically according to the following topics: the role played by commercial agriculture in the development of a labor force, the development of the cigar industry in Puerto Rico during the early years of the twentieth century, and, finally, a discussion of the first steps taken by workers in order to establish an organized labor movement.

Chapter III deals with anarchism, a topic largely unexplored in the history of Puerto Rico, but which should be considered as fundamental to understanding cigar workers' expressions. This chapter looks into the role and influence of anarchist writers in the politics and practices of cigar workers. Included in the discussion is a section on cigar workers' writings about anarchism in relation to Puerto Rico and how those ideas influenced their strikes. Because anarchism was not a predominant ideology in Puerto Rican society during the nineteenth century, a discussion of the influences of liberalism during that time is included. This study, in addition, includes a section on cigar workers' writings about anarchism and how those ideas influenced their strikes.

Chapter IV presents a discussion of the work culture, as it was practiced within the world of the cigar workers, as well as their contradictions with employers. The influence of cigar workers' practices in workplaces was deemed intolerable by employers who sought ways to eliminate them. These practices were eventually shattered by the incorporation of technology and women workers into the work process, by the introduction of division of tasks in the mode of production, and by the development of

capitalism as the dominant mode of production. In the context of this research, work culture or work practice is defined as a set of values or beliefs and rules of conduct developed among a group of people that gave meaning to their daily life experiences and that served as the basis for the construction of a specific reality. Among these practices can be found collective identity, mutual aid, autonomy, loyalty to each other, and control over work. In this research, however, cigar workers' control of factories and production does not refer to their control over companies owned by others, but to workers' intention to have meaningful control over time and working conditions.[43]

Chapter V presents a discussion on women in the history of the Puerto Rican labor movement and their involvement in the cigar industry. During the first two decades of the twentieth century as the number of women incorporated in the wage-market grew ~~occurred~~, women became visible and active in workplaces and community-related activities. The cigar industry became the most important industry for women during that period and a place where they could exchange labor for a wage. Their incorporation in factory work had implications for the production process and for their relationship with male workers and the unions. Ideology and work culture were key factors enabling cigar workers to contest managers' work rule, wages and union recognition. However, there were contradictions in this work culture between male and female workers. If masculinity represented for cigar workers a notion of manhood, which was related to skill, respectability, and autonomy, to what extent were those characteristics applicable to female workers? As part of the discussion it is important to explore the issues and moments that also promoted an environment of cooperation, inter-relation and

[43] Cooper, Once a Cigar Maker; David Montgomery, Workers' Control of America: Studies in the History of Work, Technology, and Labor Struggles (Cambridge, London: Cambridge University Press, 1979).

interaction. Gender, therefore, is important for the analysis and understanding of how the industry changed or developed in Puerto Rico, and how cigar workers unions and the organized labor movement perceived women's entrance in the wage labor force. The struggle between cigar workers and employers had a significant impact on Puerto Rican women, bringing into public view the role of female workers in Puerto Rican society. While cigar workers as a group attempted to win their solidarity as workers, the employers tried to use women as a source of cheap labor.

Patricia Cooper argued in her book that the organized labor movement in the United States made little effort to organize female workers in the tobacco industry.[44] This research explores whether cigar unions in Puerto Rico practiced similar patterns of exclusion and subordination. It will consider if local factors influenced the way in which workers of both sexes reacted to issues of class solidarity and exclusivity. If female workers were excluded and received lower salaries for the same kind of work performed by male workers, then female and male workers were not necessarily participating or sharing as equals in the same work culture or practices. For women this culture also implied that piecework tasks dominated their work and that they worked in teams rather than individually. It is also important to explain the role played by gender as a distancing factor or in exerting more influence over women than class solidarity. In the same way, there is a need to inquire about the issues and moments that promoted an environment of cooperation and solidarity, of inter-relation and inter-action.

Prudencio Rivera Martínez summarized the world of cigar workers as one of solidarity and militancy at a moment when the cigar industry was being transformed at a

[44] See Cooper, Once a Cigar Maker.

rapid pace. The story behind the expressions of Rivera Martinez is what this dissertation is about. This is the history of a small group of workers who played a leading role in organizing workers in Puerto Rico during the early years of the twentieth century.

CHAPTER II

CIGAR WORKERS AND THE LABOR MOVEMENT IN PUERTO RICO

A Review of the Literature

The main characters of this study are cigar workers in Puerto Rico during the period between the 1890s and 1920. These urban workers, skilled and unskilled, were members of a working class in development, whose most recent roots could be traced back to the nineteenth century. This chapter reviews the literature related to three main issues essential to contextualize the role played by cigar workers in the history of the labor movement in Puerto Rico. The first issue deals with the relationship between the development of a commercial agriculture and the formation of a labor force. The second issue refers to the development of the cigar industry in Puerto Rico framed within a world economy. This industry was important because it provided the opportunity to organize a large number of workers, opened the door for female employment, became a place where anarchism influenced workers, and connected Puerto Rico with the U.S. market as producer of a complete product. The third issue deals with the development of an organized labor movement in Puerto Rico, and how authors have viewed, evaluated and written about cigar workers.

Labor Force and Commercial Agriculture

The development of a labor force in Puerto Rico during the nineteenth century and early twentieth century was a long process that was directly related to the development and expansion of commercial agriculture based on sugar cane, coffee, and, eventually, tobacco production. Puerto Rico's participation in the world economy was

influenced in some instances by price increases in the international sugar and coffee markets. The profits from these markets helped to stimulate an increase in production that in turn created a need for a rural labor force capable of responding to the landowners' expectations of greater profits.[45]

The commercialization of agriculture promoted the development of a labor force in Puerto Rico. Landownership by individuals decreased during the entire nineteenth century. In 1830, close to half of the adult population owned land, but by the 1890s, the proportion of landowners was reduced by half.[46] The loss of land, therefore, was a factor in forcing people to work for a salary or to work as *agregados.*[47] There was abundant land available for the development of commercial agriculture, which became progressively concentrated in the hands of a few persons. Capital in Puerto Rico, although not as readily available, could be obtained, particularly through the merchant class. However, the main problem to be solved was the development of a labor force capable of supplying the workers needed for large-scale agricultural production.

Three main sources of agricultural labor can be identified for the first three-quarters of the nineteenth century in Puerto Rico. African slaves represented an important source of labor for sugar cane production until the abolition of slavery in 1873. This type of labor had two limitations. First, landowners did not have enough capital or available financial sources for the purchase of slaves. Secondly, the end of the slave

---

[45] Laird W. Bergad, Coffee and the Growth of Agrarian Capitalism in Nineteenth-Century Puerto Rico (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1983); and Francisco A. Scarano, Sugar and Slavery in Puerto Rico: The Plantation Economy of Ponce, 1800-1850 (Madison, Wisconsin: University of Wisconsin Press, 1984).

[46] Dietz, Economic History of Puerto Rico, 20; Miles Galvin, The Organized Labor Movement in Puerto Rico (New York: Fairleigh Dickinson University Press, 1979). 32.

[47] An *agregado* can be defined as a service tenant living on an estate, usually with land usufruct rights. Bergad, Coffee and the Growth of Agrarian Capitalism, 228.

trade in the 1850s further reduced the supply of slaves and increased acquisition costs. African slaves, however, were not the main source of labor in the production of coffee, Puerto Rico's second major crop during the first half of the nineteenth century. Family members and persons from neighboring areas provided the necessary labor. A second source of labor was provided by service tenants who protected landowners' property against squatters, sometimes receiving wages in exchange for their participation in the crop or other labors. Free or independent peasants constituted the third source of labor, although they lived primarily by subsistence farming or had small coffee farms, represented a casual-hand for agricultural production.

As mentioned before, large-scale commercial agriculture was a major factor in inducing tenants and freeing peasants to work on the *haciendas*. Several mechanisms were used during the nineteenth century to satisfy the need for workers. Government restrictions imposed in 1824 on non-slave workers who did not have legal title to the land they tilled forced these workers to work for the landowners.[48] To solve Puerto Rico's labor-shortage a government decree was issued in 1838 requiring persons without property or without sufficient resources for their subsistence to contract labor on the land of another person.[49] While that decree was overturned as inappropriate and oppressive in the following years, a new decree promulgated in 1849 had similar aims.[50]

The rationale for these decrees can be found in the landowners' interest in forcing peasants and tenants to work on their properties as a way to increase production and take advantage of the price market. The 1849 decree, for example, included in the legislation

[48] Dietz, Economic History of Puerto Rico, 41-42.
[49]Governor Miguel López de Baños, "Bando de Policía y Buen Gobierno, 1838."
[50]Governor Juan de la Pezuela, "Reglamento Especial de Jornaleros, 1849."

"anyone who did not labor for others, regardless of the length of time spent working for relatives in home production."[51] In addition, under this decree, after 1850, tenants were eliminated as a social group by prohibitions on landowners maintaining tenants on their land.[52] Free workers and tenants, therefore, were transformed into *jornaleros* or day laborers. However, Laird Bergad found in his study of coffee that the majority of *agregados* in Lares were able to retain the same relationship with landowners as before the law was approved. He found that of 728 men or heads of *agregados* subject to the 1849 law, almost 70 percent became renters by September 1850.[53]

This overview of the development of a labor force and its connection to international markets and the emergence of commercial agriculture has concentrated of the study of the sugar and coffee economies. However, there are different opinions amongst researchers as to when a labor force began to develop in Puerto Rico, what elements and factors made that development possible and how this process contributed to the development of an urban working class and city artisans. Moreover, the study of the history of labor markets in Puerto Rico has concentrated on its relationship to commercial agriculture, with an emphasis on the rural labor market. Few studies deal with urban experiences and the formation of a labor group and a labor market in the island's cities and towns.[54]

A review of the literature shows that the study of the development of social classes in Puerto Rico and conflicts between classes as well as the development of a labor

[51]Dietz, Economic History of Puerto Rico, 45.
[52]Ibid., 48-49.
[53]Bergad, Coffee and the Growth of Agrarian Capitalism,, 117.
[54] Félix Matos Rodríguez, Women in San Juan, 1820-1868 (Princeton, NJ: Markus Wiener, 1999), 8, 135.

force underwent a major change in the 1970's and 1980's. Work published in this period is characterized by the use of primary sources and Marxist analysis as a guiding force in the research. Conflicting visions of social classes, however, emerged from these works, particularly in terms of the formation of the working class and the role played by the landowners in the economic and political processes that took place during the nineteenth and early twentieth century in Puerto Rico.

Angel G. Quintero Rivera rejects the thesis that states that the Puerto Rican economy during the nineteenth century was a "rudimentary type of agrarian capitalism," that began developing with the Cédula de Gracias 1815, discussed in chapter I, the royal decree that removed legal obstacles for the expansion of commercial agriculture and opened the doors to commerce. According to him, the rise of a capitalist economy in Puerto Rico did not begin with an increase in agricultural production for exports; more important for this event was the development of the sugar and cigar industries.[55] Furthermore, he considers that the increase in commercial activity registered at that time was not a sufficient criterion for the classification of an economy as capitalist.

Quintero Rivera identified the production process as the key element for class analysis.[56] In his view**,** what occurred during the nineteenth century was a change from subsistence family agricultural production to what he called a seigniorial *hacienda* economy **–** both of which are part of the pre-capitalist system of production.[57] During this period land represented the most abundant factor in the economy while labor was more limited. Peasants preferred to work their own land rather than to work for others.

[55] Angel G. Quintero Rivera, "Background to the Emergence of Imperialist Capitalism in Puerto Rico," in Puerto Rico and the Puerto Ricans. Studies in History and Society, ed. Adalberto López (New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1972), 97.
[56] Ibid., 100.
[57] Ibid., 103.

The two mechanisms utilized by landowners, control over land and the rights over persons, are considered by Quintero Rivera to be the factors associated with a feudal regime of production.[58]

Colonial authorities promulgated the distribution of land previously cultivated by peasants to new immigrants, and the enactment of anti-vagrancy laws. Among these was the use of the "Libreta de Jornaleros," which forced workers to carry workbooks and prevented them from moving freely throughout the island without the approval of the proprietor for whom they worked. These constraints, concluded Quintero Rivera, made it impossible to develop the labor market.[59] Quintero Rivera also argued that in the Puerto Rican society of the nineteenth century there was no capitalism, no bourgeoisie, and no proletariat because the economy was in the process of structuring itself around the "hacienda." However, he recognized that the hacienda economy opened the gateway to capitalism.[60] Quintero Rivera did not consider the use of credit or vouchers for purchases at the hacienda store, for example, as equivalent to buying or selling labor power or of integrating workers into a money economy, although they represented tendencies in that direction.

On the other hand, the abolition of slavery in 1873 and the decline in the sugar industry during the second half of the nineteenth century were factors that contributed to increasing the number of potential workers in towns and urban centers, and formed the basis for the creation and development of large-scale cigar factories based on wage labor

[58]Ibid., 105.
[59]Ibid., 105. Dr. Bergad, however, considers the 1849 anti-vagrancy legislation as an attempt to create a free labor force. See "Toward Puerto Rico`s Grito de Lares," Hispanic American Historical Review 60 (1981), 635.
[60]Ibid., 98.

by the end of the century.[61] With the growth of the cigar industry in the urban centers and the rebirth of the sugar industry in the countryside at the end of the nineteenth century, according to Quintero Rivera, the Puerto Rican economy entered into a process of rapid transformation towards a capitalist economy.

The History Task Force (HTF) of the Center for Puerto Rican Studies published an important book during the late 1970s that concurs with Quintero Rivera's analysis. The authors of Labor Migration Under Capitalism, the Puerto Rican Experience, for example, considered sugar haciendas the best representative of the type of agricultural cultivation that propelled the transition to a capitalist mode of production.[62] They identified this process as beginning in the 1870s, when a social and economic movement promoted modernization of the colonial structure and the establishment of capitalist relations of production.[63] This process culminated with the U.S. economic invasion that fostered the growth of agrarian capitalism in the island after 1898 by revolutionizing the relations of production in agriculture. The History Task Force identified in their analysis three factors as key in the revolutionizing process: the rapid concentration of land ownership, the extension of areas devoted to export production, and the proletarianization of the working-class.[64]

The HTF argued, in addition, that the purpose of the "Bando de Policía y Buen Gobierno" of 1838, and the "Reglamento de Jornaleros" of 1849, was to legalize a system of servile labor and to create a class of rural workers without property. These legal measures, however, did not end tenant labor, which continued as the predominant source

[61] Ibid., 102.
[62] Centro de Estudios Puertorriqueños, History Task Force, Labor Migration Under Capitalism (New York: Monthly Review Press, 1979), 72.
[63] Ibid., 73.
[64] Ibid., 96.

of labor because landowners lacked sufficient money to pay workers in cash alone.[65] Furthermore, the rise of coffee as a major agricultural export product represented the failure to establish a capitalist plantation system under Spanish rule and the incapacity to break with the predominantly servile relations of production. The History Task Force identified payment in "vales" or vouchers, indebted tenants, seasonal labor, and the access to small plots of lands as characteristics of the coffee industry, which delayed capitalist agricultural development in Puerto Rico.[66]

Francisco J. Scarano has made important contributions to the discussion of the formation of a labor force in Puerto Rico by showing that this process occurred early in the nineteenth century and that slavery played an important role because of its importance in sugar production for the export economy.[67] In addition, his research challenged the notion that the development of the sugar industry in Puerto Rico during the nineteenth century owed little to the labor of African slaves.[68]

Scarano's case study of sugar production in the municipality of Ponce demonstrated that by the 1840s slave labor dominated, and that 7 to 9 of every 10 workers were slaves.[69] If the slave population represented only 10% of the total population in Puerto Rico, then their economic contribution was immense because the

[65] Ibid., 79.
[66] Ibid., 80.
[67] See Francisco J. Scarano, Sugar and Slavery in Puerto Rico; and "Slavery and Forced Labor in the Puerto Rican Sugar Economy, 1815-1873," in Comparative Perspectives on Slavery in New World Plantation Societies. eds.Vera Rubin and Arthur Tuden (New York: New York Academy of Science, 1977).
[68] For Quintero Rivera, for example, the Puerto Rican economy was never predominantly a slave economy. See "Background to the Emergence of Imperialist Capitalism in Puerto Rico," 101. Miles Galvin, in the Organized Labor Movement in Puerto Rico, 33, argues that contrary to other Caribbean colonies, Puerto Rico was never predominantly a slave economy; in part because the slave population never exceeded 12 % of the total population and because slavery was abolished in 1873.
[69] Scarano, Sugar and Slavery in Puerto Rico, 72.

wealth of the dominant class rested largely upon this small minority.[70] Scarano found that the preference of slave labor over free labor was based on the high cost of contracting free workers, the irregular work attendance of this kind of workers, the resistance to work discipline that characterized landless workers and peasants at that time, and the marginal quantity of land available for farming. These factors were absent from slave labor because it was available at a low cost and controlled by a strict work discipline.[71]

However, the transition from slavery to free landless labor did not provide the basis for the development of a free labor force and free labor market in Puerto Rico. What occurred was the creation of an artificial labor market tightened by legal control over the peasantry. The decline of sugar production and the price of sugar at international markets, from the late 1840s, together with an increase in the costs of slaves and the decline of the slave trade, are identified as factors that provoked a series of coercive measures to hold down the price of wage labor and to force day laborers into an unfree production system. This was the case of the *Reglamento* of 1849 that placed limitations on access to land and also defined who could be considered as a day laborer. Although this *Reglamento* was designed to create a free labor market by establishing sanctions to control the labor force, Laird Bergad found that the application of the law in Lares was subject to market conditions at the local level. According to him, the small supply of laborers was the main obstacle to the expansion of coffee production in 1849. To solve this situation the *agregados* were transformed into renters.[72]

---

[70]Ibid., 121. Dr. Bergad agrees with this interpretation, considering the slave population as important both demographically and as the principal source of labor. See Bergad, Coffee and the Growth, 54.
[71]Ibid., 33.
[72]Bergad, Coffee and the Growth, 124.

If for Quintero Rivera coffee "haciendas" were feudal because the workforce was unfree, for Laird W. Bergad, in Coffee and the Growth of Agrarian Capitalism in Nineteenth-Century Puerto Rico, coffee production was capitalist because free wage labor was used. Bergad defined the rural proletariat as workers who had no land, and because they were dependent on a salary for survival and had no personal connections with landowners, were willing to move where work was available. There are two major contributions in the work of Bergad. One is the notion that the development of the coffee industry during the nineteenth century challenged the idea that capitalism began in Puerto Rico in 1898. Another is that the development of a free labor market was a process that began in the nineteenth century and that took place in the coffee industry rather than in the twentieth century sugar plantation economy.

Bergad traced the development of a rural working class as associated with the development of coffee as an export product for an international market during the second half of the nineteenth century. He identified a process that occurred during the nineteenth century, particularly since 1840 and which intensified during the last twenty years of that century. This was a process that occurred in three phases beginning with the period of the 1840s, which represented a moment without a free labor market and vast tracts of available land in the central highlands of the island. A second phase occurred between 1870s and 1880s, characterized by the increase of landless people willing to move to mountain areas and to work for a salary. The last phase corresponded to the period between the 1880s and 1898, by which time a free labor market for coffee production was clearly in place.

Bergad's case study explored coffee production in the mountain municipalities of Lares and Yauco, areas that required a labor system capable of supplying the number of workers necessary for production at a moment when market prices for coffee were high. The rural work force in this area was characterized by the steady growth of a population without title to land; by the increasing deprivation of usufruct rights to most landless families; by the development of a seasonal migration from the coastal areas to the highlands; and by rising wages as labor demand increased.[73]

According to Bergad, the landless population in the coffee areas was not uniform in composition, in their relations with landed society, or in relation to each other.[74] Therefore, he argued, changes in conditions and organization among rural workers must be taken into consideration for the study of the nineteenth century labor force. Otherwise, presenting as homogeneous factors that influenced the formation of the labor force or presenting arguments based on generalizations, would lead researchers to the wrong conclusions.

Bergad, for example, rejected what he considered to be generalizations on this topic by Angel G. Quintero Rivera in "Background to the Emergence of Imperialist Capitalism in Puerto Rico" and Conflicto de clases y política en Puerto Rico. Quintero Rivera argued that it is incorrect to identify capitalism with the growth of external commercial relations since the nature of the labor force is the principal criterion determining patterns of economic organizations.[75] Furthermore, capitalist relations of production could not prevail in Puerto Rico during the nineteenth century because the country did not have a well-developed system of wage labor or the circulation of species

[73]Ibid., 193.
[74]Ibid., 194.
[75] "Quintero Rivera, "Background to the Emergence of Imperialist Capitalism," 90-91.

needed to produce that system. According to Bergad, capital and land must be added to the examination of labor organization, otherwise a narrow view is produced,[76] which will miss the "precise internal impact of the growth in international trade."[77] In the case of coffee, these factors responded closely to changes in market forces. Finally, Bergad argues that the availability and control of land and not of labor was the main issue between 1860 and 1890s because socio-economic changes during this period promoted the demand for more land for coffee production, which in turn increased the value and price of land. The condition of unfree labor was present until the 1870s when socio-economic changes gave rise to free labor. At this point, according to Bergad, a rural proletariat emerged in Puerto Rico.

Pedro San Miguel, in his book, El mundo que creó el azúcar: las haciendas en Vega Baja, 1800-1873, follows a similar approach to the works of Scarano and Bergad. This is a socio-economic study of a particular municipality, centered on sugar production during the first three quarters of the nineteenth century. San Miguel studied the particular experience of the municipality in the context of the broad transformations that occurred in the island as a consequence of the development of commercial agriculture. A contribution of his research to Puerto Rican historiography is that in contrast with other coffee and sugar research, the municipality under study is in the northern area of Puerto Rico. San Miguel's work traces the history of rural property in Vega Baja, explaining the concentration of land in the hands of a few proprietors, and discussing the local economic factors that influenced growth of sugar

[76]Bergad, Coffee and the Growth, 195-203.
[77]Ibid., 196.

haciendas in that municipality. In addition, his book dealt with the development of the labor force needed to guarantee the sugar production.

The case of Vega Baja "haciendas" shows that slavery and day laborers played a major role in the development of the labor force. As occurred in Ponce, slave labor in Vega Baja was used as the labor source in the sugar economy during the first half of the nineteenth century. However, San Miguel's research suggests that, by the 1860s, more than half of the sugar plantations' workforce were day workers.[78]

San Miguel rejects the idea that landowners in the sugar industry were "patriarcas del agro" or agricultural patriarchs because profit was their main goal. To that end, they increased the amount of land under their control, the number of slaves or day laborers working for them, and demonstrated great concern for information about sugar prices on the international market, as well as the price of slaves.[79] He concluded from his research that the development of a free labor market in Vega Baja was a slow process that by the 1870s remained incomplete, one in which plantation workers were alternatively drawn from the peasantry and from the rural proletariat.[80]

From the literature on "haciendas" cited in this review, it can be concluded that "haciendas" in Puerto Rico during the nineteenth century represented a point of departure for the development of an export economy based on sugar and coffee. This production unit, however, required the development and mobilization of a labor force that took different forms such as slavery, tenancy, day laboring, and proletarianization.[81]

---

[78] Pedro San Miguel, El mundo que creó el azúcar (Río Piedras, PR: Ediciones Huracán, 1989), 167.
[79] Ibid., 170.
[80] Ibid., 213.
[81] Mariano Negrón Portillo and Raúl Mayo Santana, "Conflictos en el siglo XIX: una revisión crítica de las nuevas investigaciones históricas en Puerto Rico," Revista de Ciencias Sociales 24, 3-4 (diciembre 1985): 471-497.

Proletarianization was a process that began during the nineteenth century and culminated during the early twentieth century. It was a process whereby peasants and laborers in the sugar sector were transformed into proletarians in the countryside. Meanwhile artisans were converted into proletarians in the urban areas. As the sugar economy modernized production, the modes and relations of production began to change. The decline of prices in the international market during the second half of the nineteenth century forced the sugar industry in Puerto Rico to modernize production in order to compete in the international market. This was the moment when the old sugar mills were transformed into "centrales."[82]

The abolition of slavery and the end of forced labor in 1873 promoted the mobility of workers from rural areas to urban centers and the development of a free labor market for sugar haciendas and, on a smaller scale, for coffee plantations.[83] During the last thirty years of the nineteenth century, skilled or craft workers, mainly associated with sugar production, moved to the urban areas thereby increasing the labor force in the towns. As a result an artesian sector developed in the urban areas of the colonial society.

Gervasio García and Angel G. Quintero Rivera stated in Desafío y solidaridad that three major factors contributed to delays in the formation of a working class in Puerto Rico. First, prior to the 1870s and during most of the nineteenth century, slavery and feudalism were major obstacles because slaves and serfs could not express their aspirations as a coherent group. The dispersion and isolation of these groups was an

[82] According to Bergad, *centrales*, in the nineteenth century were modernized sugar mills, usually with steam-powered machinery, Coffee and the Growth, 228.
[83] On March 22, 1873, Spain's National Assembly enacted a law abolishing slavery in Puerto Rico. See Cayetano Coll y Cuchí, Boletín Histórico de Puerto Rico, 4, 381-382. On July 13, 1873, Governor Primo de Rivera suppressed the still-in-force Libreta de Jornaleros, declaring jornaleros as subject to the general laws of the country. Cayetano Coll y Cuchí, Boletín Histórico de Puerto Rico, 11, 177.

outcome of the co-existence of subsistence and commercial agriculture. Second, the proper conditions for the development of an urban and industrial working class were not available in the urban sectors. In particular, authors stated that the almost free importation of manufactured goods was a major contributing factor in delaying the development of local manufacturing or industries, which in turn would have employed more local labor. However, another explanation for the delay in the formation of a working class can be found in the absence of a local entrepreneurial class with enough capital or interest to develop industrial production.

Third, these authors argue that abolition of slavery and of the *Libreta de Jornaleros* in 1873 were events that promoted the development of a free labor market, and increased laborers' mobility between the rural and urban sectors. With the development of modern sugar mills in the 1870s, tenants and small proprietors were transformed into proletarians. In this way workers became part of an anonymous group, whose common denominator was similar material conditions of life and their distance from the landowners. Therefore, the paternalistic relations in the rural sector began to disintegrate and low salaries and poor working conditions became good enough reasons for protest.[84]

Angel G. Quintero Rivera's essay, "Socialist and Cigarmaker: Artisans' Proletarianization in the Making of the Puerto Rican Working Class," stands as one of the few works discussing the proletarianization process that occurred in the urban areas in Puerto Rico between the late nineteenth century and the early twentieth century. He traces proletarianization in the urban areas that are identified with the growth of the

[84] García y Quintero Rivera, Desafío y solidaridad, 13-15.

tobacco industry, particularly with the establishment of a local branch of the American Tobacco Company. This process, however, did not take place simultaneously or homogeneously throughout the island.[85]

Artisans represented a small group within the working population during the nineteenth century. Their importance, however, was not in their number but in their ideology and politics. Artisans were in charge of the small-scale production of commodities to be consumed in rural locations, cities and towns. As owners of their means of production they functioned as small independent producers. Artisans' daily exchange dealings, however, promoted a group ideology based on mutual need and centered on work as essential for survival. They also organized guilds in the later part of the nineteenth century as a way of controlling the number of people working in the trade and to control the quality of the product.

The social character of artisan work, as explained by Quintero Rivera, promoted among them an ideology based on work as the source of life. This perception was in contradiction with the prevailing social structure that responded to the class interests of landowners. According to Quintero Rivera, the hegemony of the landowners was, for artisans, a reflection of their subordination to what they considered an antagonistic class. Artisans in urban areas developed certain traditions that challenged the hegemony of landowners. Quintero Rivera defines the disrespect for hierarchy and pride of self, and secondly, the tradition of dissent against authoritarian colonial political power, against the class that dominated the economic life, and against the structure of social relations, as the two most important traditions for artisans. Within the tradition of dissent, Quintero

[85]Quintero Rivera, "Socialist and Cigarmaker," 21.

Rivera identifies three movements that were unacceptable to landowners: women's liberation, atheism, and libertarian socialism.[86]

Quintero Rivera argues that the artisan sectors that experienced a more intensive proletarianization were precisely those that had increased in numerical terms and in importance for the economy. He concludes that artisans were moving toward work in the tobacco industry in the urban settings, and that work in the tobacco sector was increasingly turning toward proletarianzation. In support of his hypothesis, he points out that according to census data, the number of cigarmakers increased between 1899 and 1909 by 197 percent, while the working population as a whole increased by 24.5 percent.[87] In addition, by 1910, 75 percent of all workers in the cigar industry were salaried workers who were working in establishments employing more than 100 workers.

The Cigar Industry in Puerto Rico

The history of the cigar industry in Puerto Rico is a theme that few researchers have explored. Moreover, those that have written about this theme have concentrated on the 1930 to 1940 period. The section of this history dealing with the Spanish period, particularly the second half of nineteenth century, is awaiting a more complete examination. In terms of this work, however, there is a group of researchers who have written about the development of the cigar industry in Puerto Rico, and they are essentially in agreement on the main factors that influenced the development of the cigar industry in the island during the period from 1890 to 1920.[88]

---

[86] Ibid., 22-30.
[87] Ibid., 33.
[88] Among these researchers are Quintero Rivera, "Socialist and Cigarmaker; " Galvin, The Organized Labor Movement in Puerto Rico; Baldrich, "From the Origins of Industrial Capitalism in Puerto Rico to Its Subordination to the U.S. Tobacco Trust: Rucabado and Company, 1865-1901, Revista Mexicana del

By the end of the nineteenth century, the socio-economic conditions of most of the workers in Puerto Rico were of extremely poverty with few alternatives for new jobs or better wages. Therefore, the development of new sources of income and the establishment of new industries were vital issues for the workers and for the economy of the country. Commissioner Henry Carroll recognized this situation in 1899, when he wrote in his special report about conditions in Puerto Rico as follows:

> …the condition of the laboring classes can not greatly improve unless agriculture becomes prosperous and minor industries are developed. This means practically a revolution in the methods of raising and marketing crops, and it can not be accomplished without the influx of new capital. How this shall be attracted is one of the problems of those interested in the regeneration of Porto Rico.[89]

The United States government and mainland economic interests responded to Carroll's pledge by including sugar and tobacco in its protective market, and by providing the necessary capital for exploiting these products. As shown in Table 2, the outcome was a prosperous commercial agriculture and industry based on these two products, which generated large profits for investors and revenues for the government, but left workers in the same poor condition.

Caribe 3, 5 (1998), 80-106; and "Gender and the Decomposition of the Cigar-Making Craft in Puerto Rico, 1899-1934," in Puerto Rican Women's History: New Perspectives, ed. Félix Matos Rodríguez and Linda C. Delgado (Armonk, New York: M.E. Sharpe, 1999), 105-125. Arturo Bird-Cardona, "Between the Insular Road and San Juan Bay: The World of Puerta de Tierra," Ph. Diss. Iowa StateUniversity, 1999; and Amílcar Tirado Avilés, "Notas sobre el desarrollo de la industria del tabaco en Puerto Rico y su impacto en la mujer puertorriqueña, 1898-1920." Centro Journal 2, 7 (Winter 1989-1990): 18-29.

[89] Carroll, Report on the Island of Puerto Rico, 51.

TABLE 2: DOLLAR VALUE OF SUGAR AND TOBACCO EXPORTED TO UNITED STATES, SELECTED YEARS, 1901-1920

Year	Tobacco	Cigars	Sugar
1901	375,000	306,000	4,715,611
1905	438,000	2,152,000	11,925,804
1910	1,258,319	4,480,000	23,545,922
1915	3,204,423	6,016,000	27,278,754
1920	13,416388	11,614,000	98,923,750

Source: Victor S. Clark, Porto Rico and Its Problems, (Washington, D.C.: Brookings Institution, 1930), 606-607.

Although tobacco represented one of the three most important products of the Puerto Rican economy during the nineteenth century, the exportation of tobacco as leaf prevailed over the development of the cigar industry. By the end of the century the export of tobacco products was within the limits of 100,000 quintals.[90] Most of the tobacco production, particularly after 1870, was exported to Cuba, where it was used in the elaboration of cigars and cigarettes and re-exported to other countries, particularly to the United States. Cuban cigars and cigarettes were exported to Puerto Rico, making the island a profitable market for Cuban products. In addition, Cuban dealers purchased Puerto Rican tobacco to sell as Cuban tobacco to United States buyers. Therefore, Puerto Rican tobacco contributed to the Cuban tobacco industry and not to the development of the industry in Puerto Rico.[91]

The lack of capital, the variable quality of the plant, and legal and governmental obstacles as well as a need for a safe market, all contributed to delays in developing the

[90]Diffie and Diffie, Porto Rico: A Broken Pledge, 90.
[91]The Revista de Agricultura, Industria y Comercio, published in Puerto Rico between 1886 and 1891, raised the issue several times as an unfair practice and as a major obstacle for the development of the tobacco industry in Puerto Rico. Rivero Muñiz, states that tobacco merchants in Cuba imported tobacco leafs from Puerto Rico, and re-exported them to the United States and other foreign markets as Cuban tobacco. Tabaco, 284.

tobacco industry in Puerto Rico. In fact, by 1899 cigar production was concentrated in small shops, known as "chinchales," and only a few factories were operating at the end of the nineteenth century. Carroll identifies 108 cigar and 27 cigarette manufacturing centers as operating in the Island, but in reality most of the cigar centers were "chinchales."[92]

It was, however, after 1898 that cigars gained major importance as an industry, not only economically but also for the relatively large number of workers that were incorporated into the production of cigars and cigarettes. A similar situation occurred with the increase of tobacco leaf exportation to the United States; a steady increase was sustained between 1907 and 1920. In 1907, 4,344,659 pounds of tobacco leaf and scrap with a value of $1,232,058 were exported to the United States. By 1920, export had increased to 20,507,565 pounds with a value of $13,416,388.[93] Although U.S. economic interests never gained direct control of the land under cultivation, as was the case for sugar cane, they did exert a strong influence over tobacco farmers, who depended mainly on the tobacco Trust or its intermediaries to finance their crops. This was a process that cost farmers a portion of the market price, which middlemen received as a source of profits for the transactions.[94] The total land under tobacco cultivation in 1899 was close to 6,000 acres; by 1909 cultivation had increased to 22,000 acres, and by the 1920s it had reached 39,000 acres.[95] The main factor in this growth was the support provided by the tobacco manufacturing companies who offered tobacco growers a ready market for their production, a situation that was not always possible under Spanish rule. The export

[92]Caroll, Report on the Island of Puerto Rico, 142.
[93]Puerto Rico, Secretary's Office, Register of Porto Rico (San Juan, PR, 1926), 294.
[94]Diffie and Diffie, Porto Rico: A Broken Pledge, 96-97.
[95]Ibid., 89.

market controlled by these companies also offered a more stable and secure market for the growers' products. In Cuba, previously its major market, a new tariff of $5.00 per pound, approved in January 1899, prevented the sale of tobacco as before. This implied that there was no market for the better grades of Puerto Rican tobacco. As previously explained, "boliche," the poorest grade of tobacco, was sold in Spain, France, and Germany, but the price was too low, only two or three cents per pound, while in the Cuban market the better grades received around nineteen cents. Thus, these markets were not a substitute for the Cuban market. Searching for a new market with better prices was a goal for those persons and companies interested in exploiting the tobacco industry.[96]

At this point, the agricultural sector played an important role in the development of the cigar industry in Puerto Rico, becoming a major provider of the leaf needed for the cigar production. The need to keep exporting tobacco to traditional buyers changed because now producers could sell the leaf in Puerto Rico, as well as exporting it to the United States. As observed in Table 2.1, between 1904 and 1907, the shipment of tobacco leaf and cigars to the United States rose in quantity; increased exports raised the value from $1,715,597 in 1904 to $5,312,239 in 1907. This pattern remained for most of the period from 1901 to 1920.

[96]United States, Congress, Report of the Military Governor of Porto Rico, 56th Congress, 1st session, 1900, Senate Document 195, 192-193.

TABLE 2.1: SHIPMENT OF TOBACCO LEAF AND CIGARS TO THE UNITED STATES, 1901-1907

Year	Tobacco Leaf	Value	Cigars	Value
1901	525,834	$116,944	11,013	$296,021
1902	601,250	$107,203	70,053	$1,543,253
1903	770,224	$135,080	67,243	$1,746,483
1904	2,385,498	$260,813	59,185,000	$1,454,784
1905	2,195,723	$421,652	87,569,000	$2,146,846
1906	1,396,533	$476,539	113,223,000	$3,069,576
1907	2,800,624	$1,077,014	128,826,000	$4,235,225

Source: U.S. Dept. of Commerce and Labor, Bureau of Statistics, Commercial Porto Rico in 1906, (Washington, D. C.: GPO, 1907), 60; and The Tobacco Leaf, "A Look at Porto Rico," April 29, 1908, 4.

The advantage of selling the leaf in Puerto Rico was based on the fact that they did not have to pay for shipping, and could get a fair price selling directly to the Puerto Rican American Tobacco Company and to other cigar companies.

However, the cigar industry was growing too fast, to the point that local leaf production was not able to satisfy the local market and it was necessary to import leaf from other countries as raw material to be processed in Puerto Rico and re-exported as cigar and cigarettes to the United States.

TABLE 2.2: IMPORTING TOBACCO LEAF FROM UNITED STATES, 1901-1906

Year	Pounds	Value
1901	139,230	$24,415
1902	342,490	$93,718
1903	283,873	$140,666
1904	195,309	$82,711
1905	500,438	$166,584
1906	999,018	$361,392

Source: U.S., Dept. of Commerce, Bureau of Statistics, Commercial Porto Rico, 1906, (Washington, D.C.: GPO, 1907), 62.

The development of the cigar industry in Puerto Rico gained strength and importance with two sets of events. The first occurred during 1897–1898, while still under Spanish rule, and the other within the first ten years of U.S. rule in the island.

Puerto Rican poet Lola Rodríguez de Tió wrote a stanza in 1895, which presented Cuba and Puerto Rico as the two wings of the same bird, receiving flowers or bullets in the same heart.[97] Rodríguez de Tió's interpretation is expressed in the context of the joint Cuban–Puerto Rican political struggle against Spanish rule. However, the economic dimension in the relation of the two islands reveals differences and contradictions in how economic interests influenced their relationship as well as the way in which the Autonomous Charter impacted Cuban–Puerto Rican solidarity.[98]

In November 1897, the Spanish government enacted a decree conceding an autonomous government to Cuba and Puerto Rico. The Cuban autonomist government approved, early in 1898, a tariff of $5.00 on tobacco imported from Puerto Rico. The Autonomist government in Puerto Rico responded by imposing a high tariff on the entry of Cuban tobacco products to Puerto Rico. Cuban cigars and cigarettes had to pay one peso for each kilo, a high price compared to the four cents per kilo they had previously paid; in addition, tobacco leaf was charged 50 cents per kilo.[99] Taking into consideration

[97] Lola Rodríguez de Tió, Mi libro de Cuba, (San Juan, PR: Instituto de Cultura Puertorriqueña, 1968), 321.
[98]Laird W. Bergad, "¿Dos alas del mismo pájaro?: Notas sobre la historia socioeconómica comparativa de Cuba y Puerto Rico." Historia y Sociedad, 1 (1988): 143-153. Bergad argues that Cuba and Puerto Rico have a radically different past from all points of view – economic, social, and political. Cuba and Puerto Rico were not the two wings of the same bird, but two different birds flying toward the future in opposite directions. Although this essay makes no reference to the conflict between the autonomous governments of Cuba and Puerto Rico, provoked mainly by the tobacco conflict, I agree with the interpretation presented by Dr. Bergad. See also, Eda M. Burgos Malavé, "El conflicto tabacalero entre Cuba y Puerto Rico en 1898," Revista de Estudios Generales 4,4 (julio 1989-junio 1990): 181-191.
[99]Gaceta de Puerto Rico, 25 mayo de 1898, 1.

that Cuba was the main market for Puerto Rican tobacco,[100] the economic impact of the tariff on the country's economy was one of almost paralyzing tobacco as an export staple. The situation was a setback for local farmers but also represented an opportunity that gave impetus to the development of ~~a~~ large-scale manufacturing of tobacco products in Puerto Rico. It was an alternative for the situation of not having any other major outlet for tobacco production. This was the intention clearly articulated in the decree imposing the tariff on Cuban tobacco products whose purpose was to "protect production which is being seriously hampered, to favor the development of a local industry, and insure its future growth."[101]

Another event of great importance for the development of the cigar industry in Puerto Rico was the inclusion of Puerto Rican tobacco within the U.S. domestic market by provision of the Foraker Act, enacted in 1900.[102] As a consequence tobacco products did not have to pay an entrance duty, lowering the cost of exportation, and allowing the industry to compete favorably in the U.S. market. Tobacco export statistics as shown in Table 2.3 indicate a rapid expansion of this industry during the first two decades of the twentieth century. In addition, statistics on tobacco cultivation, production, and manufacturing show the increasing importance of the product for Puerto Rican society.

[100] In 1897, the three major buyers of Puerto Rican tobacco were Cuba (2,359,068 pounds), Spain (337,451 pounds) and United States (80,729). See Carroll, Report on the Island of Puerto Rico, 154-155.
[101] Gaceta de Puerto Rico, 25 mayo de 1898, 1.
[102] The official title of the law was "An Act Temporarily to Provide Revenues and Civil Government for Porto Rico and for Other Purposes, approved by the U.S. Congress on April 12, 1900.

TABLE 2.3: SHIPMENTS OF PUERTO RICAN TOBACCO PRODUCTS TO THE UNITED STATES, 1900-1920

FISCAL YEAR	UNMANUFACTURED TOBACCO		CIGARS AND CHEW ROOTS		CIGARETTES		TOTAL VALUE
	Quantity 1, 000 pounds	Value 1,000 dollars	Quantity Millions	Value 1,000 dollars	Quantity Millions	Value 1,000 dollars	
1900	1,145	252	N/A	12	N/A	N/A	264
1901	562	121	11	296	1	1	418
1902	666	112	70	1,543	11	28	1,683
1903	770	135	67	1,746	4	9	1,890
1904	2,385	261	59	1,455	3	5	1,721
1905	2,196	422	88	2,147	4	9	2,578
1906	1,397	477	113	3,070	4	11	3,558
1907	3,681	1,157	129	4,235	9	22	5,414
1908	4,979	1,678	106	3,408	12	29	5,115
1909	3,868	1,202	142	4,376	11	29	5,607
1910	4,120	1,255	149	4,473	12	25	5,753
1911	4,362	1,547	174	5,350	12	34	6,931
1912	5,457	2,320	169	5,078	11	32	7,430
1913	8,149	3,148	166	5,800	8	23	8,971
1914	7,534	3,099	161	5,593	5	16	8,708
1915	9,052	3,187	170	6,007	8	20	9,214
1916	8,023	3,025	157	5,528	7	17	8,571
1917	9,255	3,829	205	7,835	8	25	11,685
1918	17,114	8,968	179	7,132	4	17	16,117
1919	15,663	8,111	149	6,648	18	109	14,868
1920	20,173	13,318	227	11,607	8	76	25,001

Source: Dudley Smith, Puerto Rico's Trade with Continental United States, (1937), 34.

As early as 1902, William H. Hunt, governor of Puerto Rico, recognized the importance of tobacco for the economy of the Island. One great advantage held by tobacco, according to Hunt, was that it was almost entirely manufactured in Puerto Rico and exported as cigars and cigarettes.[103] By 1911, the export of cigars was fourteen times greater than in 1901, and the tobacco industry contributed $7,000,000 or 15 percent of the Island's total receipts from external trade.[104]

[103]Porto Rico, Governor Annual Report of 1902, (Washington, D.C.: GPO,1902),23.
[104]Porto Rico, Governor Annual Report of 1911, (Washington, D.C.: GPO,1911), 5.

A third event, related to the second, was the interest of the American Tobacco Company (ATC), known also as the Trust, in expanding its operations into Cuba and Puerto Rico. By 1899, several U.S. tobacco companies, particularly the ATC, influenced the nascent tobacco industry in Puerto Rico. The origins of the ATC go back to 1890 when the main cigarette producers W. Duke and Sons, Co., Allen and Ginter, Kinney Tobacco Co., William S. Kimball and Co., and Goodwin and Co., joined their efforts and capital to organize the Tobacco Trust. Profits from the cigarette monopoly allowed the Trust to invest in other areas of the tobacco industry. By 1894, the ATC was the dominant force in the tobacco industry –except for the area of cigars.[105] W. D. Evans considered that the Trust established its position so strongly that by 1901 its proportion of plug and twist was 68 percent of the country's total output, of smoking tobacco nearly 60 percent, of snuff over 80 percent, over 90 percent of cigarettes, and 73 percent of the market of small cigars. According to Evans, "the only important field that remained to be conquered was the manufacture of cigars and to that task attention was next directed."[106]

With the purpose of counter-attacking British tobacco interests in Cuba, U.S. tobacco interests after the war of 1898 against Spain, began to buy tobacco factories, tobacco land, and attempted to control the leaf to be exported to places in continental United States, such as Key West, Tampa, New York, Chicago, Philadelphia, and New Orleans. The Havana Commercial Company, known as the "American Trust," bought twelve big factories, producing 149 cigar brands and 36 cigarettes brands. The American Tobacco Company officially entered into the Cuban market in 1902, when it bought the

[105]Reavis Cox, Competition in the AmericanTobacco Industry, 1911-1932, (New York: AMS Press, 1970).
[106] W. D. Evans, "Effects of Mechanization in Cigar Manufacture," Monthly Labor Review 46, 5 (January 5, 1938), 1109.

cigar brand "Hijas de Cabañas y Carvajal." In Cuba, the trust developed the policy of moving the most important cigar brands under its control to the United States. The purpose was to relegate Cuba to a second-class producer of cigars and tobacco, mainly producing tobacco leaf while promoting the production of cigar and tobacco in the United States. The Trust action had positive repercussions for the development of the cigar industry in Puerto Rico.[107]

In Puerto Rico, the ATC initiated operations during 1899 when the Puerto Rican American Tobacco Company (PRATCO) was organized and subsequently purchased two factories, one for cigar manufacturing and the other for cigarette production. The ATC's original intention was to develop cigarette production to serve as the base to control markets in the Caribbean as well in the United States.[108] At that moment, the Trust was able to produce a large number of cigarettes by using machines. However, cigarette production during the period under study remained a product mainly for local consumption. This situation can be observed from the cigarette production statistics from 1901 until 1920, as presented in Table 2.3.

On the contrary, large-scale cigar production initially was not in the company's plans due to their inability to monopolize the U.S. cigar market. The Trust considered the absence of an effective and fast machine capable of lowering the cost of production as well as the lack of control over production as the main obstacles for monopolizing the cigar market. Skilled workers, who had developed a particular work culture, controlled

[107] José Rivero Muñiz, Tabaco: su historia en Cuba, 318-332.
[108] This was the view of Gen. Davis, who wrote in 1900 that "the American Tobacco Company…is understood to be arranging for a large trade with the United States, the product of manufacture to be in the form of cigarettes." United States, War Dept, Division of Insular Affairs, Reports of Brig, Gen. Georges W. Davis on Industrial and Economic Conditions of Puerto Rico (Washington, D.C.: GPO, 1900), 25.

cigar production, which was mainly a manual task. It was not until 1917 that an acceptable cigar machine was invented; two years later production was in full bloom and threatening the cigar makers' culture.[109]

TABLE 2.4: CIGAR PRODUCTION IN PUERTO RICO FOR LOCAL COMSUMPTIONAND FOR EXPORT, 1898 TO 1920

Year	Local Consumption	Export	Total Production	Total Value of Exports Cigars
1898	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
1899	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
1900	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
1901	N/A	N/A	N/A	306,115
1902	N/A	N/A	N/A	1,549,235
1903	N/A	N/A	N/A	1,753,795
1904	N/A	N/A	N/A	1,460,496
1905	N/A	N/A	N/A	2,452,054
1906	N/A	N/A	N/A	3,074,226
1907	74,698,430	132,669,823	207,368,253	4,241,410
1908	76,983,830	103,781,719	180,765,549	3,414,140
1909	84,933,260	140,302,271	225,235,531	4,383,893
1910	92,700,160	151,724,438	244,424,598	4,488,030
1911	101,064,495	174,743,098	275,807,593	5,355,223
1912	111,682,615	169,765,656	281,448,271	5,086,711
1913	119,038,300	165,768,512	284,806,812	5,800,686
1914	122,711,543	150,363,991	263,075,534	5,597,276
1915	101,423,083	174,275,407	275,698,490	6,016,122
1916	109,130,296	159,248,855	268,379,151	5,531,535
1917	N/A	210,399,365	N/A	7,843,010
1918	106,646,685	181,779,519	288,426,204	7,134,693
1919	94,334,802	149,124,690	243,459,497	6,657,522
1920	98,024,748	223,316,450	N/A	N/A

Sources: Puerto Rico. Governor of Porto Rico Annual Report 1920, (Washington, D.C.: GPO, 1921), 13, 20; Puerto Rico, Secretary's Office, Register of Porto Rico 1926, (San Juan, PR: Bureau of Materials, Printing, and Transportation), 296.

Cigar production represented an urban industry in an economy dominated by the agricultural monoculture of sugar cane and coffee. In a relatively short period of time it

[109] W.D. Evans, "Effects of Mechanization in Cigar Manufacture," Monthly Labor Review 46, 5 (January 5, 1938), 1100-1121.

became one of the major industries in Puerto Rico. In fact, it was second to the sugar industry as a major revenue source for the government, and represented a major source of profits for cigar employers. According to a 1906 report, cigar exports to the United States amounted to $3,069,576, representing 86% of the total shipments of tobacco exported from Puerto Rico to the United States. The value of the cigars exported, according to the report, showed the potential of manufacturing locally all the tobacco produced in Puerto Rico. This potential was based on the abundance of cheap labor and low rent.[110]

In Puerto Rico, before machinery started operating in full scale, the cigar industry overcame problems of labor and profitability by utilizing an abundant and cheap labor force; by taking advantage of a low level of organization in this industry; by incorporating women workers into the industry and paying a lower salary to women than men for the same kind of work; and, when machinery was introduced, by hiring women as the majority of operators.

After the issues of capital and technology were solved, the next step for employers was to develop and mold a labor force able to respond to their interests. The Trust assumed a leadership role in obtaining this goal. In this enterprise the Trust followed the patterns established by them on the mainland. Some of the elements of the Trust's strategy were increasing the use of women as part of the labor force, the use of large factories where hundreds of workers were concentrated to do portions of the work, and, when possible, avoiding labor organizations. The problem that the ATC confronted in the island was that cigar workers exerted a leadership not only in organizing their trade but were also interested in organizing workers employed in different trades. The clashes

[110]Commercial Porto Rico in 1906, 21.

between ATC and other employers and cigar workers were felt heavily during the first two decades of the twentieth century.

Among the industries established in Puerto Rico during the period under study, it was the cigar industry that registered the highest increase of females in non-agricultural employment. Women represented only 1.6 percent of the workers employed in the cigar industry in 1899. However, by 1910, they represented 27.8 percent, a considerable increase in their participation, and by the 1920s, women held the majority of jobs available in the industry, representing 52.9 percent of the workers.[111]

There were two important factors that influenced the integration of women in the cigar industry. First, most of the women were assigned unskilled tasks, particularly tobacco stripping. Second, most of the women received less money than men for the same kind of work. Employers, therefore, used the low salaries for women to keep production costs down. In fact, until the 1930s, the utilization of women and low salaries were vital for the profitability of this industry.

Although the cigar industry in the United States suffered a severe recession during the 1920s, the combination of machine production and the employment of women maintained this industry as the second most important in Puerto Rico. Still, during the 1930s, the tobacco industry employed 15 percent of the total working population and close to 66 percent of its gross income was distributed in the form of payroll.[112]

[111]Dietz, Economic History of Puerto Rico, 123.
[112] Porto Rico, Legislature, First Report of the Legislative Committee to Investigate the Industrial and Agricultural Uneasiness and Restlessness Causing Unemployment in Porto Rico (San Juan, PR: Legislature, 1930), 211-213.

The Organized Labor Movement

The study of the organized labor movement in Puerto Rico is a topic that has received little attention in Puerto Rican historiography. Few researchers have been able to consult primary sources in the process of exploring this theme. An early major source of information on organized labor was the autobiographical work of Santiago Iglesias Pantín, one of the most important leaders of the organized labor movement during the first decades of the twentieth century in Puerto Rico. However, since the 1970s new sources of information have been utilized to study the organized labor movement.

There were few opportunities under Spanish rule in Puerto Rico for workers to organize the kinds of institutions needed for promoting better salaries and improving their work conditions. Although the nineteenth century represented a period where a labor market was developed in Puerto Rico, the possibilities for organizing workers were minimal due to legal obstacles created by prevailing laws and controls exerted by the government and landowners. The 1879 penal code, for example, prohibited the gathering of persons in organizations to promote activities aimed to increase the price of work or to regulate their conditions.[113]

García and Quintero have traced the initial stage of the development of the labor movement to the 1870s when artisans began organizing clubhouses, mutual aid societies, cooperatives and trade guilds that represented the first organizations where workers had a space for their own activities. By the end of the century the organizations that initially promoted educational and recreational activities evolved into organizations willing to promote strikes and labor organizations. These organizations were mainly urban manifestations of workers who dared to collectively express their discontent for their low

[113]Código penal para las provincias de Cuba y Puerto Rico, 138.

salaries and poor socio-economic conditions. Artisan groups were major promoters of these organizations; however, their prevailed view was that particular practices and apprenticesship processes defined artisan, and that not all workers (auxiliary laborers for example) should be included or participate in their organizations.

A review of the literature by Carlos Sanabria highlights conflicting interpretations over the ideology in the early organized labor movement and the influential role played by the American Federation of Labor (AFL) in Puerto Rico.[114] There are researchers who argue that the AFL played a major role in transforming the "Federación Libre de los Trabajadores" (FLT) from a socialist-oriented group toward a trade unionist and reformist group. Other researchers, however, considered the high unemployment in the country, the political repression against workers, and the proletarianization process as major factors that influenced the path followed by the FLT in the early years of the twentieth century.

The book written by Miles Galvin, The Organized Labor Movement in Puerto Rico, belongs to the group that argues that the AFL played a major role in transforming the FLT into a trade union group. This is one of the few books published during the second half of the twentieth century that deals with the organized labor movement. The first three chapters trace the development of the organized labor from the late nineteenth century. The next two chapters explore labor ideology and strategy, and labor confrontation with the new industrialists. However, no specific role was assigned to cigar workers in the development of the labor movement. In terms of the development of agrarian capitalism in Puerto Rico as fundamental for the development of an organized

[114] Carlos Sanabria, "The Puerto Rican Organized Workers' Movement and the American Federation of Labor, 1901 to 1934," (New York: City University of New York, 2000), 17-18.

labor movement, Galvin agrees with the explanation provided by Quintero Rivera. He suffers, therefore, from the same limitations and critiques that can be made of Quintero's work.

Galvin also describes the development of the organized labor movement in Puerto Rico during the early years of the twentieth century as a copy of the United States style of "pure and simple" business unionism.[115] He concludes that under the strong influence of the American Federation of Labor, a reformist ideology prevailed during this period in the development of the organized labor movement in Puerto Rico. This interpretation views the development of the Puerto Rican labor movement as colonized, unable to guide its own development, and acting as a passive affiliate of the AFL. Galvin, at the same time, recognizes the early labor movement in Puerto Rico as radical. Workers' radicalism, however, could not be implemented because of the prevailing political conditions in the island and in the mainland, and because of the influence exerted by the American Federation of Labor.[116]

Nevertheless Galvin found that two tendencies developed in the early labor movement: a sense of pragmatism and a need to re-orient struggles toward reformist goals.[117] The "Federación Libre de Trabajadores," according to this view, promoted the idea that social reforms were only possible by participation in the electoral process rather than through strikes. Therefore, he presented the AFL's influence over the FLT as a colonized-colonizer type of relationship in which Puerto Rican workers were unable to take independent actions. This interpretation, however, was not supported by extensive

[115] Galvin, The Organized Labor Movement, 17.
[116] Ibid.,69.
[117] Ibid., 65-69.

use of primary sources but developed by the "weaving together of many secondary sources,"[118] and especially by using Luchas Emancipadoras, the autobiographical work of Santiago Iglesias Pantín, who still is considered as the "father of the labor movement in Pueto Rico," and who was the principal AFL organizer in the island during the period under study.

García and Quintero Rivera argued, on the other hand, in favor of considering the early labor movement as a movement with a socialist ideology. They also viewed the FLT, the main representative or most important group of this movement, as maintaining relative autonomy from the AFL. As explained by authors, the AFL and FLT were organizations that though allied were also different. Although the FLT accepted the principle that the major goal of the labor organization should be economic and not political, they applied it in a different way in Puerto Rico. The labor movement was inserted in the political process from the beginning of the twentieth century when organized workers favored participation in the electoral process. They discuss three instances of political participation: (1) the support given by the FLT to the Federal Party, the landowners party in 1902; (2) the coalition made with the Puerto Rican Union Party, a landowners party in 1904; and (3) FLT participation as a political party during the election of 1906.[119]

In support of the idea that the FLT maintained its autonomy during the first years of relationship with the AFL, García and Quintero Rivera present these years as a passive period during which the AFL showed little interest in the Puerto Rico organization. The situation is explained by the authors as stemming from the fact that the Puerto Rican

[118]Ibid., 13.
[119] Gervasio L. García, Historia crítica, historia sin coartada (Río Piedras, PR: Ediciones Huracán, 1989), 80-83.

working class was mainly composed of rural laborers, while the AFL promoted primarily the organization of urban skilled workers.[120]

Puerto Rican workers had their own aspirations, which influenced the way they perceived the U.S. military occupation of Puerto Rico, the potential benefits they might derive from the new government and from affiliation with U.S. workers' organizations. They viewed United States intervention in Puerto Rico as a positive advancement because they believed that liberties and freedoms previously absent under Spanish rule would be extended to them. For example, Fernando J. Matías, President of "Liga Obrera," and Juan S. Solís, President of the "Asociación de Tabaqueros," both from Ponce, were among the persons cooperating with the U.S. military commanding officer. A leading labor organizer in Puerto Rico, Iglesias Pantín, accompanied the military forces in their occupation of several towns, explaining to the workers the benefits that the United States Government in Puerto Rico would bring them.

Several changes occurred during the first years of U.S. occupation that were favorable for the development of an organized labor movement in Puerto Rico. In particular, rights recognized by the U.S. Constitution and legal system were applicable on Puerto Rico and helped workers in organizing drives. Promoting organization among workers and strike activities were not illegal under the American legal system as was the case under Spanish rule. Furthermore, a characteristic of workers' activities was that the U.S. flag was always present in their activities, symbolizing the protection provided by the U.S. Constitution.

Workers immediately made use of these rights to promote their ideas and organization. Freedom of speech and freedom of association were first exercised in

[120] García and Quintero Rivera, Desafío y solidaridad, 37.

October 20, 1898, just two days after the official occupation of Puerto Rico by the U.S. government. Workers availed themselves of these freedoms to establish the bases for the organization of the "Federación Regional de los Trabajadores de Puerto Rico" (FRTPR). The new organization proclaimed that the purpose of the group was to unite all workers who struggled for freedom and equality, without exclusion by sex. In addition, the FRTPR was in favor of resisting oppressive work conditions and was interested in promoting and cultivating alliances with labor groups in Europe and America, if such actions would benefit the Puerto Rican working class.[121]

However, political differences among members of the FRTPR culminated in splitting the organization into two groups. One group argued in favor of a relationship with a political party as the best course. The party of their preference was the Republican Party of Puerto Rico. By the end of the first decade of the twentieth century, the FRTPR had almost disappeared as a labor organization. However, another group of workers, mainly associated with *Ensayo Obrero a* newspaper group rejected any relationship with political parties, considering them as an upper-class instrument of control. They were in favor of developing their own institutions, such as labor organizations, parties, newspapers, etc. that would respond to working class interests. The rift led to the birth of the "Federación Libre de los Trabajadores de Puerto Rico" (FLTPR) in June 1899. The new labor organization maintained the same principles that were originally adopted by the FRTPR, and, from that moment on, represented the majority of the organized workers in Puerto Rico. The FLTPR received moral and economic support from the U.S. labor movement, particularly from the American Federation of Labor, in its organizational

[121] Santiago Iglesias Pantín, Luchas emancipadoras (San Juan, Puerto Rico: Cantero Fernández,1929), 93-94. However, no particular cities or places are mentioned by Iglesias,

drives and defense of workers' interests.

TABLE 2.5: CIGAR WORKERS ORGANIZATION AND MEMBERSHIP, 1910-1911

NAME	MUNICIPALITY	MEMBERS	
		Good Standing	Not Good Standing
Tabaqueros No. 467	Arecibo	45	100
Tabaqueros No. 458	Cidra	30	50
Tabaqueros No. 376	Utuado	50	100
Tabaqueros No. 460	San Juan	60	100
Tabaqueros No. 190	Gurabo	30	50
Tabaqueros No. 148	Caguas	150	200
Tabaqueros No. 472	Juncos	50	30
Despalilladoras No. 12,502	Juncos	18	N/A
Escogedores No. 388	Utuado	13	10
Tabaqueros No. 374	Mayagüez	11	20
Tabaqueros No. 481	Bayamón	200	200
Tabaqueros No. 449	Ponce	160	N/A
Tabaqueros No. 119	Puerta de Tierra	60	100
Despalilladoras No. 12,690	Utuado	30	N/A
Despalilladoras No. 12,577	Caguas	15	10
Despalilladoras No. 12,722	Bayamón	15	N/A
Tabaqueros No. 333	San Lorenzo	70	30
Despalilladoras No. 12,736	Gurabo	17	N/A
Tabaqueros No. 194	Cayey	50	40
Tabaqueros No. 386	Ciales	22	N/A
Escogedores No. 485	Caguas	10	10
Tabaqueros No. 474	AguasBuenas	N/A	25
Despalilladoras	Cayey	20	N/A
Tabaqueros No. 478	Cataño	N/A	20
Despalilladoras No. 12571	Caguas	N/A	N/A
Tabaqueros No. 376	Utuado	N/A	N/A

Source: Porto Rico Workingmen's Journal. October 15, 1910; Dec. 15, 1910; June 5. 1911.

TABLE 2.6: DIRECTORY OF FEMALE UNIONS, 1904 AFFILIATED TO THE FREE FEDERATION OF LABOR, 1904

NAME	MUNICIPALITY	NUMBER OF MEMBERS	SECRETARY
Unión Protectora de la Mujer Obrera #11752	San Juan	50	Luisa Correa
Unión Obreras Domésticas #11668	Ponce	37	Secundina Rivero
Unión Protectora de Damas #11733	Mayagüez	320	Juana Cofresí
Unión Escogedora de Café #11660	Arecibo	60	Serafina Cruz
Unión de Damas	Utuado	20	Tomasa Miranda
Unión de Damas	Guayama	22	Concepción López
Unión Protectora de Damas #11731	Salinas	39	Inéz Martínez
Unión Protectora de la Mujer	Patilla	N/A	Adela Laguerre
Unión de Damas	Yabucoa	70	Leandra Rivieras

Source: Federación Libre de San Juan, Justicia para Puerto Rico, 23-30.

TABLE 2.7: FEMALE CIGAR WORKERS ORGANIZATION AND MEMBERSHIP; 1910-1911

NAME	MUNICIPALITY	MEMBERS	
		Good Standing	Not Good Standing
Damas No. 11,752	San Juan	50	13
Despalilladoras No. 12,502	Juncos	18	N/A
Despalilladoras No. 12,690	Utuado	30	N/A
Despalilladoras No. 577	Caguas	15	N/A
Damas No. 12,702	Arecibo	38	N/A
Damas No. 12,721	San Lorenzo	39	N/A
Despalilladoras No. 12,722	Bayamón	15	N/A
Despalilladoras No. 12,736	Gurabo	17	N/A
Damas No. 12,798	Santurce	14	N/A
Costureras No. 12,839	Mayagüez	7	N/A
Damas No. 12,767	Utuado	30	N/A
Damas No. 12,742	Yabucoa	17	N/A
Despalilladoras No. 12,571	Caguas	15	10
Mujeres No. 12,551	Santurce	N/A	18
Damas No. 12,770	Ciales	N/A	18
Damas No. 12,782	Fajardo	N/A	14
Despalilladoras	Cayey	20	N/A

Source: Porto Rico Workingmen's Journal Oct. 15, 1910, Nov. 15, 1910, Dec. 15, 1910, June 5, 1911.

Although the AFL exerted the strongest influence over labor in Puerto Rico, there were other organizations that maintained contact with Puerto Rican workers. Félix Ojeda Reyes's essay "¿Colonialismo sindical o solidaridad internacional?" is the most complete work exploring the first years of the relationship between Puerto Rican workers and U.S. labor and socialist organizations. Ojeda Reyes not only used sources from Puerto Rican archives but also used primarily sources in U.S. archives. He covered the period of 1898 to 1910, exploring the first attempts of Puerto Rican labor organizations to reach an agreement of cooperation and solidarity with the Socialist Labor Party (SLP) and the Social Democratic Party (SDP) before establishing contacts and eventual membership as an affiliate of the American Federation of Labor.

The initial contact with the Socialist Labor Party occurred during the U.S. military occupation of Puerto Rico. John W. McFall, a soldier and ex-member of the Socialist Labor Party, participated in several workers meetings in San Juan while in Puerto Rico. He communicated with the SLP headquarters, expressing his opinion that it would be a positive step for the Party that Puerto Rican workers be organized under their leadership.[122]

Hence, the Socialist Labor Party (SLP) became the first ally of the Puerto Rican labor movement. By 1899, it was moving to organize and incorporate Puerto Rican workers into the Party. However, the Party's intentions were hampered by an internal struggle in the FRTPR over affiliation with political parties. One faction wanted to incorporate the FRTPR into the local Republican Party, while another group supported maintaining worker independence as the best policy to keep workers united in a common

[122] Félix Ojeda Reyes, "¿Colonialismo sindical o solidaridad internacional?," Revista de Ciencias Sociales 26, 1-4 (enero-diciembre 1987), 316.

organization in defense of their interests. While this latter group did not want affiliation with the Republican Party, they believed that in order to deal with political issues workers should incorporate into a political party organized expressly in defense of worker rights. On June 25 1899, the pro-FLTPR workers organized the Socialist Labor Party of Puerto Rico and requested its incorporation into the United States Socialist Labor Party.

Ojeda Reyes argued in his essay that the relationship with the SLP had no future because this party was immersed in an internal rift among several ideological groups. Daniel de Leon, president of the party, clashed with a group of detractors opposing his line of action on which path the Party should follow. For de Leon, for example, the AFL was a corrupt and decadent organization aiming for immediate demands rather than working for the abolition of the wage system and the overthrow of capitalism to establish a workers' government. In fact, the SLP's 1900 convention adopted a resolution prohibiting its members from working or occupying official positions in the AFL. In addition, the Party had been unable to unite or guide the various socialist groups in the United States, and its membership was still relative small in 1899, with no more than 6,000 members. However, Ojeda defined the relationship that developed between Puerto Rican workers and U.S. organizations early in the twentieth century as responding to a situation of international solidarity rather than an expression of colonial subjection.

The SLP dissident group, which included Eugene Debs, Morris Hillquit, Job Harriman, and Max Hayes, organized a conference to be celebrated from January 27 to February 2, 1900, in Rochester, New York. This conference rejected de Leon's ideas and moved to a position in favor of all trade unions regardless of their political affiliation. In addition, the convention favored the group unification with the Socialist Democratic

Party, an organization born in June 1897 as a split from the Social Democracy group. The SDP members were socialists who believed in the principles and program of the International Socialism, In addition, the party favored cooperation with organized labor, supporting strikes and boycotts as useful and necessary working class instruments against employers.[123] The SLP of Puerto Rico eventually joined the Socialist Democratic Party.

Santiago Iglesias and Eduardo Conde, the two delegates from Puerto Rico, never arrived at the Rochester conference. However, in New York City, Iglesias and Conde published a manifesto on February 12, 1900, requesting solidarity with Puerto Rico from the dissident faction. The respond given by the SDP was to suggest the AFL as the organization with whom Puerto Rican workers should rely on. Furthermore, they took advantage of the moment and made contact with members of the Federal Central Committee of the AFL in New York, requesting that they designate a group to study social conditions in Puerto Rico and to send some organizers to the Island.

The efforts made by Iglesias and Conde contributed to bringing the AFL into contact with Puerto Rican workers, a relationship that officially began in October 1901 when Santiago Iglesias was appointed AFL organizer for Cuba and Puerto Rico. Already, during the previous year (1900) Santiago Iglesias had made several requests to the AFL's annual convention for the translation of union constitutions into Spanish with the purpose of using them as propaganda to organize Puerto Rican workers of different trades as AFL locals.

The culmination of the relationship between these two labor organizations occurred in December 1901 when the FLT joined the AFL. The main reason given by

[123] Philip S. Foner, History of the Labor Movement in the United States (New York: International Publishers, 1980), 2, 392-403.

the FLT for its acceptance of AFL membership was the economic support it could get from the AFL during strikes or sickness: "to assure in the event of boycotts, strikes or injustices by owners or government, attention and solidarity…."[124] In addition, in case of migration to the United States mainland, workers would have the protection and support of unions affiliated to the AFL.

How can historians explain the affiliation of a labor group politically and ideologically oriented toward socialism with a conservative labor organization such as the American Federation of Labor? The answer may be found in their concern for the survival and future development of Puerto Rican labor organizations. For these workers the economic and political challenges they faced outweighed their concerns about the conservatism of the AFL.[125]

The challenges were formidable. The years of 1900 to 1904 are known in Puerto Rican history as the "Turbas period" because of the physical abuses by the Republican Party towards groups and individuals that disagreed with their actions. The Party controlled the executive and legislative branches of government, and as policy promoted a climate of physical confrontation and intimidation against members and sympathizers of the Federal Party, the Partido Unión de Puerto Rico, the Partido Obrero, and the Federación Libre de Trabajadores. Under the prevailing circumstances, the FLT perceived the AFL as a powerful ally to stop abuses against workers through their political and labor affiliation.[126] The AFL, as protector of the workers, promoted the idea that Puerto Rico was covered by the United States constitution and that Puerto Rican workers had a friend in the AFL and Samuel Gompers.

---

[124] Federación Libre de los Trabajadores de Puerto Rico, Reglamento (San Juan, PR: n.p, 1903), 1.
[125] García and Quintero, Desafío y solidaridad, 36-37.
[126] Mariano Negrón Portillo, Las turbas republicanas (Río Piedras, PR: Ediciones Huracán, 1990).

On the other hand, the AFL's acceptance of the FLT affiliation can be explained as a means of exerting control over a group of workers who had the right to enter into the U.S. labor market and were hence potentially a threat to job opportunities for mainland AFL members. In addition, affiliation reduced the possibility that immigrant workers from Puerto Rico would be organized and affiliated with rival organizations such as the Socialist Labor Party and the American Labor Union.

Furthermore, the relationship between the AFL and the FLT did not represent a major obstacle for the implementation of U.S. government policies in Puerto Rico or for the entrance to Puerto Rico of those economic interests willing to invest in the Island. The AFL did not support nationalism of any kind among workers, and its reformist policies represented a controlling tool for any independence or revolutionary working-class initiatives. Instead, the AFL concentrated on the organization of skilled workers, promoted business unionism, avoided or limited strikes, and failed to encourage or promote the incorporation of women into the trade unions. These AFL policies were not totally reproduced in Puerto Rico. FLT members, for example, promoted strikes — with or without AFL approval — as a means of obtaining social and economic gains. The FLT was also less reluctant than the AFL to accept women as workers and as members of their organization.

In addition, the AFL policy of not getting involved in politics was not observed in Puerto Rico by members of the FLT who actively participated in the 1904 and 1906 elections, and who played a key role in the organization of the Socialist Party in 1915. Samuel Gompers, president of the AFL, traveled to Puerto Rico in 1904 and 1914, becoming involved in both years in political activities. In 1904, he played a key role in

organizing a non-written political coalition between members of the Free Federation of Labor and the Union of Puerto Rico party. The agreement allowed the inclusion of four candidates from the FFL in the Unionist ticket. As part of the deal, La Democracia, the unionist newspaper, opened its pages to Santiago Iglesias, president of the FFL, who published a daily column. In addition, the newspaper refrained from publishing negative information about workers' activities or about the FFL and their leaders.

Conclusion

This chapter reviews the literature and contextualizes how production and labor were organized in turn of the century Puerto Rico and the role played by cigar makers in the development of the early organized labor movement in PR, focusing on three main issues. First is the relationship between the labor force and commercial agriculture during the nineteenth century. Most of what has been published related to commercial agriculture and labor is concentrated in coffee and sugar production. Few are the publications dealing with labor in urban areas. One of the most important issues discussed in these publications refers to the period when capitalism was developed in Puerto Rico. Some works on coffee and sugar argue that the Puerto Rican economy during the nineteenth century represented some type of agrarian capitalism. Laird Bergad, for example, links the development of a rural working class to the development of coffee as an export product. Angel G. Quintero, however, disputes this conclusion, explaining that coffee haciendas were feudal, and that a system of wage labor was not in place at that moment. For Quintero, it was not until the end of the nineteenth century that the economy of the country began a process of transformation due to the growth of the cigar industry in urban areas and the sugar industry in rural areas. Missing in the

discussion is the development of tobacco as an agricultural product and the role it played in Puerto Rican society.

The second issue refers to the development of the cigar industry in Puerto Rico during the first two decades of the twentieth century. This industry was important because it was the main urban employer whose large number of workers became the base for the organized labor movement. However, the history of this industry began in the nineteenth century, but at the time tobacco was mainly a product exported to Europe, with some remaining in the island for local production. In the 1870s, new market opportunities developed when most of the best tobacco cultivated in Puerto Rico was exported to Cuba to be used for mixing with Cuban tobacco or was exported to Tampa and Key West. While exporting tobacco to Cuba represented a good business for the farmers, at the same time this situation represented a major obstacle for the development of a local cigar industry because a Puerto Rican tobacco industry would be a major competitor to Cuban tobacco products. The situation represented a contradiction between the agricultural and industrial sectors in Puerto Rico. The advantage of such industry in Puerto Rico was that it would allow the use of local tobacco in the production of cigars and cigarettes, becoming then not only a provider for the local market but also a challenge to Cuban products. At the same time this industry would provide additional jobs in both the agricultural sector and in the elaboration of tobacco products.

There were two factors that can be considered as primarily responsible for the growth of the cigar industry in Puerto Rico. The first was the establishment in the island of the Puerto Rican American Tobacco Company (PRATCO), a subsidiary of the American Tobacco Company. PRATCO became the most important company in the

cigar production in Puerto Rico during the period under study, becoming the major employer in this industry while establishing new forms of production. It also provided the space for the incorporation of women in the labor force and in the waged economy. The second factor was the enactment of the Foraker Act in 1900. This law provided for the free entry of tobacco products from Puerto Rico in the United States market, providing in this way a major push for developing this industry in Puerto Rico and an advantage in that Cuban tobacco products had to pay entrance duties. Finally, the cigar industry became without a doubt the major urban employer in Puerto Rico, with a relatively large concentration of workers, male and female, employed in factories and small production centers.

This chapter found that although some authors trace the initial stages of the development of the labor movement in Puerto Rico into the 1870s, it was during the early years of the twentieth century that the organized labor has its initial advances and confrontations. During this period labor made use of certain rights protected by the U.S. constitution to promote the organization of workers. The organization of the Free Federation of Labor represented the base that served as the base for initial steps toward organizing urban workers. The leadership of the FFL understood the need to find supporters and protection from U.S. labor organizations in their growing and consolidation process. The affiliation of the FFL with the AFL in 1901 opened the door for the AFL to play a major role in the organization of urban workers, particularly cigar workers.

Writers have different interpretations regarding the degree of influence exerted by the AFL over the FFL. Some of them argue that the FFL was a replica of the AFL where

Puerto Rican workers were unable to take local actions. Other writers, however, see the FFL as maintaining relatively autonomous from the AFL, considering the labor movement as a movement with a socialist ideology orientation. Finally, this chapter found that the tendency of Puerto Rican workers was to flexibly interpret AFL laws and regulations. Particularly there were three areas in which Puerto Rican workers' actions support this conclusion: the promotion of strikes with or without AFL approval; the acceptance of women as workers and comrades was greater than in the AFL; and the AFL policy of not getting involved in politics was not observed in Puerto Rico by the FFL.

CHAPTER III

IDEOLOGY, POLITICS AND PRACTICES AMONG CIGAR WORKERS

This chapter explores the origins and development of liberalism and anarchism in Puerto Rico and its impact on workers' ways of thinking. Anarchism and liberalism were European currents adapted to specific situations and conditions in particular countries. Puerto Rico was not an exception. Liberalism impacted mainly the Creole upper class in its quest to gain political and economic control of the country, and specifically, in its goal to modernize the country. Liberalism was a secondary influence for Puerto Rican workers, who mainly responded to the socialist discourse. To understand the why and the how of anarchism in Puerto Rico, it is necessary to clarify the major ideas of its discourse as expressed by its proponents. It is important to consider the role that the Spanish anarchist movement played since it was specifically the Spanish branch of anarchism that would have a major influence in Puerto Rico.

This chapter also explores particular anarchist ideas expressed by Puerto Rican cigar workers, as well as other workers. Their statements, derived from their own publications such as books, pamphlets, newspaper articles, flyers, etc., will be discussed and interpreted. The concluding section of this chapter is dedicated to the discussion of strikes in Puerto Rico, and the roles that cigar workers played in these confrontations against employers and in the defense of workers' right to organize unions.

Liberalism

Liberalism is a European ideology that, in general, proposes the promotion and protection of the autonomy and integrity of the individual. Rights such as freedom of speech and a free press, the freedom to associate and organize, freedom from fear of reprisal, and freedom of religion became fundamental tenets of the liberal discourse. In addition, this ideology postulates the need for a free market where individuals could be free to pursue their self-interests in an exchange economy, based upon the division of labor. The price mechanism became the force determining what shall be produced and how much is produced. Free choice among buyers and sellers determines how capital, labor, and goods should be employed and compensated. Finally, liberalism postulates that government intervention in the economy should be limited and that its power should be divided into three branches known as the executive, the legislative, and the judicial.

Puerto Rican society during the nineteenth century was aware of the European currents of liberalism and modernization and knew of the impact of this ideology in the United States as well as in the new nation-states created in Latin America during the early nineteenth century. In the case of Puerto Rico, however, liberalism and modernization were not pursued in conjunction with the creation of a national state, but within the context of a colonial status during the nineteenth century. The local Creole upper class was divided on how to promote liberal ideas in Puerto Rico. One sector promoted the use of armed struggle to obtain independence from Spanish rule. During this time several conspiracies and rebellions occurred in the island claiming for the independence of Puerto Rico. The Grito de Lares, an armed rebellion against the Spanish government in the island that took place on September 23, 1868, is considered for some

authors as the moment when the Puerto Rican nationality was born.[127]

Meanwhile another sector of the society promoted reforms aimed at gaining political and economic autonomy within a system similar to the Canadian relationship with Great Britain. Román Baldorioty de Castro first and then Luis Muñoz Rivera became the principal defenders of this political solution during the last third of the nineteenth century. During the late 1890s two autonomous parties were organized to defend Puerto Rican autonomy, but held different views on strategies and politics. The Liberal Reformist Party, whose main leader was Luis Muñoz Rivera, representing the most conservative of the two parties, was willing to negotiate an agreement with any Spanish political party, from conservative, to monarchist, or liberal and republican. The Orthodox Autonomist Party, whose main leader was José Celso Barbosa, considered that any agreement should be made with a Spanish republican party.[128] Although the presence of radical or revolutionary liberalism remained a latent force until the end of the Spanish authority in Puerto Rico, it was the autonomous sector that prevailed in the country. They were able to organize local parties, send representatives to lobby in the Spanish Parliament or Córtes, and promoted their liberal aspirations through their newspapers and publications, such as El Autonomista, and La Democracia.

Modernity, during the nineteenth century in Puerto Rico, was identified with three basic concepts: the idea of progress, citizenship, and intellectual representation.[129] First,

---

[127]Germán Delgado Pasapera, Puerto Rico: sus luchas emancipadoras (1850-1898) (Río Piedras, PR: Editorial Cultural, 1984) presents several conspiracies and rebellions related to the struggle for independence that occurred during the second-half of the nineteenth century.

[128] Francisco Scarano, Puerto Rico: cinco siglos de historia (San Juan, PR: McGraw-Hill, 1993), 430-443, 514-528.

[129] Silvia Alvarez Curbelo, Un país del porvenir (San Juan, PR: Ediciones Callejón, 2001), 27. In addition to this book, works by Matos Rodríguez, Women in San Juan, 1829-1868 (Princeton, NJ: Markus Wiener Publishers, 1999) and Martínez Vergne, Shaping the Discourse on Space; Charity and Its Wards in

during the last third of the nineteenth century, Puerto Rican liberals sought the modernization of the country, which implied the development of free trade as a substitute for trading only with Spain; the use of technology and science in agricultural production; and the access to education that at that moment was mainly available to upper-class families. Secondly, they promulgated the values of a civil society, including the abolition of slavery and the recognition of rights for all citizens, and they also advocated the end of Puerto Rico's colonial subjugation.[130] Slavery, according to the liberal sector, represented an obstacle for a developing society. Moreover, abolition would bring benefits such as the inflow of foreign capital, population growth, greater circulation of money, and commercial and industrial development. Liberal reformists favored the social and economic reorganization of society, but still saw the need for a social hierarchy. They rejected notions of equality or a society without classes. Furthermore, they recognized the need to maintain their moral and spiritual values as the guiding values of the whole society, which they saw as essential for the defense of their properties and place in society.[131]

Third, liberal ideas were expressed in several publications; among them was the Exposición Universal de París en 1867, by Román Baldorioty de Castro, one of the main defenders of liberalism in Puerto Rico. What Baldorioty de Castro saw in Paris convinced him that Puerto Rico should be integrated in the economic circuits of the world's modernity.[132] A few years later, in 1870, as a representative of Puerto Rico in

---

Nineteenth-Century San Juan (Austin, Texas: University of Texas Press, 1999), provide a new account and interpretation of liberalism in Puerto Rico during the nineteenth century.

[130]Alvarez Curbelo, Un país del porvenir, 123-127.

[131]Ibid., 152.

[132] Román Baldorioty de Castro, Exposición universal de París en 1867 (San Juan, PR: Imprenta de Acosta, 1868).

the Spanish Córtes, he made two major requests: to establish a new relationship between Puerto Rico and Spain similar to the Canadian relationship with Great Britain, and the abolition of slavery.[133]

Two other publications of this period were of major importance for the cause of liberalism. In 1873, Joaquín Sanromá published Puerto Rico y su hacienda, where he analyzed the political and economic limitations slavery represented in the push for modernization.[134] Another publication in this direction was José Ramón Abad`s work, Puerto Rico en la Feria-Exposición de Ponce en 1882, published in 1885, which supported changes in the political economy of Puerto Rico and in its agricultural production and relations with Spain, as fundamental for the modernization of the country.[135] These events occurred during a period of liberal government in Spain. In the 1870s, taking advantage of the Spanish reforms in the Peninsula that were extended to Cuban and Puerto Ricans, a group of Puerto Ricans formed the Liberal Reformist Party in 1874. Since the beginning, the party was dominated by two tendencies: assimilation with Spain and autonomy from Spain. In 1887, this party was transformed into the Puerto Rican Autonomist Party and in 1896 it promoted an agreement with the Fusionist Liberal Party in Spain in order to obtain autonomy for the island if this party assumed power in Spain.

The royal decree of November of 1897, establishing an Autonomous Charter for Cuba and Puerto Rico, represented the political culmination of the modernization process for liberals willing to remain loyal to Spain. The dispositions of the Charter left some

[133]Alvarez Curbelo, Un país del porvenir, 148-149.
[134] Joaquín Sanromá, Puerto Rico y su hacienda (Madrid: Imprenta de Fortanet, 1873). In addition, see Alvarez Curbelo, Un país del porvenir, 172-173.
[135] José Ramón Abad, Puerto Rico en la feria-exposición de Ponce en 1882 (Ponce, PR: Tipografía El Comercio, 1885). See also Alvarez Curbelo, Un país del porvenir, 188-194.

activities of the government and of the economy in local hands, particularly trade and commerce with foreign countries.[136] Liberals perceived the changes promoted and promised by this Charter as an opportunity to move Puerto Rican society forward. However, in the exposition of Prime Minister Práxedes Mateo Sagasta to the Queen of Spain, he made clear, when he explained the reasons for granting autonomy to Cuba and Puerto Rico, that no substantial change was to be made in the Antilles, and that the relationship between the Crown and the colonies should not change.[137]

In Puerto Rico, the Monarchy and the Catholic Church's control and interference in society represented a major obstacle to modernizing the country.[138] Liberals, for example, rejected this interference in workers´ lives because they saw changes in labor conditions as fundamental for the well being of the country. Salvador Brau, historian and sociologist, wrote in 1882 of the need to improve the conditions of Puerto Rican day laborers as an essential step toward modernizing the country. Brau presented several ideas on how to overcome the major "defects" that were identified for Puerto Rican workers, particularly, the accusations of "indolence" and "vices." He rejected the use of vagrancy laws as a way of forcing people to work. Instead, he argued in favor of attracting workers to work by education, together with promoting the idea of better socio-economic conditions through work, and the creation of associations for workers.[139]

Socialism and Anarchism: Writers and Ideas

While liberalism dominated the aspirations of the upper class in Puerto Rican

[136] Puerto Rico, Documents on the Constitutional History of Puerto Rico (Washington, D.C.: Office of the Commonwealth, 1964), 22-46.
[137] Ibid., 13-22.
[138] Matos Rodríguez, Women in San Juan, 1820-1868, 100-124.
[139] Salvador Brau, "Las clases jornaleras," in Disquisiciones Sociológicas (Río Piedras, Puerto Rico: Editorial Edil, 1971), 26-70.

society, and exerted some attraction for workers, sectors of the working class were aware of the workers' struggles occurring in Europe and their impact in the Americas, as well as of the main socialist currents in Europe during the second-half of the nineteenth century. By the 1870s artisans were identifying with socialism and rejecting capitalism, the state, and religion. They began learning about socialism by reading newspapers and books clandestinely bought to Puerto Rico, and in artisans' social centers. Another form of learning about these ideas was through contact with Spanish immigrants, as was the case of Santiago Iglesias and Emilio Fariza, or Puerto Ricans traveling to Spain, as in the case of Eduardo Conde.[140] A curious event occurred late in the 1860s when a biography of Karl Marx was published in the city of Mayaguez.[141] However, the major influence in Puerto Rico came not from the school of socialism promoted by Karl Marx, but from the anarchist branch of socialism. Anarchism provided urban workers an ideological coherence to the artisan perception of work and ways of life. Fundamental for them was the recognition of the importance of uniting all workers, skilled, unskilled, rural, urban, female and male, in their aim of building an egalitarian society organized around work.

Anarchist ideology has been articulated in three main ideas: the emphasis on individual liberty, the rejection of authority, and the promotion of socialism.[142] Although there are different schools of anarchism, in essence all of them agree on the need to eliminate existing governments and the need for a radical alteration of society.[143]

---

[140] Francisco Scarano, Cinco siglos de historia, 479

[141] Cruz Monclova, Historia de Puerto Rico, Tomo II, Primera Parte, 290.

[142] As a point of clarification, in this work anarchist thought is considered as a developed and articulated ideology of the nineteenth century, although some writers trace its origins to previous centuries. José Alvarez Juncos, for example, considers that it is not possible to talk about anarchism as an ideology until the nineteenth century with the writings of Max Stirner and Pierre-Joseph Proudhon. See La ideología política del anarquismo español (1868-1910), 584.

[143] For a discussion of varieties of anarchism, see Gerald Runkel's, Anarchism: Old and New (New York: Delta Book, 1972), Chapter 1; and George Woodcock, Anarchism: A History of Libertarian Ideas

Theories of anarchism, however, do not agree on what methods should be utilized in the revolution or what form society should ultimately take.[144] Other areas of disagreement included the nature of human beings and the role of morality and religion.

Considering their goals, anarchism can be classified in three major tendencies: Individualistic Anarchism is associated with Pierre-Joseph Proudhon, who envisioned a society composed of reasonable and resourceful persons that work and assert their own being, are respectful to others but in no sense dependent upon them.[145] The Mutualist group associated with Michael Bakunin, Peter Kropotkin, and Enrico Malatesta, favored free association and mutual contracts among members of societies. Communes and Federations may come into being, and groups can enter into larger federations with others. The third classification, Collectivistic Anarchism, holds that people are brought together for resistance to oppression and for the satisfaction of their economic needs. This group is composed of several sub-variations such as syndicalism, anarcho-syndicalism, collectivism, and communism.

In addition to the differences in goals, there are also different means to achieve those goals. On the one hand, there were those who held that revolutionary violence should be employed as often and as widely as possible. They organized openly when permitted or became secretive and conspiratorial when thwarted or repressed. They promoted revolutionary violence on a broad scale or simply aimed at the seizure of a factory. They instilled terror in their enemies by individual acts of assassination or "propaganda by the deed." They promoted the general strike, the destruction of factories

---

(Cleveland: World Publishing Company, 1970), 20-23.
[144] Gerald Runkle, Anarchism: Old and New, 9.
[145] Gerald Runkle, Anarchism: Old and New, 10.

and machines, and drove away government officials.[146] Pacifistic anarchists, on the other hand, confronted the violence of the state with actions of love and tried to convert others to their views by example and persuasion.

The influence of anarchism in Puerto Rico during the late nineteenth century and early years of the twentieth century was produced by the circulation and reading of the writings of Pierre-Joseph Proudhon, Michael Bakunin, Peter Kropotkin, and Enrico Malatesta, although other anarchist writers and practitioners were also known by artisans living mainly in the urban areas. These authors contributed to providing unity to the theoretical vision of what should be an anarchist society, and some of them exerted a strong influence in the emergence of the theory of "propaganda by the deed." In the case of Spain, it was not until the late 1880s that ideas of "propaganda by the deed" had any significant impact on Spanish anarchism. In fact, it was not until the 1890s that a good number of actions were taken in the name of "propaganda by the deed."[147] By the dawn of the twentieth century, "propaganda by the deed" was mainly practiced in Spain and Russia.[148]

Proudhon, a French artisan (1809-1865), who experienced the Revolution of 1848 and served in the Constituent Assembly, perceived anarchy as an ordered society without government and argued in favor of workers' self-emancipation by way of the voluntary organization of their own labor. This kind of emancipation would come about not by

[146] Ibid., 11.
[147] Two of the most important activities that took place were the bomb at the Barcelona's Corpus Christi Day Procession, in June 7, 1896, that left eleven persons dead and forty wounded, and the assassination of Antonio Cánovas del Castillo, Spanish Prime Minister, by Michel Angiolillo, an Italian anarchist, on August 8, 1897.
[148] Murray Bookchin, The Spanish Anarchists (New York: Harper Colophon, 1978), 115-122.

political but by economic means.[149] In addition, Proudhon proposed a mutualist system based on an equitable exchange between self-governing producers, organized individually or in association, and financed by free credit. The mutualist society organized on an egalitarian basis was going to be united and linked at all levels by a Federal principle binding the groups by contract and mutual interest rather than by laws.[150] Referring to the collective force needed for the production of goods and the division of labor required, Proudhon offered a different meaning from the one found in capitalist thought: By participating in gains and losses, by a graded scale of pay, and the promotion to all grades and positions, the production of the collective force ceased to be a source of profit to a small group of managers and owners, becoming instead the property of all workers. In his view, the division of labor would cease to be a cause of degradation for workers, who would be educated broadly and be under the obligation of apprenticeship in a cooperative system with other workers.

Bakunin's (1814-1876) main ideas were published in two books, God and the State (1871) and Statism and Anarchy (1873). Central to his philosophy was the concept that rebellion was inherent to individuals; he considered it the only way individuals could recover their full human dignity. Rebellion should be aimed toward all hierarchical authority such as the state, church, and God. Bakunin argued that revolutionary instincts were stronger in backward southern and eastern European countries such as Italy, Spain, and Russia, than Northern or Western Europe. If despair and instincts were the main motive forces of social revolt, then, rather than looking within the industrial proletariat,

[149] Proudhon expressed these ideas in What Is Property?, an 1840 publication, where he advocated for the first time in favor of a society without a government. See, Marshall S. Shatz, The Essential Works of Anarchism (New York: Bantam Books, 1971), 81-82.

[150] These propositions are found in Proudhon's General Idea of the Revolution in the Nineteenth Century, published in 1851. See also Shatz, The Essential Works of Anarchism, 81-82.

Bakunin favored looking within the lower strata of the working class, including criminals, and other outsiders for the true agents of rebellion.[151]

In terms of religion and the idea of God in the life of human beings, Bakunin argued that religion as promoted and preached by priests, influenced people from infancy to develop mental and moral habits. He argued that the idea of God had been used by all kinds of governments to keep people in ignorance because ignorance represented an essential condition for maintaining power. Depriving people of education, reading, etc., allowed workers to accept religious traditions without criticism.[152] Finally, Bakunin rejected government and state power as guiding forces for the lives of people in society. Happiness and freedom for people would be only possible when they built their own lives by organizing themselves from below, and by means of autonomous and totally free people associations not subject to official control.[153]

Bakunin accepted the concept of Federalism as developed by Proudhon. However, contrary to Proudhon, he rejected the idea that it was possible to create mutualism associations within existing societies that could eventually replace those societies without violent revolutionary actions. Bakunin promoted the need for working class agents to use direct action and was in favor of a violent revolution as essential for removing all existing institutions and as necessary to the construction of a free and peaceful society. In addition, he suggested that the means of production should be owned collectively, providing remuneration to each worker equal to the amount of work he

[151] See Bakunin's "Statism and Anarchy," in Sam Dolgoff, Bakunin on Anarchy (New York: Vintage Books, 1972), 323-350. Also, Shatz, The Essential Works of Anarchism, 124.
[152]Shatz, The Essential Works of Anarchism, 132-133.
[153]Bakunin, "Statism and Anarchy," in Dolgoff, Bakunin on Anarchy, 158.

actually performed. These ideas are frequently found in Puerto Rican urban workers' publications of the period.

Kropotkin's (1842-1921) contribution to anarchist thought is based on the importance he assigned in his writings to mutual aid as a factor in social evolution and the major role he played in the development of the theory of anarchist communism, according to which "everything belongs to everyone." He argued that the distribution of production and goods should be based exclusively on human needs. For Kropotkin, generations of workers who lived and died in misery had generated wealth during the nineteenth century, which accrued to select groups and individuals. However, advances in technology, agriculture, etc. created great riches that were neither shared proportionally among members of society nor were individual needs taken into consideration. The limitations suffered by workers, therefore, were not created by nature, but produced by the ambitions of a few men: Poverty was artificially generated. He considered mutual aid and solidarity, conversely, to be major factors that would insure social progress and the promotion of a higher culture.[154]

In The Conquest of Bread, published in 1892, Kropotkin proposed a different form of organizing societies where wealth would be shared equitably. He envisioned a revolutionary society organized as a federation of free communist groups where all producers could be mutually interdependent to the point that it would be impossible to measure the contribution of any particular individual. The kind of anarchist revolution promoted by Kropotkin was one that perceived a peaceful displacement of the prevailing system of social production and distribution. In the new arrangement of society all

[154]La cuestión social en Puerto Rico (San Juan, Puerto Rico: Tipografía Acosta, 1904), written by artisan Ramón Romero Rosa, discusses ideas of poverty and solidarity according to the Puerto Rican context.

individuals had an equal claim to the goods of society, and each would be rewarded according to his needs rather than according to his work.[155]

Contrary to collectivists who were willing to recognize a distinction between skilled and unskilled workers, Kropotkin considered it necessary to erase wage distinctions and to promote equal access to knowledge and training. Another idea that distanced Kropotkin from Proudhon and Bakunin was the question of the state *after* the revolution. While Proudhon and Bakunin were in favor of destroying the state, Kropotkin favored the establishment of anarchist communism after breaking the power of the prevailing system, a formula that he described as one of "communism without government." Finally, he argued in favor of the decentralization of industry appropriate to a non-governmental society.

It is not surprising that anarchist ideas found fertile ground in Puerto Rico given the circumstances that the country was controlled by three major forces: the Spanish military government, the influence exerted in the island by the church, and the Creole upper class. In addition, the socio-economic conditions of the urban and rural workers made the anarchist organization of society around work very attractive. However, how did these ideas find their way to Puerto Rico? The main current of anarchist thought and influence in Puerto Rico came from Spain, which together with Italy were the two European countries where anarchism had its most powerful influence during the second part of the nineteenth century. This influence began in Spain in October 1868, when Giuseppi Fanelli, an Italian anarchist and follower of Bakunin, arrived in Barcelona and addressed a group of workers, composed of printers, shoemakers, and house painters, on

[155]Shatz, The Essential Works of Anarchism, 184-228.

his anarchist ideas and the "bitterness of his anger toward human suffering and exploitation."[156] On January 24, 1869, Fanelli organized the Madrid section of the International Workingmen`s Association (IWA), also known as the First International. The IWA had been founded in London in 1864 with the purpose of merging labor movements with socialist political groups.

The ideas of Proudhon, Bakunin, and later Kropotkin, found a receptive audience among urban workers in Barcelona and land laborers in Andalucía. Anarchist ideas for them represented a different view of society and one in which they would have a leading role. Material conditions in Spain made Bakunin's ideas very attractive to landless peasants, artisans facing ruin, workers with no stake in society, and intellectuals and students who had no place to go. For all of them, anarchism provided a coherent body of ideas based on a revolutionary federalism and a radical collectivism that were rooted in local initiatives and decentralized social forms. On the other hand, Bakunin's atheistic and anti-clerical views were shared by a large segment of Spanish workers at a time when the Catholic Church was the largest landowner and wealthiest institution in Spain, and was closely linked to the monarchy and the nobility.

In Spain, by the mid-1870s, anarchism was gaining support among skilled workers such as vineyard laborers, wine processing men, masons, and bakers in the cities of Jeréz and Cádiz.[157] A proletarianization process took place in Jeréz de la Frontera between 1897 and 1907 as small owners and skilled artisans were forced to enter into a wage labor system because of declining prices and the rising costs of producing wine, a

[156] See Bookchin, The Spanish Anarchists, 14; also Paul Thomas, Karl Marx and the Anarchists (London: Routledge, 1980), 317-318.
[157]Temma Kaplan, Anarchists of Andalucia, 1868-1903 (New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1977), 75-76.

situation that eroded their profits.[158] Anarchists tried to organize labor syndicates that would unite small producers with employees, peasants with urban workers, and skilled with unskilled workers.[159]

Anarchist activities and organization efforts did not go unnoticed by Spanish authorities, who initiated a campaign of persecution and suppression against them. In 1871 workers and peasants in Jeréz organized themselves as the Universal Workers Casino for self-protection and to avoid government actions and laws. This type of association was allowed and promoted by state and ecclesiastical authorities. The anarchist Spanish Regional Federation was banned in 1874 and was only able to resume political activities in 1881 under a new name, the Federation of Workers of the Spanish Region.

During the early 1880s, a southern agrarian organization known as "Mano Negra," presumably influenced by anarchism ideas and individuals, was accused of attempting to bring down the Spanish government and of trying to sweep away the landed aristocracy of Andalusia by resorting to violent means. The crimes attributed to "Mano Negra" served in 1883 as an excuse for the government to deal a severe blow to all agrarian radicalism by suppressing all efforts to organize workers.[160] After 1882, Spanish anarchists split between collectivists and libertarian communists. Although most of the Andalusian anarchists leaned toward libertarian communism, those from Seville and Jeréz remained collectivists. In addition, according to Kaplan, anarcho-collectivists

---

[158]Temma Kaplan, "The Social Base of Nineteenth-Century Andalusian Anarchism in Jeréz de la Frontera" Journal of Interdisciplinary History 6, 1 (Summer 1975), 47-49.

[159]Temma Kapplan, "The Social Base of Nineteenth-Century Andalusian Anarchism in Jeréz de la Frontera," 50-61. Similar tactics were used by cigar workers in Puerto Rico trying to organize rural workers at the beginning of the twentieth century.

[160] Clara E. Lida, "Agrarian Anarchism in Andalusia," International Review of Social History 14, part 3 (1969): 315-321.

favored strikes as a method for improving working conditions in contrast with anarcho-communists who favored "propaganda by the deed."[161] By the closing years of the nineteenth century the anarchist movement in Spain entered in a new phase of development. The reprisals against anarchists accused of terrorist actions together with repressive legislation led to the dissolution of the "Pact of Union and Solidarity" in 1896. "Propaganda by the deed" was abandoned as a strategic form of direct action and anarchists began to place more emphasis on the importance of education in achieving their social goals.

Anarchism in the Americas

During the nineteenth and early twentieth century, anarchist ideas and anarcho-syndicalism activities spread from Europe to several countries in the Americas. Early in the 1870s, for example, sections of the International were established in Uruguay and Argentina. In the case of Mexico, some authors had traced anarchist influence in the Mexican working-class as back as the 1860s. Anarchism was an important factor in the development of this class and of agrarian movements through the 1930s.[162] Since the mid-nineteenth century, Mexican workers were exposed to anarchist publications. They adhered to the socialism espoused by Proudhon and Bakunin, not the one proposed by Marx. Later, they adopted the communist anarchism of Kropotkin and finally moved to anarcho-syndicalism.[163] Artisans and the urban labor force were the initial groups willing to listen to anarchist ideas, as their prevailing socio-economic and political

[161]Temma Kaplan, "The Social Base of Nineteenth-Century Andalusian Anarchism in Jeréz de la Frontera," 67-68.

[162]John M. Hart, Anarchism and the Mexican Working-Class, 1860-1931 (Austin: University of Texas Press, 1987), ix.
[163]Ibid., 16-17.

conditions could not meet their expectations. Displaced by urban industrialism, they suffered a proletarianization process. In addition to publications, an important factor in maintaining anarchism as a leading force in Mexican society was the immigration of Spaniards who arrived in Mexico during the period of 1885 to 1900.[164]

The period of 1890 to 1912 in Argentina represented the formative years when the working-class increased in number and began expressing discontent with the prevailing structure of society. During this period anarchism represented one of four oppositional groups; the other three were socialism, syndicalism, and popular movements that dominated the development of their organizations. It began acquiring strong support among workers until it reached the point of being the ideology most accepted by workers' organizations.[165] Anarchism manifested in two particular forms in Argentina: individualist actions against institutions and persons representing authority, and the other rejecting the modern state and promoting the substitution of this state with an autonomous federation of free men.[166] Anarchists published books, pamphlets, and a daily newspaper La Protesta Humana. However, their most important contribution was their leadership in the organization of the Federación Obrera Regional Argentina, better known as FORA.

In the case of Chile, urban workers in Santiago and Valparaíso played a major role in the development of the labor movement during the first three decades of the twentieth century. In these efforts, anarcho-syndicalists became the most important players within the working-class until the 1930s. The supporters of this tendency were

[164]Ibid., 17-18.
[165] Hobart Spalding, La clase trabajadora argentina (Documentos para su historia, 1890-1912) (Buenos Aires: Editorial Galerna, 1970), 19-22.
[166]Ibid., 58-59.

predominantly native-born and tended to be workers rather artisans. Peter De Shazo argues that the urban workers were the driving force of the organized labor movement in early twentieth century Chile, considering that the role of nitrate miners was small by comparison. Urban workers led the most strikes, extracted the most significant concessions from employers, and built the most durable labor organization, pioneering the rise of the labor movement in Chile.[167]

The emergence of anarchism as an influential force in the Cuban labor force began in the 1880s. There were at least three sources that aided the spread of anarchist ideas: The first are anarchist publications from Spain; second, the reading of periodicals and books in the tobacco factories in the early 1880s; and third, the migration of anarchist workers to Cuba who were able to integrate into local workers' organizations and became effective propagandists of anarchism and organizers of workers. To this last point, Joan Casanovas argues that most of the *Peninsular* immigrants came from areas of Spain with little anarchist presence, and that the most popular anarchists were Creoles.[168] Anarchists played a leading role during the 1887 congress of Cuban labor organizations and during the labor congress of 1892, where they consolidated their leading position in the labor movement. Publications such as El Productor, El Trabajo, El Obrero, El Artesano, and El Clarín, some published during the 1880s and 1890s, represented other ideological instruments for their cause, not only in Cuba, but also in the community established in the United States.[169]

---

[167]Peter De Shazo, Urban Workers and Labor Unions in Chile, 1902-1927 (Madison, Wisconsin: University of Wisconsin Press, 1983).
[168] Joan Casanovas, Bread, or Bullets! Urban Labor and Spanish Colonialism in Cuba, 1850-1898 (Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press, 1998), 11-12.
[169] Instituto de Historia del Movimiento Comunista y la Revolución Socialista de Cuba, El movimiento obrero cubano: documentos y artículos (La Habana: Instituto Cubano del Libro, 1975),Tomo I, 1865-1925, 110-111.

In Cuba, by the end of the 1880s, cigar makers assumed a role of leadership, playing the position as a vanguard of the working-class. This was the moment when cigar makers began moving from reformism as the solution to their socio-economic and political conditions, to anarchism to guide their demands. However, Cuban anarchists developed their own kind of anarchism by taking from the Spanish movement only those principles, organizational models, and strategies that could work for them in a colonial society.[170]

Anarchist influence followed Cuban cigar workers in the United States, particularly Florida and New York. In 1885, for example, Vicente Martínez Ybor opened a cigar manufacturing plant near Tampa, at a site that eventually became known as Ybor City. This action was part of a policy by cigar manufacturers to move their production from Cuba and New York to Florida, and from Key West to Tampa, in order to avoid labor organizations they considered to be "sources of unrest and violence."[171] The labor organizations, however, followed the industry to Florida.

The initial organizing attempts by the Cigar Makers International Union among Cuban immigrants did not have the outcome desired or fulfill expectations and in 1899, the immigrants remained unorganized. However, the Sociedad de Torcedores de Tabaco de Tampa y sus Cercanías, better known as "La Resistencia," filled the vacuum. "La Resistencia" was organized during the Fall 1899, and was an important cigar workers' organization that followed an anarchist orientation and had as a purpose "to resist the exploitation of labor by capital and to maintain the equalization of prices in this

[170] Joan Casanovas, Bread or Bullets!, 584.
[171] Durward Long, "La Resistencia: Tampa's Immigrant Labor Union," Labor History 6, 3 (Fall 1965), 194.

industry"[172] In addition, "La Resistencia" was not only an anarchist organization; it was a union of immigrants trying to organize workers in an area where the business community considered labor unions to be negative influences for the community. This organization challenged the combined wealth and power of the manufacturers, of the newly organized tobacco trust, and of representatives of the U.S. labor movement, as well as Tampa's local government. The activities promoted by "La Resistencia," particularly the use of strikes as a bargaining tool, provoked a violent response by employers. Among the tactics used by employers were arrests on charges of vagrancy and the use of vigilante groups to beat workers. Furthermore, members of this organization suffered kidnappings and forcible deportation.

Anarchism had serious repercussions in the Cuban independence movement, impacting events inside Cuba, as well as those occurring within the Cuban community in the United States. Cuban cigar workers in New York and Florida were receptive to anarchist ideas promoted in Cuba. By the 1880s, tensions and conflicts emerged within the Cuban cigar communities, dividing its members between factory owners and cigar workers. By 1886, for example, Cuban cigar workers in Key West viewed Cuban cigar capitalists as manipulators of the independence movement for their own interests. In particular, these workers considered that employers were suppressing strikes in the name of Cuban independence.[173]

The original anarchist position called for Cuban and Spanish workers to exclusively support a socialist revolution that would be free of bourgeois interference or control. However, anarchists eventually split into those who remained loyal to the idea of

[172] Ibid,.196.
[173] Gerald E. Poyo, "The Anarchist Challenge to the Cuban Independence Movement, 1885-1890," Cuban Studies/Estudios Cubanos 15, 1 (Winter 1985), 30-31.

a socialist revolution and those who either supported the Cuban insurrectionists or the Spanish government in the island. Spanish anarchists, in particular, were ambivalent about the best course to follow in the Cuban-Spain conflict. They did not understand the anti-colonial struggle. They had to confront the question of collaborating with Cuban insurrectionists or staying outside the conflict. Two different approaches were followed: First, anarchists in Spain argued that Cuban insurrectionists would derive some benefit from their struggle because they would emancipate themselves from a government though still be the slaves of a new government.[174] Anarchists in Florida and New York, however, had a different position. In 1895, for example, the Spanish anarchist Enrique Creci, in El Despertar, rejected any posture of passivity or neutrality and argued instead for joining forces with the insurrectionists. This position was influenced by the fact that a large number of insurrectionists were workers overwhelmed by the economic crisis.[175]

After the bomb against a Corpus Christi procession in Barcelona in 1896, the Spanish government began a systematic repression against anarchists that eventually gave way to the Montjuich legal proceedings. In the spring of 1897, ninety prisoners were brought to trial. Of the group, twenty-six were found guilty; some were sentenced to death sentences, others got sixty-four years while some were found not guilty. However, the acquitted prisoners were imprisoned again, and this time sent to an African penal colony. These two factors had a negative impact in the anarchist movement in Spain, expressed, for example, in their difficulties to celebrate legal activities, and in the enactment of a special law for the repression of anarchists. Meanwhile, this situation contributed to the migration of anarchist workers to other countries, such as Cuba, Puerto

[174] Rafael Nuñez Florencio, "Los anarquistas españoles y americanos ante la guerra de Cuba," Hispania (Revista Española de Historia) 51, 179 (September-December 1991), 1086.
[175] Ibid., 1087. In addition, see Bookchin, The Spanish Anarchists, 121.

Rico, and the United States. In addition, there was a group of anarchists in Spain that concentrated their efforts in the analysis of the impact of the Montjuich process in their movement. They perceived the Cuban war as an issue of secondary importance.[176] However, these years coincided with the period when a group of anarchists arrived in Cuba and Puerto Rico.

Anarchism in Puerto Rico

Few publications deal with the origins and development of anarchism in Puerto Rico. The work of Rubén Dávila Santiago's El derribo de las murallas, based on documentation produced during the period of the late nineteenth century until the 1930s, is a valuable contribution. It is the best reference work for understanding the development of anarchist ideas in Puerto Rico.[177] Of more recent production are two doctoral dissertations dealing with the years of the early labor movement in Puerto Rico that specifically dedicate a chapter to anarchist thought in the island. Arturo Bird-Cardona presents in chapter V, "Different Routes to Solidarity," the presence and role of anarchism in the Puerto Rican labor movement. Bird-Cardona considers that anarchist influence in Puerto Rico began early in the twentieth century, a period when a group of Social Studies Centers functioned as schools of anarchist thought. He describes some of the elements of Spanish anarchism that mainly influenced the local workers such as the idea of freedom, the return principle, and faith in science and reason. For him, anarchism was the most radical wing of the Puerto Rican labor movement and the most persecuted. In the particular case of cigar makers, they were blacklisted by the Trust. However, they

[176]Ibid., 1080 and 1092.
[177] Rubén Dávila Santiago, El derribo de las murallas (Río Piedras, PR: Editorial Cultural, 1988).

built prestige from their militancy, literary production, and constant denunciation of the system. The major limitation of this chapter is the author's use as main source of information the book by Dávila Santiago.[178] Carlos Sanabria's dissertation also discussed the theme of anarchism in chapter III, "The Ideology of the Early Labor Movement," in which he surveyed the major writings of prominent labor leaders to demonstrate the influence that radical working class ideology had on the early labor movement in Puerto Rico. The limitation of this chapter is that no specifics or historical context for anarchist theory are provided. Sanabria does not link the writings and actions of these labor leaders with anarchist thought and does not differentiate among the schools of thought within anarchism ideology.[179] However, the history of anarchism in Puerto Rico goes beyond what these authors have written as presented in the following paragraphs.

The above summary of some of the ideas found in the writings of Proudhon, Bakunin, and Kropotkin represents a theoretical framework that influenced the actions and activities of cigar and other workers in Puerto Rico. Anarchist concepts found fertile ground among Puerto Rican urban workers, mainly artisans and workers such as typographers, carpenters, dockworkers, painters, and cigar workers, who accepted, particularly after 1898, the idea that technology and social progress could provide more than enough resources to improve their working conditions. In San Juan, a group of them organized the Ensayo Obrero collective, the name taken from the first newspaper published by workers with an anarchist orientation. Among the members were Ramón Romero Rosa, typographer, labor leader and probably the most prolific labor writer in

[178] Arturo Bird-Santana, "Between the Insular Road and San Juan Bay," 103-127.
[179] Carlos Sanabria, "The Puerto Rican Organized Workers' Movement and the American Federation of Labor," 62-100.

Puerto Rico during the early years of the twentieth century; Santiago Iglesias Pantín, carpenter, who was a key leader in the organization of the Free Federation of Labor, and who also promoted the relationship with the American Federation of Labor; and Eduardo Conde, painter and anarchist who traveled and worked in Spain and in New York, and became one of the most important labor organizers during the period under study.

The main obstacle to social and economic improvement was the uneven distribution of wealth under prevailing capitalism or merchant systems supported by the state and the church. The close relationship between the state and the church as symbols of power and guardians of the upper layers of society and their role in keeping workers in perpetual subordination were important factors in the case of Puerto Rico.[180] The blind obedience to ecclesiastical authorities and the acceptance of hardship or resignation to harsh socio-economic conditions in this life in order to be compensated with a better life after death were conditions and promises rejected by poor people.[181] Workers considered the Catholic Church a major factor, together with the Spanish government, in keeping workers in the dark. In their writings they defined Church control as one that had relegated workers to conditions of ignorance and servility for four centuries.[182]

Another influenced view was the idea that workers should concentrate primarily on socio-economic factors rather than struggle for political changes. Therefore, class struggle should be fought at the social and economic levels, as the political process was

[180]Matos Rodríguez, Women in San Juan, 1820-1868; and Martínez Vergne, Shaping the Discourse on Space develop this idea in their books.
[181]See Fernando Picó, De la mano dura a la cordura (Río Piedras, PR: Ediciones Huracán, 1999); Angel G. Quintero Rivera, Vírgenes, magos y escapularios (San Juan, PR: Centro de Investigaciones Sociales, Universidad de Puerto Rico, 1998); and Carroll, Report on the Island of Porto Rico.
[182]See the writings of Manuel F. Rojas, Cuatro siglos de ignorancia y servidumbre en Puerto Rico, (San Juan, PR: Imprenta La Primavera, 1914); and Eduardo Conde, Acusación y protesta (Puerta de Tierra, San Juan, PR: Imprenta Unión Obrera, 1919).

perceived as an instrument to guarantee the perpetual exploitation of workers. However, the participation of workers' organizations in political activities organized by local parties represented a contradiction to the practice of rejecting the political process. One of the main reasons given by the workers, for example, for organizing the Socialist Party in 1899 was that political participation allowed workers to formulate or change laws in the best interests of workers. Their experience in participating in the elections of 1904, 1906 and 1917-1920, however, showed this postulate to be incorrect.

Strikes and other militant activities driven or influenced by anarchists seemed to have occurred in Puerto Rico mainly during periods of relative prosperity or good harvests. At this time workers pushed for better wages and better working conditions, while employers and government used the mechanisms or instrument of the State, mainly police forces and laws, to suppress the activities of workers such as strikes, stoppages, and demonstrations. PRATCO records of earnings for the period 1912 to 1920, for example, show that only in 1914, 1917, and 1919 did those earnings go below $600,000. Cox suggested that the bitter and long strikes in the cigar industry that marked those years were the main cause for that situation.[183]

TABLE 3: EARNINGS OF THE PUERTO RICO TOBACCO COMPANY, 1912-1920

YEAR	EARNINGS (dollars)
1912	701,593
1913	671,973
1914	569,198
1915	683,499
1916	860,105
1917	511,331
1918	708,378
1919	137,934

[183]Cox, Competition in the American Tobacco Industry, 288.

1920	998,948

Source: Cox, Competition in the American Tobacco Industry, 1911-1932, 288.

As in the Cuban case, in Puerto Rico increasing militancy did not reflect a defined ideological position, but rather a general radicalization influenced by anarchism and anarchists. This was the case of "Cruzada del Ideal," previously explained, that not only promoted the unification of all workers, urban and rural, in the same organization, but also perceived peasants as still uncorrupted by the debilitating influences of a technological society. The government report on how negatively they perceived the participation of members of the "Cruzada del Ideal" in the January to March 1915 agricultural laborers strike against sugar mill owners serves to illustrate this point. The Bureau of Labor, according to this report, was unable to obtain a settlement of all differences at all places where the strike was declared due to "the intervention of the labor agitators" interest in continuing the strike for a long period of time. The report also expressed that:

> As soon as the outside agitators began to take part in the strike and to preach violence and lawlessness as a means to secure higher wages and shorter hours of work, fires were started in the cane fields at different parts of the island and great damage was done to the properties of the employers…in the attempts made by the insular police to restore order and to prevent the wanton destruction of property, clashes between the police and the strikers occurred at Juncos, Vieques, and Ponce, which unfortunately resulted in the killing of five or six strikers and the serious wounding of two policemen.[184]

However, actions that can be described as "Propaganda by the Deed" can be found among their activities. With these actions anarchists tried to call attention to the plight of the working class or some other social issue. They could sabotage the workplace or property in a factory or attempt against the life of a manager or

[184]Puerto Rico, Governor Annual Report 1915 (Washington, D.C.: GPO, 1916), 36.

representative of the cigar company, a strikebreaker, or a government official. The case of a group of cigar makers from Caguas, accused of killing the owner and foreman of a cigar factory, can be mentioned in this category. Among the accused was Juan Vilar, an important anarchist writer. Another case occurred in Bayamón where Justo Andrade, a cigar maker, killed Adolfo Reyes, accusing him of breaking a strike.[185]

In Europe, Bakunin's ideas spread mainly in those countries with large numbers of peasants, domestic workers, and artisans threatened in different ways by the capitalist mode of production and organization of society. In Puerto Rico, in a similar way, anarchism appealed to workers negatively impacted by the new capitalist mode of production, those on the margins who faced capitalism as a prospect, and those who felt threatened enough to call for a new kind of response. Therefore, the acceptance of anarchism ideas among Puerto Rican workers, particularly those in cigar production, during the late nineteenth century and early twentieth century, can be explained as a rebellious response against the rapid socio-economic changes occurring in the country. In the case of cigar makers, industrialization of the trade and increasing specialization represented the dehumanization of the workers. In addition, the growth of cities and towns around centers of cigar manufacturing where workers lived in unhealthy and crowded conditions provided fertile ground for anarchist ideas.[186]

In the Puerto Rican experience, as in Spain, Bakunin's ideas on church and state, landlord and capitalist, and parliament and bourgeoisie seemed more immediately

[185]Puerto Rico Eagle, "El crimen de Caguas," March 11 1911, 1; La Correspondencia de Puerto Rico, "El crimen de Caguas," March 15, 1911, 7. La Correspondencia de Puerto Rico, "Sangrienta tragedia en Bayamón,"March 11, 1911, 1.

[186] See United States, Thirteenth Census of the United States Taken in the Year 1910, Statistics for Puerto Rico; Fourteenth Census of the United States Taken in the Year 1920,Statistics for Puerto Rico, 1920; Government of Puerto Rico, The Need of Providing Land for the Laboring Classes in Puerta de Tierra, 1913: and Puerto Rico, Bureau of Labor, Report on the Housing Conditions of Laborers in Porto Rico, 1914.

relevant and a more forceful approach than the ideas on the same topics proposed by Marx. For example, Marx's emphases on gradualism and organization, on parliamentary procedure, and on the need to build up the political and the industrial power of organized labor did not appeal to the workers. In this sense, Marx did not take into consideration colonial relationships (as between Puerto Rico and Spain), the lack of legal or legislative representation in the Spanish political system, and laws forbidding labor organization. However, at some point during the second decade of the twentieth century, becoming Russian events a factor, Marx's ideas began to gain adherents among urban workers, particularly cigar workers. For example, a group of cigar workers organized as the "Soviets of Bayamón," who published a newspaper named El Comunista in 1919 and 1920.[187] Marx considered that political reforms seeking to make the state more liberal and democratic should be supported and used by those wanting revolutionary emancipation in its more permanent form. In addition, he argued that workers should extract reforms and concessions from the State and engage in political activities. Marx considered these political activities as a means towards emancipation, not an end worthy of pursuit for its own sake. While parliamentary representation was not going to replace class conflict, it could represent an additional forum for workers.

By 1870, the anarchist movement was formally established in Madrid and Barcelona, and spread across all of Spain. At the present, there is no conclusive evidence that includes Puerto Rico in that dissemination. Indirect information however suggests an affirmative response. For example, the free society envisioned by Proudhon in which artisans and peasants collectively owned industrial enterprises and negotiated and contracted with one another to satisfy their material needs found support among artisans

[187] El Comunista, 1919-1920.

in Puerto Rico in the 1870s. The letter published in 1874 in El Artesano, by a worker, represents an early document referencing Proudhon's views on a free society. In addition, works published during those years by members of the upper class and by the military and the Church, expressed concern for socialist ideas and their possible influence on the artisans. The conservative newspaper El Boletín Mercantil, for example, in an editorial published in 1885, argued in favor of improving labor conditions as a means to repress the diffusion of socialist doctrines as well as potential influence on uprisings and strikes.[188]

If in Jeréz de la Frontera anarchism had an immediate influence on the rural sector, in Puerto Rico its initial impact occurred among urban workers and craftsmen, such as carpenters, typographers, painters, and cigar-makers, among others, but not in the areas of sugar or coffee production. On the other hand, the general perception among workers of the role played by the Catholic Church in Puerto Rico was similar to the one held by a large number of Spanish workers. The Church was allied to the Monarchy and was a wealthy institution.[189] The strategy of Jérez workers of using a casino as a cover-up for their activities and thinking can be found in Puerto Rico. After 1860, for example, artisans used casinos, their social centers, as a cover for their activities in order to keep operating within the legality of the moment. As Quintero Rivera has demonstrated, by the same period of time, the same process of proletarianization that had taken place in Jeréz de la Frontera in Spain among artisans and small producers occurred in Puerto

[188] García and Quintero Rivera, Desafío y solidaridad, 26-27; Cruz Monclova, Historia de Puerto Rico, Tomo II, Parte 2, 936.
[189] See Félix Matos Rodríguez, Women in San Juan; Teresita Martínez-Vergne, Shaping the Discourse on Space; and Henry K. Carroll, Report on the Island of Porto Rico.

Rico.[190]

Cigar Workers Writings on Anarchism

Cigar workers and other urban workers began writing radical documents expressing their views of Puerto Rican society and the social and economic limitations and oppression suffered by workers. The important fact is that these documents went beyond the spontaneous denunciation of particular situations; they were impregnated by an ideology, carrying a message and posing alternatives to how society should be organized for those who produced wealth but were living in total deprivation. In short, they found in anarchist ideology the instrument to promote the idea that the emancipation of workers was in their own hands. Furthermore, their writings had the purpose of raising workers' consciousness about the struggle between labor and capital. As pointed out by Dávila Santiago, anarchist discourse could be found in books, flyers, journals, literally expressions, and mass meetings.

This discourse functioned on three levels: as a political language used to formulate general conceptions to orient actions; as a literary expression that could be found in novels, short stories, plays, poems, and essays; and finally as a form of knowledge used for theoretical formulation, teaching, and activism.[191] Among the writers influenced by anarchist ideas and whose literary production affirmed a working class discourse were Luisa Capetillo, Angel María Dieppa, Manuel F. Rojas, Juan Vilar,

[190]Temma Kaplan, "The Social Base of Nineteenth-Century Andalusian Anarchism in Jeréz de la Frontera," Journal of Interdisciplinary History 6, 1 (Summer 1975), 47-70; Angel G. Quintero Rivera, "Socialist and Cigarmaker;" and Rafael Alonso Torres, Cuarenta años de lucha proletaria (San Juan, PR: Imprenta Baldrich, 1939).

[191] Rubén Dávila Santiago, El derribo de las murallas (Río Piedras, PR: Editorial Cultural, 1988), 89. See also Ricardo Campos, Apuntes sobre la expresión cultural obrera en Puerto Rico (San Juan, PR: CEREP, 1973); Carmen Centeno Añeses "Modernidad, subalternidad y resistencia en la literatura obrera puertorriqueña (1898-1910)," Ph.D. diss. Centro de Estudios Avanzados de Puerto Rico, 2005.

and Venacio Cruz.

Luisa Capetillo was a prominent feminist, anarchist leader and labor organizer in Puerto Rico during the first two decades of the twentieth century. In addition to her work as a Reader in cigar factories, she also played an active role in the "Cruzada del Ideal" after 1909. She was a prolific writer who completed four books and a number of articles in the Puerto Rican proletarian press. Capetillo was not only an anarchist writer and organizer with a record of struggle in Puerto Rico, but also traveled and lived in New York, Ybor City, Tampa, and in Cuba at different times during the first two decades of the twentieth century, where she collaborated in the labor press and in the labor movement among cigar workers. She was deported from Cuba because of her support for the anarcho-syndicalist movement, and eventually returned to Puerto Rico where she participated in numerous strikes of agricultural workers.[192] Between 1917 and 1919 she was arrested several times for her activities in support of sugar cane workers; in particular she was criminally charged for disorderly conduct and inciting riots.[193] Between 1919 and 1920 she lived in New York City where she worked as a Reader and collaborated in the labor press.

As an anarchist Capetillo expressed conviction for the need for a new society where private property would be abolished as well as the State; where religion would no longer be needed; and where all means of production would be owned in common.[194] In this society everyone would exchange what was produced for what they needed.[195] The

[192] Norma Valle Ferrer, Luisa Capetillo, obra completa (San Juan/Cayey: Depto. del Trabajo, 2008); Julio Ramos, Amor y anarquía (Río Piedras, PR: Ediciones Huracán, 1992).
[193] Valle Ferrer, Luisa Capetillo: obra completa, 308-312; Luisa Capetillo: historia de una mujer, 125-129.
[194] Luisa Capetillo, Mi opinión sobre las libertades, derechos…. (San Juan, PR: Biblioteca Roja, 1911), 87 and 94.
[195] Luisa Capetillo, Ensayos libertarios (Arecibo, PR: Tipografía Real Hermanos, 1907), 29.

type of anarchism promoted by Capetillo was based on class struggle against capitalism and for a society that with the eventual triumph of workers would be organized as a cooperative community. Furthermore, she promoted education and cooperative society and organization as essential ingredients for a General Strike that would lead to the establishment of an anarchist society.[196] Capetillo did not advocate for violence as an instrument of class struggle, rather she advocated for the promotion of education, because "violence cannot be the mother of liberty".[197]Capetillo did not see a contradiction with being an anarchist and belonging at the same time to the FFL, because by joining this labor organization, in the short term, workers would be protecting their economic well-being.[198]

Angel María Dieppa, syndicalist, was an urban cigar worker and anarchist who supported Bakunin's ideas and made favorable references to Kropotkin and Malatesta. He knew about the 1869 meeting of the International and of the ideological struggle between Marx and Bakunin.[199] He considered the Bakunin movement as anti-political, revolutionary and collectivist. Dieppa believed that the cooperative movement and parliamentary socialism had only served to undermine the revolutionary labor movement. In his opinion, the only way to destroy capitalism and to end workers' misery was by supporting violence and direct action as promoted by anarcho-syndicalists. In addition, because religion and states were allies of the bourgeoisie in its efforts to oppress and exploit the working class, they should be considered as enemies of workers. The

[196]Ibid., 25-26.
[197] Capetillo, Mi opinión sobre las libertades, derechos, 77.
[198] Capetillo, Ensayos libertarios, 34, and Influencias de las ideas modernas (San Juan, PR: Tipografía Negrón Flores, 1916),
[199]Angel María Dieppa, El porvenir de la sociedad humana (Pta. De Tierra, San Juan, PR: Tipografía El Eco, 1915), 5.

prevailing State and Church morals, liberties, and rights only represented humiliation for the working class. In short, the type of anarchism promoted by this cigar worker called for the destruction of the capitalist system and establishing a society characterized by equality and mutual solidarity.

Manuel F. Rojas was an early organizer of the labor movement in Puerto Rico, a leader of the Free Federation of Labor and of the Socialist Party. He wrote two books and many newspaper articles published in Puerto Rico and in the United States during the period under study. In addition, he worked as a reader and considered himself to be an anarchist. Rojas presented the same ideological weakness as other cigar worker anarchists who found no contradiction in supporting the relation between the Free Federation and the American Federation of Labor. For him, the relationship with the AFL was based on the role played by this organization when repression against workers surged in Puerto Rico.

Juan Vilar was a cigar maker, who in 1904 collaborated in the founding of Juventud Estudiosa (a social studies group) and became known as an intellectual leader of the labor movement. He wrote articles for the labor press and published Páginas Libres in 1914. The main issue discussed in this book is the importance of the strike as the weapon of the workers in their struggle against capital. Vilar viewed society as divided into two groups, rich and poor, and considered the misery and ignorance of workers as a product of their lack of unity. A way to begin to change the conditions of workers, and eventually of society, was assigning a role to education as the vehicle to transform and improve working-class conditions. In addition to his intellectual role and as promoter of education among workers, Vilar is known for the violent events that

occurred in Caguas in 1911 where some people died and the insular government arrested several cigar workers, accusing them of conspiring to overthrow the government

In summary, a critique of the existing society, a call for a new economic and political order, and a plan for bringing about social change the ideology of the early Puerto Rico labor movement can be perceived in the writings of these cigar workers' leaders. The use of strikes as an instrument of pressure for immediate demands against cigar manufacturers and other employers and as a vehicle to obtain long term changes in society played a central role in their actions and ideas. These cigar workers recognized in their writings the role of violence in maintaining the capitalist system; they also proposed non-violent methods of struggle, but never renounced the use of violence and strikes as instruments of pressure. In several instances, they advocated for the development of the great general strike.[200]

Cigar workers and Strikes

Cigar workers followed a practice of direct action against employers as a means to defend their work culture or work practices and to demand better wages and personal treatment. The strike represented the principal instrument used by them to challenge the changes that were limiting their role in society and workplaces. Little is known about the history of strikes in Puerto Rico or about the history of cigar workers' strikes, but the few references available traces cigar workers strikes back to the third part of the nineteenth century when several actions were registered. Two particular cases can be mentioned. The first case occurred in 1882, in the cigar factory Las Dos Estrellas; the second case happened in 1897, in La Ultramarina factory. The first strike responded to workers'

[200] Carlos Sanabria, "The Puerto Rican Organized Workers' Movement," 96-98.

complaints that they were receiving less than one-fourth of the selling price. The strike ended when the owner of the factory agreed to the 25 percent increase the workers were demanding. However, eventually the situation returned to the lower prices.[201] The second case involved the workers' right to employ a reader. The reader was an important component of cigar makers' culture. It consisted in hiring a person whom they paid for reading books and other materials in the factory during working hours. It represented a way of educating workers in social doctrine and political issues, and an increase in their level of knowledge through their discussions.[202] Workers won the strike but the owner of the factory limited the reading only to leisure or recreational lectures, prohibiting the reading of books, journals, and newspapers with social content.[203]

In 1892 and 1895 cigar makers were among several artisan groups and rural workers who promoted strikes demanding an increase in their salaries.[204] These strikes were actions without a central direction that surged as a reaction to an increase in food prices. However, at the same time, they can be interpreted as an early example of artisans' growing consciousness and perception of their interests as different from those of landowners and merchants. These movements were an influence in artisans' attempts to get organized. It was during the 1890s that artisans began to frame their demands for better working conditions and better wages as collective issues, and not as individual demands. In 1897, for example, a group of one hundred cigar makers employed in *La Ultramarina*, declared a strike because the company suspended the elaboration of the

[201] Carroll, Report on the Island of Porto Rico, 717.

[202] For a description and discussion of the Reader and other cigar makers customs and traditions see Vega, Memoirs, 19-26.

[203] La Democracia, August 27, 1897, 1.

[204] For an interpretation of the 1895 strikes see Francisco Moscoso's series of six articles in Claridad, En Rojo, April 30 to June 4, 1996.

expensive cigars in favor of the cheapest ones. They interpreted that working on the non-expensive cigars implied less wages for them. In addition, those workers not employed for this task would then be hired as strippers, a work that represented a decrease of wages, as well as a demotion in their profession.[205]

The benefits or profits of the industry were not reaching them because wages were still low and work was unstable and insecure. In the words of a cigar maker:

> …the owners of factories have had no other end in view than the oppression of the artisan. A cigar maker in Porto Rico has never been able to enjoy a life of comfort, as the manufacturers, taking advantage of an honest class of workers, have not lost an opportunity to exploit them, preventing them from attending to their many necessities.[206]

Another strike in which cigar makers were involved was the 1900 strike in which a large number of workers, both urban and rural, protested the monetary change that occurred in Puerto Rico. One of the provisions of the Foraker Act called for the termination of the circulation of the Spanish provincial currency three months after the Act went into effect, on May 1, 1900. The new monetary system put in place three months later reduced the buying power of the people by 30 percent. Landowners, professionals, and workers were all affected by this change, but the impact was more deeply felt among the workers. The meager salaries received were not enough to purchase what workers usually consumed because prices remained the same or were increased. The FFL led the struggle for an increase in salaries to compensate for what they had lost in the exchange. The initials steps for the strike were taken in San Juan and had an urban and artisan bases, however, the movement soon expanded to the rural areas

[205] La Correspondencia de Puerto Rico, August 22, 1897, 2.
[206] Carroll, Report on the Island of Puerto Rico, 764-765.

and covered different sections of the country. Also, during the strike, the FFL requested solidarity and support from U.S. labor and political organizations. Different groups in the United States responded to the call by protesting to various federal authorities — including the President—and by collecting funds for Puerto Rican workers. In New York, for example, several unions raised money in support of the strikers. In particular, the New York Central Federation Union sent a monetary contribution to the Puerto Rican strikers, and urged all organized workers in the United States to protest against the repression in Puerto Rico to the President and the Congress for the repression in Puerto Ricoto. The Typographical Union also made a call to organized workers to appeal to Washington for the release of Puerto Rican labor leaders from jail and to stop further persecution against them. Labor and socialist newspapers published in New York printed articles supporting the strikers and the union organization in Puerto Rico.[207]

After the 1900 experience, artisans, particularly cigar makers, continued using strikes as an important weapon in their struggle for economic demands and for control of work. While not the decisive factor, workers had to take into consideration the strike policy established by the AFL. One important aspect of the Cigar Makers International Union (CMIU), which was one of the strongest members of the AFL, was the limitation placed upon the right of local unions to strike. To promote a strike required obtaining the proper approval, otherwise strikers were not entitled to receive CMIU benefits. This approval required that all strikes involving less than twenty-five members had to submit a petition to strike to the CMIU executive board. When there were more than 25 strikers

[207] Iglesias, Luchas emancipadoras, 171-213; Igualdad Iglesias de Pagán, El obrerismo en Puerto Rico: época de Santiago Iglesias *1896-1905 (Palencia de Castilla, España: Ediciones Juan Ponce de León, 1973),127, 152-153; Philip S. Foner, History of the Labor Movement in the United States, 2 (International Publishers, 1980), 431

the proposal had to be approved by all local unions in the jurisdiction where the strike was taking place.[208] This process represented a way of controlling or limiting strikes because failing to follow it implied a denial of benefits, and without benefits it was very hard to sustain a strike for a long period of time.

Cigar workers played a central role in promoting strikes in their own industry as well as in other industries, particularly of agricultural workers in the sugar industry. Five of the six most important strikes that occurred between 1906 and 1910 were involved in the cigar industry. Between 1911 and 1913, cigar workers promoted at least seventeen strikes, although most were lost. Nineteen-fourteen was an important year for cigar workers because they promoted one of their biggest work stoppages and won the strike. In this conflict they were able to include all factories and branches of PRATCO, which represented more than half of the workers employed in the cigar industry in Puerto Rico. During the fiscal year 1915-1916, they were active in six strikes against cigar companies, involving 2,605 strikers (See Table 3). The fiscal year of 1916-1917 records 27 strikes in 18 municipalities, involving 7,217 strikers (See Table 3.1). The next fiscal year of 1917-1918, records 36 strikes in 19 municipalities, involving 7948 strikers (See Table 3.2). The period of 1919-1920 records 40 strikes in 20 municipalities involving 5,406 strikers (See Table 3.3). In 1919 they were involved in an important strike in which a representative of the Cigar Makers Union in Puerto Rico stated: "[workers] are bravely resisting against the deliberate purpose of the trust to destroy the cigar makers'

[208] T. W. Glocker, "The Structure of the Cigar Makers' Union," in Studies in American Trade Unionism, edited by Jacob H. Hollander and George E. Barnett, (New York: ARNO Press, 1969), 61-62; Cooper, Once a Cigar Maker, 99-101.

organization, which is the backbone of our organized movement in Porto Rico...."[209]

TABLE 3.1: TOBACCO STRIKES FISCAL YEAR 1915 – 1916

TOWN	OCCUPATION	NUMBER OF STRIKERS
Bayamón-Cataño	Strippers	300
Comerío	Cigar makers	40
Juncos	Cigar makers	125
Maricao	Cigar makers	N/A
San Juan and Bayamón	Cigar makers	2,000
Santurce	Cigar makers	140

Source: Puerto Rico, Governor Annual Report, (Washington, D.C.: GPO, 1916), 520.

TABLE 3.2: TOBACCO STRIKES FISCAL YEAR 1916 – 1917

TOWN	OCCUPATION	NUMBER OF STRIKERS
Aguas Buenas	Cigar makers	300
Aibonito	Leaf Selectors	150
Arecibo	Strippers	60
Bayamón	Strippers	300
Bayamón	Cigar makers	1,000
Bayamón	Leaf Selectors	300
Caguas	Cigar makers	400
Caguas	Strippers	260
Cayey	Cigar makers	125
Cataño	Strippers	180
Ciales	Cigar makers	80
Comerío	Tobacco Laborers	300
Comerío	Cigar makers	40
Guayama	Cigar makers	12
Gurabo	Strippers	100
Manatí	Cigar makers	300
Mayagüez	Cigar makers	150
Peñuelas	Cigar makers	200
Ponce	Cigar makers	300
Ponce	Leaf Selectors	24
San Juan	Cigar makers	1,800
San Juan	Strippers	300
San Juan	Cigarette boxers	30

[209] American Federation of Labor, Report of Proceeding,1919, (Washington, D.C.: American Federation of Labor), 421.

TOWN	OCCUPATION	NUMBER OF STRIKERS
San Juan	Cigarette Makers	38
San Lorenzo	Cigar makers	300
Utuado	Strippers	108
Utuado	Cigar makers	60

Source: Puerto Rico, Governor Annual Report, 1917 (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1917), 552-553.

TABLE 3.3: TOBACCO STRIKES FISCAL YEAR 1917 – 1918

TOWN	OCCUPATION	NUMBER OF STRIKERS
Aguas Buenas	Cigar makers	305
	Strippers	37
Arecibo	Strippers	75
Barceloneta	Strippers	67
Bayamón	Cigar makers	942
	Strippers	137
	Other Workers	297
Caguas	Strippers	268
	Strippers	550
	Strippers	82
	Cigar makers	80
Cataño	Strippers	225
	Strippers	225
Cayey	Cigar makers	265
	Strippers	18
	Other Workers	68
Cidra	Cigar makers	139
	Strippers	10
	Other Workers	46
Coamo	Strippers	25
Gurabo	Cigar makers	6
Juana Díaz	Cigar makers	80
Juncos	Strippers	108
	Strippers	180
Manatí	Cigar makers	353
	Strippers	221
	Other Workers	154
Mayagüez	Cigar makers	115
Morovis	Strippers	130
Naranjito	Strippers	87

TOWN	OCCUPATION	NUMBER OF STRIKERS
Peñuelas	Cigar makers	87
	Strippers	46
Ponce	Cigar makers	340
	Strippers	375
San Juan	Cigar makers	1,227
	Strippers	558
	Other Workers	1,366
San Lorenzo	Strippers	151
	Strippers	85
	Cigar makers	281
	Strippers	95
	Other Workers	35
Toa Alta	Cigar makers	25
	Strippers	40
Utuado	Cigar makers	100

Source: Puerto Rico, Bureau of Agriculture and Labor, Bureau of Labor, Strikes in Puerto Rico During Fiscal Year 1917-1918 (San Juan, P.R.: Bureau of Supplies, Printing and Transportation, 1918), 34-36.

TABLE 3.4: TOBACCO STRIKES FISCAL YEAR 1919 – 1920

TOWN	OCCUPATION	NUMBER OF STRIKERS
Aguas Buenas	Cigar makers	275
Arecibo	Strippers	55
	Strippers	100
	Strippers	45
	Strippers	100
Bayamón	Strippers	187
Cataño	Strippers	187
Caguas	Strippers	140
	Strippers	10
	Strippers	78
	Strippers	56
	Strippers	12
	Strippers	25
	Strippers	71
	Strippers	212

	Strippers	47
	Strippers	112
Cayey	Leaf Selectors	250
	Leaf Selectors	250
	Cigar makers	35
Cidra	Strippers	130
Coamo	Strippers	133
Corozal	Strippers	No Data
Gurabo	Cigar makers	39
	Strippers	90
Juncos	Strippers	240
	Cigar makers	90
Manatí	Strippers	600
Morovis	Strippers	300
Naranjito	Strippers	200
San Juan	Strippers	40
	Strippers	300
	Strippers	80
	Box factory workers	130
	Cigar factory workers	No Data
San Lorenzo	Strippers	250
Toa Alta	Strippers	100
Vega Baja	Strippers	400
Vieques	Cigar makers	12
Yauco	Strippers	25

Source: Puerto Rico, Report of the Governor of Porto Rico (Washington. D.C.: GPO, 1921), 557-559.

Cigar workers were also involved in the sugar industry strikes of 1905 and 1906. During the agricultural strike of April 1905, for example, cigar workers José Storer, Gerardo Núñez, and Eugenio Sánchez López (general organizer of cigar workers in Puerto Rico) were arrested and accused of inciting to riot, of promoting disorderly conduct, and disrespecting the United States flag.[210] Unión Obrera informed about the participation of José Storer, cigar maker, and Eduardo Conde (brush painter), in a meeting on March 26, 1905, celebrating the reorganization of the agricultural union in

[210] In general, Unión Obrera is the best source of information from the workers point of view of the events of the 1905 and 1906 agricultural strikes. Also see, Iglesias, Luchas emancipadoras, 336-337, and Iglesias de Pagán, El obrerismo en Puerto Rico, 360-361.

Santa Isabel.[211] The same publication describes the activities of José Ferrer Ferrer, cigar maker from Caguas, with the agricultural workers from Ponce, Peñuelas, and Yauco.[212]

In 1915, cigar makers and the "Cruzada del Ideal" promoted strikes in 24 sugar plantations, in which 17,625 sugar workers were involved. The following year, they instigated a strike in the sugar industry for a five-month period in which 40,000 workers participated, covering 32 municipalities. In some cases, cigar workers served as leaders of the sugar cane workers and presented their demands to landowners and to the Trust.

There were several reasons for this strike effervescence. One has to do with the constant increase in the cost of living that did not correspond to what workers were earning, although cigar makers in comparison to most workers in the same industry and with other workers in general had a good salary. The steady increase in food costs was a finding present in several of the reports prepared on working conditions during this period. A 1901 report found that wages had not advanced much, but prices of all commodities involved in the cost of living had increased and, in some instances, had doubled.[213] A 1914 report maintained that the cost of living was much higher than generally believed and that basic staples demanded a high "proportion of the small and irregular incomes of most laborers."[214] Years later, in 1919, another report revealed that:

> …since the time these prices were taken up to the time of writing this report, there will be such altering of the prices that will gradually make subsistence impossible up to the limits of the inconceivable. Our investigations in the laborers homes could serve to treat it extensively, presenting the most horrible scenes of absolute misery caused rather than

[211] Unión Obrera,April 2, 1905, 3; and "Reorganizados. La unión agrícola de Santa Isabel se reorganiza," April 9, 1905,1.
[212] Unión Obrera, "Noticias de la huelga," May 7, 1905, 2.

[213] Azel Ames, "Labor Conditions in Puerto Rico," Bulletin 34, (U.S. Department of Labor 1901), 398.
[214] Porto Rico, Department of Labor, Charities and Corrections, Bureau of Labor, Second Report to the Legislature of Porto Rico, (San Juan, PR: Bureau of Supplies, Printing, and Transportation, 1914), 91.

by low wages by the high cost of commodities.[215]

However, at the same time, limiting their actions to economic issues and depending on strikes was not always the best way to reach their goals. They realized that political power was necessary to implement or convert workers' demands into laws. These concerns gave way to the organization of the Socialist Party in 1915, which represented the political instrument of the FFL.

Another factor influencing the strike effervescence was the proletarianization of cigar makers that culminated during this period. New manufacturing centers based on salary relations appeared that provided a labor market for displaced rural workers. Between 1899 and 1909, for example, the number of cigar makers increased disproportionately in relation to other artisan groups. The increase for cigar makers was 197 percent, while for typographers it was only 4 percent; tailors and bricklayers suffered reductions of 8 and 13.5 percent respectively.[216] This was a situation where artisans were moving to the tobacco industry at the same time that the work in this industry was undergoing a process of proletarianization and mechanization. At this moment, the workers' main concerns were work conditions and the remuneration they would receive for the sale of their labor power. Not having control of the political process to promulgate laws meant that strikes and organization were ways to reach their economic goals.

A similar process was occurring in the United States. The period between 1912

[215] Porto Rico, Governor Annual Report,1919, (Washington, D.C.: GPO, 1920), 705.

[216]García and Quintero Rivera, Desafio y solidaridad, 73. The authors base their claims on statistics taken from the 1899 and 1910 censuses but no specific numbers are included.

and 1920 has been defined as the "battle in the workplace."[217] During these years a great number of strikes were promoted by the CMIU, and by non-union workers. Between 1912 and 1920, for example, the CMIU promoted 938 strikes. At the heart of the strikes were the cigar makers' concerns for control over their lives and work, and recognition that their interests were different from and antagonistic to those of employers. The scientific management and the reorganization of production undermined artisan autonomy and power. Workers mounted a massive challenge to managerial authority, employing a series of issues such as the 8-hour day, enforcement of work rules, union recognition, discharge of unfriendly foremen, and the regulation of hiring and dismissal of workers.[218]

The 1914 and 1918-1919 strikes in the cigar industry in Puerto Rico, two of the most important strikes during this period, were also a reflection in the country of the "battle in the workplace." During the 1914 strike, cigar makers raised several demands that were immediately rejected by PRATCO. Among them were the formation of a commission to intervene in all conflicts that could arise in the factories; the 8-hour day; the removal of two managers who were unfriendly or disrespectful to workers, particularly to women; and that sanitary laws be strictly observed. The company's position was that the workers' demands were out of the question and that they would not accept or discuss the suggestion of submitting matters that were in dispute to an arbitration commission. In addition, PRATCO did not accept for discussion with cigar

[217] See Cooper, Once a Cigar Maker, 123-158.
[218], For an interpretation of this process in the case of the United States see David Montgomery, The Fall of the House of Labor: The Workplace, the State, and American Labor Activism, 1865-1925 (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1987) Particularly, Chapter 4 "The new unionism and the transformation of workers' consciousness in America, 1909-22," and Chapter 5 "Whose Standards? Workers and the Reorganization of Production in the United States, 1900-20."

makers the appointment of Company employees, considering this point as unworthy of discussion.[219]

Although workers gained some increases in their wages, the issue of the control of the workplace was not resolved satisfactorily for either of the two parties. The same issue re-surfaced during the 1918-1919 strikes. One of the principal demands of cigar makers was that the company should restrict the daily output of cigars as a way to provide work for all of them. In other words, cigar makers were demanding a voice in the control of production. PRATCO had another view, as expressed by Luis A. Toro, its president. According to him, the Company had an overproduction of cigars, a situation brought about by the end of War World I. In addition, on February 1919, the United States government imposed a tax on tobacco products, which increased prices and caused a drop in the sale of cigars in the United States.

Under these circumstances, to maintain or increase profits, PRATCO decided to reduce production costs and personnel (particularly men), and to increase productivity. A means to obtain this goal was by incorporating machines and employing more women in the industry. The demands of the workers were rejected by PRATCO because the company was the "only arbiter as to its personnel, and it never will yield these rights." As a warning to the government and to exert pressure, Toro emphasized that the strike was causing a loss of revenues for the government, and if labor was not put under control, then capital would stay away from Puerto Rico and no new industry would be established in the island.[220] The situation was well understood and summarized by the Governor of

[219] Porto Rico, Bureau of Labor, Strike of the Tobacco Workers Against the Porto Rican-American Tobacco Co, 1914 (San Juan, PR: Bureau of Supplies, Printing and Transportation, 1914).

[220] United States, Bureau of Insular Affairs, Record File 975.

Puerto Rico to the Chief of the Bureau of Insular Affairs:

> As I understood it from the conversation with representatives of both sides, the point in dispute is not the one of wages, or the conditions of labor, but whether or not the Porto Rico American Tobacco Company shall have the power to close any of their smaller factories, or discharge any of the cigar makers who were employed last January, at any time, or for any reason.[221]

The impasse between workers and employers was finally solved in favor of the latter. By 1919 the structure of the cigar industry had changed sufficiently in Puerto Rico to allow the use of machinery in production; the establishment of new branches for the purpose of dispersing production and reducing the impact of strikes; and the creation of a new labor source drawn from the ranks of women. These factors were essential in beginning to change the balance of power within the industry — a tendency that was consolidated during the 1920s.

Conclusion

This chapter has showed that anarchism, during the early years of the twentieth century, became the main ideological influence among urban workers, providing coherence to their perception of how society should be organized and the role workers should play in it. Anarchism's influence can be found in the writings and publications of a group of worker writers, as well as in the activities promoted by them, particularly those related to the use of strikes as an instrument of pressure against employers.

It can be said that cigar workers as part of a group of workers that expressed the need to incorporate anarcho-syndicalism in their struggle for the construction of a society

[221] United States, Bureau of Insular Affairs, Record File 975. Letter of Governor Arthur Yager, May 26, 1919. For additional information on the cigar-makers' position, see Rafael C. Lozano, Relampagueos (Historia de una huelga), (Ponce, PR: Imprenta El Día, 1918).

dominated by workers. In the cigar industry workers maintained the right to collective self-management in their workplaces, and clearly expressed their capacity to administer their own affairs. The experience of cigar workers in Puerto Rico shows that cigar workers' actions and activities were characterized by attitudes of class warfare (rhetoric, strikes, corporal assaults) incorporated in the organized labor movement as short and long terms goals. As an immediate concern, they promoted labor organization and made the union the vehicle to obtain short-term improvement for workers within the existing system. However, they also promoted the long-term goal of overthrowing capitalism and replacing it with a "collectivized system of worker-managed productive property." In addition, these workers were in favor of direct action by workers to obtain their short and long-term goals. Therefore, mobilizing primarily against the employer on the front lines of the class struggle was perceived as the most effective means to achieve their goals. In this scheme, unions became a vehicle of struggle for cigar workers to redeem their claims of class emancipation.

The actions and activities of cigar workers and their unions in Puerto Rico were similar to what occurred with cigar workers in Cuba and the United States. Among the factors that can be noted that help to explain the similarities in the Cuban, North American, and Puerto Rican cases is the influence of changes in technology and in the mode of production that took place during this period of time. The transformation of the labor process and labor relations is similar in these countries. For all of them strikes represented an instrument of pressure and of advancing their goals. Participation in strike activities as measured by the frequency of strikes, number of strikes and working days lost, represents a reliable measure of cigar workers' unrest and challenge to the existing

ruling order in the workplace and in society in general. This period (1909-1920) saw a great challenge by the workers to the power and authority of employers.

In addition, the progressive concentration of cigar makers and other workers in cities led to more segregated and homogeneous neighborhoods, which aided workers' growing class-consciousness and helped to promote solidarity among them. The case of Puerta de Tierra is an example. This neighborhood developed as a working-class neighborhood within San Juan, where cigar workers, dockworkers, carpenters, and other workers joined efforts to promote and defend their class interests.

In the case of cigar workers, working for a variety of cigar employers extended contacts between them, fostering an identification of mutual interests and a perception of the possibilities of joint actions. This contact was facilitated by workers' traditions of frequent changes of employers, work sites and geographic locations. This situation not only occurred in Puerto Rico where workers moved between towns and cities, working for different employers, but also included workers moving freely between Puerto Rico, Cuba, and the United States.

Their numbers grew along with the rapid process of urbanization that occurred between 1898 and 1920, while labor relations in the cigar industry were being altered during the same period. The trend of the cigar industry to shift from skilled to unskilled labor when possible, to employ non-union workers, or to substitute male for female workers, further threatened job control. Thus, strikes became very common during the period under study.

There is a series of characteristics found in the group of cigar workers that help to explain their support for syndicalism. First, cigar workers frequently changed jobs and

they were often not tied to a single type of employment. When demand declined in a particular place, they move internally to other areas or migrated to places in Cuba or the United States. Second, cigar workers were not bound to a single, long-term employer and had no informal restraints that characterized a client-patron relationship. They were in a dependent position on the job, but the fact that they often have to change their place of work made them less vulnerable to fear from dismissal than those workers who had semi-permanent employers in other industries. On occasions, workers had little time to act immediately when grievances were presented to factory-managers. They had no time for a long-term planning of resistance or for raising a strike fund. They had to respond with tactics that had economic impact for employers. Direct action was an acceptable practice for cigar workers.

Another explanation for workers' support for organization was that their working conditions were being re-structured with the introduction of new sources of power, by technological innovations that changed the nature of the economy and its industrial processes. These transformations impacted working and living conditions. In 1910, the United States Immigration Commission report stated that the absorption of a large member of unskilled immigrants coming mainly from Europe was possible only by the invention of mechanical devices and processes that eliminated or reduced the need for the skilled and experienced workers required in a large number of occupations.[222] Certainly, this was the case of the cigar industry in the United States, as well as in Cuba and Puerto Rico. The process of deskilling and the increased demands of work as a result of economic changes and technological innovation influenced the radicalization of cigar

[222] United States, Immigration Commission, Reports of the Immigration Commission (New York: ARNO Press, 1970, Reprint).

workers, who perceived these changes as a negative influence in their lives and in their work practices, undermining the control they once had over their working activities. The next two chapters will explore these and other concerns in relation to employers and female workers.

CHAPTER IV

CIGAR MAKERS WORK CULTURE AND THEIR CONTRADICTIONS WITH EMPLOYERS GOALS

In the early twentieth century, cigar workers were able to control their work conditions in ways that were almost unique among industrial workers. During this period a battle ensued between workers and employers, as the former sought to protect their prerogatives, while the employers attempted to undermine and destroy cigar workers' culture and practices. To understand the contradictions and struggles within this industry three very important issues have to be taken into consideration: First, the nature of the work culture that prevailed among cigar workers, which they sought to preserve. Secondly, the application of new technology and management practices incorporated by employers into the production process. And, third, the contradiction between workers and employers, stemming from antithetical positions, one characterized by a more pre-capitalist mode of production and the other representing early capitalist development.

The first part of this chapter discusses the meaning of work culture as explicated by several historians who have written about this topic in relation to the cigar industry. The next section presents the main cigar makers' practices and their influence within the workplace, in particular, the use of strikes in Puerto Rico and the role cigar workers played in confrontations against employers. The last section focuses on the role employers played in the process of undermining cigar workers' existing work culture.

Defining Work Culture in the World of the Cigar Industry

Early in the twentieth century, in the cigar-making town of Cayey, in a factory of 150 workers, a young boy named Jesús Colón overheard a person inside the building reading to the workers. What Colón experienced was an encounter with the Reader, a practice well established among cigar makers in their workplace, and considered part of their work culture. It was amazing to Colón that a group of workers who barely knew how to read and write were able to discuss politics and literature based on the works of writers such as Peter Kropotkin, Karl Marx, Emilio Zola, Victor Hugo, and others.[223]

Bernardo Vega, a cigar maker from the same town as Colón, confirms the role and importance of the Reader in the world of cigar workers. Vega was not only aware of the Reader from working in Puerto Rico, but also witnessed the same practice in New York, where he migrated in 1916.[224] José Santana, another Puerto Rican cigar maker who migrated to New York and later moved to Chicago, was familiar with the figure of the Reader and other cigar-maker practices. In fact, the phrase, "Once a cigar maker, always a cigar maker…," that served as the title of Patricia A. Cooper's book about cigar-making culture, was passed on to her by Santana. For him the phrase meant "that you may get away from the trade for a couple of years, but you always have in mind the cigar makers. And if something goes wrong when you are working somewhere else, you will go back to the cigar shop…."[225]

This work culture and work practices were not exclusive to Puerto Rican workers or to cigar workers in the United States. The cigar-makers' work culture was also shared

[223]Jesús Colón, "A Voice Through the Window," in A Puerto Rican in New York and Other Sketches (New York: International Publishers, 1982), 11-12.
[224] Vega, Memoirs, 19-26.
[225]Cooper, Once a Cigar Maker, viii.

by Cuban cigar workers and probably first arose in Cuba. The Reader, for example, existed among Cuban workshop cigar makers since the 1860s.[226] Latino cigar workers also maintained this work culture in Tampa and other cities in Florida.[227] Originally the work culture of the cigar industry represented a particular way in which workers worked and related to one another. However, as the cigar industry introduced technology and new administrative practices and, increasingly, the use of non-skilled workers, other workers involved in cigar production began to share or make their own some of the practices involved in this work culture. The concept of work culture has been defined in different ways in the world of cigar production and in the world of work.

David Montgomery equated tobacco culture and cigar culture as synonymous with craft autonomy, a way by which workers attempted to control production. The basis of this autonomy rested on an ethical code developed around their work relations that was sustained by the organizations they created to protect their interests and values.[228] Montgomery referred to work culture as work practices through which skilled workers exercised considerable discretion over their own work and that of their helpers.[229] Patricia A. Cooper defines work culture as the "patterns of daily work into which any newcomer would become initiated after a time — the unwritten rules, the way of doing the job, and how one thought about his or her work… Work culture revealed the struggles with employers and expressed workers' own oppositional values and outlook…." In addition, Cooper considers work culture as "a matrix of values, traditions, beliefs, and

[226] Gaspar Jorge García Galló, Biografía del tabaco habano (La Habana: Universidad Central de Las Villas, 1959).
[227] Gary R. Mormino and George E. Pozzetta, The Immigrant World of Ybor City (Urbana/Chicago: University of Illinois Press, 1987).
[228] David Montgomery, Fall of the House of Labor (Cambridge/London: Cambridge University Press, 1987), 9-57.
[229] David Montgomery, Workers' Control in America (Cambridge/London: Cambridge University Press, 1979), 114.

practices of workers in a particular work place or occupation" that is created in the dynamic struggle between those who work and those who buy their labor. It is related both to the work process itself and to workers' interpretation of that work.[230]

For this dissertation work culture is defined as a pattern of behaviors learned or adopted by a group of persons (male and female)—in this case cigar workers—, that is transmitted from generation to generation in their place of work and community or what Bernardo Vega called the "customs and traditions of the tabaqueros."[231] This culture includes a set of values, beliefs, and rules of behavior that give meaning to their work experiences and that serve as a basis for the construction of a specific social reality. The evidence regarding these work practices among cigar workers in Cuba, Puerto Rico and the United States points to a similarity of experience: they participated in a culture in which they had control over their time and working conditions, grounded in their unique skills and in their solidarity and loyalty to one another.

The new technologies and management practices that were introduced as the industry expanded, however, allowed employers to develop a more efficient work process and to adjust the industrial relations within the factory to their own interests. The intention of cigar workers to control production and to impose their desired work conditions was undermined by management who promoted the specialization of workers, with some performing specific tasks repeatedly, and others working as machine tenders. The new production rules and technology in the factories had several objectives. Among these was the establishment of complete and exclusive control of production and factory affairs, the establishment of working relationships with individuals and not unions, and

[230] Cooper, Once A Cigar Maker, 2, 319.
[231] Vega, Memoirs, 19.

rewarding workers according to their merits, coupled with freedom for management to evaluate what those merits might be. Disputes would be settled directly with the worker without union intervention.

The goal was to maximize profits while investing the least amount of money possible. The main advantage of the introduction of the team system in the production of cigars, for example, as expressed by Cooper, was not in the increased efficiency or speed of the operatives, but in the cheaper labor that could be employed, which in turn lowered the cost of production. In addition, the team system helped employers to reduce the financial investment in training each individual worker. This was possible because employers no longer had to teach the whole cigar rolling process to all employees, they saved time and money by teaching only a section of the process.[232] With this segmentation of labor, cigar culture entered into a process of devaluation and deconstruction.

Occupational Categories in the Cigar Production Process

The world of the cigar making industry, at the beginning of the twentieth century, included workers performing different tasks divided into several occupational categories. Cigar factories were characterized by an occupational hierarchy in which the size of the factory determined the number of occupational categories into which the work could be divided. The largest factories with more employees had the tendency to have more occupational categories when compared with smaller factories where tasks could be combined and done by the same workers. A 1905 report, for example, found that in Puerto Rico several categories of workers were involved in cigar manufacturing. The

[232] Cooper, Once a Cigar Maker, 169-170.

first phase of the work employed leaf strippers, cigar classers, bundlers, wrappers, packers, dryers, leaf wetters, and cigar makers. There was a second phase employing classers, banders, stampers, and bundlers.[233] However, cigar makers were the most important occupational category in large cigar factories as well as in medium and small cigar production sites. Cigar makers had the task of rolling tobacco materials to make the cigars. As a group, they were responsible for the development of a particular way of practicing their work. The practices originally shared by cigar makers were eventually incorporated by other workers involved in cigar production such as tobacco strippers, who began to make at least some if not all of the cigar makers' practices part of their work experience. The willingness to participate in strikes and the use of the Reader, for example, were two aspects of the customs and traditions of the cigar makers that influenced tobacco strippers. For this reason the work culture of the cigar factory or workshop can be framed as the experience of cigar workers and not exclusively of cigar makers. Information gathered by the Bureau of Labor, for example, indicated that female strippers contributed forty cents a month from their salaries to pay the Reader.[234]

The status of the skilled cigar maker was strongly influenced by the size and difficulty of production as well as the rate of pay in the making of different types of cigars. Making cigars required several years of learning the work, and represented a craft as well as an art form, conditions that allowed them to control the trade. Cigar makers mainly used a techniques defined as the "Spanish Method" to produce quality cigars. This method required skilled workers to hand-roll each cigar in order to obtain the correct

[233] Walter E. Weyl, Labor Conditions in Porto Rico (Washington, D.C.: GPO, 1905).
[234]See La Democracia, "Práctica de la fraternidad con las despalilladoras," August 13, 1919, 1; and "La práctica del socialismo en La Colectiva," August 23, 1919, 1.

length, circumference, density, and tightness, skills acquired through long practice.[235] The fact that these workers retained the secrets and techniques of how to produce quality cigars in their minds provides a partial explanation for cigar makers being able to have enormous control over production.

Wage rates for cigar makers were determined by a system of piecework wherein a specific amount of money was received for each one thousand cigars produced. Piecework for other workers in cigar production, namely machine tenders, had a different impact because it forced them to speed up their production in order to obtain a better salary. However, in the case of cigar makers the implication was different. Piecework provided highly skilled cigar makers the opportunity to set the pace of their handwork and to determine their hours of work. For example, individual workers arrived and left work when they chose and were also permitted the unrestricted smoking of the company's cigars while in the factory. In addition, they received three free cigars per day to be smoked or sold outside the factory or workshop. Cigar makers attempted to and succeeded in exercising control their lives and asserting their autonomy. However, this control was relative and vanished within the first three decades of the twentieth century due to the transformation of the work process with the introduction of new technology and the incorporation of women into the cigar industry.

The first phase of rolling a cigar was in the hands of the tobacco strippers, whose task was to remove the strip in the center of the leaf and to prepare the materials to be used by cigar makers in the rolling of the cigars. There were two types of stripping: the

[235]See Mormino and Pozzetta, The Immigrant World of Ybor City, 100; García Gallo, Biografía del tabaco habano, 77-87.

stripping of "capas" or wrappers and the stripping of "capotes" to be used as filler.[236] Initially, stripping in Puerto Rico was a job done mainly by male workers; however, from early in the twentieth century, tobacco stripping became a task performed by female workers. Finally, the "rezagadores" or wrapper selectors were those workers, mainly males, in charge of sorting the tobacco leaves to be sent to cigar makers based on color, maturity and texture.

After cigars were rolled, a second phase of production took place in which four occupational categories could be identified. First, the "escogedores" or packers were specialized workers in charge of selecting uniform lots of finished cigars for packing in wood boxes. Each lot contained fifty cigars and was known as "vitolas," a name given to the type of cigar made. The "fileteadores" or casers were non-skilled workers in charge of decorating the boxes. The "anilladores" or banders placed a ring on each cigar, indicating the name and rank of the brand. Unlike cigar makers and strippers, the personnel hired in the second phase of production did not represent a large number of workers. However, the difference in salaries was similar to what prevailed between cigar makers, wrapper selectors, and tobacco strippers. The packers were few and had good salaries; in fact, they were better paid than cigar makers, based on their expertise that allowed them to supervise the work done by cigar makers. Meanwhile, casers and banders were piecework employees, and were few in number, with low monetary compensation.

Foremen, while knowledgeable in the cigar production process, were not members of cigar workers' organizations, nor did they share workers' cigar making

[236] García Gallo, Biografía del tabaco habano, 74.

practices. They were the representatives of the employers in the factories and received better salaries than most of the other categories of workers. Their main tasks were related to supervising floor activities and defending their employers' interests. In particular, they supervised the quality of the cigar made as well as the stripping performed by women. Evidently, the pressure exerted by foremen in the workplace was a frequent cause for disputes between workers and employers. For example, on September 22, 1913, cigar makers in the PRATCO factory in San Juan declared a strike demanding that foremen have more respect for workers' values. In another case, on September 27, 1918, in Caguas, female tobacco strippers in the factory of Rosenstadt and Waller declared a strike; among the issues raised by the women was a call to fire the foreman.[237]

Cigar Maker Practices and Their Influence in the Work Place

During the second half of the nineteenth century and extending into the first two decades of the twentieth century, cigar makers developed a number of practices that allowed them to influence the production process as well as impacting the work of other employees in the industry. The control exercised by cigar makers in the production process can be explained in terms of how this process was organized at that moment, and the factors needed for production. In the late nineteenth century, in the U.S. and Puerto Rico, industrial capitalism was built through an expansion of pre-industrial methods of production. This situation allowed skilled workers to maintain greater control over the workplace by using a variety of means to resist the subordination that owners sought to

[237]See "La industria del tabaco, los tabaqueros, organización y cuestiones generales (Extracto de un informe del organizador Prudencio Rivera Martínez)," Justicia, 15 noviembre de 1914, 2. Also, Puerto Rico, Departamento de Agricultura y Trabajo, Negociado del Trabajo, 6to informe anual del Negociado del Trabajo, 1919, 28.

impose. The methods of resistance included efforts to control the supply of labor and piece rates, the use of informal bargaining, the defense of restrictive work practices, and the use of the Reader.

The Reader was probably one of the most important components of the cigar makers' culture. This practice originated in Cuba and extended to Puerto Rico, and areas of the United States. On December 21, 1865, a period when workshops were transforming into factories, the first Reader began reading at El Figaro, a cigar factory in Havana. A few weeks later, on January 9, 1866, Partagás, the most important cigar company in Havana, incorporated the Reader.[238] However, Jaime Partagás, the owner, had to approve the literature to be read. This constraint reveals a conflict between workers and employers regarding the Reader, and what could or could not be read at the factory, a situation that was present also in Puerto Rico and the United States. While employers claimed the right to control their factories, the workers claim on the Readers was based in part on the fact that the workers were paying for their services.

The Reader was hired and paid by cigar makers to read to them during the workday. Reading was a particular form of education, a way of acquiring knowledge while laboring. Carmelo Honoré, head of the Bureau of Labor, noted in 1923 that, "reading was like a food for the brain of workers." Honoré considered reading to be a "system of education for workers," providing great benefits for a good numbers of men and women in the cigar industry.[239] The role of the Reader was to help to provide illustration and education to a great number of these workers who had a limited education

[238] Araceli Tinajero, El lector de tabaquería: Historia de una tradición cubana (Madrid: Editorial Verbum, 2007), 33-37.
[239] Puerto Rico, Depto. de Agricultura y Trabajo, Negociado del Trabajo, Noveno informe anual del Negociado del Trabajo, (San Juan, PR: Negociado de Materiales, Imprenta y Transporte, 1923), 53-54.

or were illiterate. Knowledge became an instrument to defend their rights in the factories and workshops as well as a key element in the development of their ideology. According to Epifanio Fiz Jiménez, a cigar maker from Bayamón, it was the Reader that made cigar workers the group best prepared for the struggles that organized labor confronted in Puerto Rico. Factories where Readers were active became schools that trained workers who could better fight for improved working conditions of work and higher salaries for all workers.[240]

Reading occupied two to three hours a day, and consisted of one and a half hours in the morning when novels, history, and scientific works were read, and a session in the afternoon when local and international newspapers and world affairs occupied workers' attention. An important subject for workers was the discussion of politics, mainly anarchism and socialism. According to Cachón Ressy Montañez, a cigar maker from Bayamón, readings in the factories included works by local labor writers such as Ramón Romero Rosa and Luisa Capetillo, as well as writers such as Victor Hugo, Alexander Dumas, Eliseo Reclus, Emilio Sola, Karl Marx, Frederick Engels, Michael Bakunin, Leon Tolstoy, José Vargas Vila, and Vicente Blasco Ibañez, among others.[241] For Mormino and Pozzetta, reading represented "the independence, distinctiveness, and artisan character of cigar work."[242] Bernardo Vega considered factory reading as the institution that made cigar workers "the most enlightened sector of the working class." For him, the Reader embodied the workers' desire to achieve independence, which is why they resisted the employers' attempts to impose management's will on the shop

[240] Epifanio Fiz Jiménez, Bayamón y su gente, (Barcelona: Ediciones RVMBOS, 1960), 124-125.
[241] Mario A. Rodríguez León, "D. Cacho Ressy Montañez, tabaquero ilustrado de Bayamón," Notas de Bayamón, 58.
[242] Mormino and Pozzetta, The Immigrant World of Ybor City, 97.

floor.[243] The struggle to have a Reader in the shop or factory was a frequent point of contention between workers and employers and frequently led to strikes.

An employer's refusal to have a Reader could spark a strike that often spread to workers at other factories in the area who left their jobs in order to show solidarity with strikers' demand that the Reader be hired or re-instated. In 1897, for example, cigar makers working at La Ultramarina factory used the strike as a tool to defend the practice of hiring a Reader during working hours. As part of the agreement to settle the strike, employers agreed to allow for the Reader, but with the condition that readings would be limited to recreational materials. The reading of books, journals and newspapers with social content was still forbidden.[244] The settlement of a cigar makers' strike at the Portela factory, in January 1899, explicitly established not only that reading would be allowed but also established the period between 8:00 and 9:30 in the morning and 1:00 and 2:30 in the afternoon as the times during which the reading would take place.[245]

During the first two decades of the twentieth century, the pressure mounted by workers did not always succeed in forcing employers to accept the Reader. Whether or not workers had a Reader often depended on the effectiveness of the confrontation with employers. The readings not only challenged political and ideological issues of the day through discussions of anarchism and socialism, they also often represented for employers a loss of production time and therefore of profits because at the end of each reading session, workers had discussions of what had been read and each one had the opportunity to speak. According to their tradition, a cigar maker was willing to lose an hour of work defending his view of what had been read.

---

[243] Vega, Memoirs, xv, 22.
[244] La Democracia, August 21, 27, 1897, 1.
[245] La Federación Obrera, January 14, 1899, 3.

The Reader, however, was a practice that the employers always challenged and opposed. This occurred, for example, when a group of female workers in Caguas declared a strike demanding better wages, less hours of work, respect as women from the foremen, and for the Reader to be allowed to read the labor press. The company accepted the demands with some modifications, except for the reading. The company rejected not only the reading of the labor press, but also any kind of reading dealing with politics or social and economic issues. The only kind of reading allowed were novels and other similar literature that would not affect the interests of the company. Cigar workers questioned this policy because, in their understanding, reading was an issue of concern only to workers because they and not the company were responsible for paying the Reader. There is no further information on how the reading issue in this case was finally resolved.[246]

Another expression of the significance that cigar makers assigned to the Reader is found in two resolutions presented and accepted in the 1907 assembly to organize cigar makers into one big union in order to then affiliate with the Cigar Makers International Union of the United States. The first resolution argued that reading in the workshop provided harmony among workers, it had educational purposes and maintained order on the floor. Therefore, the resolution called for making reading mandatory if not in all shops, then at least in those that were affiliated with the International Union. The second resolution declared that reading in the workshop was needed for all workers, but particularly for illiterate workers, so reading had to be imposed in cigar workshops in

[246]Unión Obrera, "De Caguas," July 26, 1911, 3.

Puerto Rico.[247] In summary, as expressed by Bird-Cardona, the knowledge acquired from readings provided workers the ideological tools to strengthen their dissent from the official culture and served as the basis to develop an alternative view of how society should be organized.[248]

During the 1920's employers increased their attacks against the use of Readers in their factories and workshops. Responding to their opposition, in 1923, Carmelo Honoré, as head of the Bureau of Labor, stated that in a country like Puerto Rico, whatever could help to provide education to the people should be supported, and should be recognized as a positive contribution to society. To this end Honoré recommended to the Legislature the enactment of a law prohibiting any clause in a contract between workers and employers eliminating reading in factories and workshops.[249] His efforts, however, failed to gain support in the Legislature and employers continued gaining ground in their efforts to impose their rules in the factories and workshops. This situation was a setback for workers, though new efforts were made in the Legislature the following years. By 1930, however, the practice of hiring Readers was vanishing from cigar factories and workshops.[250]

Among other cigar makers practices can be mentioned the custom of not allowing a rigid working schedule to constrict their days. Cigar makers could walk in and out of the workplace as they pleased, often taking extended coffee breaks or going to non-

[247]Unión Obrera, "Asamblea magna de los tabaqueros de Puerto Rico. Resolución número 8," January 12, 1907, 2; "Asamblea magna de los tabaqueros de Puerto Rico. Resolución número 20," January 16, 1907, 2.
[248]Bird-Cardona, "Between the Insular Road and San Juan Bay," 26.
[249] Puerto Rico, Negociado del Trabajo, Noveno informe anual, 1923, 55.
[250] Puerto Rico, Dept. de Agricultura y Trabajo, Negociado del Trabajo, Décimo-cuarto informe anual del Negociado del Trabajo (San Juan, PR: Negociado de Materiales, Imprenta y Transporte, 1930), 23.

working activities.[251] On some occasions, they worked until they had made enough cigars to cover their expenses and stopped working after their goal was reached. In other instances they stopped work in the middle of the afternoon or took a day off now and then during the week. In addition, according to a government report, fully ten percent of the men did not work on Mondays.[252]

For cigar makers the solidarity and comradeship required in their trade was built in the long process of apprenticeship during which they acquired their skills. In addition, apprenticeship represented an instrument of controlling the trade. This practice was embedded in an artisan ideology rooted in the worldview that society should be organized around workers and their specific needs. By organizing in guilds, artisans could control the number of people working in the industry and the quality of the product. The importance of this aspect was recognized in a resolution presented in the 1907 assembly, which sought to regulate apprenticeship as these future cigar makers were expected to continue their work practices and profession. The Cigar Maker Union, therefore, had the responsibility of developing skilled workers and making sure that apprentices remained no more than 5 percent of the skilled workforce in each workshop.[253] The apprenticeship process required a three-to-five year period to master the skills of making cigars.

Employers, on the other hand, had limited power to deal with issues of production because of high turnover rates and excessive absenteeism among male workers. There were constant tensions between cigar makers' culture, which demanded respect from the

[251] Cooper, for example, found that in York, Pennsylvania, cigar makers frequently abandoned their work to attend baseball games on spring and summer afternoons. In Detroit, women refused to work during Polish holidays. See Once a Cigar Maker, 198.
[252]Puerto Rico, Special Report of Bureau of Labor to the Legislature of Porto Rico, 1912 (San Juan, PR: Bureau of Supplies, Printing, and Transportation, 1913), 57.
[253]Unión Obrera, "Asamblea magna de los tabaqueros de Puerto Rico. Resolución número 18." January 15, 1907, 2.

company, and the employers' goal of increasing profits. The introduction of technology and scientific management in the cigar industry helped employers to maximize their investment. In the process, employers influenced the transformation of the workers' culture by initially limiting and eventually breaking down cigar culture and workers' attempts to control or disturb the production process.

Among cigar makers a common practice was to take home three cigars at the end of the day and other six on Saturdays, a practice known as "la fuma" or the "smoking." Workers considered this practice as a personal right and as an unwritten law that had to be honored by employers. Workers considered rolling "smokers" for their use as part of their compensation. This practice, however, was challenged in the United States by a campaign of the Tobacco Leaf Journal in 1908. Although this campaign did not have a concrete positive outcome for employers, it was another sign of their disapproval of cigar makers' practices. A few years later, however, employers received support from the federal government when the Commissioner of Internal Revenue ruled in September of 1911 that smokers had to be taxed just as any cigar in the factory.

Of course, the campaign initiated by The Tobacco Leaf, as well as the ruling of the U. S. Internal Revenue Service (IRS), were extended to Puerto Rico, where it impacted employer-worker relations. In the PRATCO branch of Bayamón, for example, a controversy between workers and employers took place in January 1909, because the company refused to authorize workers to take out the smokers based on the ruling of the IRS that smokers had to be taxed. The employer, however, was willing to allow cigar makers to take out the smokers with two conditions. First, they had to take the smokers out by hiding them in their clothing while employers' representatives looked the other

way. Second, cigar makers were responsible for any monetary claims made by the local Internal Revenue agents about the cigars if stopped outside the factory. Workers rejected this proposal because they understood that smokers were a practice respected by all factories in the world, and employers were using the IRS ruling only to scare workers.[254]

Cigar workers in general and cigar makers in particular were very concerned with the degree of control they had over working conditions and with employer regulations that could influence their output and earnings. The introduction of weight-scales in the cigar industry, for example, represented a way of controlling production costs because it allowed employers the ability to assign a specific amount of tobacco to each cigar maker. In this form, employers could generally keep records of each cigar maker's output in relation to the amount of tobacco used by individual workers. The employers' rationale was that weighing tobacco would discourage wasting tobacco and would force cigar makers into working economically and conserving the tobacco. In addition, employers watched the use of wrapper tobacco because of its delicate nature and high cost. For workers, however, weighing tobacco challenged certain power and customs workers perceived as part of their work. They viewed this as an offense to their dignity and honesty. Furthermore, it questioned their integrity and their centered place in activities occurring at the workplace and in the production process.

Ventilation and open windows, for example, was another issue associated with cigar makers' earnings and quality of work. Open windows created a draft for the men and dried out tobacco, making it more difficult to work with. Therefore, there were moments when cigar makers decided to go back home rather than staying in the workplace and laboring under conditions they considered unacceptable.

[254]El Eco del Torcedor, "El conflicto de las fumas," January 9, 1909, 1.

Cigar makers' freedom in the factory was tied to piecework and the ability to work quickly and efficiently. Cigar makers carefully distinguished between their own time and the employers' time. Those who came late or left early might not make many cigars, but at least the choice was that of the worker. For them, time should not be spent working tobacco cheaply or making cigars of poor quality. While serving the employers' interests, these conditions did not serve the interests of the cigar makers. Workers making cheap cigars received less salary for a regular day of work than those working better quality leaf.

Artisan skill gave cigar makers a sense of dignity and accomplishment that promoted among them an air of superiority in relation to less-skilled workers who produced an inferior product or made half a cigar like those working in teams. In the factory, cigar makers made distinctions between themselves and the other factory workers, but they were aware that the only way to maintain their work culture was by organizing and incorporating the other workers in the cigar workers union. This action of incorporating non-skilled workers in their unions did not necessarily imply that they recognized these other workers as equals.[255]

Employers and the Vanishing Culture of the Cigar Workers

Cigar workers' work culture was not free of contradictions or conflict. Cigar makers, for example, allowed and embraced different points of view within their community. They accepted patterns of shop-floor life such as verbal exchanges between

[255] Cooper states that while Tampa cigar makers often brought all tobacco-factory operatives into the union that did not mean that all were treated equally. "They observed a rigid status hierarchy in the factory: packers and selectors looked down on cigar makers, who sneered at strippers**,** and so on down the line." Once a Cigar Maker, 113. A similar situation occurred in Puerto Rico.

socialists and non-socialists or anyone else on economic matters. In addition, the relationship with female workers, as will be presented in the next chapter, became a major contradiction within their work culture and within this work group.

There were however important external developments that fundamentally challenged cigar makers' culture and those were the innovations introduced by employers. They used new technology and new management practices as tools not only to increase productivity and revenue, but also as instruments to reduce the number of workers and to more tightly control in the factories. This situation represented a major setback to cigar workers. In Puerto Rico, before the full-scale use of machinery, the cigar industry overcame problems of labor and profitability by utilizing an abundant and cheap labor force and by taking advantage of a low level of organization in this industry. Increasingly, employers also began to incorporate women in the industry, paying them less than men for the same kind of work, and when machinery was introduced in the industry, by using women as its main operators.

The initial years of the cigar industry in Puerto Rico during the early twentieth century was accompanied by a change in the mode of production. Artisan production began to give way to production based on a division of tasks, the concentration of workers in big factories, and the continual incorporation of women into the new industry. After 1900 three-quarters of those working in cigar factories were employed in sites of more than 100 workers. In 1907, "La Colectiva," PRATCO´s main factory, had a total of 350 cigar makers, 450 female strippers, 100 male and female rezagadores, and other 227 workers employed in other tasks for a total of 1,127 workers. In addition, PRATCO branches had a work force divided as follows: Río Piedras employed from 275 to 300

workers; Bayamón employed 1,000 workers; and in Ponce, the Industrial Company employed 500 workers. In addition, the Porto Rico Leaf Tobacco Company, a subsidiary dealing mainly with stripping tobacco, with locals in the towns of Caguas, Cayey, Aibonito, Juncos, San Lorenzo, and Comerío had a workforce that fluctuated from 8,000 to 10,000 individuals.[256]

During this period cigar making became one of the most important manufacturing industries in Puerto Rico. According to the 1910 census, of approximately 400,000 wage earners, only 15,582 were engaged in manufacturing industries. In addition, 89 percent of the factories were employing less than 21 persons while only sugar and cigar manufacturing were above this level of employees. In fact, the only two industries in Puerto Rico employing over 1,000 workers were in the sugar and the cigar industry with 2,521 employees.[257] Furthermore, cigar and cigarette companies were the only industries in Puerto Rico employing more than 1,000 workers at the time. By 1920, close to 80 percent of tobacco production was made in factories with 500 or more workers.[258] A 1918 government report identified 5,174 cigar makers working in 222 cigar shops distributed in 63 municipalities, with an average wage of $2.50 per day. In addition, there were 136 tobacco-stripping shops with a total of 9,852 female workers.[259]

By 1918, employers were pressing for the open shop concept and began gaining control of planning, directing, and supervision of production. With this transformation

[256] La Democracia, "Una visita a La Colectiva," October 23, 1907, 4.

[257] See Puerto Rico, Bureau of Labor, Special Report of Labor to the Legislature of Porto Rico, 1912, 11-12.

[258] See Governor of Puerto Rico, Government Annual Report, 1900-1920 (Washington, DC: GPO, 1920; also James L. Dietz, The Economic History of Puerto Rico, (Princeton University Press, 1986) 117.

[259] Puerto Rico, Depto. de Agricultura y Trabajo, Negociado del Trabajo, 6to. Informe Anual del Negociado del Trabajo (San Juan, PR: Negociado del Trabajo, 1919), 14.

occurring in the cigar industry, cigar workers' culture confronted an increasingly adverse situation to what had prevailed in the industry. Technology and scientific management became key factors in the way production was organized,[260] and undermined the traditional autonomy of cigar makers as they promoted production based on segmentation in which workers were specialized in preparing a section of the work, which meant repeating that fragmented task each day. The use of machine attendants in the cigar industry was a process introduced in Puerto Rico early in the twentieth century. By the second decade of that century it was well established, particularly in the tasks assigned to female workers. Furthermore, segmented production allowed increased direct supervision by the foreman over the workers and greater visibility of management in the workshop.

In 1917, ten years after the first description of "La Colectiva," the new characterization of this workplace emphasizes the mechanization process and the large number of machines incorporated in the production process. "La Colectiva" now had machines to reduce tobacco to threads to be used in the elaboration of cigarettes, and machines to produce cigarettes at a rate of 31,500 cigarettes per hour per machine, for a total production of 283,000 cigarettes in 9 hours of daily work; and machines that completed the process from packing the cigarettes into boxes to stamping the Internal Revenue seal. The factory had machines that prepared the tobacco to be used in the elaboration of little cigars, and machines to made small cigars such as Little Cigar, Ricoro, Restina, Portino, Poraco, that had the United States as their main market. Each

[260] See Daniel Nelson, American Rubber Workers and Organized Labor, 1900-1904 (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1988), 1; and David Brody, Steelworkers in America: The Nonunion Era (New York: Harper, 1969). These books offer case studies where technology and the new management system affected workers' control of their workplace, producing confrontations with employers and the further development of the union.

one of these machines was capable of producing 5,000 small cigars in nine hours, although, at that time, the company was only producing from three to four thousand cigars by machine. This workplace had another group of machines that were operated by female workers in the production of cigars such as Flor de Castilla, Diana, Victoria, Magnolia, Princesa, and Toro.[261]

The new mode of production as pointed out by Montgomery, produced a "divorce between the technical and social systems of control in the factory," and employers' interests in operating factories at full capacity made job tenure increasingly sporadic for workers based on the assumption that there were plenty of idle workers waiting to occupy the jobs of those still employed in the factories.[262] Census data on the number of workers in Puerto Rico and unemployment figures in Puerto Rico during the period covered by this research clearly provide support to this argument.

TABLE 4: MALE AND FEMALE UNEMPLOYMENT IN PUERTO RICO, 1899-1930

Year	Population 10 years and older		Employed		Unemployed		Percent of Unemployed	
	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female
1899	322,567	336,727	267,764	46,931	54,803	289,796	17	86
1910	386,516	395,084	317,256	76,892	69,260	318,192	18	81
1920	447,777	456,646	322,466	86,462	125,311	370,184	28	81
1930	544,184	549,239	378,033	125,776	166,151	423,463	31	77

Source: United States, Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census, Fifteenth Census of the United States, 1930 (Washington, DC: GPO, 1933), 57.

The work ethic in terms of number of cigars produced by each cigar maker, and

[261] El Tiempo, "Una Hermosa fábrica de cigarros y cigarrillos que hace honor a Puerto Rico –Es una rama de la Porto Rican American Tobacco Co. – Cerca de mil mujeres libran la subsistencia en ella," November 12, 1917, 1.
[262] Montgomery, Workers' Control in America, 101-102.

the number of workers needed for production, suffered a setback because technology and new management practices were able to set the pattern of production to be used in the factory. A similar situation occurred with the workers´ autonomy based on their knowledge of their tasks. The new work practices allowed employers to decide who were the more competent workers to perform the tasks and under what conditions tasks should be undertaken. Therefore, wages began to be individualized because the tasks assigned and performance of each worker had to be evaluated separately in order to set wages. In Puerto Rico, the information available shows that the range of wages paid was small and low wages prevailed for most workers. For employers, as expressed by Montgomery, "class wages" represented a non "scientific practice."[263]

Machines and new methods of manufacture promoted large-scale production and concentration in the cigar industry. Technology represented a key factor in the reorganization of the industry, in advancing the employers' interests, in diminishing the bargaining power of the union and of deskilled workers, and in modifying cigar makers' ways of doing things in their workplaces. As part of this new environment, changes occurred in the cigar industry such as the substitution of small shops by large factories, although small shops never disappeared;[264] the use of non-skilled workers as the main component of the labor force in the industry; and, related to this change, the increasing employment of female workers.

The impact in the tobacco industry of technology and scientific management was closely connected to the development of new business approaches, together with the

---

[263] Montgomery, Workers´ Control in America, 122-123.
[264] In 1912 there were around 200 small cigar shops in Puerto Rico, located in private houses, with a labor force of two or three cigar makers and several apprentices. They mainly manufactured cheap cigars for local consumption. Porto Rico, Special Report of Bureau of Labor to the Legislature of Porto Rico, 1912, 60.

merging and consolidation of companies in several industries in the United States during the late nineteenth century and the first two decades of the twentieth century. As a means of controlling the cigar industry, the American Tobacco Company developed a campaign that included such tactics as organizing a cigar company, buying competing companies in order to introduce several cost-efficient measures, extensive advertising, and drastic price undercutting. The Tobacco Trust organized the American Cigar Company (ACC) in 1901. This company almost immediately became the largest single producer of cigars, although it did not control the market. ACC cigar production in 1901 represented 10.9 percent of the total output in the United States. By the following year the company's output represented 16.4 percent of the total. Still by 1910, the Trust only controlled 14 percent of the overall cigar market.[265] The ACC lost money from the beginning of operations — $3.5 million in 1902, although loses were covered by profits obtained in the other branches of the tobacco industry under its control. In addition, the Trust organized the American Machine and Foundry Company (AMFC) in 1901 with the purpose of developing a cigar-making machine. This represented another case in which Duke and the Trust, following the same pattern that worked so well in the manufacturing of cigarettes, hoped to use technology in an attempt to mechanize cigar production.

New technological changes also promoted changes in the structure of the industry as well as in the relations between employers and workers. Among these changes were: the introduction of the wooden mold, suction table, stripping machine, and bunch-making machines.[266] The mold, for example, allowed an untrained worker to bunch cigars,

[265] Unite States, Bureau of Corporations, Report of the Commissioner of Corporations on the Tobacco Industry, Part II: Capitalization, Investment and Earnings (Washington, DC: GPO, 1911), 4, 31-32, 42, 58.
[266] The wooden mold consisted of a wooden block usually containing 15 cigar-shaped grooves for the reception of bunches. The suction table consisted of a metal sheet with a perforated plate in the center.

making obsolete the art and skills of certain workers, and promoted the specialization of labor and subdivision of tasks. The mold therefore contributed to making the segmentation of the work process possible and shortened the training period that a worker needed in order to produce a cigar. This was a major factor in the increase of the number of women employed in the industry, and at the same time represented a threat to the skilled cigar maker.

The suction table put the apprentice at the same level as the experienced wrapper cutter. As a way of confronting this new threat to the cigar makers' skills, the union established a policy whereby no cigar made by machinery would be allowed to carry the union label. However, this policy did not stop the introduction of technological advances in the industry. The bunching machine sped up the production of the semi-skilled bunch maker. It also allowed employers to save in terms of the quantity and cost of labor.[267]

While these changes produced by technology brought an increase in production, they did not initially represent a displacement of labor, a process that occurred later during the 1920's and 1930's. The role technology played during this period was to provide an opportunity to use unskilled and semi-skilled workers to operate machines, representing a change in the type of labor force needed, and shifting the work force from skilled craftsmen to unskilled and semi-skilled workers, thus helping employers to gain

---

The wrapper leaf was held on the perforations by suction created by an exhaust system; as the operator lowered and raised a metal plate a roller passed over the leaf, cutting the proper sharp edges into the plates. The stripping machine was used for the removal of the stem from the tobacco leaf. The long filler cigar machine, that carried out all the necessary operations for the complete manufacture of a long-filler cigar, from the feeding of the filler-leaf into the machine by the first operator to the inspection of the cigar by the last operator. Monthly Labor Review, "Technological Changes in the Cigar Industry and Their Effects on Labor." (December 1931): 11.

[267] As expressed by Meyer Jacobstein in The Tobacco Industry in the United States (New York: Columbia University Press, 1907), 85, this machine represented an original $350 investment to lease, plus $5.00 per week payment to a skilled operator who then could produce 25,000 bunches per week. If those 25,000 bunches had to be done by mold, the cost would be $75.00. These two combined processes demonstrate a reduction in the cost of production from $75 to $5.

control of the workplace and production. The employers used technological advances to reduce the bargaining power of their workers through the elimination or weakening of their skills. On the other hand, mechanization negatively affected cigar makers' conception that skill was essential to one's economic and social position.[268]

The workers employed as machine operators and those participating in the teamwork system were mainly recruited from unskilled and female workers. In fact, companies preferred female workers who could be hired at lower wages. For manufacturers, the teamwork system did not necessarily represent an increase in workers' efficiency, but rather a cheaper labor force and lowered production costs. This process allowed manufacturers to use machine operators whose work training did not have the same connotations as that of the cigar makers' culture. It also decreased the time required to teach new workers the teamwork system and thus allowed the tobacco companies to lower investment in training individual cigar makers.

In short, the main issue here was a confrontation between two views about how to organize production, a clash between the authority of the employers and their foremen in their objective to maximize profits within a capitalist system, and the autonomy that skilled cigar workers were accustomed to exercising in their workplaces. In the case of the United States, early in the twentieth century, after a cigar makers' strike in New York City, a trade journal raised this issue as a question: "Can the factory owners afford to place themselves in the important hands of the union and surrender for good all their

[268] On these issues see Irwin Yellowitz, Industrialization and the American Labor Movement, 1850-1900, (Port Washington, New York: Kennikat, 1977), and David T. Rodgers, The Work Ethic in Industrial America, 1850-1920, (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1979).

legal and natural rights to control their own factories?"[269] Furthermore, from the employers' point of view, as expressed in 1912 by John Calder, President of the Remington Typewriter Company, "The last thing a good manager would think of doing would be to make his policies of shop management the subject of a referendum."[270]

Calder's statement summarized the transformation process and struggle occurring in certain industries during the late nineteenth and early twentieth century, among them the cigar industry. In the same manner, PRATCO maintained a policy of undermining workers' control of the production process during the period under study. In a 1914 strike, Luis A. Toro, president of PRATCO, for example, wrote a letter to J.C Bill, Jr., Chief of the Bureau of Labor, expressing the view of the Company:

> Your suggestions of submitting to an arbitration of the matters involved in the controversy is entirely out of the question and will not be accepted nor discussed by the officers of the Company. The matters of appointments of employees of this Company at the different Branches will not either be accepted for discussion with the striking cigar makers, as we have considered this point entirely out of discussion.[271]

To confront management and technology and to defend their autonomy in how they conducted their work, workers in the factories of the Puerto Rico American Tobacco Company and other smaller cigar producers made use of an egalitarian moral code, and a strong militancy in their efforts to preserve their prerogatives and work culture. The attempts by cigar workers to maintain collective control over their conditions of work implied the enforcement of work rules, union recognition, discharge of unpopular foremen (or retention of popular ones), regulation of lay-offs or dismissals, and activities in solidarity with other groups of workers.

---

[269] The Tobacco Leaf, March 7, 1900, 6.
[270] Montgomery, Workers´ Control in America, 1.
[271] Letter from Luis A. Toro to J.C. Bills, May 9, 1914. Bureau of Insular Affairs. File 975. Roll I, Doc. # 131.

The main tool used during the period of 1898 to 1920 to gain or establish collective control was strikes, particularly from 1910 forward. In the case of union recognition, cigar makers felt the need to organize one big union precisely because the Trust in Puerto Rico found cheap workers with the necessary skills to produce good quality cigars at a lower price. This situation was convenient for the Trust but had a negative impact on the workers and the unions because unions did not have the strength to challenge the Trust and because they were receiving lower salaries in Puerto Rico than in the United States for the same kind of work[272]. Therefore, cigar makers were not only interested in organizing a national union of cigar makers but also in affiliating to the Cigar Makers' International Union of America. In the case of sympathy with other groups of workers, for example, when a group of tobacco strippers at La Colectiva declared a strike at the end of February 1907, asking for better wages, from 12 and a half cents to 15 cents per load, and better treatment from the foreman, a group of male cigar makers from the same factory offered their solidarity and moral and material support.[273]

On September 23, 1913, cigar makers declared a strike against PRATCO factories, demanding better quality tobacco to work with, and respect from employers. The following month, another group of cigar makers in Juncos declared a strike for better wages. In February 1914, cigar makers declared a strike in San Juan factories in solidarity with a group of female strippers who had declared a strike demanding better wages. This was a case where more than 3,000 cigar makers responded to the female strippers, calling for solidarity and, in addition, included another demand for better

[272]Unión Obrera, "Carta informe de los Tabaqueros publicada en Chicago. January 18, 1907, 2.
[273]Unión Obrera "Huelga de Despalilladoras," March 1, 1907, 2.

payment for "vitolas."[274] On July 14, another strike was declared in Caguas with workers demanding better salaries and the correction of certain moral issues.[275] In terms of promoting workers' activities, cigar workers were able to celebrate Labor Day in 1914 as an activity that they all had to observe in Puerto Rico, and forcing cigar making shops to close for the day.[276]

Although the cigar makers' union organized a good number of those working in the cigar industry, a large number of the total workers employed by the industry remained outside of the organization. However, organized or not, cigar makers shared a common style of work, ways of rolling cigars, and valued the autonomy of this work, though not all agreed in maintaining the relationship with the CMIU or concurred with the work developed within the cigar workers' group by the Joint Consulting Committee[277] and the Free Federation of Labor. Some cigar makers remained outside because they disagreed with Puerto Rican unions' relationship with the American Federation of Labor and the Cigar Makers International Union, favoring instead the development of a local organization. Venacio Cruz, for example, an anarchist and cigar maker, openly expressed his opposition to the CMIU and the AFL early in the twentieth century. On different occasions Cruz publicly accused the Free Federation of Labor of advancing a campaign to discredit him because of the critical questions he raised against the Puerto Rican organized labor movement's relationship with the AFL and the CMIU.[278]

José Vilá was another critic who argued that cigar makers' autonomy and work

[274] Justicia, November 14. 1914, 2.
[275] Justicia, November 14, 1914, 2
[276] Justicia, November 14, 1914, 2.
[277] This group, which was affiliated with the CMIC, was in charge of organizing, giving direction, and controlling the organizational drives of cigar makers in Puerto Rico.
[278] Venacio Cruz, "Carta pública," El Comunista, 19 de junio de 1920, 3.

culture had three weaknesses. First, both the Free Federation of Labor and the local cigar makers' union in his view were weak and unable to challenge the power of the employers. To support his argument he raised as evidence the case of Otilio Navarro, a cigar maker who had returned from New York and requested a table (a job) in the PRATCO Bayamón factory. This request was denied without any intervention or contestation from the Joint Consulting Committee. Second, the weakness shown by the cigar workers' representative was perceived by Vilá as additional proof that employers were gaining control of the workshops. Third, according to Vilá, the introduction of machinery by employers represented a threat to their jobs because the use of machines could produce greater quantities at a faster pace could eventually the workers.[279]

There were other workers such as the Selectors, who were not interested in the cigar organization because they earned good wages without the union. In addition, low wages and the large number of available workers made organizing drives very difficult. Nevertheless, it was not uncommon for workers to join the union during times of unrest. When strikes were over, however, some left the union and ceased paying dues. This practice was a constant source of complaints at the FFL, the AFL, and the CMIU headquarters.

In 1917, leaders of the Joint Consulting Committee of the cigar makers union reaffirmed the need to organize workers employed in all of the departments of a factory. Settlements made by cigar makers with employers, according to them, had to include all workers involved in the elaboration of cigars at any particular shop or factory. This was a necessary step to be taken to avoid a situation where workers could declare a strike in their section of the shop, and immediately request a solidarity action from cigar makers.

[279] José Vilá, "Entre tabaqueros," El Comunista, 18 de diciembre de 1920, 4.

The intention was to avoid a chain reaction that could inevitably stop work at the shop or factory. Under these circumstances, the Joint Consulting Committee called for a meeting where these workers would be represented and where an open discussion could be had of issues impacting their work, wages, health, etc., and where agreement could be reached on how proceed in future situations.[280]

In the meeting on August 31, 1917, cigar workers agreed on a number of demands to be made to employers and also agreed on having the Joint Consulting Committee as their representative to negotiate with PRATCO and other companies. The initial response of PRATCO was to accept the demands made by workers. However, they also immediately instructed branch managers and foremen to disregard the agreement to increase wages and to reject any claim made by a shop commission on behalf of individual workers. Furthermore, shop commissions were denied the right to visit different departments of the factory to investigate conditions of work and wages paid by the company.[281]

By the end of the 1910's, confrontations between cigar workers and employers were increasingly resolved in the favor of the latter. The work culture so much valued by cigar workers vanished under the new policies and instruments used by employers. To resolve the impasse of the 1918-1919 strike, Luis A. Toro, president of PRATCO, submitted a proposal in December 1918, committing to hire back all the workers previously left out and promising a bonus to each worker at the end of the year. This promise, however, was contingent on workers' cooperation and commitment to

[280] "Cuerpo Consultivo Conjunto de las Uniones de Tabaqueros, Distrito de Puerto Rico: Convenio Especial de los Branches de Tabaquería," Unión Obrera, August 17, 1917, 3.
[281] "Cuerpo Conjunto Consultivo de las Uniones de Tabaqueros de Puerto Rico. Comité Central de la Huelga: Proclama de Huelga General," Unión Obrera, November 1, 1917, 1-2.

employers to increase productivity in the departments involved in the production of cigars. According to Toro, workers should understand that the interests of the Company were their own interests.

However, Toro stipulated three main conditions: First, workers had to maintain discipline and order in their workplace. Second, that the administrators of PRATCO were the only entity authorized to decide the work to be done in each department. Third, that by January 1919, a new policy manual regulating the activities and production process at the factories would be in place and that this policy had to be followed to the letter of the law by all workers, with the administrator of each branch responsible for implementation. Under the new manual, for example, workers had to arrive at a time set by the company and workers paid by piecework could not set their own hours of work. The profit-sharing proposal made by Toro, in his view, was only a way to make workers understand that the more work they do the higher level of profit sharing they would enjoy. This interpretation, however, did not take into consideration increasing wages and reducing hours of work as the formula to improve the cigar workers' quality of life. This offer, moreover, did not imply a change in relations between workers and employers. The account book, for example, that kept track of the conditions of the partnership, was the employers' sole domain. This meant that because employers exclusively kept the account books, they also exclusively determined what profits were to be shared.[282]

The cigar workers rejected this proposition, and hence 1919 opened in Puerto Rico with a strike against PRATCO's main factories and branches. It is significant to mention that the rationale for the strike was embedded in the defense of cigar workers' culture, and represented for them the survival of their work practices. The conflict

[282] El Tiempo, December 22, 1918, 5.

involved issues of control of production, employment, and management prerogatives. According to Toro, the company was willing to satisfy the workers' petition to provide work to all cigar makers in Puerto Rico. PRATCO was willing to open as many branches as possible and hire as many workers as possible. This promise, however, would be contingent on the numbers of cigar orders the company had. For Toro, wages was not the main issue in the controversy. The key element involved in the dispute had to deal with the demands of the market and how a company should be managed. According to Toro, factories would remain closed until workers changed their attitude. He claimed that it was not possible for the company or any other corporation to employ more workers than needed.[283] This was the main issue involved here for Toro; as a capitalist investment the company was regulated by conditions of the market and the profits they could expect from their investment.

Cigar makers' strikes, according to Toro, were more frequent in Puerto Rico than in any other place in the United States. The frequency of strikes was for him a major factor that had forced previously established cigar corporations in Puerto Rico to close operations. He stated that in Puerto Rico, as soon as a strike was settled, a new conflict appeared. In his opinion, the frequency of strikes was due to the cigar makers' practice of incorporating in their union a large number of workers that had nothing to do with the cigar business. He refers here to the cigar makers' practice of making any problem that could surge in any of the cigar operations or departments as their own, therefore a partial strike by non-cigar makers could result in a strike that eventually affected all the

[283]El Mundo, April 10, 1919, 3.

departments of the factory.[284] Finally, as expressed in another article, PRATCO considered Puerto Rico as a unique case of workers demanding that a company employ a larger force than it can make use of. The company considered this position wrong, claiming that the company was the "only arbiter as to its personnel."[285]

In January 1921 a new strike of cigar workers erupted in the PRATCO factories. Close to 10,000 workers supported the strike movement, but by September 1921 the strike ended with the Trust emerging as the clear winner. From that moment PRATCO decided not to recognize the union and established the policy that workers' complaints would be resolved in direct conversation with the worker and not with the representative union. In addition, the company resolved that no longer will there be permanent workers' commissions in the factories and the Reader was prohibited.[286]

Conclusion

This chapter found that transformations that occurred in the cigar industry single-out a shift from cigar makers as unique producers of cigars to a situation of having to share the labor process with other workers involved in the cigar production. There were now several occupational categories in the cigar production process, though the most important were still cigar makers and tobacco strippers. The importance of these two groups of workers was centered in the large number employed in factories and workshops, as well as in their labor militancy, participation in strikes, and support for the organization of workers. As discussed in this chapter, cigar workers in Puerto Rico

[284] "Importante entrevista con el prestigioso y conocido hombre de negocios D. Luis Toro, El Mundo, April 14, 1919, 3.
[285] El Día, "History of the Strike of the Cigar Makers of the Porto Rican American Tobacco Company," May 5, 1919, 1.

[286] José Joaquín Rodríguez, "Auge y crisis en las filas del movimiento obrero puertorriqueño, 1900-1924," MA Thesis, 1987, 65-66.

shared a particular set of customs and traditions that defined their behavior in the factory and workshop. For employers, however, this work culture represented a threat to their control of the workplace, as well as a loss of profits. To change the situation employers, during the first two decades of the twentieth century, began to challenge the customs and traditions that cigar workers had expressed as natural and given.

The introduction of new technology and new management practices allowed employers to increase profits and provided the necessary mechanisms to control the factory, diminishing the influence exerted by cigar workers in their place of work. There was in addition an internal source of conflict between workers, a new player incorporated into cigar production. They were female workers who were not only employees but also potential members of the union. The discussion of women in the cigar industry is a matter taken up in the next chapter.

CHAPTER V

WOMEN IN THE HISTORY OF THE PUERTO RICAN LABOR MOVEMENT: CLASS SOLIDARITY AND GENDER CONFRONTATION AMONG CIGAR WORKERS

This chapter begins with an overview of women's participation in Puerto Rican history, emphasizing the intersection of gender and Puerto Rican history during the nineteenth century and the early twentieth century. The chapter then explores the role of gender in the cigar industry and the impact of women's incorporation as wageworkers in this industry, particularly because the first two decades of the twentieth century are important for the study of changes in the patterns of women's work and family life. Increasingly during this period women were incorporated into the wage-market, becoming more visible in the workplace and in community-related activities. The cigar industry, for instance, became the most important industry for women to exchange their labor for salaries. The number of women employed in this industry increased from 60 in 1899 to 8,573 in 1920, while men increased from 3,683 workers in 1899 to 5,098 workers in 1920.[287]

Women's incorporation into factory work also had implications for the production process and for their relationships with male workers. Gender, it will be argued, is an important factor in the analysis and understanding of changes in the cigar industry, and of how the cigar makers' union and the labor movement perceived and reacted to women's entry into the wage labor force. This chapter explores the problematic relationship of gender within cigar workers' culture, and also aims to offer an explanation for the tensions and contradictions between male and female workers in cigar production. I

[287]United States, Bureau of the Census, Fourteenth Census, 327, 1691.

assess the impact of women's work and outcomes on the organized labor movement during the period under study.

Women, Labor and Society in the Nineteenth Century in Puerto Rico: An Overview

Puerto Rican society under Spanish rule developed as a patriarchal and paternalistic society with a strong military presence and with considerable influence exerted by the Catholic Church. The subordination of women to men, in general, was almost absolute. Women from different social classes were raised to be obedient and to be good wives and mothers, fulfilling in this way the domestic role assigned by society. The prevailing laws dealing with the administration of common property in marriage, authority over children, and some labor practices limited the rights of women.[288] In addition, one of the main tasks of women as mothers during this period was to reproduce labor, particularly after the prohibition of the slave trade and, later, with the abolition of slavery.[289] After 1898, with the expansion of United States business activities in Puerto Rico, women were effectively incorporated as wage workers into the productive process as new industries were established in the country, particularly in the cigar industry. According to Fernando Picó, for example, cigar factories and stripping shops in the municipality of Utuado were responsible for the incorporation of women into the world of labor as wage earners by the beginning of the 1900s.[290]

During the Spanish colonial rule in Puerto Rico women were mainly involved in

[288] Edna Acosta-Belén, "Puerto Rican Women in Culture, History, and Society," in The Puerto Rican Woman (New York: Praeger, 1986), 3.

[289] Marcia Rivera, "The Development of Capitalism in Puerto Rico and the Incorporation of Women into the Labor Force," in The Puerto Rican Woman, edited by Edna Acosta-Belén (New York: Praeger, 1986), 31.

[290] Fernando Picó, "Las trabajadoras del tabaco en Utuado, Puerto Rico, según el censo de 1910," Hómines 9, 1-2 (1985): 270-271.

the production and service sectors of the economy, Women in the rural sector worked in the fields planting and harvesting coffee, sugar, and tobacco, and as servants in the landowners' houses. In the case of coffee, for example, women were the main coffee pickers during the last twenty-five years of the nineteenth century. In the urban sector, women earned their livelihood sewing, washing, ironing, and cleaning houses or in domestic services, and selling home-prepared food.[291] In the city of San Juan, by mid-nineteenth century, the three main trade practices by women were washers, servants, and seamstresses. Their role in society has been characterized by their lack of access to the world of work that in turn generated fewer resources to make their own choices in life. When women were owners they did not administer their estates, and as wageworkers they did not necessarily receive direct financial remuneration for their work.[292]

According to Marcia Rivera, by the end of the nineteenth century, there were 43,189 women engaged in these jobs, representing 91 percent of all women employed in the country, while only 1,868 women worked in agricultural tasks.[293] At that moment, few industries or factories operated in Puerto Rico, and few opportunities existed for women to do any kind of industrial work. As shown in Table 5, by 1899, Puerto Rican working women were concentrated in the following categories of work: servants, laundresses, seamstresses/dressmakers, teaching, straw-hat making, nursing, operators in tobacco factories, and sales.

[291]See Olga Jiménez de Wagenheim, "Mujer y sociedad en el Puerto Rico del siglo XIX," Centro Journal 2, 7 (Winter 1989-1990): 10-17.
[292] Fernando Picó, "Las trabajadoras del tabaco en Utuado," 269-270.
[293]Marcia Rivera, "The Development of Capitalism in Puerto Rico," 32.

TABLE 5: WOMEN MAIN OCCUPATIONS IN PUERTO RICO, 1899-1920

GROUP	1899	1910	1920
Servant	18,453	18,781	15,382
Laundresses	16,855	25,884	16,317
Seamstresses/Dressmakers	5,785	11,200	12,650
Teacher	246	1,172	2,636
Nurse	64	189	362
Straw Hatmaker	387	2,862	3,633
Sales	25	108	376
Operators in Tobacco Factories	60	3,204	8,573

Source: United States, Dept. of War, Porto Rico Census Report 1899, United States, Bureau of the Census, Thirteenth Census, 1910 and Fourteenth Census, 1920.

These categories of work remained the major areas of work for women as reflected in the 1910 and 1920 censuses. In terms of this research it is worthwhile to mention the associations that can be established between the cigar industry, female workers and the labor movement in general. As noted in Table 5, a significant change occurred in the cigar category with the increased participation of women workers from 60 in 1899 to 3,432 in 1910, and ultimately to 8,573 in 1920. Women in most work categories during the period under study did not develop group solidarity among themselves as their capacity to organize was hampered. Women working in the tobacco industry represented an exception because they worked in groups and were influenced by the Reader. Attempts made in this industry to organize women generated solidarity, and directly and indirectly played a role in the organization of all workers early in the twentieth century.

The expansion of the manufacturing and commercial sector of the economy in Puerto Rico by the end of the nineteenth century and early twentieth century brought changes in the structure of the labor market. These changes had a direct impact on women and contributed to their incorporation into wage work in urban sectors. In the cigar industry, for example, employers took advantage of the large number of women available to work. Another factor influencing the incorporation of female workers' into the cigar industry was women's perception that this industry provided an opportunity for earning money in exchange for their work, a condition that was not present in work done at home. However, women were located in the lower-paying jobs in these new work activities in the cigar industry, receiving wages considerably lower than those earned by men doing the same tasks. The incorporation of women into the work force in the cigar industry, according to some male cigar workers, was a contributing factor in reducing the value of labor power. This perception was influenced by the employers' practice of paying lower wages to women than men for the same kind of work. In addition, female workers represented a displacement threat for male workers because women were willing to work for less. This was not correct because those female cigar workers were submitted to the same hard working conditions prevailing in this industry. In particular, those women working as tobacco strippers or classifying leaves, the principal categories of work available for women in this industry.[294] Furthermore, female workers expressed solidarity during male strikes, and demanded better wages for themselves.

The Role of Women in the Cigar Industry under the Factory System

[294] Picó, "Las trabajadoras del tabaco en Utuado," 268-282; Rivera, "The Development of Capitalism in Puerto Rico," 36-37; Tirado, "Notas sobre el desarrollo de industria del tabaco en Puerto Rico y su impacto en la mujer puertorriqueña, 1898-1920," 22-28.

In 1880, Carroll D. Wright defined the factory as the place where raw materials could be converted into finished goods by consecutive harmonious processes carried along in one establishment.[295] The factory system, then, played an important role in the integration of women into the world of work. In Puerto Rico, as was the case in the United States, the cigar industry became one of the first industries to make use of the factory system. As explained by Edward C. Kirkland, the invention of machines and the development of new methods to do the work were decisive for the success of the factory system. The mechanization and division of tasks in the factory was a positive stimulus for the incorporation of women into the factory system, outside of the domestic domain. Skills previously acquired only with years of practice could now be obtained in a short period of time due to the use of machinery.

When in 1899 the American Tobacco Company began operations in Puerto Rico, it had the intention of operating under the factory system. As part of this process, the Trust, looking to maximize its capital investment, began a process of recruiting and training workers for a factory system. The Trust was interested in workers with particular characteristics, such as the unskilled, mainly women, who lacked labor organization and representation. Women were recruited because they could be paid lower wages, normally from 40 to 50 percent less, and hence increased the profitability of employers. In terms of the organization of production, the factory system, therefore, allowed the division of tasks in the process of moving materials from raw to finished

[295]United States, Bureau of the Census, Tenth Census of the United States, 1880, "Report on the Factory System of the United States," 548. In 1902, the U.S. Congress officially recognized the factory system by providing that the collection of statistics of manufactures "be confined to manufacturing establishments conducted under what is known as the factory system, exclusive of the so-called neighborhood and mechanical industries," as cited by Edward C. Kirkland, Industry Comes on Age: Business, Labor, and Public Policy, 1860-1897 (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1961), 171.

product. A de-skilling process also occurred among artisans.

TABLE 5.1: PERSONS IN GAINFUL OCCUPATIONS IN PUERTO RICO, BY CLASS OF OCCUPATION AND SEX, 1899

Class of Occupation	Total Number	Percent	Male	Female
Agriculture, Fisheries, and Mining	198,761	62.8	73.9	3.9
Domestic and Personal Service	64,819	20.5	10.2	78.4
Manufacturing and Mechanical Industries	26,515	8.4	7.5	13.4
Trade and Transportation	24,076	7.6	8.3	3.6
Professional Service	2,194	0.7	0.7	0.7
Total	316,365	100	101	100

Sources: U.S. War Department, Report on the Census of Porto Rico, 1899, 99; Walter E. Weyl, Labor Conditions in Puerto Rico, 1905, 740-741..

In 1899, there were 316,365 workers in gainful occupations in Puerto Rico, divided into five categories. Agriculture, mines and fishing represented the largest group with a total of 198,761 employees, 73.9 percent of these were male and 3.9 percent were female. The second group was represented by those working in domestic and personal services with a total of 64,819 persons (10.2 percent male and 78.4 percent female). The third group corresponded to those in the manufacture and mechanical industries with 26,515 persons (7.5 percent male and 13.4 percent female). The fourth group involved those persons in commerce and transportation activities with 24,076 workers (8.3 percent male and 3.8 percent female). The final group consisted of those who provided professional services that included a total of 2,194 persons (0.7 percent males and 0.7 percent females). This census showed that by 1899 the industrial sector in Puerto Rico was simple, rudimentary, and that manufacturing companies, commerce, transportation,

and the professional sector had a small share of the economy. There was a ratio of 17 workers for every 100 working in the occupations previously mentioned.[296]

The 1910 census, the first official U.S. Census on Puerto Rico, showed that the agricultural sector still dominated the Puerto Rican, while the manufacturing sector was small and controlled by the cigar, sugar, and coffee polishing industries. As shown in Table 5.2, the distribution of workers in the three main industrial productive areas was as follows: 5,062 in sugar, 120 in coffee, and 7,025 in tobacco. While most of the workers in the sugar cane industry were male (91 percent), and women were minimally represented (1.4 percent), in the cigar industry, the ratio of female representation stood considerably higher at 78.9 percent for men and 17.4 percent for women.

TABLE 5.2: AVERAGE NUMBER OF WAGE EARNERS FOR SELECTED INDUSTRIES, WITH PERCENT BY SEX AND AGE, 1919 AND 1909

Industry	Census	Wage Earners (Average Number)	Percent of Total		
			16 Years of Age And Over		Under 16 Years of Age
			Male	Female	
All Industries	1919	15,985	84.6	14.7	0.7
	1909	15,582	85.1	10.0	4.9
Bread and other bakery products	1919	880	99.0	0.6	0.4
	1909	1,197	98.3	-	1.7
Clothing, Men's	1919	179	3.4	91.6	5.0
	1909	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Coffee Cleaning and Polishing	1919	578	21.5	78.5	-
	1909	120	75.0	25.0	-
Food Preparation	1919	129	42.6	57.4	-
	1909	122	38.5	56.6	4.9
Foundry and Machine-	1919	271	100.0	-	-

[296] United States, War Department, Report of the Census of Porto Rico, 1899 (Washington, DC: GPO, 1900), 99-101.

Industry	Census	Wage Earners (Average Number)	Percent of Total		
			16 Years of Age And Over		Under 16 Years of Age
			Male	Female	
shop products	1909	188	88.3	-	11.7
Printing and Publishing Job	1919	143	93.7	6.3	-
	1909	82	90.2	4.9	4.9
Printing and Publishing, Newspaper and Periodicals	1919	168	97.0	2.4	0.6
	1909	271	89.7	3.3	7.0
Sugar Cane	1919	7,490	98.0	0.2	1.0
	1909	5,062	91.1	1.4	7.5
Tobacco, Cigars and Cigarettes	1919	5,098	70.2	29.7	0.1
	1909	7,025	78.9	17.9	3.2
All Other Industries	1919	1,049	88.5	10.6	1.0
	1909	1,515	86.9	7.7	5.4

Source: United States, Dept. of Commerce Bureau of the Census, Fourteenth Census of the United States Taken in the Year 1920. Volume IX, Manufactures, 1919, 1685.

The information provided by the 1920 Census can be interpreted as a summary of the changes that occurred in the agricultural and manufactory sectors of the economy. Regarding workers, there were several differences between the 1920 and 1910 censuses. By 1920 the number of female employees in the industrial sector showed an increase from the previous census. In the case of cigars industry, however, a decrease occurred in the number of workers laboring, from 7,025 in 1910 to 5,098 employees in 1920. However, women's representation in the cigar industry increased from 18 percent in 1910 to almost 30 percent of those workers. That more women were working did not necessarily imply that they were integrated into the unions as the same pace as they were incorporating into the labor force. It was in the cigar industry where more women

workers were recruited into the labor force and where more participation in union activities among all female workers took place.

Industrial discipline was a key factor for the success of the factory system. From the employers' viewpoint, workers recruited under this system should adapt to a new industrial discipline. The hours of labor and wages would be regulated and wages were to be assigned under a new piecework system that allowed for payment to be controlled by the number of cigars made and stripping completed, not for a day of work.

In addition, the success of the factory system depended on a system of supervisors and foremen who managed the Company's branches. Employers in the cigar industry, as in any other industry, considered that their investment and ownership in a capitalist enterprise conferred to them the right to manage the industry to best suit their interests. In the case of production, employers considered that their right to appoint or hire managers and foremen for the branches was not up for discussion.

Employers in Puerto Rico were within the parameters of what the new management and technology system promoted for the tobacco companies during the period under study. Owners had the right to establish or determine labor policy. However, labor unions and unaffiliated workers challenged this prerogative. The Trust and other local employers considered the intervention of cigar workers in the productive process, in particular, those of the local branches of the CMIU, the AFL, and FFL, as irresponsible. They viewed unions' efforts to influence production as disturbing and detrimental to their interests; in their view, decisions as to how to conduct business or how to treat their employees remained were their sole prerogative.

Impact of the Deskilling Process in the Cigar Industry in Puerto Rico

The deskilling process, in addition to the factory system, represented another factor that influenced labor operations and the development of a united labor organization in the cigar industry.[297] In the case of the United States, Christiansen, Philips, and Prus have established that between 1850 and 1919, capital-intensive mechanization and technical integration favored the employment of men, while deskilling favored the employment of women.[298] Although Puerto Rico did not participate in the kind of industrialization taking place in the United States, the deskilling process underway in the U.S. also impacted how the cigar industry developed in Puerto Rico during the early years of the twentieth century.

A sign of the deskilling process in Puerto Rico was the introduction and use of the wooden mold in cigar production by cigar manufacturers in 1905. As explained by Juan José Baldrich, the mold facilitated the fragmentation of the craft into bunch-making as a separate task from wrapper-rolling the finished bunch. Manufacturers introduced teamwork to manufacture the cigar so that no one person had to master the complete craft anymore. Another moment in the deskilling process occurred in 1913 when employers introduced the use of suction tables in their factories [299]

The relationship between technological changes that occurred in the cigar industry in Puerto Rico at the turn of the twentieth century and a gendered-based division of labor

---

[297] Deskilling is defined in this research as a process in which the worker loses the right to design and plan work; in which the work is fragmented into meaningless segments, and the tasks and redistributed among unskilled and semi-skilled workers. An outcome of this process is the transformation in the structure of control. See Craig Littler, "Deskilling and Changing Structures of Control," in The Degradation of Work? Skill, Deskilling and the Labour Process (London: Hutchinson, 1983), Stephen Wood, 122.

[298] Jens Christiansen, Peter Philips, and Mark Prus, "Women, Technology, and Work: The Gender Division of Labor in U.S. Manufacturing, 1850 to 1919," Research in Economic History 16 (1996): 105-106.

[299] Juan José Baldrich, "Gender and the Decomposition of the Cigar-Making Craft in Puerto Rico, 1899-1934, 111-113. See also, Walter E. Weyl, Labor Conditions in Puerto Rico, 1905, 759, and Porto Rico, Bureau of Labor, Special Report of Bureau of Labor to the Legislature of Porto Rico, 1913, 62.

represented key factors in the erosion of occupational sex segregation prevalent in 1899. These changes helped to reduce or eliminate the obstacles to women's employment based on strength or skill required.[300] Occupational segregation, however, did not vanish totally because supervisory positions were filled by men and male labor still predominated among cigar makers until the 1920s. Female workers mainly filled positions such as machine operators and tobacco strippers, and received low wages.

In Puerto Rico, in general, deskilling helped employers to reduce their dependency on male craft workers and to shift work to less skilled and low-wage labor. In this way employers moved away from a craft labor market into a more open labor market. In addition, deskilling helped to reduce the bargaining power of the cigar workers as well as fundamentally altering their work practices. Furthermore, deskilling represented a way to promote divisions between male and female workers, making it more difficult to organize workers in this industry. Although males continued to be the primary source of labor for the production of higher priced cigars, employers used female workers and new technology in the production of cheaper cigars.[301] Finally, the different categories of workers involved in cigar production reflected the prevailing discrimination against women. For the same task or work performed, female workers normally received half of the wage paid to male workers. According to a 1912 report, for example, working women were largely employed in the cigar industries in tasks such as stripping, packing, boxing, trimming, and filling. In addition, women in large factories were employed to do the most expert work, selecting and grading cigars. The wages for these women were

[300] See Mark J. Prus, "Mechanization and the Gender-Based Division of Labour in the US Cigar Industry," Cambridge Journal of Economics, 14 (1990), 63.
[301] Ibid., 64.

only about one half of what was paid to men.[302]

Deskilling weakened the power of the union and provided opportunities for employers to hire unskilled workers that in the case of Puerto Rico were largely represented by women. The antagonism of some male workers against female workers can be explained in part by the association of women with declining male bargaining power. In reality, however, the opportunity to undermine workers' organizations was produced by the deskilling process. Unable to keep women out of the industry or to prevent the segmentation of women's labor within cigar making, men eventually opened their unions to women workers in an act of survival.[303]

In terms of the impact of deskilling on the task of organizing workers in the cigar industry, there is little doubt that deskilling was a major factor in reducing the number of male cigar makers in the industry. Deskilling also had the effect of reducing the potential number of cigar makers available to be organized. The prevailing segregation by sex in this industry remained. Males and females were not integrated as co-workers in rolling cigars, or employed as equals in the process of stripping tobacco. Female workers, on the contrary, kept their standing as stemmers, and, at the same time, kept their role as unskilled workers who were displacing male workers in the production of cigars. However, the organized labor movement realized the importance of organizing women as bona fide members of the union if unions were going to survive as workers´ organizations. As cigar-making skills were drastically being reduced, a new situation was created for organized labor. Women not only had to be taken into consideration as

[302]Porto Rico, Department of Labor, Charities, and Correction, Bureau of Labor, Special Report of the Bureau of Labor to the Legislature of Porto Rico, 1912 (San Juan, PR: Bureau of Supplies, Printing, and Transportation, 1913), 27.
[303]Prus, "Mechanization and Gender," 68.

an essential factor in the labor market and in the factories, but also as key element in the success of a cigar workers union in Puerto Rico. Considering that cigar workers were the backbone of the organized labor movement, their success or failure had consequences for the whole country.

Cigar makers were interested ideologically in uniting all workers employed in the industry in a common struggle against employers and capitalism and for a more equal society structured under socialism. As technology and innovation were advancing in the cigar industry, the gender issue represented an enormous obstacle to their aspiration because women were perceived by a sector of male workers as a threat to the jobs available in the industry, which in their view, should be first and foremost reserved for men.

The Nascent Labor Movement and Female Workers

During the period under study, the labor movement tried to overcome the "threat" represented by female workers. Therefore, the rapid incorporation of women into tobacco production was quickly followed by attempts to incorporate them into the nascent Puerto Rican labor movement, a broad based movement that took into consideration the full and equal participation of women in all its organizational and political efforts. Gender was not initially considered to be an obstacle for the aspirations of the working class and the organized labor movement. In 1897, the Group of *Ensayo Obrero*, for example, declared in its platform to be in favor of "associating, uniting and federating workers of both sexes."[304] In 1903, the FFL, in Article II of its program, proclaimed that its "objective is to unite all types of manual workers of both sexes." In

[304] The rationale for the organization of workers was published in Ensayo Obrero, June 1, 1897, 1. Also cited in Santiago Iglesias Pantín, Luchas emancipadoras, 93.

addition, Article II stipulated that, "all Congresses shall name a Committee on the Organization of Women Workers."[305]

These concerns were manifested in several workers' congresses. At the Third Congress in 1905, of the 55 delegates who participated, five were women. Moreover, there was representation from ten women's unions, and one of the labor commissions was dedicated to the organizing of women. Various resolutions on women were presented during the proceedings.[306] For cigar workers one of the two most important resolutions was number 26, a call to include female workers belonging to Ladies Unions into the 1906 strike campaign. This action was considered strategic in attracting other women into the organization. In this way, the association spirit among women would be improved and expanded. The other resolution, number 57, requested the appointment of special organizers to deal with women's issues within the FFL. Santiago Iglesias, president of the FFL, and cigar makers José Storer and Jesús María Balzac, were appointed as members of the commission in charge of organizing women workers.[307]

In 1905, as a way to improve their socio-economic condition, the FFL again proposed a campaign to organize female workers. This time, the proposal was supported by a group of twelve unions in diverse trades who considered the moment as appropriate for launching this type of campaign.[308] FFL expectations were not realized and the lack of success did not stop them to keep trying. That is why, three years later, in 1908,

---

[305] Federación Libre de los Trabajadores de Puerto Rico, Reglamento de la Federación Libre de los Trabajadores de Puerto Rico (San Juan, PR: Federación Libre, 1903), 1.
[306]See Federación Libre de los Trabajadores de Puerto Rico, Reporte de procedimientos del tercer congreso obrero celebrado en Mayagüez por la de la Federación de los Trabajadores de Puerto Rico, en los días del 14 al 24 de junio de 1905 (Mayagüez, PR: Imprenta Unión Obrera, 1906),
[307]Ibid., 21, 30, and 36.
[308]See "La mujer obrera en Puerto Rico" in Puerto Rico Workingmen Journal, March 1905, and Yamila Azize, La mujer en la lucha (Río Piedras, PR: Editorial Cultural, 1985), 63.

during the Fifth Congress, two female members of the organization presented several resolutions aimed at developing an organizing drive to incorporate more female workers into the FFL. During this congress, Resolution No. 39 petitioned the Executive Committee to form a Commission of officials that would be directly in charge of organizing women workers in all job classifications. Another resolution, No. 30, stated that good male organizers were those who organized their female family members.[309]

The Sixth Congress of Workers, celebrated in 1910, reported that by July 1909, 37 women's unions had been organized: 28 were protective women's unions, six tobacco stripper organizations, two of needle workers and one of embroiderers. Six women's unions members were represented at the Congress and many individual women attended.[310] Among the resolutions presented, one had bearing on the organization of women workers in different occupations. Resolution No. 59 called on members "To organize the country's working women into the heart of the Free Federation."[311]

Another resolution, number 67, dealt directly with the need to organize the women recently incorporated into the nascent tobacco industry because they were being exploited and furthermore utilized to undermine male workers in the industry. The resolution tackled the problem head on:

> That all organized workers in San Juan and its barrios, Cataño and Bayamón, that are heads of households or are responsible for families though not heads of households, and have a female member of the family working in that area, are obligated to immediately organize them; this Congress orders the same efforts be made to organize your relatives that are working in those conditions in whatever time is available, and where you may not have the parental authority…[312]

---

[309] As cited in Federación Libre de los Trabajadores de Puerto Rico, Procedimientos del sexto congreso obrero de la Federación de los Trabajadores de Puerto Rico (San Juan, PR: Imprenta Murillo, 1910), 150-151.
[310] Ibid., iii-iv.
[311] Federación Libre de los Trabajadores de Puerto Rico, Procedimientos del sexto congreso obrero, 1910, 66.
[312] Ibid., 65.

By 1913, according to the Special Report of the Bureau of Labor, working women were largely employed in various processes of cigar manufacturing, such as stripping, packing, boxing, trimming, and filling. In addition, many of the large factories employed women to do the most expert work such as selecting and grading cigars. Women were also hired to run machines utilized for the manufacture of cheaper grades of cigars and cigarettes. In terms of the cigar industry women's wages averaged only about one-half of what men earned; however they were the best paid of any considerable class of working women on the Island.[313]

A New Gender Order Among Workers In The Cigar Industry

The first two decades of the twentieth century can be defined as a period when women were integrated in large numbers into the labor force in Puerto Rico. They were recruited as cigar workers, in packing and canning activities, cleaning services, needlework, and as servants. Independent of the industry in which they were working, women had similar characteristics in that they were consistently paid less than male workers for the same kind of work. Another common characteristic was that in each industry women were assigned to those tasks that had the lowest remuneration. This was the case in the cigar industry where women were hired for tasks such as stripping, filling boxes, and ringing cigars that constituted the lowest paid jobs in the industry.

Before machinery started operating in full scale in Puerto Rico, the tobacco industry overcame problems of labor and profitability by being able to draw from an

[313]Porto Rico, Department of Labor, Charities, and Correction, Bureau of Labor, Special Report of the Bureau of Labor to the Legislature of Porto Rico, (San Juan, PR: Bureau of Supplies, Printing, and Transportation, 1913), December 1912, 28.

abundant and cheap labor force; by taking advantage of the low level of organization in this industry; by incorporating women into the industry, thereby substituting union (and non-union) men with women; by paying less to women than men for the same kind of work; and, when machinery was introduced in the industry, by using women as their main operators.

Cigar production in Puerto Rico was accompanied by a change in the mode of production. Artisan production started giving way to a production based on a division of tasks, with workers concentrated in big factories, and with a continual incorporation of women into the new industry. The tendency by 1900 was that three-quarters of those working in cigar factories were employed in places with more than 100 workers. In fact, cigar and cigarette companies were the only industries in Puerto Rico that were employing more than 1,000 workers in a single site. By 1920, close to 80 percent of tobacco production was done in factories with 500 or more workers. Furthermore, the tobacco industry, between 1899 and 1920, registered the highest increase of females in non-agricultural employment. Women represented only 1.6 percent of the workers employed in the tobacco industry in 1899. However, by 1910, they represented 27.8 percent, a considerable increase in their participation, and by the 1920s, they held the majority of jobs provided by this industry, constituting 52.9 percent of the work force.[314]

After solving the problems of capital and technology, the next step for the cigar industry was to develop and mold a labor force according to the industry needs. In this enterprise the Trust followed the pattern it had established on the mainland: using more women as part as the labor force, organizing large factories where hundreds of workers

[314] James L. Dietz, Economic History of Puerto Rico, 117, 123.

were concentrated to do portions of the work and, when possible, avoiding labor organizations. The problem confronted by the ATC in Puerto Rico was that cigar workers exerted a leadership not only in organizing their trade, but also on workers in general.

The new gender division among workers in the cigar industry brought with it conflicts that were reflected in issues such as wage differentials. Differences in salaries had two important repercussions for the working class and for the organized labor movement. On one hand, women began questioning the reasons for the difference in payment for the same kind of tasks. At this point, they not only questioned this inequity, they also moved to organize themselves as a way to improve working conditions. In 1904, for example, Josefa Pérez, in representing a group of women in Puerta de Tierra, asked for help from the FFL leadership to organize women in this working class neighborhood. She challenged Ramón Romero Rosa, member of the organizing commission, by asking "If you provide voluntary work to organize male workers, why can't you do the same for the female workers?" Puerta de Tierra was not only a working class neighborhood, particularly for cigar workers, but was also the site of the largest PRATCO factory in Puerto Rico, where a large number of women worked in different tasks in the production of cigars. As expressed by Josefa Pérez, the organization was needed "to defend ourselves against employers´ exploitation." The FFL immediately provided two voluntary organizers, José Storer and Severo Cirino, who promoted a series of meetings where more than 200 women participated, aimed at developing a local union of female workers in Puerta de Tierra.[315]

[315]La Democracia, June 24, 1904, 6; 12, 13, 15, and July 21, 1904, 6.

San Juan neighborhoods were not the only ones where the FFL tried to organize women. The campaign, for example, was extended to the Guayama municipality where Antonio Lebrón, an FFL organizer, expressed to women the idea that the lack of organization allowed exploitation by the privileged class.[316] In Mayaguez, the Women's Protective Union No. 11733 (coffee grinders), in the name of more than 400 hundred members, expressed in a message to Beekman Winthrop, governor of Puerto Rico, that the only way to gain respect from employers was to organize a union sponsored by the FFL. This labor organization, in their view, was going to provide the necessary instruction to obtain better wages and to improve their quality of life.[317] With this purpose, Gregoria Molina and Juana Cofresí called for a meeting between the FFL organizer and those women interested in the well-being of their class to discuss the future of Local No. 11733. They proposed an active campaign of protest and propaganda to awaken the consciousness of their exploiters. In particular, they expressed that women "should not think about the Motherland [patria] but in the hunger they were suffering."[318] If Puerto Rican workers were in a process of organizing themselves to demand better wages and improve their working conditions, then women should not be excluded from this process. This position was taken by a group of thirteen women in Ponce, who considered the organization of workers as fundamental for the vindication of women's rights. To fulfill their role in the organization they invited their fellow women workers to a meeting sponsored by the FFL. Carmen Rosario, Juana Terra, and Martín Vargas also

[316]La Democracia, July 13, 1904, 6.
[317]La Democracia, September 16, 1904, 6. This communication was signed by Gregoria Molina, pres., Margarita Vélez Muller, vice-pres., Rosa Pizziri, Elisa Cazares de Torrents, Emilia Gómez, Julia Alers, María F. Delgado, Bibiana Balines, Laura Ruiz, and Alicia García.
[318]Unión Obrera, December 4, 1904, 1; December 11, 1904, 2; January 22, 1905, 1.

signed the invitation.[319]

On the other hand, differences in salaries raised concern and protests among male workers, mainly because they believed that employers were using female workers in order to cut their costs. They argued that because of this "saving" factor, employers preferred to hire women, and that women's employment represented a potential threat to men's opportunities to obtain jobs. Male workers in the cigar industry accepted the right of women to get jobs, but they were concerned with the implications of this integration because it could also mean a displacement of male workers that could result in a reduction in wages for certain tasks in the industry.

This gender conflict was a source of debate within the organized labor movement, and was reflected in their annual meetings. In January 1911, during the second annual meeting of the cigar makers union, a male worker argued that:

> Too much has been written about the threat pending over the cigar makers in Puerto Rico... The road to follow is to induce and obtain the organization of these women. There is a Propaganda Committee of Unions from the District of San Juan, who has a mandate of making them a calling for the organization, making the major efforts to obtain their organization, and as a last resort, if women's goal is to destroy the trade, then we have to extirpate the evil, stopping their training and work in the trade.[320]

In response to Pedro San Miguel´s call, the Assembly approved a resolution in favor of organizing women. Therefore, the mandate of the union was to organize female workers and if that was not possible, then the union had to stop women from learning the trade. This resolution apparently did not have great repercussion on the issue of women in the cigar industry because it was brought back in the following years.

The debate on the integration of women in the cigar industry remained alive and

[319] Unión Obrera, "Federación Libre de Puerto Rico," March 7, 1907, 2.
[320] Pedro San Miguel, Informe a la Segunda Asamblea de Uniones de Tabaqueros, 81.

in 1913, during the Third Assembly, the issue was presented as:

> Every day the industry is invaded by women who not finding work in other trades or perceiving the cigar industry as more lucrative penetrate in this industry to be exploited without consideration and to be used as an arm of the companies against us for their disorganization, education, and weakness these female workers are a threat to all. Because now it is not possible to prevent entirely women's access to this industry, easy and practicable resolutions should be adopted to organize female workers in those places where they are working, and to control as possible the growing number of women in the cigar industry in Puerto Rico.[321]

Still in 1915, confronting the opposition of some male workers to their participation in the cigar industry, a group of female workers claimed the right to work and demanded that male workers make clear their position. They posed an ideological argument as the basis for their demand. According to them, any socialist who opposed women's participation in the struggles for life or who denied women the right to develop their faculties, or who prevented women from gaining an honest salary in the workshops, was not a real socialist or stopped being one when they expressed such views.[322]

The concern expressed by organized cigar makers during the 1911 and 1913 assemblies had some validity as shown in Table 5.3. This table shows the number of locals organized and the number of members for the years 1908, 1910, 1911, and 1913. Although the numbers for 1908 and 1910 indicate success in organizing locals and increasing the number of members, the figures for 1911 and 1913 reveal a decrease in membership, a factor that gives some validity to male workers' concern regarding the incorporation of female workers in the cigar industry. However, during the period from 1911 to 1913, the "threat" of female workers was more apparent than real. The advances that had been made by the organized labor movement in this industry were at a standstill

[321] Prudencio Rivera Martínez, Tercera Asamblea, 1913, FLT, Actuaciones de la Segunda y Tercera, 48.
[322] Unión Obrera, November 10, 1915, 1.

though not necessarily because of the incorporation of women. The majority of female workers were active in stripping and other tasks needed to complete the product, but not in rolling cigars, which had been the heart of production and the main source for recruiting members. A major factor in the lack of advancement was the failure of the cigar-maker union organizers to attract other cigar makers working in the industry into the union. There were cigar workers who rejected the unions for ideological reasons or because they had political differences with the leadership of the cigar workers union, or because they considered union dues to be too high.

TABLE 5.3: CIGAR MAKERS UNIONS, 1908-1913

Municipality	Local #	Members			
		1908	1910	1911	1913
San Juan	1919	66	N/A	210	130
San Juan	460	98	213	154	100
Bayamón	481	127	565	467	335
Bayamón	418			-	30
Caguas	148	258	416	303	261
Caguas (escogedores)	485	N/A	8	N/A	-
Cayey	194	28	36	105	62
Ciales	386	-	22	33	21
Cidra	458	32	79	40	55
Ponce	449	44	152	125	60
Juncos	472	19	118	105	50
Arecibo	467	72	65	48	42
Utuado	376	56	n/A	85	50
Utuado (escogedores)	388	13	18	13	10
San Lorenzo	333	25	88	71	45

Municipality	Local #	Members			
		1908	1910	1911	1913
Gurabo	190	30	73	46	37
Mayagüez	374	17	61	2	-
Vega Baja	390	7	-	N/A	-
Cataño	473	N/A	N/A	N/A	-
Aguas Buenas	474	-	-	N/A	-
Manatí	350			-	30
Carolina	459	N/A	-	-	N/A
Total		892	1914	1807	1318

Source: Federación Libre de los Trabajadores de Puerto Rico. Cuerpo Consultivo Conjunto de las Uniones de Tabaqueros. Libro de actuaciones de la primera asamblea Regular de las uniones de tabaqueros en Puerto Rico, celebrada en Caguas, P.R., durante los días 14, 15 y 16 de julio de 1908. San Juan, PR: Tipografía Real Hermanos, 1910, 13-14. Federación Libre de los Trabajadores de Puerto Rico. Procedimientos del sexto congreso obrero de la Federación Libre de los Trabajadores de Puerto Rico, 1910, 168. Federación Libre de los Trabajadores de Puerto Rico. Actuaciones de la Segunda y Tercera Asamblea Regular…San Juan, PR: Porto Rico Progress Publishing Co. 1914, 57, 68.

The need to organize female workers as expressed in the 1911 and 1913 congresses reflects the interest of male workers in incorporating non-unionized women into their ranks because they believe that otherwise the interests and vindication of workers as a class would be negatively affected. Women should participate in the struggle to improve the working conditions of all workers, as well as in the struggle to create a new society. The organization of all workers was central to this goal.

Groups of women were also clear on this issue. In 1907, a group of female workers expressed that it was important for women to struggle for their rights and that the best way to do so was through organization.[323] Furthermore, these women stated that protective unions had clear political and trade objectives. To this point, the Women's

[323]Unión Obrera, March 7, 1907, 1.

Protective Union of San Juan declared that the organization was not a welfare group, but an organization struggling for the living and for their health, which could only be obtained via an increase in wages. In their own words, "the struggle to improve their existence and welfare, justice and redemption, is the principal objective of the female labor unions."[324]

Women maintained that the commitment of the FFL and of the cigar makers' unions should be to promote that every woman or man who worked for wages should be organized. To become a member of a union was not only a right, but also a duty to defend against the exploitation of the employers. These views were shared by some leaders and organizers such as Julio Aybar, organizer and Director of Unión Obrera, who considered that no one living at this time, in the early twentieth century, could deny that women deserved the right to work. For Aybar, the new ideas that were engendering protests demanded that men understand that women did not belong to them. He argued that men should assume the revolutionary position of accepting the fact that women belonged to themselves, and that men should accept the idea that they were partners with women in all areas of their relationships.[325] In this sense, no union had the moral right to deny or close its doors to any man or woman who worked in the cigar industry. Later, in 1919, Juan S. Marcano, a leader of the FFL, wrote that "the working woman is our comrade of misery and deprivation, and it is not possible for her to continue under the same conditions subjected to the most shameful exploitation."[326]

The arrival of the American Tobacco Company in 1899 not only stimulated the

[324] Unión Obrera, May 2, 1907, 1.
[325] Unión Obrera, August 21, 1906, 3.
[326] Juan S. Marcano, Páginas Rojas (Humacao, PR: Tipografía Conciencia Popular, 1919), 63.

growth of the cigar industry in Puerto Rico, but also coincided with the actions promoted by a group of urban workers in favor of organizing workers into trades and unions. Cigar makers, carpenters, typographers, and painters were among those workers who first promoted the idea of a relationship with the American labor movement. Their efforts attracted the attention of the American Federation of Labor that began organizing Puerto Rican workers in 1901, and of the Cigar Makers International Union, which officially arrived in Puerto Rico in 1906. The craft unionism established by the AFL as the main source for the organization's strength, followed also by the CMIU, was not totally accepted in Puerto Rico. The FFL and the local cigar makers' union maintained loyalty to both organizations, but in their actions and reactions, they took into consideration the reality of Puerto Ricans.

This was a period when urban workers were increasingly confronting employers, particularly the Trust, in opposition to the introduction of machinery in their workplaces as well as the new mode of production in the cigar factories. These factors represented a real threat to their jobs and to their work culture. In this critical period, the cigar union became the major instrument for organizing workers to protect their interests. For cigar-makers mechanization became a problem in several ways. First, it was a threat to their skills, jobs, and earnings because workers with lower levels of skill who in turn received substandard wages could be used to displace them. Second, when the substitution process arrived, they found that the new worker was typically female. Third, male workers felt their way of life and even their manhood was threatened, which they felt impelled to defend. Ileen A. Devault argues that the craft unions of the AFL, including those in Puerto Rico, were based on a decidedly masculinist definition of skill. The

socially constructed category of skills ensured continuing debate over the nature and content of those skills. Some workers and some union members argued in response that the individuals they excluded were merely unskilled and not of any particular group such as women.[327]

Employers used the payment of low salaries for women as a way of decreasing or keeping down production costs. The situation was not an exclusive development in Puerto Rico because the same tendency existed in the United States and other countries which were making the transition from agriculture to industry. Low salaries and less participation in union affairs were also major factors for the employment of women in the U.S. tobacco industry. For example, according to a 1902 study in New York, "employers' preference for women….seems to arise partly from the fact that women will take lower wages and are less subject to labor agitation."[328] Another factor influencing their employment was the organization of the ATC, which introduced the team work concept in the industry, not so much as a way to increase production but as a vehicle for employing a cheaper labor force. Male cigar makers did not accept teamwork easily because it represented a threat to their work culture. Particularly, cigar makers accused employers of hiring women to undercut male wages and the women of collaborating with this policy. This was one of the initial arguments for not welcoming women in unions, and for not choosing them as leaders.

This situation, in part, explains organized labor's opposition to women's integration into the tobacco industry. In the 1901 meeting of the AFL, cigar makers

[327]Ileen A. Devault, United Apart: Gender and the Rise of Craft Unionism (Ithaca/London: Cornell University Press, 2004), 76.
[328] Patricia A. Cooper, Once a Cigarmaker, 162.

introduced a resolution opposing female participation in the cigar industry, arguing that women represented a double threat to male workers. Women could be used to decrease the salary men received and women could be used to substitute for male employment.

These considerations were also present when Puerto Rican cigar makers held their meetings. During the 1910 congress of the FLT, for example, a resolution was introduced calling for the organization of women working in the cigar industry because they were exploited and trained to substitute male workers.[329] By organizing and integrating women into cigar makers' unions, male workers were trying to counteract the employers' tactic of paying lower salaries to women, thereby depressing wages in the industry. It also represented a clear opposition to the general substitution of male workers with female workers, and particularly, in cases of strikes, when employers could use female workers as strikebreakers.

While union solidarity and exclusive practices supported by male workers laboring in the cigar industry played a major role in preventing or failing to organize women in the United States,[330] Puerto Rican cigar makers, as documented here, developed an early solidarity and promoted the integration of women as equals into their unions and activities (strikes, etc.). However, in the end, their efforts failed as in the United States because production changed relatively quickly from small-shop production to the large-scale non-union (or weak union position) factory model where women represented either a large number or were the majority of workers. In this respect, the mechanization of production represented a severe blow to the organized labor movement, to the skilled workers, and to the cigar makers' culture. Patricia Cooper, for example,

[329] Federación Libre de los Trabajadores, Procedimientos del Sexto Congreso Obrero, 1910, 65.
[330] Cooper in Once A Cigarmaker, 114-115

who found that with the shift in the structure of the cigar industry, especially by the second decade of the century, "large firms using some machinery, a division of labor, branch factories, and a labor force composed of women begun to change the balance of power within the industry."[331]

In terms of the cigar industry, the discussion of the participation of women in the labor force was made mainly through the activities promoted by the Cigar Makers Union of Puerto Rico, which discussed the impact of women in the cigar industry, in several of their meetings and conferences. From its inception in 1907, the Union established an opening for women's participation. The constitutive assembly of the Union stated that the meeting was "absolutely free for all men and women in the trade."[332] During the Cigar Makers assembly, of January 1911, women's participation in the industry was raised again based on the role that women could play in the industry. In the report "La mujer en la industria," the organizer Eugenio Sánchez López, acknowledged that "the new times had brought a notable change: the women had just left home to be incorporated into factories to struggle for their lives, rather than to struggle for their subsistence. And the cigar industry seemed to be the appropriate destiny for them."[333] In addition, Sánchez López accused employers of providing training and jobs for these women in their workshops or factories, where they were exploited and, eventually thrown out without any consideration. He considered the situation as a tactic used by employers to increase the pool of workers in the industry and to secure competition among workers for the same jobs.

[331]Ibid., 151.
[332]Flyer, September 15, 1906.
[333] Federación Libre de los Trabajadores, Actuaciones de la Segunda y Tercera, 51.

The 1913 Assembly discussed the same issue again. A report about women expressed concern about their incorporation into the industry because of their potential role in undermining the presence of male workers in this industry:

> The industry is invaded daily by women who…are exploited without any consideration, and become an arm for employers against us because of our disorganization, their education and weakness. These female comrades in this way, together with machines... are a threat to all.[334]

Male cigar makers had only two options to deal with the issue. Either they organized female workers or they had to oppose women's training and working in the industry by all means. Realizing the impossibility of preventing women's entry into the industry, and also guided by their anarchist ideology, they opted for the development of a campaign to integrate women into the union.

As documented in the labor press women could indeed respond as wage earners who felt exploited. They demonstrated a high level of militancy and struggle as workers during strike periods and challenged the traditional roles that society had assigned to them. Most of the strikes women participated in were related to salary increases; payment of lower salaries than males for the same kind of work; working in less remunerative tasks in the industry; poor working conditions; and to express solidarity with other female and male workers on strike. The information available also indicates that despite their high level of militancy, women did not occupy high posts in the FLT; and that most of their activities developed at the local level. During the period under consideration, the members of the Joint Board of cigar workers in Puerto Rico, were all male workers, and the only two presidents of this board, Eugenio Sánchez López (1907-1911) and Prudencio Rivera Martínez (1911-1920) were also male workers.

[334] Federación Libre de los Trabajadores, Actuaciones de la Segunda y Tercera, 48.

Cigar makers promoted the organization of women working in the cigar industry because they were exploited and used to substitute male workers. By organizing and integrating women into cigar unions, male workers were trying to counteract the use of women to depress wages in the industry and the general substitution of male workers with female workers, particularly during strikes. The transformation of the cigar making industry in Puerto Rico also contributed to the proletarianization of cigar makers. As new manufacturing centers were established, a labor market based on salary relations developed for displaced workers from the rural areas.

Displaced artisans and non-skilled workers were moving to the tobacco industry precisely as the work in this industry was undergoing a process of proletarianization and mechanization. At this moment, the main concerns of workers were working conditions and the amount of money they could receive for the sale of their labor power. Not having control of the political process to promulgate laws in their favor, strikes and organization represented the means of achieving their economic goals. Therefore, trade and cigar unions were not only concerned with the incorporation of gender into the industry, but also by the numbers of male workers, both skilled and unskilled, who were overcrowding the industry and, who like women, were unorganized. In terms of this concern, Consuelo S. Marcial, a female cigar worker, advised non-organized male cigar workers to join the union because the organization represented for workers the best, most effective and secure option to gain strength in order to demand respect from employers respect for their rights.[335] This call is interesting in that it was coming from a female worker who was a member of the union to male cigar makers who were not members.

[335] El Eco del Torcedor, "A los torcedores no organizados," November 7, 1908, 2.

During the strikes of 1918 and 1919, for example, cigar makers demanded a voice in the control of production but the Company had another view. The principal demand of cigar makers was for the employer to provide employment for all the workers by restricting the daily output of cigars. The Company argued that a combination of overproduction of cigars, together with a tax imposed on tobacco products had resulted in increased prices to the consumers, and produced a drop in the sale of cigars in the United States. Under these circumstances, to maintain or increase their profits, PRATCO decided to lower production costs by reducing personnel, particularly men, and to increase productivity. A way to realize this goal was by incorporating machines and employing more women in the industry. As a warning to the government and to exert pressure, the Trust also maintained that the strike was causing a loss of revenues for the government, an important source of income for local authorities.

The impasse between workers and employers was finally resolved in favor of the Trust. By 1919 the structure of the cigar industry had changed sufficiently in Puerto Rico to allow the use of machinery in production, the establishment of new branches for the purpose of dispersing production and reducing the impact of strikes, and the creation of a new labor source drawn from the rank and file within the industry, tendencies that were consolidated during the 1920s.

Gender Relations in the Cigar Industry

Employers' goals in Puerto Rico followed the dictates of what big business had been able to establish in the United States through the use of the new management and technology during the period under study. As argued by Ileen A. Devault, to increase returns on the investment, cigar companies had to control three critical areas: wages,

hours and weeks of work, and discipline in the factory.[336]

By the beginning of the 1920s decade, employers in the cigar industry were getting the upper hand in their relationship with employees. Cigar workers' autonomy and their control of the production process were coming to an end. The incorporation of women into the industry at this critical time had a great impact not only on the industry as a whole, but also on relations between workers, and eventually on the cigar workers' culture. Female workers, who represented mainly the unskilled cigar workers coming into this industry, were at the center of the internal labor conflict together with the issue of skill. The way workers managed these conflicts was crucial for the growth and strength of the organized labor movement. Among urban and industrial workers, cigar workers represented an important sector for the future direction of organized labor in Puerto Rico, in particular, the role that cigar makers and strippers could play. It was a basic fact that among the categories of workers in the cigar industry, cigar makers and strippers, judging by their numbers, superseded all other categories. In addition, these two groups were the most militant during conflicts with the employers and the most oriented toward being organized. However, the same work culture that had impacted cigar makers and strippers had both a positive and negative impact on their relationship, influencing their solidarity but also causing distancing by reason of gender. As expressed by Iris Young:

> Gender, like class, is a vast multifaceted, layered, complex, and overlapping set of structures and objects. Women are the individuals who are positioned as feminine by the activities surrounding these structures and objects.[337]

---

[336] See Ileen A. Devault, United Apart: Gender and the Rise of Craft Unionism, 2004.
[337] Iris Marion Young, "Gender as Seriality: Thinking about Women as a Social Collective." Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society 19, 31 (Spring 1994): 728.

This means that there are ways in which workers manifested their gender and class identities both simultaneously and serially. Most of what has been written about labor historiography in Puerto Rico largely examines work culture as practiced mainly by groups of males. The work culture, however, has to be seen more dynamically, incorporating similar or common and different experiences among women in cigar industry.

In terms of the cigar makers' culture, the question of whether it followed a pattern of inclusion and equality or a pattern of exclusion and subordination needs to be addressed. As pointed out in chapter III, cigar workers shared some practices at work and in their community, practices that defined their world and have been considered by some historians as cigar makers' distinct work culture. While initially this culture promoted the perception that *all* cigar workers shared this culture or some elements of it, or the perception that gender did not play a role in the acceptance, rejection, or modification of it, in practice working men and women interpreted this culture differently. The cigar makers' work culture was not free of ambiguities and contradictions as was shown in the unequal treatment and differential outcomes for cigar makers, female workers, and unskilled workers, the three main constituents of this work culture. As expressed by Patricia A. Cooper, this culture "embodied values that were at once egalitarian and exclusivistic, generous and reactionary, anticapitalist and accommodationist."[338]

The development of the cigar industry in Puerto Rico is representative of the power relationship between employers and workers. It had a major social impact upon a sector of the working class. In this industry, cigar makers promoted a culture in which

[338] Cooper, Once a Cigarmaker, 4-5.

they had control over time and working conditions. This kind of culture was based on their solidarity and loyalty to each other and in the skills acquired after a long process of apprenticeship. Employers were in constant tension with workers due to cigar makers' culture and to their demand for respect and dignity. The Trust and other employers considered this culture to be an obstacle for increasing their profits and their right to conduct business in the most efficacious manner for the Company.

Gender, however, represented a new factor to be taken into account in the worker-employer relationship. In terms of women, the issue of power inequality was present when compared to male workers and the inequality in the workplace produced by employers. In this sense, a careful definition of work culture should be employed that is not limited to that which was practiced by groups of male workers. Women's work culture in the cigar industry should be understood as the way women perceived and imposed social order, acted out their own rules, and constructed meaning in their lives. In this sense, women shared class characteristics with male workers but also experienced differences based on their gender.[339]

Work culture among cigar workers has to be explained on three levels. The practices followed mainly by male workers, practices followed by female workers, and the practices common to the majority of workers, such as the use of the Reader. Similar to what Cooper found in her research, the work culture among male workers in Puerto Rico was expressed in their autonomy, collective identity, control over work, respect for manliness, duty to the trade, loyalty to one another, and the traveling system.

Female work culture was expressed in terms of their opposition to sexual harassment; their distance from their employers, and wanting to challenge employers at

[339] See Alice Kessler-Harris, "Problems of Coalition-building," 119.

the right moment; working in teams rather than depending on individual skills; and observing strict work schedules. There were other traits of the male cigar culture that did not apply to female workers such as the traveling system. If for male cigar makers skills were traditionally obtained after a long process of apprenticeship, time and experience, for female workers skills were acquired from the training in the use of new technology incorporated into the industry and the division of labor used by employers. Women workers in the cigar industry demanded respect for their dignity, honor, rights, and justice from employers, as well as from comrades in the struggle. Dignity, for example, had a different meaning for men and women laboring in the cigar industry. While dignity for men referred mainly to the practice of the craft, females referred to the capacity to retain their sense of place while earning a living.

The gender issue is crucial to understanding the changes taking place in the industry and the perception of the labor movement that the entry of women into the wage labor force represented a threat. Since cigar makers were unable to keep women out of the factory, their antagonism toward women's participation only undermined the long-term prospects for the union. Hence, while gender played a key role in distancing women and men working in the same industry, class solidarity represented a factor that united them against employers and capitalists as their common enemies.

The history of organizing workers in the cigar industry in the period under study reveals moments when an environment of cooperation, of inter-relation and of interaction existed between men and women workers. This was the particular situation during conflicts with employers where "cross-gender strikes" occurred.[340] This type of action

[340] This term is used to define those strikes in which females and males workers participated. See Devault, United Apart, 2.

was mainly based on class solidarity. In Ponce, on August 23, 1917, for example, a group of female cigar makers working at La Sultana factory declared a strike demanding better wages for working a certain type of tobacco. The women's actions provoked male cigar makers to join the strike.[341] One month later, at the end of September, a group of female strippers declared a strike in La Habanera, La Colectiva branch in Mayagüez, demanding better wages and working conditions. A Strike Committee of nine female workers was organized that had the support of the FFL and of a group of male cigar workers from the same branch.[342] Another instance occurred on November 4, 1918, in the factory of Tomás Rodríguez located in Cayey, when thirty cigar makers declared a strike in support of twelve female tobacco strippers who were demanding a reduction in the tobacco load from 12 pounds (for $0.20) to 6 or 8 pounds (for $0.20).[343]

Nevertheless, the institutional characteristics of the cigar makers' union and their cultural expression, as discussed in the previous chapter, played a major role in gender tensions within the labor movement in Puerto Rico, particularly in organizational drives in the cigar industry. This was a case where a group of male workers in the cigar industry, and some of their male leaders, regarded female workers with suspicion, considering that female workers represented an obstacle for the consolidation of workers' forces. Women had no access to the power structure in a union dominated by males who insisted in defining the role and place that women should play against employers and against capitalism. The need or desire to organize female workers was not only a question of class solidarity; implicit also was the incentive to protect the earning power of

[341] Unión Obrera, "Huelga en Ponce," August 28, 1917,1.
[342] Unión Obrera, "Despalilladoras en huelga en Mayagüez," October 8, 1917, 2.
[343] Porto Rico, Bureau of Labor, Annual Report, 1919, 30.

men. As competitors for the same jobs, some cigar maker organizers thought that women could be controlled better from within rather than from the outside. This perception and position proved to be a disaster for strengthening and consolidating the union in the industry, and was a setback to the overall interests of the organized labor movement.

The case of Puerto Rico showed some movement away from pure and simple craft unionism. The aim was to bring all factories or branches workers into one single union, an objective established in the 1907 cigar makers conference. Labor organizations were interested in bringing female workers into the union and although male leaders did not necessarily provide space and voice for female workers, they did take seriously women's demands against employers.

Male cigar makers and their organizational movement were not immune to the friction, resentments, mistrust, and defensiveness raised in general by male workers against the incorporation of women in the world of work. Men's attitudes, however, can be explained not only as a form of historically based gender discrimination, but also as a function of the social position they had acquired in society based on their monopoly of skills as cigar makers. The main concern in the organized labor movement, and among male cigar workers, was their perception that women tended to reduce wages in the industry, thereby devaluing their position or status. This concern was not without foundation because technology and new managerial practices reduced or eliminated the control and the jobs of the skilled workers. In 1911, for example, during a strike of tobacco selectors, male workers complained that employers were using "unfortunates, ignorant, and unskilled women" to substitute them in their work. They acknowledged that women had the same right to do any kind of job, but maintained that the use of

women by employers as strikebreakers or to reduce the price of work should not be allowed. If women wanted to work they should demand the prices stipulated without degrading the work. Similar strikebreaking situations of tobacco selectors occurred in Aguas Buenas, Caguas, San Lorenzo, and Cayey.[344]

Conflict with employers was the main issue of both work cultures, and their strikes reflected common issues such as demands to improve bad stock, to fire or restore a foreman, to increase wages, and to stop changes in the system of work. The tactics utilized in undertaking struggles were similar in factories employing male and female workers. In instances, women rioted outside the factories, occupied buildings, attacked scabs physically, or sabotaged production. There were cases of women being accompanied in the picket line by their small children. Women supported strikes and their right to work in a militant ways, sometimes using physical force to oppose the entrance of strikebreakers into the factories. In "La Colectiva, La Marina" branch, for example, a violent incident occurred when a riot broke out as a group of female strikebreakers tried to force their way into the factory. The police intervened, arresting strikers Emilia Alonso, Angeles Colón, Segunda Géigel and Rafaela Martínez. In this incident strikebreaker Carmen Nieves ended up with a broken head. A similar incident took place at the same time in Puerta de Tierra in the main branch of "La Colectiva.". In this case, Alejandrina Genaro, a strikebreaker, suffered a head contusion; and strikers Gabriela Muriel and Agustina Lansón were arrested.[345] The article mentions that the strike was not broken because of the actions taken by women.

Pablo Vega Santos, the FFL organizer in the area of Caguas, in his report on the

[344] Pablo Vega, "De Caguas," Unión Obrera, July 14, 1911, 1.
[345] El Tiempo, "Dos mujeres heridas y seis arrestadas," October 21, 1916, 1.

strike in the branch of La Colectiva in Caguas, states that "women offered more evidence of audacity and resistance than the totality of men who mainly were murmuring and expressing their desire to go back to work." According to him, these female comrades had more courage, integrity, and enthusiasm than a good number of men.[346] In another incident in Caguas, a group of nine female workers signed an article arguing that according to their understanding no socialist would oppose women's participation in the labor force. In this particular, they congratulated FFL organizers and socialists Severo Torruellas and Pedro Correa. However, the group of women argued that those women working in the Johnson cigar factory who opposed their actions were members of the Republican and Union parties.[347]

Women as a group were not united by gender or class; they were responding in different ways to their reality, with some supporting organization and collective efforts as the best way to improve their lives, while others preferred to act individually or on their own. It can be pointed out, using records of the period, that cases occurred where women failed to support other women in the industries or failed to support organizing drives based on their roles or place they occupied in the cigar industry. The evidence suggests that not all female workers in the cigar industry were employed as strippers or were below this category of work. There were women, for example, employed as rezagadores and foremen who received better wages and benefits than the rest of female workers. In this regard, there was the case of female workers employed stripping tobacco whose work was marked by the differences in the wages they received. There were gradations in the

[346] Pablo Vega Santos, "De Caguas," Unión Obrera, July 26, 1911, 3.
[347] Unión Obrera, "Felicitación," November 10, 1915, 1. The article was signed by Gregoria Pujols, Belén Torres Aranjo, Ana Rodríguez de López, Eugenia Bonilla Aranjo, Ramona Rivera Rodríguez, Ignacia Hernández, Marcola Vélez, María L. Vázquez, and Basilia Santiago.

wages received by female workers in stripping tobacco. A 1919 contract between a tobacco stripper company and the female workers shows that although all women belonged to the stripper category, there were different tasks and payment for the work, such as abridoras ($0.25 per load of 18 pounds), selectors ($0.25 per load of 18 pounds), revisadoras ($0.90 per day of nine hours), engavilladoras ($0.32 per every 100 gavillas), women per day ($0.60 for eight hours of work), and wetting ($1.00 per day of nine hours).[348]

In Vega Baja, a group of tobacco strippers working at the facilities of Rose, Portela y Co., Félix López e Isidro Menéndez y Co. declared a strike for mid-October 1917. Women were demanding an increase in their wages of 40¢ per day, better working conditions and respect as women. The effectiveness of the strike was threatened by the hiring of fifteen female strike-breakers. Those on the street rejected the strikebreakers' intervention, calling them poor specimens, adulators, traitors and sellers of their dignity.[349] On October 22, 1917, a group of strippers working at La Plata Tobacco Co., in Comerío, met in assembly and agreed on two issues: to request from the company that tobacco loads should be six pounds, and demanding that María Vizcarrondo be expelled from the factory because she was an enemy of workers and a strike-breakers' agent.[350] In another of these incidents, at the end of August 1919, Juma Malaret, Josefa Pérez, tobacco strippers in Puerta de Tierra, physically attacked Estefanía Campos, considered to be a strike-breaker, provoking nose and neck contusions.[351]

Cases occurred where female workers showed no class or gender solidarity. A

[348]El Mundo, "Convenio firmado entre la Porto Rico Leaf Tobacco Co. Y los trabajadores de la misma en Comerío," April 30, 1919, 3.
[349]Unión Obrera, "Lucha obrera intensísima. Huelga de despalilladoras," October 16, 1917, 1.
[350]Unión Obrera, October 23, 1917, 3.
[351]El Tiempo, "Dice que fue agredida," August 29, 1919, 2.

male worker, for example, complained in an article about the lack of solidarity of a group of women who remained working while other female strippers were on strike. He considered that women should unite to fight together for their rights.[352] A second article in El Vigilante explains the reasons that moved some female strippers to remain working while the rest of the strippers were on strike. It was a matter of moral concern expressed by some of the women in a petition to their employer. They requested that he not place female workers with bad reputations together with ladies and children working in the factory. The reason, according to the article, was to avoid certain employees who played "certain dishonest games with those women."[353] The situation shows an internal split among a group of female workers based on a moral condition and not on gender.

In "La Colectiva" in San Juan, "La Marina" branch, a group of female workers complained about the inability or difficulty of married women getting a job, while other women with less need or experience were hired without a problem. The reason expressed in the article was that newly hired women had the "sympathies" of the foreman.[354] There was also the case of a group of stemmers who rejected the union, the strike, male workers and fellow female workers, and were willing to accept any conditions if they were re-hired immediately. There was also the case of a group of 150 female stemmers who were on strike in Cidra demanding better wages and conditions of work. However, around 100 of them decided to go back to work without gaining any concessions from employers. The rest of the group stayed out of the factory on strike. The striking women argued that they too were poor and had great need but that they also had dignity. They accused the

[352]El Vigilante, Defensor de la Huelga, "Hacia la razón," February 15, 1911, 2.
[353]El Vigilante, Defensor de la Huelga, "Conversando," February 15, 1911, 2.
[354]Unión Obrera, "¡Pobres mujeres! signed by "Varias operarias," November 12, 1915, 1; "Las trabajadoras de la Colectiva: ¡Pobres mujeres,!signedby "Varias operarias, November 23, 1915, 1; "¡Pobres mujeres,! Las trabajadoras de la Colectiva," signed by "Varias operarias," December 3, 1915, 3.

group that returned to work of contributing to their suffering because their actions provoked the employer to not allow them to return to their place of work.[355]

By the end of 1920, Prudencio Rivera Martínez, President and organizer in Puerto Rico of the CMIU, stated the policy of the union with respect to wages paid to male and female workers employed in the cigar industry. He declared that no reduction in wages would be allowed and that employers were informed of the union's position. Under no circumstance would a reduction in the salaries received by men and women working in the elaboration of cigar or employed in any other department of the industry in the Island be allowed.[356] But Rivera Martínez's statement was too little and too late, to change or stop the displacement process occurring in the cigar industry and negatively impacting the labor movement.

Conclusion

According to the themes discussed in this chapter, the case of Puerto Rico during the early years of the twentieth century suggests that cigar making was an industry that maintained differentials in wages and status. However, the transformations that occurred between 1890 and 1920 in the cigar industry in Puerto Rico demonstrated that technology and new managing practices were capable of reversing the advantages self-assigned and maintained by cigar makers. Under the new environment, unskilled and semi-skilled workers were integrated into the industry, particularly female workers who were able, at some point, to elaborate cigars with the help of machines.

Cigar workers in general and cigar makers in particular, both the men and women employed in the industry, tried to resist and oppose the changes introduced by employers

[355] Justicia, "Huelga de despalilladoras en Cidra," November 24, 1919, 3.
[356] Prudencio Rivera Martínez, "Actitud resuelta. Así deben hacer todos los oficios," Unión Obrera, December 14, 1920, 1

that were having a negative impact in their craft autonomy. In resisting they realized the need to organize new workers and to promote unions in the cigar industry, and acquired a new understanding of the role that they should play in the labor movement as defenders of the working class. As a result, they demonstrated that cigar workers were not a passive component of the working class.

Promoting the organization of workers, however, generated internal contradictions, such as the ones represented by the organizational scheme assumed by male labor leaders to deal with the incorporation of female workers into the cigar industry. Although from an ideological perspective this incorporation did not represent a major issue, the practice demonstrated a different situation. Gender segmentation emerged as a factor that was never satisfactorily solved for males and females during the period under study.

CONCLUSIONS

Cigar workers represented a small sector of the Puerto Rican labor force, but constituted a vanguard of the urban proletariat that was able to give shape and leadership to the early organized labor movement in the country's history. However, their role was influenced by the types of changes introduced in the development of the cigar industry in Puerto Rico, and the prominent participation of PRATCO (ATC) in the tobacco industry in the country. The cigar industry is a representative case in Puerto Rican history of introducing a new industrial work process and order in the workplace.

The cigar industry as established in Puerto Rico became an important producer of cigars and played an important role as a leading cigar-manufacturing center within the U.S. cigar industry. It had the same importance as factories established in New York, New Jersey, Chicago, Tampa, and Key West. In addition, it was the major urban employer in Puerto Rico with a relatively large concentration of male and female workers employed in factories and small production centers. PRATCO was the most important company among those companies competing in this industry. The principal employer of cigar workers on the island, PRATCO manufactured two-thirds of all cigars made in Puerto Rico. PRATCO factories established new forms of production, segmenting the work, and increasing the number of female workers.

The pattern followed in the development of the cigar industry in Puerto Rico suggests that it was not much different from what was occurring in the United States. Employers were interested in altering the structure of production, moving away from an individual type of production to mass production, promoting the substitution of unskilled workers for skilled workers, promoting gender preference by hiring women to

displace male workers, and influencing the response and behavior of workers. Deskilling practices, for example, helped employers reduce their dependency on cigar-makers, and, at the same time, aided them in undermining the bargaining power of cigar workers and their work culture.

The size of the factory, the discipline of the workplace, and the displacement of skilled workers were patterns employed by PRATCO and other companies that influenced the development of the cigar industry in Puerto Rico. Furthermore, the industry was geared mainly to the United States market; in fact, the free entry of tobacco products from Puerto Rico into this market after 1900 was a major factor in the establishment and development of the cigar industry in Puerto Rico. During the first two decades of the twentieth-century, the island emerged as a major cigar-manufacturing center for the United States market.

The introduction of new technology and new management in the workplace caused a reduction in the need for skilled workers, such as cigar makers. The introduction of the mold as a technological advance that allowed the standardization and simplification of the work, for example, provided employers with the opportunity to change production from skilled to unskilled workers. The employers reorganized some areas of cigar production such as bunching, previously a cigar makers' task, into a teamwork system that allowed unskilled workers to undertake this work. For cigar workers the teamwork system represented a displacement threat and in response they organized in an effort to control their work. In the case of steaming, a task performed by male workers by the end of the nineteenth century that required little skill, employers increased the number of female workers hired for this work. Employers then reduced the

wages paid to women for steaming. Women also worked without legal protection since employers knew that they had a large pool of women waiting to be employed in the cigar industry who had few alternatives to finding employment.

The period under study was a moment when segments of the working-class in Puerto Rico searched for ways to channel their social and economic concerns. The organization of a labor movement to confront employers in the defense of their interests was an alternative explored by urban workers from different trades. But it was one particular group of workers—those employed in the cigar industry—, who played a major role in the events that shaped the early struggle for a labor movement in Puerto Rico.

The elaboration of cigars constituted during this period the only large-scale industry that could be defined as such, and in which a high number of male and female workers were employed in large factories. Workers moved in several directions in search of strategies that would help them to protect their role and position within the working class and society-at-large. They organized themselves in the cigar makers' union and became members of the Free Federation of Labor, and affiliated with the American Federation of Labor and the Cigar Makers' International Union. They also were able to incorporate women in their organization and struggles, although seldom in decision-making positions.

Cigar makers in Puerto Rico reacted in similar ways to cigar workers in the United States, Cuba, and the Philippines, promoting a culture and a way of working that gave them control over time, production, and working conditions. For example, during the period under study, cigar workers' strikes followed similar patterns in all four countries. Resistance to the way work was reorganized in the cigar making industry was

for all of them the main focus of strikes or one of the most important. Furthermore, in these countries, the development and consolidation of cigar workers' unions represented a major issue in their disputes with employers. Therefore, this dissertation suggests that the experience of Puerto Rican cigar workers cannot be considered as an exception or isolated case. On the contrary, their experience has to be contextualized and analyzed, taking into consideration what was occurring in these countries.

The threat to their work culture, the incorporation of female workers in the industry, the conflict and solidarity between male and female workers, and the frequent strikes against employers were some of the issues present in the cigar industry in Puerto Rico. However, this was not a unique case because similar issues were also present during the same period of time in the cigar industry in the United States, Cuba, and the Philippines.

Anarchism has been a topic in Puerto Rico that remains in relative obscurity. Few are the works that explore their presence, influence, and contribution to Puerto Rican society. This ideology, however, became an important influence over workers during the early years of the organized labor movement in Puerto Rico. Workers modified ideas and issues expressed by European anarchist writers, tailoring them according to Puerto Rican circumstances and to their fellow workers' conditions. They struggled in favor of labor reforms in the workplace, and proposed a non-hierarchical society where workers played a major role.

This study found a close relationship between anarchism and cigar workers, who became the main proponents of anarchism among workers of different trades in the island. As expressed by Arturo Bird-Cardona, their militancy, the passion of their ideas,

their prolific literary production and constant denunciation of the injustices prevailing against the working class in Puerto Rican society gained them prestige among workers, and provided the opportunity to influence the labor movement.[357] Peter de Shazo wrote that during the first decades of the twentieth century in Chile, "the great majority of union men and women may not have understood the teachings of Kropotkin or Marx, but they perceived the potential benefits of organization."[358] A similar statement can be made in the case of Puerto Rican workers who also perceived the potential benefits of organization. Some of these workers were influenced by anarchism and developed as leaders and organizers in the cigar industry during the period under study. The early proponents of anarchism did not have a high level of ideological development, however, wherein their writings and actions they clearly identified the state, the Church, and capitalism as their enemies. Furthermore, anarchist ideas served organizers in promoting a sense of class identity among workers, the notion that unions were instruments for improving their lives and institutions to protect them against repression. Another characteristic of anarchism in Puerto Rico was that their supporters or followers were predominantly native-born workers.

The history of anarchism in Puerto Rico shows that anarchists did not constitute a majority in the labor movement or of cigar workers' organizations. However, their importance and major role lay in their work as propagandists – verbally and in written form – of new ways to organize society where workers would form the center of social and political organization. Furthermore, they demonstrated their leadership in their efforts to organize workers in the cigar industry, and also moved around the country organizing

[357] Bird-Cardona, "Between the Insular Road and San Juan Bay," 109.
[358] Peter De Shazo, Urban Workers and Labor Unions in Chile (Madison, Wisconsin: University of Wisconsin Press), 210.

other workers. They participated in social studies groups, and some of them published books. In Puerto Rico, it was mainly the Free Federation of Labor that celebrated annual meetings and congresses. The cigar workers' unions were the exception to this situation; their importance and leadership led them to organize similar activities exclusively for cigar workers.

During the period under study, a group of Puerto Rican anarchist writers emerged who belonged to different trades but expressed similar ideas. They were mainly influenced by European anarchists such as Michael Bakunin, Peter Kropotkin, and Enrico Malatesta. The influence of these authors is found in their writings expressing their rejection of the state, the Church, and of capitalism. Among Puerto Rican writers can be mentioned Ramón Romero Rosa, Eduardo Conde, Luisa Capetillo, Pablo Vega Santos, Angel M. Dieppa, Juan Vilá, and Juan José López. All of them used the available labor press, such as Unión Obrera, Justicia, and other short-lived publications.

Their writings became historical documents that provide evidence of how Puerto Ricans expressed their anarchist thought and their vision of the world as a workers' society. Their writings are important and significant sources of information to understand, in their own words, how they understood their role in society, and how they sought to change their reality. In addition, they informed other workers about the principal socialist and anarchist writers, presenting their main ideas and how these ideas could be applied in Puerto Rico. At the same time, their writings became material to be used by Readers in the factories and workplaces. In this way, they provided to those workers unable to read the opportunity to educate themselves in social and economic ideas important for the working class.

Urban workers were a major force in the early efforts of organizing labor unions in Puerto Rico. Cigar workers promoted the organization of the union as a vehicle to obtain short-term improvements in their social and economic conditions. However, they also had a long-term objective expressed in their intention to create a new society oriented by anarchist ideas. It can be argued that cigar workers, through their resistance struggles and their support for organizing urban and rural workers, were the labor group most responsible for keeping unionism alive in Puerto Rico during this period.

Some concern has been expressed over workers' understanding of and commitment to anarchist ideology as expressed by European writers. However, what some people has perceived as a "contradiction" in the workers' ideology, was perceived by them as a normal position with no contradiction for them. The case of Angel María Dieppa sheds some light on this issue. Dieppa, a cigarmaker who considered himself an anarchist, belonged to different labor organizations, from the most radical to the most conservative. He was a member of La Resistencia (The Resistance) and of the Industrial Workers of the World, when he was in New York and Tampa, and was a member of the Free Federation of Labor and the American Federation of Labor in Puerto Rico. Whether as a member of a radical or conservative organization, Dieppa never abdicated his anarchist ideology. Why? For Dieppa, the struggle against capitalism was the most important fight of all.[359]

While there is no historical account of strikes in Puerto Rico, including the period under study, this absence is not an obstacle to recognize from the evidence of this dissertation that strikes, although not always effective, were the most important instrument for cigar workers in their confrontation against employers. Strikes provided

[359] Angel María Dieppa, "La unión combinada debe ser nuestra divisa," Justicia, February 3, 1917, 8.

them a sense of self-respect and confidence, and represented a statement of their rights to question employers' authority. The analysis of cigar workers' strikes recorded during the period under study shows that strikes centered on cigar manufacturing issues. Among these issues were the protection of their right to organize or protect their unions; defense of the grievance committees in the workshops; limits on employers' ability to exercise complete control over the production process; hygienic conditions in their work places; the right to express their demands for better wages and to show solidarity with other workers in the industry.

The cigar industry was responsible for opening a space for the integration of women into the Puerto Rican labor force and the labor movement early in the twentieth century. These events occurred several decades before "Operation Bootstrap," the Puerto Rican government's industrialization program that began during the 1940s, and has been identified in the history of Puerto Rico as responsible for integrating women into the industrial economy and moving them away from home. However, the historical evidence shows that going out to work in an industrial activity occurred during the period of 1890s to 1920.

Women's struggle in Puerto Rico at the beginning of the twentieth century was in general a three-tiered struggle. As a group, women had to fight the traditional expectations of society; and, as workers, they had to fight employers in a class struggle, while also fighting the cigar union and organized labor in a gender struggle. Twentieth-century labor history in Puerto Rico cannot be discussed without including the role and importance played by women workers in the cigar factories. Women consolidated their place in the rank-and-file by supporting a variety of militant union actions against

employers and by confronting state authorities (police, etc.). At all moments, once they became involved, they often proved to be as militant as men in strikes.

The profile of the Puerto Rican population employed in industrial activities, as shown in the early censuses demonstrated that women working in tobacco stripping and cigar makers became the most important groups in the cigar industry. They were essential for the organization of workers into a union, and were key players during strikes. Cigar makers unions, however, did not provide female workers the opportunity to gain access to the power structure of the union. The exception was at the local level in female strippers and protective unions, although women workers were always supervised or responded to a male organizer. Implicit in this action was the male worker's assumption of the place and role of women in society. The number of organized working-class women in Puerto Rico represented a small fraction of the potential number that could be organized. Although it might appear to be a small number, it is also clear that between 1900 and 1920, the number of organized women workers increased in Puerto Rico, but not at a rate to be a threat to the male leadership in the FFL or to represent an organized threat to employers. In fact, the experience during the period under study was that the number of male cigar-makers was not growing at the same pace as the number of female workers incorporated into the cigar industry

Why did female workers employed in the cigar industry not have a larger number of organized members in the cigar unions? This research suggests discrimination and prejudice based on gender existed among workers in the industry as well as in the unions. In addition, there were male and female workers who did not belong to the union and sought individual answers to working conditions, by reason of apathy, or because they

could not afford to pay union membership fees and dues. Other workers rejected the union because they had ideological and political differences with the leadership of the FFL or cigar union.

By the early 1920s, the cigar industry in Puerto Rico had entered another phase, centered more on stripping than cigar-making production. While male workers, particularly cigar makers, decreased in number, role and importance among organized workers, female workers increased in number and importance in the industry. In line with this trend, by the 1930's, the bulk of cigar production in Puerto Rico was machine made, following the same pattern in terms of the equipment used and the organization of large factory units. Women operated the cigar-making machines, and along with stampers, labelers, or packers were earning wages that were as high as any group of industrial women in the country. Furthermore, when compared with men working in hand factories, earnings for men averaged much lower than those of the women machine makers. This was the case cited in the investigation that found a hand factory paying cigar-makers $5.82 for a 44-hour week, while women employed as full-time machine operators were receiving between $8.00 and $10.00 for less than 44 hours.[360] At this moment, the female for male workers substitution process in the cigar industry was completed.

Cigar workers were ideologically committed to supporting women's equal rights and defended equal payment for the same kind of work. This dissertation however suggests that workers, in general, perceived the situation as one where their jobs were threatened by other workers, and not specifically as a threat that was coming from

[360] Caroline Manning, The Employment of Women in Puerto Rico, 27-28.

women. In this sense, the factory system, the deskilling process, and new technologies adopted by the industry exerted a strong influence in changing the composition of the work force, the path followed by the organized labor movement in urban areas in establishing industrial factories.

There were moments when male and female workers overcame their gender differences and united in the struggle against employers, showing class solidarity. The wave of strikes that occurred during the period, particularly between 1909 and 1920, represented a confirmation of this class solidarity. However, there were instances that showed gender differences and female workers' subordination as well. Expressions of the subordination occurred in the leadership of the FFL where few or no women occupied a leadership position in the union at the national level; and where the wages received for the same kind of work done by a male workers was another area of discrepancy. However, in terms of this research, the most important difference between male and female workers is represented by the way work culture was interpreted by each group. It can be concluded that gender, as explored in this work, is an important factor in the analysis and understanding of changes in the cigar industry, and of how cigar makers' union and the labor movement in general perceived and reacted to women's entry into the wage labor force.

Cigar makers' culture promoted solidarity among workers, expressing in their discourse the need for a new social order centered on the capacities and aspirations of all workers. Initially, the organization of production, who will be involved in the production of cigars, became a major contradictory factor of this culture. On one hand, they were

against the mass integration of unskilled workers in their trade arguing that this type of worker would increase the supply of inferior quality cigars hurting their reputation and wages. Instead, they promoted a process of apprenticeship leading to master of the trade. On the other hand, particularly after 1907, they realized the need to organize their struggle for better wages and control of their work not by keeping unskilled workers outside of the organization, but by organizing all workers employed in the cigar industry, as expressed in the 1907 resolution for organizing the Cigar Workers Union of Puerto Rico. At this point, cigar makers transformed their struggle into a trade-unionist struggle against employers. The union became an essential instrument of support for their immediate demands.

In conclusion, this dissertation explores the role played by cigar workers in the development of the labor movement at a moment when new technology and new management practices in the cigar-making industry impacted skilled male cigar makers and unskilled female workers. These factors played a major role in altering the structure of production, in promoting a gender preference, in influencing the way workers responded to protect their position in the cigar industry and in promoting changes in the ways work was organized. Cigar workers' actions and reactions responded to a changing society in the process of consolidating a capitalist mode of production in the cigar industry, where low wages and poor working conditions remained as constants, and where technological and managerial changes represented a threat to their work culture and to their organization.

The case of cigar workers suggests the need to keep exploring the role of urban workers in the development of the labor movement in Puerto Rico. This research represents a contribution different from other works dealing with cigar and tobacco issues. It contends that the study of Puerto Rican cigar workers should be related to the changes and transformations that occurred in Puerto Rico, and concomitantly in other cigar producing countries. The case of Puerto Rico was not unique because similar processes were taking place at the same time in the United States, Cuba, and the Philippines. Some of these works concentrate in the microcosm presenting a limited scope, whereas my research places cigar workers in a larger transnational context. Bird-Cardona, for example, concentrates his study in Puerta de Tierra, a working class neighborhood in San Juan, where PRATCO established its main factory. This location, although important, did not comprise the total world of cigar workers and was not the only factory belonging to PRATCO. Other areas of San Juan, as well as municipalities such as Bayamón and Caguas, were also important in the world of cigar production in Puerto Rico. Furthermore, improving working conditions and wages in the cigar industry, as well as aspects of their work culture, were common to the workers in Tampa, Havana, and Luzon.

This research goes beyond the work done by Baldrich, who concentrates on the impact of technology over the work done in the cigar industry. My research also covers issues of technology and management in relation to cigar unions and the organization of the labor movement. In addition, Baldrich did not explore the role that strikes played in the aspirations and goals of cigar workers. Another difference from other works is found

in the study of a particular group of workers. Sanabria's research, for example, concentrates on the study of artisan groups as the main players in the early history of the labor movement and in relation to the AFL. Although he is correct in this appreciation, Sanabria deals with artisans as a collective group and did not explore the contribution of any particular group of workers.

In addition to contextualizing the development of the cigar industry during the early years of the twentieth century, this research also explores the development of the cigar industry in Puerto Rico before 1898. In the same way, I explore the influence of anarchism over workers in a more extended way, discussing its origins in Puerto Rico, its main anarchist thinkers and local anarchist writers. My work is more inclusive, expanding the discussion of issues of work and organization from cigar makers to cigar workers, because the other workers were also participants in the events that took place in this industry. Finally, gender and ideology as explored in this dissertation are key factors to be taken into consideration in the analysis of the labor movement in Puerto Rico.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

PRIMARY SOURCES

Archival Sources

American Federation of Labor. Samuel Gompers and William Green Letterbooks, 1901-1924.

American Federation of Labor. Proceedings, 1898-1920.

Puerto Rico. Archivo General de Puerto Rico. Fondo: Departamento de Estado. Serie: Corporaciones con fines de lucro.

Puerto Rico. Archivo General de Puerto Rico. Fondo: Departamento de Estado. Serie: Corporaciones sin fines de lucro.

Portela vs. The American Tobacco Company. D.P.R. 4, 1903.

United States vs. American Tobacco Company. 221 US 106.

United States. National Archives and Records Administration. Bureau of Insular Affairs. Record Group 350, File 975.

Printed Sources

Periodicals

Campaña Obrera. 1906.

Cigar Makers' Official Journal. 1908.

Conciencia Popular. 1919.

La Correspondencia de Puerto Rico. 1897, 1898, 1911, 1915, 1922.

La Democracia. 1897, 1898, 1904, 1907, 1917, 1919.

El Centinela. 1909.

El Comunista. 1920.

El Criterio Libre. 1900.

El Eco Proletario. 1892.

El Eco del Torcedor. 1908-1909.

El Liberal. 1898.

El Mundo. 1919.

El Obrero. 1889.

El Obrero Libre. 1902.

El Pan del Pobre. 1901.

El Porvenir Social. 1898, 1899.

El Tiempo. 1911, 1916-1919.

El Trabuco. 1900, 1901.

El Vigilante. 1911.

Ensayo Obrero. 1897, 1898.

La Federación Libre. 1899.

La Gaceta de Puerto Rico. 1898.

La Justicia, 1901.

Justicia. 1914-1921.

La Huelga. 1911.

La Voz del Obrero. 1903, 1919.

La Voz Humana. 1907.

Luz y Vida. 1909,1910.

New York Times. 1898-1920.

Puerto Rico Eagle. 1902, 1911.

Puerto Rico Workingmen's Journal. 1905, 1910, 1911.

Revista de Agricultura, Industria y Comercio, 1886-1891.

Revista Obrera. 1893.

The Tobacco Leaf. 1907.

Unión Obrera. 1904-1921.

United States Tobacco Journal.

Yo Acuso. 1918.

Government Publications

Ames, Azel. Labor Conditions in Porto Rico. United States, Department of Labor. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1901.

Carroll, Henry K. Report on the Island of Porto Rico. Washington, D. C.: Government Printing Office, 1900.

Manning, Caroline. The Employment of Women in Puerto Rico. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1934.

Marcus, Joseph. Labor Conditions in Porto Rico. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1919.

Peterson, Florence. Strikes in the United States, 1880-1936. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1938.

Porto Rico. Department of Agriculture and Labor. Bureau of Labor. Fifth Annual Report of the Bureau of Labor to the Legislative Assembly of Porto Rico. San Juan, PR: Bureau of Supplies, Printing, and Transportation, 1917.

Porto Rico. Department of Agriculture and Labor. Bureau of Labor. Twelfth Annual Report of the Bureau of Labor to the Legislative Assembly of Porto Rico. San Juan, PR: Bureau of Supplies, Printing, and Transportation, 1928.

Porto Rico. Department of Labor, Charities, and Correction. Bureau of Labor. Fourth Annual Report of Bureau of Labor to the Legislature of Porto Rico. San Juan, PR: Bureau of Supplies, Printing, and Transportation, 1916.

Porto Rico. Department of Labor, Charities and Corrections. Bureau of Labor. The Need of Providing Land for the Laboring Classes in Puerto de Tierra. San Juan, PR: Bureau of Supplies, Printing and Transportation, 1913.

Porto Rico. Department of Labor, Charities, and Corrections. Bureau of Labor. Second Report of the Bureau of Labor to the Legislature of Porto Rico. San Juan, PR: Bureau of Supplies, Printing and Transportation, 1914.

Porto Rico. Department of Labor, Charities, and Corrections. Bureau of Labor. Seventh Annual Report of the Bureau of Labor to the Legislature of Porto Rico. San Juan, PR: Bureau of Supplies, Printing and Transportation, 1920.

Porto Rico. Department of Labor, Charities, and Correction. Bureau of Labor. Special Report of Bureau of Labor to the Legislature of Porto Rico, 1912. San Juan, PR: Bureau of Supplies, Printing, and Transportation, 1913.

Porto Rico. Department of Labor, Charities, and Corrections. Bureau of Labor. Strike of the Tobacco Workers Against the Porto Rican-American Tobacco Co. San Juan, PR: Bureau of Supplies, Printing and Transportation, 1914.

Porto Rico. Department of Labor, Charities, and Corrections. Bureau of Labor. Third Annual Report of the Bureau of Labor to the Legislative Assembly of Porto Rico. San Juan, PR: Bureau of Supplies, Printing, and Transportation, 1915.

Porto Rico. Legislature. First Report of the Legislative Committee to Investigate the Industrial and Agricultural Uneasiness and Restlessness Causing Unemployment in Porto Rico. San Juan, PR: n.e., 1930.

Porto Rico. Legislature. Second Report of the Legislative Committee to Investigate the Industrial and Agricultural Uneasiness and Restlessness Causing Unem ployment in Porto Rico. San Juan, PR: n.e., 1931.

Porto Rico. Legislature. Third Report of the Legislative Committee to Investigate the Industrial and Agricultural Uneasiness and Restlessness Causing Unemployment in Porto Rico.San Juan, PR: n.e., 1932.

Puerto Rico. Bureau of Labor.Report on the Housing Conditions of Laborers in Porto Rico, 1914. San Juan, PR: Bureau of Supplies, Printing, and Transportation, 1914.

Puerto Rico. Bureau of Agriculture and Labor.Bureau of Labor.Strikes in Puerto Rico During the Fiscal Year 1917-1918. San Juan, PR: Bureau of Supplies, Printing, and Transportation, 1918.

Puerto Rico. Departamento de Agricultura y Trabajo. Negociado del Trabajo. Noveno informe anual del Negociado del Trabajo. San Juan, PR: Negociado de Materiales, Imprenta y Transportación, 1923.

Puerto Rico. Departamento de Agricultura y Trabajo. Negociado del Trabajo. 6to. Informe anual del Negociado del Trabajo. San Juan, PR: Negociado del Trabajo, 1919.

Puerto Rico. Departamento de Agricultura y Trabajo. Negociado del Trabajo. Decimo-cuarto informe anual del Negociado del Trabajo. San Juan, PR: Negociado de Materiales, Imprenta y Transporte, 1930.

Puerto Rico. Departamento del Trabajo. Compilación de leyes obreras vigentes en Puerto Rico. San Juan, PR: Negociado de Materiales, Imprenta y Transporte, 1931.

Puerto Rico. Documents on the Constitutional History of Puerto Rico. Washington, D.C.: Office of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, 1964.

Puerto Rico. Governor Annual Reports. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, Series 1900-1921.

Puerto Rico. Legislature. First-Third Report (1930-1932) of the Legislative Committee on Unemployment to Investigate the Industrial and Agricultural Uneasiness.San Juan, PR: n.e., 1932.

Puerto Rico. Negociado del Trabajo. Compilación de leyes obreras, 1902-1921. San Juan, PR: Negociado de Materiales, Imprenta y Transporte, 1922.

Puerto Rico. Puerto Rico Reconstruction Administration. Census of Puerto Rico: 1935: Population and Agriculture. Washington, D.C., 1938.

Puerto Rico. Secretary's Office. Register of Porto Rico, 1901, 1910, 1926. San Juan, PR: n.e., 1901, 1910, and 1926.

United States. Bureau of Corporations.Position of the Tobacco Combination in the Industry.Report of the Commissioner of Corporations on the Tobacco Industry. Part I. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1911.

United States. Bureau of Corporations.Report of the Commissioner of Corporations on the Tobacco Industry. Part II: Capitalization, Investment, and Earnings. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1911.

United States. Bureau of Labor.Twenty-First Annual Report: Strikes and Lockouts. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1907.

United States. Congress.56th Congress, 2nd.Session.House.Agricultural Resources and Capabilities of Porto Rico. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1901.

United States. Congress. 56th Congress, 1st Session. Senate. Free Trade Between the United States and Puerto Rico, Document 195. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1901.

United States. Congress.56thCongress, 2nd.Session.House. Report of Military Governor of Porto Rico. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1901.

United States. Congress. 57th Congress, 1st Session. Senate. Report of the Commissioner of the Interior for Porto Rico.Document 5. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1902.

United States. Congress.Hearings before the Special Committee of the House of Representatives to Investigate the Taylor and Other Systems of Shop Management.2 volumes. Washington, D.C.: GPO, 1912.

United States, Department of Commerce and Labor. Bureau of Statistics.Commercial Porto Rico in 1906. Washington, D.C.: GPO, 1907.

United States. Department of Commerce and Labor.Bureau of the Census. Thirteenth Annual Report, Hand and Machine Labor. 2 vols. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1899.

United States. Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census. Fourteenth Census of the United States Taken in the Year 1920. Volume I, Population: Number and Distribution of Inhabitants. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1921.

United States. Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census.Fourteenth Census of the United States: 1920. Bulletin: Population: Porto Rico. Composition and Characteristics of the Population. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1921.

United States. Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census.Fourteenth Census of the United States Taken in the Year 1920. Volume IX, Manufactures 1919. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1923.

United States. Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census. Fifteenth Census of the United States, 1930.Census of Agriculture and Population. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1933.

United States. Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census. Thirteenth Census of the United States Taken in the Year 1910. Volume IV: Population 1910, Occupation Statistics. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1913.

United States. Department of Commerce and Labor, Bureau of Statistics. Commercial Porto Rico in 1906. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1907.

United States. Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census. Thirteenth Census of the United States Taken in the Year 1910.Statistics for Porto Rico. Washington, D.C.: GPO, 1913.

United States. Immigration Commission. Reports of the Immigration Commission. New York: ARNO Press, 1970. [Reprint]

United States. War Department. Division of Insular Affairs. Reports of Brig. Gen. George W. Davies on Industrial and Economic Conditions of Puerto Rico. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1900.

United States. War Department. Porto Rico Census Office. Report on the Census of Porto Rico, 1899. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1900.

Weyl, Walter E. Labor Conditions in Porto Rico. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1905.

SECONDARY SOURCES

Abad, José Ramón. La exposición agrícola e industrial de tabaco realizada en Ponce, Puerto Rico, durante el mes de diciembre de 1883. Memoria que presenta la Junta Directiva redactada de orden de la misma. San Juan, PR: El Vapor, 1884.

_____. Puerto Rico en la feria-exposición de Ponce en 1882: memoria redactada de orden de la junta directiva de la misma. Ponce, PR: Tipografía El Comercio, 1885.

Abbott, Edith. Women in Industry. A Study in American Economic History. New York: D. Appleton and Comp., 1910. Reprinted ARNO Press, 1969.

Abril, Mariano. El socialismo moderno. San Juan, PR: Tipografía "La Primavera," 1911.

Acosta-Belén, Edna, editor. The Puerto Rican Woman: Perspectives on Culture, History, and Society. New York: Praeger, 1986.

Aguayo, Rafael C. Manual del cultivo del tabaco. Ponce, PR: s.e., 1884.

Alonso Torres, Rafael. Cuarenta años de lucha proletaria. San Juan, PR: Imprenta Baldrich, 1939.

AlvarezCurbelo, Silvia. Un país del porvenir: el afán de modernidad en Puerto Rico (siglo xix). San Juan, PR: Ediciones Callejón, 2001.

Alvarez Juncos, José. La ideología política del anarquismo español (1868-1910). Madrid: Siglo Veintiuno Editores, 1976.

Anderson, Mary. "The Federal Government Recognizes the Problems of Women in Industry." American Federationist. 32, 6 (June 1925): 452-454.

Andrews, John B. and W. D. P. Bliss. History of Women in Trade Unions. New York: ARNO Press, 1974. [Reprint of the 1911 edition published as Volume 10 of the U.S. Bureau of Labor: Report on the Condition of Woman and Child Wage-Earners in the United States, in 19 Volumes, issued as Senate Document no. 645 of the 61st Congress, 2d session. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1911.]

Ayala, César. Sugar Kingdom: The Plantation Economy of the Spanish Caribbean, 1898-1934. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1999.

Ayala, César J. and Laird W. Bergad. "Rural Puerto Rico in the Early Twentieth Century Reconsidered: Land and Society, 1899-1915." Latin American Research Review 37, 2 (2001): 65-97.

Azize, Yamila. La mujer en la lucha. Río Piedras PR: Editorial Cultural, 1985.

Azize, Yamila. Luchas de la mujer en Puerto Rico, 1898-1919. San Juan, PR: Litografía Metropolitana, 1979.

Baer, Willis N. The Economic Development of the Cigar Industry in the U.S. Lancaster, Pennsylvania: Arts Printing Co., 1933.

Baerga Santini, María del Carmen. "! A la organización, a uniros como un solo hombre…!": La Federación Libre de Trabajadores y el mundo masculino del tabaco." Op.Cit. 11 (1999): 219-251.

Bakunin, Michael. God and the State. New York: Dover Publications, 1976.

Bakunin, Michael. Statism and Anarchy. Cambridge; New York: Cambridge University Press, 1990.

Baldorioty de Castro, Román. Exposición universal de París en 1867. Memoria presentada a la comisión provincial de Puerto Rico. San Juan, PR: Imprenta de Acosta, 1868.

Baldrich, Juan José. "Cigars and Cigarette in Nineteenth Century Cuba." Revista/Review Interamericana 24, 1-4 (Spring/Winter 1994): 8-35.

Baldrich, Juan José. "From the Origins of Industrial Capitalism in Puerto Rico to its Subordination to the U.S. Tobacco Trust: Rucabado and Company, 1865-1901." Revista Mexicana del Caribe 3, 5 (1998): 80-106.

Baldrich, Juan José. "Gender and the Decomposition of the Cigar-Making Craft in Puerto Rico, 1899-1934."In Puerto Rican Women's History: New Perspectives, edited by Félix V. Matos Rodríguez and Linda C. Delgado, pp. 105-125. Armonk, New York: M.E.Sharpe, 1999.

Baldrich, Juan José. Sembraron la no siembra: los cosecheros de tabaco puertorriqueños frente a las corporaciones tabacaleras, 1920-1934. Río Piedras, PR: Ediciones Huracán, 1988.

Baldwin, Roger N., editor. Kropotkin´s Revolutionary Pamphlets: A Collection of Writings by Peter Kropotkin. New York: Benjamin Blom, 1968.

Balsac, Jesús María y Santiago Valle. Revolución. Mayagüez, PR: Imprenta La Bruja, 1905.

Barceló Miller, María de Fátima. La lucha por el sufragio femenino en Puerto Rico, 1896-1935. Río Piedras, PR: Ediciones Huracán/ Centro de Investigaciones Sociales, Universidad de Puerto Rico, 1997.

Baron, Ava. "Gender and Labor History: Learning from the Past, Looking to the Future." In Work Engendered: Toward a New History of American Labor, edited by Ava Baron, 1-46. Ithaca, New York: Cornell University Press, 1991.

Bayer, Osvaldo. Los anarquistas expropiadores y otros ensayos. Buenos Aires: Editorial Planeta, 2003.

Bergad, Laird W. "Agrarian History of Puerto Rico, 1870-1930." Latin American Research Review. 13, 3 (1978): 63-94.

Bergad, Laird W. Coffee and the Growth of Agrarian Capitalism in Nineteenth-Century Puerto Rico. Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1983.

Bergad, Laird W. "Coffee and Rural Proletarianization in Puerto Rico, 1840-1898." Journal of Latin American Studies 15, 1 (May 1983): 83-100.

Bergad, Laird W. "Dos alas del mismo pájaro? : Notas sobre la historia socioeconómica comparativa de Cuba y Puerto Rico." Historia y Sociedad. (1998): 143-153.

Bergad, Laird W. "Toward Puerto Rico's Grito de Lares: Coffee, Social Stratification, and Class Conflict, 1828-1868." Hispanic American Historical Review 60 (1981): 617-642.

Berkman, Alexander. What Is Communist Anarchism? New York: Dover Publications, 1972.

Bird-Cardona, Arturo. "Between the Insular Road and San Juan Bay: The Cigar World of Puerta de Tierra." Ph.D. Dissertation, Iowa State University, 1999.

Bird-Cardona, Arturo. "La huelga cañera de 1915 y la fundación del Partido Socialista." M.A. Thesis, University of Puerto Rico, 1986.

Boletín Mercantil. Al gobierno de la nación, a los representantes en Cortes de la isla de Puerto Rico. San Juan, PR: Imprenta del Boletín Mercantil, 1892.

Bookchin, Murray. The Spanish Anarchists: The Heroic Years, 1868-1936. New York: Harper Colophon Books, 1978.

Bottomore, Tom, editor. A Dictionary of Marxist Thought. Cambridge, Mass.: Blackwell Publishers, 1995.

Brau, Salvador. "Las clases jornaleras en Puerto Rico." In Ensayos (Disquisiciones Sociológicas), pp. 13-73. Río Piedras, PR: Editorial Edil, 1971,

Breen, T. H. Tobacco Culture: The Mentality of the Great Tidewater Planters on the Eve of Revolution. Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1985.

Brody, David. Steelworkers in America: The Nonunion Era. New York: Harper, 1969.

Burgos Malavé, Eda M."El conflicto tabacalero entre Cuba y Puerto Rico en 1898. Revista de Estudios Generales. 4, 4 (julio 1989- junio 1990): 181-191.

Burkholder, Mark A., and Lyman L. Johnson.Colonial Latin America. New York: Oxford University Press, 1994.

Bushnell, David, and Neil Macaulay.The Emergence of Latin American in the Nineteenth Century. New York: Oxford University Press, 1988.

Campos, Ricardo. Apuntes sobre la expresión cultural obrera en Puerto Rico. San Juan, PR: CEREP, 1973.

Campos, Ricardo and Juan Flores. "Migración y cultura nacional puertorriqueñas: perspectivas proletarias." In Puerto Rico: identidad nacional y clases sociales, edited by Angel G. Quintero Rivera, José Luis González, Ricardo Campos, and Juan Flores, 46-81. Río Piedras, PR: Ediciones Huracán, 1981.

Capetillo, Luisa. Ensayos libertarios. Dedicados a los trabajadores de ambos sexos. Arecibo, PR: Tipografía Real Hermanos, 1907.

Capetillo, Luisa. Influencia de las ideas modernas. San Juan, PR: Tipografía Negrón Flores, 1916.

Capetillo, Luisa. La humanidad en el futuro. San Juan, PR: Biblioteca Roja, 1910.

Capetillo, Luisa. Mi opinión sobre las libertades, derechos, y deberes de la mujer, como compañera, madre y ser independiente. San Juan, PR: Biblioteca Roja, 1911.

Carreras, Juan. Santiago Iglesias Pantín. Su vida, su obra, su pensamiento: datos biográficos. Epoca 1896 a 1940. San Juan, PR: Editorial Club de la Prensa, 1970.

Casanova, Joan. Bread, or Bullets: Urban Labor and Spanish Colonialism in Cuba, 1850-1898. Pittsburgh, Pa.: University of Pittsburgh Press, 1998.

Centeno Añeses, Carmen. "Modernidad, subalternidad y resistencia en la literatura obrera puertorriqueña, 1898-1940." Ph. Diss. Centro de Estudios Avanzados de Puerto Rico y el Caribe, 2005.

Centro de Estudios Puertorriqueños. History Task Force. Labor Migration under Capitalism: The Puerto Rican Experience. New York: Monthly Review Press, 1979.

Christiansen Jens, Peter Philips, and Mark Prus. "Women, Technology, and Work: The Gender Division of Labor in U.S. Manufacturing, 1850 to 1919." Research in Economic History 16 (1996): 103-126.

Chiba, Yoshihiro. "Cigar-Makers in American Colonial Manila: Survival During Structural Depression in the 1920s." Journal of Southeast Asian Studies 36, 3 (October 2005): 373-397.

Coll y Cuchi, Cayetano. Boletín Histórico de Puerto Rico. San Juan, Puerto Rico: Imprenta Cantero Fernández, 1914. Volumen 2.

Coll y Cuchi, Cayetano. Boletín Histórico de Puerto Rico. San Juan, PR: Imprenta Cantero Fernández, 1914. Volumen 4.

Colón, Edmundo D. La gestión agrícola después de 1898. San Juan, PR: s.e., 1948.

Colón, Edmundo D. Datos sobre la agricultura de Puerto Rico antes de 1898.San Juan, PR: TipografíaCantero, 1930.

Colón, Jesús. A Puerto Rican in New York and Other Sketches. New York: International Publishers, 1982.

Colón Ortiz, Enrique. "La mujer puertorriqueña y el movimiento obrero: 1898-1908." Tesina Bachillerato, Universidad de Puerto Rico, 1981.

Colón, Alice, Margarita Mergal, and Nilsa Torres. Participación de la mujer en la historia de Puerto Rico (las primeras décadas del siglo veinte). Río Piedras, PR: Centro de Investigaciones Sociales, Universidad de Puerto Rico/ Rutgers University at New Brunswick, 1986.

Conde, Eduardo. Acusación y protesta. Puerta de Tierra, San Juan, PR: Imprenta Unión Obrera, 1919.

Cooper, Patricia A. Once a Cigar Maker: Men, Women, and Work Culture in American Cigar Factories, 1900-1919. Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1987.

Córdova, Gonzalo. Santiago Iglesias, creador del movimiento obrero de Puerto Rico. Río Piedras, PR: Editorial Universidad de Puerto Rico, 1980.

Corretjer, Juan Antonio. Albizu Campos y las huelgas en los años '30. Guaynabo, PR: Liga Socialista, 1969.

Cox, Reavis. Competition in the American Tobacco Industry, 1911-1932. A Study of the Effects of the Partition of the American Tobacco Company by the United States Supreme Court. New York: AMS Press, 1970 [Reprint].

Cruz Monclova, Lidio. Historia de Puerto Rico (Siglo XIX). 3 Volúmenes. Río Piedras, PR: Editorial Universitaria, 1962.

Cruz, Venacio. Fragmentos: colección de poesías. San Juan, PR: Tipografía El Listín Mercantil, 1903.

Cruz, Venacio. Hacia el porvenir. San Juan, PR: Imprenta La República Española, 1906.

Dávila Santiago, Rubén. "Algunas consideraciones sobre las primeras organizaciones obreras y la conciencia de clase." Revista de Ciencias Sociales 22, 3-4 (1980): 301-321.

Dávila Santiago, Rubén. El derribo de las murallas: orígenes intelectuales del socialismo en Puerto Rico. Río Piedras, PR: Editorial Cultural, 1988.

Dávila Santiago, Rubén. El derribo de las murallas y el Porvenir de Borinquen. San Juan, PR: CEREP, 1983.

Dávila Santiago, Rubén. "El pensamiento social obrero a comienzo del siglo xx en Puerto Rico." Revista de Historia 1, 2 (julio-diciembre 1985): 149-167.

De Diego, José. "Cuestiones obreras." In Nuevas campañas. San Juan, PR: Instituto de Cultura Puertorriqueña, 1966.

Devault, Ileen A. United Apart: Gender and the Rise of Craft Unionism. Ithaca/London: Cornell University Press, 2004.

Díaz Caballero, Arlene. "Las trabajadoras asalariadas en Santurce, 1910." Anales de Investigación Histórica, Nueva Serie, 1 (1988): 1-139.

Dieppa, Angel María. El porvenir de la sociedad humana. Pta. De Tierra, San Juan: Tipografía EL ECO, 1915.

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

Diffie, Bailey and Justine Diffie. Porto Rico : A Broken Pledge. New York: Vanguard Press, 1931.

Dolgoff, Sam, editor. Bakunin on Anarchy: Selected Works by the Activist-Founder of World Anarchism. New York: Vintage Books, 1972.

Duarte Hurtado, Martin. La máquina torcedora de tabaco y las luchas en torno a su implantación en Cuba. La Habana, Cuba: Editorial de Ciencias Sociales, 1973.

Dubofsky, Melvyn. Industrialism and the American Worker, 1865-1920. Arlington Heights, Illinois: Harlan Davidson, 1985.

Edwards, Stewart, editor. Selected Writings of Pierre-Joseph Proudhon. New York: Anchor Books, 1969.

España. Ministerio de Ultramar. Código Penal para las Provincias de Cuba y Puerto Rico y ley provisional de enjuiciamiento criminal : mandados observar por el real decreto de 23 de mayo de 1879.Madrid: ImprentaNacional, 1879.

Evans, W. D. "Effects of Mechanization in Cigar Manufacture." Monthly Labor Review 46, 5 (January 5, 1938): 1100-1121.

Federación Libre de los Trabajadores de Puerto Rico. Cuerpo Consultivo Conjunto de las Uniones de Tabaqueros de Puerto Rico. Actuaciones de las segunda y tercera asambleas regulares de las uniones de tabaqueros en Puerto Rico afiliadas a la Cigarmakers' International Union of America. San Juan, PR: Porto Rico Progress Publishing Co., 1914.

Federación Libre de los Trabajadores de Puerto Rico. Cuerpo Consultivo Conjunto de las Uniones de Tabaqueros en Puerto Rico. Libro de actuaciones de la primera asamblea regular de las uniones de tabaqueros en Puerto Rico (Cigar Makers'

International Union of America), celebrada en Caguas, P.R., durante los días 14, 15 y 16 de Julio del 1908. San Juan, PR: Tipografía Real Hermanos, 1910.

Federación Libre de los Trabajadores de Puerto Rico. Procedimientos del sexto congreso obrero de la Federación de Trabajadores de Puerto Rico. San Juan, PR: Tipografía M. Burillo, 1910.

Federación Libre de los Trabajadores de Puerto Rico. Reglamento de la Federación de los Trabajadores de Puerto Rico. San Juan, PR: Federación Libre, 1903.

Federación Libre de los Trabajadores de Puerto Rico. Report de procedimientos del tercer congreso obrero celebrado en Mayagüez por la Federación de los Trabajadores de Puerto Rico, en los días del 18 al 24 de junio de 1905. Mayagüez, PR: Imprenta Unión Obrera, 1906.

Federación Libre de San Juan. Justicia para Puerto Rico, por Samuel Gompers. Traducido por Santiago Iglesias. Washington, D.C.: American Federation of Labor, 1905.

Fernández Méndez, Eugenio. El tabaco en nuestra historia y costumbres. San Juan: PR: n.p., 1997.

Ferreras Pagán, J. Biografía de las riquezas de Puerto Rico. San Juan, PR: Tipografía Luis Ferreras, 1902.

Foner, Philip S. History of the Labor Movement in the United States: From the Founding of the American Federation of Labor to the emergence of American Imperialism. Vol. 2 New York: International Publishers, 1975.

Foner, Philip S. History of the Labor Movement in the United States: The Policies and Practices of the American Federation of Labor, 1900-1909. Vol. 3 New York: International Publishers, 1973.

Foner, Philip S. The Spanish-Cuban-American War and the Birth of American Imperialism. Vol. I, 1895-1898. New York: Monthly Review Press, 1972.

Fraga Iribarne, Manuel. Las constituciones de Puerto Rico. Madrid: Ediciones Cultural Hispánica, 1953.

Gage, Charles E. The Tobacco Industry in Puerto Rico. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1939.

Galvin, Miles. The Organized Labor Movement in Puerto Rico. New York: Fairleigh Dickinson University Press, 1979.

García Gallo, Garpar Jorge. Biografía del tabaco habano. La Habana: Universidad Central de Las Villas, 1959.

García, Gervasio L. Historia crítica, historia sin coartadas : algunos problemas de la historia de Puerto Rico. Río Piedras, PR: Ediciones Huracán, 1989.

García, Gervasio L. "Las primeras actividades de los honrados hijos del trabajo." Op. Cit. 5 (1990): 181-247.

García, Gervasio L. Primeros fermentos de organización obrera en Puerto Rico. San Juan, PR: CEREP, 1974.

García, Gervasio L., and Angel G. Quintero Rivera. Desafío y solidaridad: breve historia del movimiento obrero puertorriqueño. Río Piedras, PR: Ediciones Huracán, 1982.

García Ochoa, María Asunción. La política española en Puerto Rico durante el siglo xix. Río Piedras, PR: Editorial Universidad de Puerto Rico, 1982.

Glocker, T. W. "The Structure of the Cigar Makers' Union," in Jacob H. Hollander and George E. Barnett (eds.), Studies in American Trade Unionism. New York: ARNO Press, 1969.

Gómez Acevedo, Labor. Organización y reglamentación del trabajo en el Puerto Rico del Siglo XIX. San Juan, PR: Instituto de Cultura Puertorriqueña, 1970.

Gompers, Samuel. "Accept the Machine –Organize the Workers." American Federationist. 30, 9 (September 1923): 718-721.

Gompers, Samuel. Justicia para Puerto Rico. San Juan, PR : Federación Libre de San Juan, 1904.

González Fernández, Doria. "La manufactura tabacalera cubana durante la segunda mitad del siglo XIX." Revista de Indias. 52, 194 (1992): 129-156.

Griffin, John H. Strikes: A Study of Quantitative Economics. NY: Columbia University Press, 1939.

Hall, Michael M. and Hobart A. Spalding Jr. "The Urban Working Class and Early Latin American Labour Movements, 1880-1930." In The Cambridge History of Latin America, edited by Leslie Bethell, VI, 325-365.Cambridge University Press, 1986.

Hart, John M. Anarchism and the Mexican Working-Class, 1860-1931. Austin: University of Texas Press, 1987.

Hewitt, Nancy A. Southern Discomfort: Women's Activism in Tampa, Florida, 1880s – 1920s. Champaign: University of Illinois Press, 2001.

Hewitt, Nancy A., and Suzanne Lebsock, editors. Visible Women: New Essays on American Activism. Urbana and Chicago: University of Illinois Press, 1992.

Higham, John. Strangers in the Land: Patterns of American Nativism, 1860-1925. New York: 1963.

Hiller, Ernest T. The Strike: A Study in Collective Action. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1928.

Honoré, Carmelo. "Relaciones del capital y el trabajo: influencia social de las huelgas." In Conferencias dominicales dadas en la Biblioteca Insular de Puerto Rico. Volume 2, 172-178. San Juan, PR: Bureau of Labor, 1914.

Iglesias de Pagán, Igualdad. El obrerismo en Puerto Rico: época de Santiago Iglesias (1896-1905). Palencia de Castilla, España: Ediciones Juan Ponce de León, 1973.

Iglesias Pantín, Santiago. Luchas emancipadoras : crónicas de Puerto Rico. San Juan, PR: Cantero Fernández, 1929.

Ingalls, Robert P. Urban Vigilantes in the New South: Tampa, 1882-1936. Knoxville: University of Tennessee Press, 1988.

Ingalls, Robert P. and Louis A. Pérez Jr. Tampa Cigar Workers. Gainesville: University Press of Florida, 2003.

Instituto de Historia del Movimiento Comunista y la Revolución Socialista de Cuba. El movimiento obrero cubano: documentos y artículos. La Habana, Cuba: Instituto Cubano del Libro, 1975.

Jacker, Corinne. The Black Flag of Anarchy: Antistatism in the United States. New York: Charles Scribner's Son, 1968.

Jacobstein, Meyer. The Tobacco Industry in the United States. New York: Columbia University Press, 1907.

Jiménez de Wagenheim, Olga. "Mujer y sociedad en el Puerto Rico del siglo XIX." Centro Journal. 2, 7 (Winter 1989-1990): 10-17.

Joll, James. The Anarchists. New York: Universal Library, 1966.

Kaplan, Temma. Anarchists of Andalusia, 1868-1903. New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1977.

Kaplan, Temma. "The Social Base of Nineteenth-Century Andalusian Anarchism in Jerez de la Frontera." Journal of Interdisciplinary History. 6, 1 (Summer 1975): 47-70.

Kessler-Harris, Alice. "Problems of Coalition-Building: Women and Trade Unions in the 1920s." In Women, Work and Protest: A Century of U.S. Women's Labor History, edited by Ruth Milkman, Boston: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1985. 110-138.

Kessler-Harris, Alice. "Where Are the Organized Women Workers?" Feminist Studies. 3, 1-2 (Fall 1975): 92-110.

Kirkland, Edward C. Industry Comes of Age: Business, Labor, and Public Policy, 1860-1897. Vol. IV. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1961.

LaFeber, Walter. The New Empire: An Interpretation of American Expansion, 1860-1898. Ithaca, New York: Cornell University Press, 1971.

Levy, Teresita. "The History of Tobacco Cultivation in Puerto Rico, 1898-1940." Ph. D. Dissertation. City University of New York, 2007.

Lida, Clara E. "Agrarian Anarchism in Andalusia: Documents on the Mano Negra." International Review of Social History. 14, Part 3 (1969): 315-352.

Lida, Clara E. Anarquismo y revolución en la España del siglo xix. Madrid: Siglo Veintiuno de España, 1972.

Libby, Justin. "Our plain duty: Senator Joseph B. Foraker and the first civil government of Puerto Rico." Mid-America. 69, 1 (1987): 39-59.

Little, Craig. "Deskilling and Changing Structures of Control." In Degradation of Work?: Skill, Deskilling and the Labour Process, edited by Stephen Wood, pp. 122-145. London: Hutchinson, 1983.

Long, Durward. An Immigrant Co-operative Medicine Program in the South, 1887-1963. Journal of Southern History 31, 1 (February 1965): 417-434.

Long, Durward. "Labor Relations in the Tampa Cigar Industry, 1885-1911." Labor History. 12, 4 (1971): 551-559.

Long, Durward, "La Resistencia:" Tampa's Immigrant Labor Union." Labor History 6, 3 (Fall 1965): 193-213.

López, Juan José. Voces libertarias. San Juan, PR: Tipografía La Bomba, c1910.

Lozano, Rafael C. Relampagueos (Historia de una huelga). Ponce, PR: Imprenta El Día, 1918.

Manning, Caroline. The Employment of Women in Puerto Rico. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1934.

Marcano, Juan S. Páginas rojas. Humacao, PR: Tipografía Conciencia Popular, 1919.

Marcus, Joseph. Labor Conditions in Porto Rico. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1919.

Martínez Vergne, Teresita. Shaping the Discourse on Space: Charity and Its Wards in Nineteenth-Century San Juan. Austin, Texas: University of Texas Press, 1999.

Matos Rodríguez, Félix V. Women in San Juan, 1829-1868. Princeton: Markus Wiener Publishers, 1999.

Matos Rodríguez, Félix V. and Linda C. Delgado. Puerto Rican Women' History: New Perspectives. Armonk, New York: M. E. Sharpe, 1999.

Maximoff, G. P., editor. Bakunin: el sistema del anarquismo. Buenos Aires: Editorial Proyección, 1973.

Miller, Martin A., editor. Selected Writings on Anarchism and Revolution: P. A. Kropotkin. Cambridge: M.I.T. Press, 1970.

Montgomery, David. The Fall of the House of Labor: The Workplace, the State, and American Labor Activism, 1865-1925. Cambridge/New York: Cambridge University Press, 1987.

Montgomery, David. Workers' Control in America: Studies in the History of Work, Technology, and Labor Struggles. Cambridge, London: Cambridge University Press, 1979.

Monthly Labor Review. "Technological Changes in the Cigar Industry and their Effects on Labor." 33, 6 (December 1931): 1275-1310.

Mormino, Gary R., and George E. Pozzetta. The Immigrant World of Ybor City: Italians and Their Latin Neighbors in Tampa, 1885-1985. Urbana/Chicago: University of Illinois Press, 1987.

Mormino, Gary R., and George E. Pozzetta. "The Reader Lights the Candle: Cuban and Florida Cigar Workers' Oral Tradition." Labor Heritage. 4 (Spring 1993): 4-27.

Mormino, Gary R. and George Pozzetta. "Spanish Anarchism in Tampa, Florida, 1886-1931." In Struggle a Hard Battle: Essays on Working Class Immigrants, edited by Dirk Hoerder, pp. 170-198. Illinois: Northern Illinois University Press, 1986.

Moscoso, Francisco. "Las huelgas obreras en Puerto Rico, 1895." Claridad, En Rojo, April 30 to June 10, 1993.

Murray, John E. and Kristen Keith. "Male-Female Earnings Differentials in Early 20th Century Manila." Exploration in Economy History 41 (2004): 361-376.

Negrón Portillo, Mariano. Las turbas republicanas, 1900-1904. Río Piedras, PR: Ediciones Huracán, 1990.

Negrón Portillo, Mariano and Raúl Mayo Santana. "Conflictos en el siglo XIX: una revisión crítica de las nuevas investigaciones históricas en Puerto Rico. "Revista de Ciencias Sociales 24, 3-4 (diciembre 1985): 471-497.

Nelson, Daniel. American Rubber Workers and Organized Labor, 1900-1941. Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1988.

Núñez Florencio, Rafael. "Los anarquistas españoles y americanos ante la guerra de Cuba." Hispania (Revista Española de Historia) 51, 179 (septiembre-diciembre 1991): 1077-1092.

Ojeda Reyes, Félix. "¿Colonialismo sindical o solidaridad internacional? Las relaciones entre el movimiento obrero puertorriqueño y el norteamericano en los inicios de la Federación Libre (1898 – 1910)." Revista de Ciencias Sociales 26, 1-4 (enero-diciembre 1987) : 309-343..

Ortiz, Altagracia, editor. Puerto Rican Women and Work: Bridges in Transnational Labor. Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1996.

Pérez, Erick J. "La lectura en los talleres de tabaco de Puerto Rico." La Torre del Viejo 1, 2 (1984): 37-38.

Pérez, Erick J. "La prensa artesanal y obrera en Puerto Rico: 1873-1940." Pensamiento Crítico 15, 72 (1992): 50-56.

Pérez, Erick J and David Baranov. Bibliografía sobre el movimiento obrero de Puerto Rico, 1873-1996. San Juan, PR: Ediciones CILDES, 1996.

Pérez, Jr., Louis A. Cuba Between Empires, 1878-1902. Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press, 1983.

Pérez, Jr., Louis A. Cuba and the United States: Ties of Singular Intimacy. Athens : University of Georgia Press, 1990.

Pérez, Jr., Louis A. Essays on Cuban History, Historiography, and Research. Gainesville: University Press of Florida, 1985.

Pérez, Jr., Louis A. "Reminiscences of a Lector: Cuban Cigar Workers in Tampa. Florida Historical Quarterly. 53, 4 (April 975): 443-449.

Perloff, Harvey S. Puerto Rico's Economic Future. Chicago: University Press of Chicago, 1950.

Peterson, Florence. Strikes in the United States, 1880-1936. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1938.

Picó, Fernando. De la mano dura a la cordura: ensayos sobre el estado ausente, la sociabilidad y los imaginarios puertorriqueños. Río Piedras, PR: Ediciones Huracán, 1999.

Picó, Fernando. Libertad y servidumbre en el Puerto Rico del siglo XIX. Río Piedras, PR: Ediciones Huracán, 1983.

Picó, Fernando. "Las mujeres trabajadoras del pueblo de Caguas en septiembre de 1870." Revista del Instituto de Cultura Puertorriqueña. 1, 2 (Julio-diciembre 2000): 47-48.

Picó, Fernando. "Las trabajadoras del tabaco en Utuado, Puerto Rico, según el censo de 1910." Hómines. 9, 1-2 (1985): 268-282.

Picó, Isabel. "Apuntes preliminares para el estudio de la mujer puertorriqueña y su participación en las luchas sociales de principio de siglo." In La mujer en la sociedad puertorriqueña, edited by Edna Acosta-Belén, 23-40. Río Piedras, PR: Ediciones Huracán, 1980.

Picó, Isabel. "The History of Women's Struggle for Equality in Puerto Rico." In The Puerto Rican Women, edited by Edna Acosta-Belén, 46-58. New York: Praeger, 1986.

Picó, Isabel. Women and Puerto Rican Politics: Technical Report to the National Foundation of Science. Río Piedras, PR: Social Science Research Center, University of Puerto Rico, 1985.

Poyo, Gerald E. "The anarchist challenge to the Cuban Independence Movement, 1885-1890." Cuban Studies/Estudios Cubanos. 15, 1 (Winter 1985): 29-42.

Price, Richard. "The Labour Process and Labor History." Social History 8, 1 (January 1983): 57-75.

Proudhon, Pierre-Joseph. General Idea of the Revolution in the Nineteenth Century. New York: Haskell House Publishers, 1969.

Proudhon, Pierre-Joseph. What Is Property? An enquiry into the Principle of Right and of Government. New York: H. Fertig, 1966.

Prus, Mark J. "Mechanization and the Gender-Based Division of Labour in the US Cigar Industry." Cambridge Journal of Economics. 14 (1990): 63-79.

Quintero Rivera, Angel. "Background to the Emergence of Imperialist Capitalism in Puerto Rico." In Puerto Rico and the Puerto Ricans. Studies in History and Society. New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1972.

Quintero Rivera, Angel. Patricios y plebeyos: Burgueses, hacendados, artesanos y obreros. Las relaciones de clase en el Puerto Rico de cambio de siglo. Río Piedras, PR: Ediciones Huracán, 1988.

Quintero Rivera, Angel. "Socialist and Cigarmaker: Artisans' Proletarianization in the Making of the Puerto Rican Working Class." Latin American Perspectives. 10, 2-3 (Spring-Summer 1983): 19-38.

Quintero Rivera, Angel. Vírgenes, magos y escapularios: imaginería, etnicidad y religiosidad popular en Puerto Rico. San Juan, PR: Centro de Investigaciones Sociales, Universidad de Puerto Rico, 1998.

Quintero Rivera, Angel. Workers' Struggle in Puerto Rico: A Documentary History. New York: Monthly Review Press, 1976.

Ramos, Julio. Amor y anarquía: los escritos de Luisa Capetillo. Río Piedras, PR: Editorial Huracán, 1992.

Ritter, Alan. Anarchism: A Theorical Análisis: Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1980.

Rivera-Giusti, IvetteMarie. "Gender, Labor, and Working-Class Activism in the Puerto Rican Tobacco Industry. "Ph.D. Dissertation. State University of New York at Binghamton, 2004.

Rivera, Marcia. "The Development of Capitalism in Puerto Rico and the Incorporation of Women into the Labor Force." In The Puerto Rican Women: Perspectives on Culture, History and Society, 30-45, edited by Edna Acosta-Belén. New York: Praeger, 1986.

Rivera Quintero, Marcia. "El feminismo obrero en la lucha de clases en Puerto Rico (1900-1920)." Claridad-En Rojo, 13 al 19 marzo 1981, 4-6.

Rivera Rodríguez, Juan. "Ideología y movimiento obrero: relación entre la ideología y el desarrollo histórico del movimiento obrero a principios del siglo XX." Tesis de Bachillerato, Universidad de Puerto Rico, 1985.

Rivero Muñiz, José. Tabaco: su historia en Cuba. 2vols. La Habana: Instituto de Historia, Academia de Ciencias de la República de Cuba, 1965.

Rodgers, David T. The Work Ethic in Industrial America, 1850-1920. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1979.

Rodríguez Castro, María Elena. "Oir leer: tabaco y cultura en Cuba y Puerto Rico." Caribbean Studies 24, 3-4 (1991): 221-239.

Rodríguez de Tió, Lola. Mi libro de Cuba. Obras Completas. San Juan, PR: Instituto de Cultura Puertorriqueña, 1968.

Rodríguez, José Joaquín. "Auge y crisis en las filas del movimiento obrero puertorriqueño, 1900-1924." M.A. Thesis. University of Puerto Rico, 1987.

Rojas, Manuel J. Cuatro siglos de ignorancia y servidumbre en Puerto Rico. San Juan, PR: La Primavera, 1914.

Romeral, R. del. Catecismo socialista. San Juan, PR: s, e., 1905.

Romero Rosa, Ramón. La cuestión social en Puerto Rico. San Juan, PR: Tipografía, 1904.

Rosario Natal, Carmelo. Puerto Rico y la crisis de la guerra hispanoamericana (1895-1898). San Juan, PR : Editorial Edil, 1989.

Runkel, Gerald. Anarchism: Old and New. New York: Delta Book, 1972.

Sábato, Hilda, and Luis Alberto Romero. Los trabajadores de Buenos Aires: la experiencia del mercado, 1850-1880. Buenos Aires: Editorial Sudamericana, 1992.

San Miguel, Pedro. El mundo que creó el azúcar: las haciendas en Vega Baja, 1800-1873.Río Piedras, PR: Ediciones Huracán, 1989.

Sanabria, Carlos. "The Puerto Rican Organized Workers` Movement and the American Federation of Labor, 1901 to 1934." Ph.D. Dissertation, City University of New York, 2000.

Sanromá, Joaquín. Puerto Rico y su hacienda. Madrid: Imprenta de Fortanet, 1873.

Scarano, Francisco J. "Slavery and Force Labor in the Puerto Rican Sugar Economy, 1815-1873." In Comparative Perspectives on Slavery in New World Plantation Societies, Edited by Vera Rubin and Arthur Tuden, 553-563. New York: Academy of Sciences, 1977. New York.

Scarano, Francisco J. Sugar and Slavery in Puerto Rico: The Plantation Economy of Ponce, 1800-1850. Madison, Wisconsin: University of Wisconsin Press, 1984.

Shaffer, Kirwin R. Anarchism and Countercultural Politics in Early Twentieth-Century Cuba. Gainesville, Florida: University Press of Florida, 2005.

Shatz, Marshall S., editor. The Essential Works of Anarchism. New York: Bantam Books, 1971.

Shazo, Peter de. Urban Workers and Labor Unions in Chile, 1902-1927. Madison, Wisconsin: University of Wisconsin Press, 1983.

Silén, Juan Angel. Apuntes para la historia del movimiento obrero puertorriqueño. Río Piedras, PR: Editorial Cultural, 1978.

Simon, S. Fanny. "Anarchism and Anarcho-Syndicalism in South America." Hispanic American Historical Review 26, 1 (February 1946): 38-59.

Smith, Dudley. Puerto Rico's Trade with Continental United States. 1937.

Sonesson, Birgit. Puerto Rico's Commerce: From Regional to World Wide Market Relations. New York: New York University Press, 1985.

Spalding, Hobart. La clase trabajadora argentina (documentos para su historia, 1890/1912). Buenos Aires: Editorial Galerna, 1970.

Spalding, Hobart. Organized Labor in Latin America, Historical Case Studies of Urban Workers in Dependent Societies. New York: Harper Torchbooks, 1977.

Stubbs, Jean. Tobacco in the Periphery: A Case Study in Cuban Labour History, 1860-1958. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1985.

Suárez Findlay, Eileen J. Imposing Decency: The Politics of Sexuality and Race in Puerto Rico, 1870-1920. Durham: Duke University Press, 1999.

Taller de Formación Política. Huelga en la caña, 1933-34. Río Piedras, PR: Ediciones Huracán, 1982.

Taller de Formación Política. No estamos pidiendo el cielo: huelga portuaria de 1938. Río Piedras, PR: Ediciones Huracán, 1988.

Thomas, Paul. Karl Marx and the Anarchists.London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1980.

Thompson, Paul. The Nature of Work: An Introduction to Debates on the Labour Process. London: MacMillan, 1993.

Tilly, Louise A. "Paths of Proletarianization: Organization of Production, Sexual Division of Labor, and Women's Collective Action." SIGNS: Journal of Woman in Culture and Society. 7, 21 (Winter 1981): 400-407.

Tinajero, Araceli. El lector de tabaquería. Historia de una tradición cubana. Madrid: Editorial Verbum, 2007.

Tirado Avilés, Amílcar. "Notas sobre el desarrollo de la industria del tabaco en Puerto Rico y su impacto en la mujer puertorriqueña, 1898-1920." Centro Journal. 2, 7 (Winter 1989-1990): 18-29.

Torres, Alfonso. Solidaridad. San Juan, PR: Unión Tipográfica, 1905.

Unión de Tabaqueros 481. Balance general de la Unión de Tabaqueros 481, desde el año 1907 al 1er. Trimestre de 1912. Bayamón, PR: Tipografía "El Progreso," 1912.

Valle Ferrer, Norma. Luisa Capetillo: historia de una mujer proscrita. Río Piedras, PR: Editorial Cultural, 1990.

_____. Luisa Capetillo. Obra completa: Mi patria es la libertad. San Juan; Cayey, PR: Departamento del Trabajo y Recursos Humanos de Puerto Rico; Proyecto de Estudios de la Mujer, universidad de Puerto Rico, Recinto de Cayey, 2008.

Vázquez Medina, Angel. "Las despalilladoras de tabaco de Manatí." Revista de la Universidad de América 5, 1 (mayo 1993): 45-48.

Vega, Bernardo. Memoirs of Bernardo Vega: A Contribution to the History of the Puerto Rican Community in New York. New York: Monthly Review Press, 1984.

Vijande, Enrique. Apuntes estadísticos-económicos referentes a la Isla de Puerto Rico que pueden servir para el arreglo de los aranceles de aduana y del sistema monetario. Barcelona: Tipografía de la Casa P. de Caridad, 1896.

Vilar, Juan. Páginas libres. San Juan, PR: Editorial Antillana, 1914.

Wolfson, Theresa. "Where Are the Organized Women Workers?" American Federationist. 32, 6 (June 1925): 455-457.

Wolfson, Theresa. The Woman Worker and the Trade Unions. New York: International Publishers, 1926.

Wood, Stephen, editor. The Degradation of Work? Skill, Deskilling and the Labour Process. London: Hutchinson, 1983.

Woodcock, George. Anarchism: A History of Libertarian Ideas and Movements. Cleveland: World Publishing Company, 1970.

Yellowitz, Irwin. Industrialization and the American Labor Movement, 1850-1900. Port Washington, New York: Kennikat Press, 1977.

Young, Iris Marion. "Gender as Seriality: Thinking about Women as a Social Collective." Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society. 19, 31 (Springs 1994): 713-738.

Zayas, Nancy, and Juan Angel Silén, eds. La mujer en la lucha hoy. San Juan, PR: Ediciones Kirikiki, 1972.