

NEW MASSES

ESTABLISHED 1911

Editor

HERMAN MICHELSON

Managing Editor

ALEXANDER TAYLOR

Associate Editors

THEODORE DRAPER
JOSHUA KUNITZ

CROCKETT JOHNSON
WILLIAM B. SMITH

Contributing Editors

ROBERT FORSYTHE, JOSEPH FREEMAN, MICHAEL GOLD,
HORACE GREGORY, GRANVILLE HICKS, LOREN MILLER,
BRUCE MINTON, WALTER RALSTON, ISIDOR SCHNEIDER.

Business and Circulation Manager

GEORGE WILLNER



Trends in the Legion

CONFLICTING tendencies run all through the report made to the American Legion convention by the retiring national commander, Harry Colmery. There was a clear denunciation of the Nazis' attempt to gain power in the United States "to save us from communism." This went together with a confused lumping of Communists with the anti-democratic forces of Hitler. There was a warning against allowing the Legion to become a tool of strikebreaking agencies, mixed up with a suggestion that the Legionnaires could be deputized "as citizens, not as Legionnaires, to defend property and law and order"—which opens the door wide to an anti-labor position. There was determined opposition to war with a call for a peace convention, but no analysis of the war-breeding situation brought about by the aggression of the fascists. There was an implied criticism of President Roosevelt's proposal to curb the Supreme Court's power to override the will of the people.

Obviously Colmery's report was an attempt to meet the views of all sections of the Legion. It represents a distinct advance over many previous Legion reports. It approaches the labor issue gingerly, if confusedly. It is in the main a defense of democracy against fascist encroachments. The question is how democracy can best be defended, and on this central point the Legion is in need of education rather than in a position to dispense it.

The Black Case

THERE is more than one issue involved in the controversy about Justice Black. It is altogether possible to demand that Justice Black clear himself of the charge of being a Klansman or resign while recognizing that his accusers themselves constitute the most dangerous reactionary coalition in America. It is altogether possible to denounce any connection which Justice Black has or had with the Ku Klux Klan while recognizing that the

Hearst-Liberty League propaganda machine which raised the issue was not interested in saving the Supreme Court from a possible Klansman. Rather, they were concerned with smearing that portion of Black's record which was progressive and starting a counter-offensive against the Roosevelt administration.

Justice Black has not yet spoken. His silence does not make things any brighter for him, but final judgment on the truth of the charges must wait until he speaks up. Labor and all progressive-minded people can have nothing further to do with him, except to demand his immediate resignation, unless he makes the most categorical and sweeping repudiation of the Klan and all its works. An organization which is guilty of so much barbarous and criminal persecution of the Negro people and other minorities in this country cannot be tolerated in any form. Still, it remains to be said that while what Justice Black said or did eleven years ago is important, what he believes in and stands for now is more important. In 1926 Black may have had the wrong kind of friends. It is certain that today he has the right kind of enemies.

No matter what Justice Black says in answer to his accusers, it remains a fact that the campaign against him has been started and prosecuted by the very economic royalists who were decisively trounced last November. The hypocritical shouters about Black's membership in the Klan are the very ones who today are using Klan tactics against labor's right to organize. They do not attack Black in order to advance liberalism and democracy in this country. They attack in order to strengthen reaction, bigotry, and intolerance.

Roosevelt's Speech

PRESIDENT ROOSEVELT's speech on the anniversary of the Constitution was notable not so much for the new things he said but for the determination with which he reiterated old ones. He was in good form, and many of his shafts at the legalistic corruption of the Constitution and the illegal usurpation of power by the Supreme Court were stinging. It is significant that he spent relatively little time glorifying the past. His main emphasis was on the present. The same speech might by and large have been made in the midst of the fight over the Supreme Court during the last session of Congress.

There is an important identity of viewpoint between the President's speech and Louis B. Boudin's article on the Constitution in the last issue of the NEW MASSES. Both agreed that there are really two Constitutions, one which reactionaries have

"interpreted" in order to impede and restrict democratic processes and the other which was intended to establish and safeguard democratic processes. Mr. Boudin expressed this idea in his concluding injunction: "Save the Constitution by depriving the Supreme Court of the power to pervert or destroy it!" President Roosevelt fully implied as much throughout his speech, especially as exemplified in his concluding words: "I ask that they [the American people] exalt the glorious simplicity of its purposes rather than a century of complicated legalism." To go back to the original intentions of the constitutional fathers on the Supreme Court means to strip the Court of its power to declare enactments of Congress unconstitutional.

Why the S.P. Declines

THE COMMUNIST PARTY is fifty-five thousand strong and growing fast. The Socialist Party is at the lowest point of membership it has ever touched. Those who ponder on these two facts and seek the reason can find it in a speech made last Saturday before the Massachusetts State Convention of the Communist Party by Earl Browder. In a comprehensive survey of the general political situation, on the main theme of "Democracy and the Constitution," Browder discussed the recent policy of the Socialist Party. We quote this entire section of the speech, as a thumb-nail analysis of the leadership of the Socialist Party, which Socialists may study—with a graph of their declining party membership before them:

Our Socialist friends still, for example, think that they have moved over to the "left" of the Communists. They have the opium-illusion that by fighting everything progressive, and especially the Communists, they are fighting for socialism. They still do not understand that their confused sectarian position is discrediting their name among the masses, harming the cause of socialism, and objectively aligning them with the reactionaries.

How otherwise explain the absolutely fantastic mistakes made by the chief Socialist leader, Norman Thomas? You will remember that in 1933 we had the Blue Eagle brand of New Deal, a national coalition beginning with Wall Street and the Liberty League elements, and extending to the left to include everyone but the Communists, with many signs of fascist tendencies within it. At that time Norman Thomas found it possible, together with Hillquit, to visit Roosevelt, pledge support, and praise the New Deal as the best possible short of socialism and almost socialism itself.

But in 1935, when the Liberty League organized the Republican-Democratic offensive against Roosevelt, when the fascists turned on him—precisely that moment was chosen by Norman Thomas to also turn bitterly against Roosevelt, and in 1936 to make such a campaign that was officially welcomed by Landon and his aides as a help to them.

Up until 1933, Norman Thomas was an advocate of the League of Nations, at a time when it had the function only to preserve the Versailles Treaty.

But when Hitler withdrew, when the Japanese withdrew, when Mussolini defied it and stopped attending its Councils, when the Soviet Union entered, when the League became even if very inadequately the scene of a struggle for peace—at precisely that moment Norman Thomas turned against the League and began to denounce it.

Last year when the Socialist Caballero became premier of the Spanish Republic, we pleaded with him to throw the Socialist Party fully in support of that government, but he refused and was suspicious of Caballero; but when Caballero, proved inadequate, was replaced by Negrin, another Socialist premier, then Norman Thomas suddenly hastened to the support of Caballero. Such is the policy of a Socialist Party which refuses the people's front, and thereby becomes the plaything of Trotskyist and reactionary influences, losing the respect of all workers and progressives.

Fascists in the Press

WE are indebted to the *Paris Populaire*, official organ of the French Socialist Party under the editorship of Vice-Premier Léon Blum, for conclusive proof that a tie-up exists between certain American newspaper correspondents in Spain and the Franco insurgents. One letter, reproduced in the issue of September 7, is signed by a certain Ariel L. Varges, a Franco agent in Chicago, to Merry del Val, Franco's representative in Great Britain and former Spanish ambassador to that country. Part of the letter, reproduced in facsimile, reads as follows:

What you should do is to send an able man here for a lecture tour. It will cost money. Do the job in splendid style and hit the front pages at the time when the big drive for Madrid is launched. This will be excellent publicity to discredit the "mopping up" comment which will follow the entry into the capital. The best man would be the professor you sent to Talavera. I've forgotten his name—he is the chap whom Herrera drove to Merida at your request.

Packard's work is well appreciated in this country. The same is true for Carney of the *N. Y. Times*.

Now know the name of the professor in question. But the newspapermen are easy to identify. Reynold Packard is United Press correspondent with the Franco forces. He has been one of the most brazen apologists for the fascist atrocities and a correspondent who never records anything but fascist victories. The other is William P. Carney, an old and valued friend of fascism whose poisoned pen is hired by the *Times*.

Gov. Earle Exposes Himself

GOVERNOR EARLE of Pennsylvania returned from Europe last week very hot against dictators. A few days later he put on a fine exhibition of pinchbeck dictatorship himself, by banning all showings of

the *Spanish Earth* in Pennsylvania. That the governor is personally responsible for the ban is clear. The State Board of Motion Picture Censors had held up the *Spanish Earth* ten days, an unusual delay. The day after Earle came back he is reported to have seen the picture; the order banning it followed. And the only explanation given by the board, through Patrick Duffy, one of its members, is that the *Spanish Earth* is pro-loyalist.

Governor Earle is credited with strong presidential ambitions, and also with liberal leanings. He seems to be singularly dumb about what is involved in his ban on the film. If this picture, admittedly one of the best documentary films ever made, is banned because it is "for" the Spanish government—then whom is Governor Earle for? Doesn't he know that the Spanish government is fully recognized by the United States government as a friendly power? And is he completely unaware of the great groundswell of liberal and progressive thought in this country which supports the cause of Spanish democracy?

The NEW MASSES has previously remarked on Earle's disregard for ordinary civil liberties, as exemplified in his banning of *Spain in Flames* last spring. This is his blind spot, and like all spots of organic origin, it seems to be growing steadily. A governor with a presidential bee in his bonnet—and with hopes of gaining liberal and progressive support—has to do more than make speeches about the evils of foreign dictatorships. He has to avoid acting like a little dictator himself, and a dictator, moreover, who by his arbitrary action helps the fascists.

LaGuardia Blunders

THE New York primary settled some questions and raised others in that city's tangled political situation. It is still difficult to tell just what the ultimate line-up of forces will be because the scene continues to shift rapidly, almost from day to day. Senator Copeland's decisive defeat in both the Republican and Democratic primaries made his complete withdrawal inevitable. The defeat of three important old-guard Tammany district leaders combined with the Copeland fade-out has probably put the Sullivan-Marinelli-Smith leadership out of business. Whether Mahoney wins or loses, the Farley-Flynn machine will most likely be in a position to take over Tammany Hall in some sort of receivership.

The rapidity with which Senator Copeland and Leader Sullivan decided to drop the fight against Mahoney should not lead us to assume that the two factions have

entirely repaired the rupture between them. More significant was Mahoney's first statement after the announcement of the primary results that now all factions have to get together against LaGuardia. It is altogether likely that, in the long run, a new Tammany will emerge, incorporating a good many of the club-house loafers and fixers of the old. The "new" Tammany will salvage as much as possible from the wreckage of the "old" in order to restore the same machine-politics under a new façade. What has happened is not a change in principles so much as a change in straw-bosses.

Mayor LaGuardia came out of the election the heavy favorite. His large write-in vote of more than 50,000 votes in the Democratic primary shows that his appeal cuts across party lines. For this reason, it is even more difficult to understand the mayor's endorsement of Red-baiter and strike-breaker George U. Harvey of Queens for reelection as borough president. LaGuardia can gain very few votes from the Harvey followers, to whom he is already anathema, while Harvey will now try to crawl back under the mayor's protective liberal coverings. This will probably not succeed because the American Labor Party and the Socialist and Communist Parties have all repudiated the mayor's endorsement. The endorsement is not only a political blunder of the first magnitude. It is a retreat from the position taken by the mayor in his only speech before a Republican audience when he said that he had two nominations already and the third would have to come without begging.

One Big Company Union

THE company-union policy of the A. F. of L. leadership emerges on another sector of the labor front. In Hollywood, the cinema moguls are faced with an N.L.R.B. election to determine the bargaining agent for the film writers under the provisions of the Wagner Act. The producers have an unholy fear of any independent organization of writers and, foreseeing a victory of the Screen Writers' Guild of the Authors' League of America, have launched a determined drive to "force" trade-union status on the entire industry. Through William Bioff, representative of the reactionary International Alliance of Theatrical Stage Employees, they have announced a comprehensive drive to bring all studio workers, from day laborers to directors, into one big happy company union ruled by the iron hand of Brown, international president of the I.A.T.S.E.

This is "industrial unionism" with a vengeance. The I.A.T.S.E. is dominated from the top and hasn't had a meeting in several



years. Rumblings from below indicate a strong insurgent movement of militant rank and filers calling themselves the "White Rats." What move the White Rats will make in this latest development remains to be seen.

The Screen Actors' Guild, the Screen Directors' Guild, and the Screen Writers' Guild, the "Big Three," have made a joint statement warning the Motion Picture Producers' Association and the I.A.T.S.E. that they will continue to speak and act for their own membership. Acting independently, the Society of Motion Picture Film Editors (cutters) and the Artists & Illustrators have issued a call for a meeting of all the independent guilds. These include the Scenic Artists', Art Directors', Set Designers', Draughtsmen's and Interior Decorators' guilds as well as the big three and the company-sponsored associations of white-collar workers.

At this writing it is too early to prophesy a federation of guilds taking in all classes of workers not at present within the I.A.T.S.E. The whole Hollywood situation is in a muddle, but one thing seems certain: the I.A.T.S.E. and their producer-sponsors have bitten off more than they can chew. Militant trade-unionists within the I.A.T.S.E. and the various guilds will stage a conclusive battle to determine representation and control.

Slavery Is Back

WARREN COUNTY, GA., celebrated Constitution week in its own sweet way by canceling the Thirteenth Amendment and reestablishing the "peculiar institution" which the Civil War was supposed to have shot out of existence. We have seen documentary proof of it in a photograph of

a cotton field showing pickers at their breaking work with a farmer standing over them with a shotgun.

This 1937 version of chattel slavery is much a matter of dollars and cents as the ante-bellum variety. It seems there been a labor shortage in Warren County and in nearby Glascock County as Warren County farmers are paying cotton pickers forty cents a hundred pound. Glascock County farmers offered the seventy-five cents, according to Sheriff Hagan of Warrentown, "and a drink of liquor in the morning and evening." Warren County farmers rose to the occasion, not with a counter-offer of still higher wage but by bringing out the guns. "There was no trouble," the sheriff is quoted as saying, "although a number of them carried guns and fired them into the air. They told the pickers there was plenty of cotton to pick in Warren County and asked them to stay home and pick it. They decided to stay."

Forced labor of this kind could not be maintained without the active cooperation of public officials. Aiding the sheriff in support of the labor-exploiting growers is the W.P.A. in Georgia, which drives unemployed workers to the broiling fields; starvation wages by threatening to take them off relief rolls. There is no cellar whatever for wages in the deep South; with the organic alliance of employer, sheriff, and the W.P.A., there is no level to which living standards of workers cannot be driven. The next session of Congress will have to legislate on a program in which a wages and hours bill will occupy a central position. In other sections of the country a wages and hours law is of commanding importance; in the South it is a matter of life and death.

Unity in Rubber

TWO hundred men and women from the rubber factories distinguished themselves for militant, progressive, industrial unionism in the second annual convention of the United Rubber Workers' Union in Akron last week. During the past year they have brought their membership from twenty-five thousand to seventy-five thousand, and established collective bargaining with the bulk of the industry after a series of some thirty bitterly fought strikes. The big job remains of bringing in the fifty thousand rubber workers who are still unorganized; the convention concentrated on this.

Sherman H. Dalrymple, reelected president by acclamation, warned the convention that the newly won conditions in the big centers like Akron, where the six-hour day prevails with the highest wage rates in the industry, could not be maintained when

hundreds of small, sweatshop factories scattered throughout the country continued to wage in some of the worst cut-throat competition at the expense of the unorganized workers. The delegates hammered out a constitution and adopted measures which not only augur well for the men and women in rubber, but also indicate that the R.W. is by way of being a pace-setter in labor movement.

Unity was the keynote and the convention strengthened and deepened it. The one or two dissonant notes heard in the convention were quickly drowned out in the harmony of solidarity which was the most marked characteristic of the parley. Allan Haywood, New York C.I.O. director, got a big hand when he told the convention that one of the best ways of preserving unity was to accord every worker the right to his own political beliefs and to look upon Red-baiting as a force of destruction turned against the whole C.I.O. movement.

China and the Neutrality Issue

THE inconsistency of American policy in the Far East is one of the most serious factors in the whole situation. A practical blow to peace, like the President's order forbidding government-owned vessels from transporting munitions to either belligerent, is quickly followed by an abstract defense of the principles of peace, like Secretary of State Hull's broadcast. Secretary Hull's broadcast is just as quickly followed by the American embassy's precipitate departure from Nanking.

While the President's action was not an invocation of the Neutrality Act, it was a step in that direction. All American shippers have already been warned that they transport munitions either to China or Japan at their own risk, and doubtless few will now run that risk. Nevertheless, Secretary Hull still found it possible to assert that "if the rule of law gives way to international anarchy, the security of this country would become seriously jeopardized" and, further, that "any nation which completely fails to show interest in, and to give support for, the existence of international order would lose its influence for peace and thus neglect its part in sustaining any civilized basis of relationship between nations."

Yet is not this latter just what the President's order leads to in practice? Japan has wantonly substituted the rule of anarchy for the rule of law, this time on a vaster scale than ever before. Its militarists in control of government policy have chosen deliberately to whip China into submission solely through superiority in the weapons of de-

The convention stood for unity in the labor movement on the basis of industrial unionism, and gave a practical demonstration of what it wanted by honoring Wilmer Tate, president of the Akron A. F. of L. Central Labor Union, who took the platform to score the A. F. of L. "brass hats and sleeping beauties" as splitters. "We're not fighting each other in Akron," he said, "and we're not going to. They may take my dues book away from me, but I won't line up with that crowd!"

The third big achievement of the convention was the forthright way in which it tackled the question of independent political action by labor, and here again rubber workers brought forth a practical demonstration by pointing to Akron, where a united campaign by all sections of the labor movement swept the primaries with a slate of Labor's Non-Partisan League candidates, eleven out of twelve of whom were nominated.

struction. This can be achieved only in violation of at least two treaties—the Nine Power Treaty of 1922 and the Briand-Kellogg Peace Pact of 1928—to both of which China, Japan, Great Britain, and the United States are signatories.

Indeed, the President's order is in some respects more frightful in its effect than would be the enforcement of the Neutrality Act as a whole. This order deals solely with armaments. It is well known that Japan is fully capable of arming itself but partially lacks the raw materials, while China has the raw materials but lacks a war industry. If the raw materials as well as the finished products of war were embargoed, the effect of "neutrality" would be somewhat equalized for both countries, though even in this case Japan would be the chief beneficiary. But the President's order explicitly omits raw materials though these might be affected under the Neutrality Act itself. The President's order thus enforces the very worst element in the Neutrality Act without actually involving the act itself.

Now, as the war in the Far East continues, the propaganda in this country on behalf of Japan is likely to become more intense and effective than at present. The Japanese government has already announced that it is sending a delegation of three—a business man, a "labor leader," and a newspaper editor—to sell its aggression to the American people. Japan has always been able to count on a number of correspondents, British by birth but in the employ of American papers, to convey Japanese view-

point here through the "news." Byas of the New York and London *Times* is an example.

This propaganda is likely to be quite subtle. The Japanese are satisfied with our neutrality legislation, for it works in their favor. The Japanese Foreign Office immediately announced that it was "highly satisfied" with the President's order. The Chinese government, on the contrary, entered an official protest, and Nanking official circles viewed the act as equivalent to a first-rate Japanese victory on the field of battle.

In this respect, the Japanese propagandists need simply to synchronize their propaganda with that of some pacifist and isolationist circles in this country. They need only to take advantage of the confusion rampant among those who believe they are serving the interests of peace, and they will succeed in whitewashing Japan's criminal aggression. The Japanese Foreign Office finds objective support considerably to the left—in the *New Republic*, for example.

A determined campaign has been waged by the *New Republic* for nothing less than full enforcement of neutrality. Its only criticism of the measure is that it gives the President some discretion in enforcing it. They would make it mandatory. Otherwise the *New Republic* has gone as far in its demand for enforcement as the most rabid isolationist. The latest reason offered is taken from an article in the *Far Eastern Survey* by William W. Lockwood, Jr. This article alleges that neutrality is not only sound but that it helps, if anybody, China rather than Japan. The *New Republic* hastened to adopt this view, which flies in the face of all the facts and the instantaneous reaction of those best in a position to judge, the Japanese and Chinese foreign offices. The Lockwood argument, briefly, alleges that Chinese trade is bound to be stopped anyway by a Japanese blockade so that the embargo on munitions for Japan is so much gained. It blithely takes for granted American countenancing of this blockade as though that were not the very point at issue.

Here lies the extreme danger of pro-Japanese propaganda. The Japanese Foreign Office is "highly satisfied" with neutrality, and so is the *New Republic* and a number of influential peace societies. The Japanese defend their aggression by accusing the Chinese of "lack of coöperation," and Dr. Arthur Deerin Call, secretary of the American Peace Society, just back from Japan, says practically the same thing. The Japanese, according to the doctor, are simply trying to induce the Chinese to trade with them. Under these complicated and confused circumstances, some hard thinking on neutrality is more necessary than ever—especially among those who honestly seek to keep this country out of war.

Terror in Puerto Rico

The regime of Governor Winship, protecting the sugar investments of Wall Street, has been responsible for a virtual civil war there

By John Buchanan

NOT all of your sugar comes from Cuba. Some comes from Hawaii, some from the Philippines, a little from Louisiana. A lot of it comes from Puerto Rico. The next time you put a lump of sugar in your coffee think of this.

Think of eleven gallant fighters against imperialism, lawyers, students, university graduates, leaders of the Nationalist Party of Puerto Rico. They have been buried alive for half a year in the medieval fortress of La Princesa, in the shadow of the ancient battlements of El Moro in San Juan. They have been held under bail totaling a quarter of a million dollars. As this goes to press they have been taken from La Princesa.

Under heavy guard they were rushed across the island. The cars they rode in rolled over mountain roads that reveal vistas of breathtaking beauty, between fields that at this time of year breathe the heavy-sweet scent of sugar cane. They were taken to the town of Ponce.

Ponce is one of the oldest towns on the island. It is one of the most Spanish. Physically, the twentieth century has scarcely touched it. In one of its ancient courtrooms the eleven men have faced a jury made up of plantation managers and *cipayos*. (A *cipayo* is a Puerto Rican who licks the boots of his American oppressors.) They are being tried for murder.

They are being tried in connection with the brutal police massacre that took place in Ponce on March 21, Palm Sunday. Just how eleven Nationalists, most of whom were not even present, can be responsible for the slaughter of eighteen helpless citizens by the police and the wounding of nearly two hundred more is a mystery that only Governor Blanton Winship and a few of his police tools can answer. Hundreds of police, scores of G-men, and "experts" of all descriptions have been working for months to prove the connection.

The trial, which began September 13, is an event of major importance. Its causes and its consequences touch the lives of millions of Americans. Yet you will not find the details in your local newspapers.

That sounds startling, but the reason is simple. The correspondents of the American press in Puerto Rico are Governor Winship's publicity men. Take Harwood Hull. He supplies both the Associated Press and the New York Times; and both he and his young son are on the Winship payroll. Hull is a prosecution witness in this trial.

That is why you see so little news about the struggle for Puerto Rican independence. That is why you see no news at all about the

campaign of terror and intimidation that is being carried on by Winship and his clique, the rough and ready business agents of the sugar trust. Winship is particularly anxious to avoid publicity on this case.

From what news about the trial has come through, in the Spanish-language press, it is known that eleven out of the twelve jurors are self-declared enemies of independence. (Seven are Republicans, four "Socialists," one a liberal.)

Pérez Marchand, former prosecuting attorney (resigned) who conducted the first investigation of the "crime" now being tried, is a defense witness.

Hardly had the trial opened when it was announced that ten more Nationalists had been arrested in Guánica, sugar capital of the south coast. Nationalists are being arrested on every conceivable charge. Sympathizers are being arrested for the crime of collecting money for the defense.

One witness stated that he was not testifying of his own free will, that he had received a bribe from government agents, and that he had contributed the sum of the bribe to the defense.

IN ORDER TO UNDERSTAND the war that is raging in Puerto Rico—for it is war as surely as Hitler's "revolution" was war—it is necessary to go back a few years.

The United States acquired Puerto Rico in 1898. A fact conveniently forgotten by most

American historians is that, when we grabbed the island from Spain, Puerto Rico had already been granted autonomy. The act had been signed by the Spanish crown but was not yet in force, pending the outcome of the war. Then the American imperialists stepped in. Puerto Rico is still struggling to win some form of autonomy.

Under American rule there were rapid economic changes. Small land holdings began to disappear. Spaniards who held larger tracts of sugar lands sailed for home, leaving American banks to buy up the holdings dirt cheap. Absentee ownership became the rule instead of the exception. Meanwhile there were "improvements." The American authorities introduced modern sanitation and hygiene. The birth rate went up. It is still up. A high birth rate means cheap labor.

There were also improvements of the mind. The great, benevolent power of the North prepared a program of enlightenment for its little, brown children of the South. "Americanization" was begun on a grand scale. It tried to extirpate the Spanish language by forcing Spanish-speaking Puerto Rican teachers to teach all their classes in English.

This has had several results. First, it has provoked bitter resentment on the part of most Puerto Ricans. Second, it has produced a small class of *pitayanquis* or *cipayos*, who today are the native apologists for American imperialism. Third, it has produced a new, hybrid English-Spanish dialect to puzzle future etymologists.

The rapid expropriation of the native landowners, first the small and then the big, caught the Puerto Rican worker between the blades of an economic scissors. Deprived first of land and then of his source of home-grown food, not only did he have to work for the absentee landowner at low wages, but he also had to import all his food from the United States at shockingly high prices. Nothing was grown in Puerto Rico except export crops.

Cheated of autonomy when the American imperialists brought them "freedom from the slavery of Spain," the Puerto Rican leaders never ceased to struggle for political freedom. Finally, in 1917, they won American citizenship. The Jones Act provided for an elected legislature with limited powers. It gave Puerto Rico a resident commissioner at Washington, whom the Puerto Ricans have to pay for sitting in Congress without having the privilege of a vote. It left the office of governor to be filled by appointment by the President of the United States, and the governor was to appoint men to fill most of the key-



Ruth Gikow