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This book is dedicated to the memory of our friend and colleague Juan Flores, 1943–2014.
In many analyses of migration and immigration, relatively little attention has been paid to the role that the characteristics of settled areas have played in the adaptation of immigrants and migrants. Rather, a long-standing tradition in urban analyses, exemplified by the early work of sociologists Robert Ezra Park, Ernest Burgess, and Roderick McKenzie (1925), has focused on how areas were changed by the entrance of "newcomers." This focus on how newcomers have changed what existed has continued regardless of whether these newcomers were (1) of the "gentry" variety; (2) new immigrants replacing older immigrants—as in Dominicans and Mexicans overtaking formerly predominantly Puerto Rican and/or Black areas, or (3) new generations of the same immigrants or migrants settling in predominantly Mexican, Puerto Rican, or African American areas. Although this is an important and valid approach in understanding urban development and ethnic succession, my interest here is in how established ethnic communities have provided the historical base upon which newer communities have developed. Secondarily, I am interested in how these longer-term historical changeovers have created...
the New York City we know today. I focus particularly on the role that Puerto Ricans and the Puerto Rican migration played in contributing to (1) the Latino communities of today and (2) what New York is today.

COMMUNITIES IN CONSTANT CYCLES OF SETTLEMENT AND TRANSITION ... AND THE DISCONNECT

It is generally acknowledged that New York has served as a port of entry for immigrants. But less clear in the public mind has been how these changes have created the city that we know today. Take, for example, the ever-present "bodegas" (i.e., local Mom & Pop grocery stores) of New York. This term no longer needs translation in New York. How did it become a part of the New York lexicon? Did Dominicans introduce the bodega? Puerto Ricans? The bodegas that came to populate not just Spanish-speaking areas but the city as a whole were not an invention of the Dominican community, or of the Puerto Rican community, but appear to have had their genesis in much earlier, perhaps less researched, Spanish-speaking communities in New York. Historically, and contrary to what most (Latino and non-Latino) New Yorkers envision when they think of a "bodega," *Merriam-Webster's Collegiate Dictionary* indicates that the word actually refers to a warehouse in Spain or "a storehouse for maturing wine." So, in the same way that the Puerto Rican established bodegas where delicatessens—or delis, as they are universally known—previously stood, then these businesses passed to more recent Puerto Ricans or Dominicans. Now, in some instances, Asians or Mexicans have taken over those same establishments.

THE ARRIVAL OF LATINOS DURING THE "LONG HIATUS"

However, in order to better understand the experience of Puerto Ricans and the role they have played in the development of New York and its constant cycles of settlement and transition, it is important to understand the temporal context during which most Puerto Ricans arrived. Although their numbers were few and their communities small, there were Puerto Ricans (and Cubans) who came to New York as political exiles, merchants, or skilled tobacco workers during the latter half of the nineteenth century. More Puerto Ricans began to arrive after the annexation of Puerto Rico by the United States in 1898; then they came in substantial numbers after the passage of the Jones Act in 1917, which made Puerto Ricans citizens and sanctioned their service in the military and their participation in World Wars I and II. It was the post–World War II migration that is referred to as "the great migration," for this is when the largest numbers of Puerto Ricans arrived. Indeed, this migration was so concentrated in New York that it spawned the now classic Broadway musical and then movie *West Side Story*, which came to frame the Puerto Rican experience for the American public.

But this Puerto Rican (im)migration took place in a larger temporal context, referred to by Doug Massey (1995) as the "long hiatus." This was the 1930–69 period when few European and other immigrants came to the United States, because of the restrictive federal immigration laws passed after World War I and during the 1920s. The Great Depression and the Second World War also curbed immigration to the United States. Countries in Europe restricted emigration from their countries during wartime and rebuilt their economies during the postwar period. However, during this hiatus period, many Puerto Ricans and Mexicans came. Many came to fill labor shortages occasioned by the decline in immigration, the war involvements, and the expansions of the economy. Indeed, so many Mexicans arrived that the US Census Bureau counted them in the 1930 census by adding a special category for them. It was also during this period that Puerto Ricans began to (im)migrate in larger numbers. Although not often acknowledged, both these immigrations boosted the economies where the immigrants settled. The early (im)migrants entered a world where any departure from the white, nonethnic American—whether in language, accent, culture, or color—was often a basis for exclusion or discrimination. During this long hiatus, even movie actors of European extraction felt compelled to change their names to more bland—termed by some "harmonious"—English-sounding names in order to achieve their American Dream. Consequently, and for example, Bernard Schwartz became Tony Curtis, Natasha Nikolaevena Gurdin became Natalie Wood, and Joe Yule became Mickey Rooney (Jarvie 1991, 91). Nevertheless, in New York, as elsewhere, these Latino immigrants persevered and built their communities, often upon the remnants of older and
smaller Latino communities, or created new communities, as in the "West Side," the Lower East Side (which came to be known as Loisaida), the Bronx, and Brooklyn.

Those large numbers of Puerto Ricans who came after World War II also arrived during the McCarthy era, and entered a system that embraced the entrenched assimilationist ethos of an earlier period. The diversity, cosmopolitanism, and international flavor that is so much a part of New York today was present mainly as a dim historical antecedent, evident more in unread historical texts than in real-life classrooms. (This history of diversity was seldom acknowledged or taught during this hiatus period.) The political conservatism—and McCarthyism in particular—created mistrust of Puerto Ricans' history of struggle for political independence and influenced their reception. Some viewed Puerto Ricans suspiciously—as terrorists, even—because of the Nationalist uprisings in Puerto Rico protesting US control. There were also political acts that occurred in the States during the Truman administration; for example, four Puerto Rican nationalists opened fire on the US House of Representatives in 1954. Ironically, the cloud of distrust that these political acts cast upon these newcomers then is perhaps better understood from our post-9/11 vantage point, in the attitudes held by some toward Islamic communities today.

But these Latinos pushed ahead in spite of these reactions, and their children came together in the "Plante" or "Forward" rallying call. In so doing, they carved out new cultural and social spaces for Latinos from a city that became rather unresponsive to ethnic and cultural differences. Felipe Luciano, a New York Puerto Rican and one of the founders of the Young Lords Party, articulated this view of Puerto Ricans as trailblazers: "As the pioneers of Latino empowerment and pride, especially east of the Mississippi, we've paved the road for all Spanish speaking peoples coming to American cities, including Mexicans, Dominicans, Central Americans, etc." (Felipe Luciano, "A New Deal between Staten Island and Island Puerto Ricans: The View from a New York 'Rican," guest commentary, NYCityLatinoPolitics. March 30, 2011). It is this history—of how these earlier waves of Latinos in New York contributed to and altered New York's cultural, political, and social landscape—that is often missing from analyses of contemporary immigrants in New York. This chapter, and this volume more generally, seek to address and fill in these views, for, as the title of this volume suggests, Latinos in New York are communities in transition. Then, again, New York has also been a place where communities are in continual transition.

Consequently, we also need to better understand that, in many respects, today's immigrants are not entering the same city that Puerto Ricans or immigrants encountered at the beginning of the twentieth century. They are entering a city that changed greatly during the sixties and seventies in terms of how diversity and immigrants were viewed and accommodated. The city changed in many ways during those decades because of the individual and collective action of Puerto Ricans and their allies. A few of such changes that were significant, impactful, and path breaking were bilingual education, bilingual voting assistance, removing accents as a barrier to employment in the school system and elsewhere, eliminating height and weight requirements for police officers and fire fighters, establishing the Latino arts and theatrical companies and institutions (still vibrant now), establishing institutions that facilitated high-school-to-college pathways, and founding the Puerto Rican studies programs that became the foundation for subsequent Latino and Latin American studies programs throughout the region.

Immigrants today enter a city where the law requires that bilingual education or ESL (English as a Second Language) must be provided to children who speak another language. This requirement came about when Aspira, a Puerto Rican agency (led by Antonia Pantoja) sued the Board of Education because it was not educating all of the city's children. This case was litigated through the courts and resulted in the 1974 Bilingual Consent Decree agreement with the Board of Education, which required that children in need of English instruction be provided with it.

Immigrants enter a city that provides bilingual voting assistance. The legislation that today requires this stems from the success of the Puerto Rican Legal Defense and Education Fund (PRLEDF—today known as Latino Justice PRLDEF), which went to court and, in 1973, won the argument that Puerto Ricans, as citizens—and some as former military personnel—should be allowed to register and vote in their own language. Soon after, Latinos who arrived with college educations from other countries could and did find jobs in the school system and elsewhere, because Puerto Ricans had argued that "accents" should not be a barrier to entering the teaching, social work, or other professions. Before this, some Puerto Rican, and likely others Latino, professionals raised in New York were rejected as possible teachers only because interviewers had detected an "accent" during their interviews for the job.
Today, the police and fire departments are more integrated than in the past; we can find police officers and firefighters who speak Spanish. This is, in part, because PRIDEF challenged the requirement that recruits had to meet certain height and weight measurements.

Spanish-speaking and bilingual theater and drama continue to flourish and nourish new talent both in acquired spaces and in public outdoor spaces, in large part because of many hard-fought struggles by Latinos to establish themselves and subsequently to survive as freestanding, quality institutions. Institutions like Teatro LATEA, El Repertorio (the Spanish Repertory Theater), the Puerto Rican Traveling Theater, and Pregones are places that continue to present dramas of particular interest to many Spanish-speaking communities, as well as to support and sustain the new (as well as the veteran) dramatic talents of actors within these communities and from other Spanish-speaking countries. These theaters continue the earlier New York traditions of other ethnic theaters, where plays were performed, for example, in Yiddish, in Italian, or bi-lingually.

It is not major news that the visual- and performing-art works of aspiring Latin Americans from various countries are exhibited in New York. In the past, the works of globally acknowledged Latin American artists, such as Diego Rivera and José Clemente Orozco, were exhibited in major institutions. However, Latin American artists who were not so well known had difficulty having their works exhibited in New York. Puerto Rican artistic institutions that were established against great odds and with major sacrifices (e.g., El Museo Del Barrio and Taller Boricua) have, from their inception, sought to provide a space for artists from all Latin American countries when other museums were not interested in their work. And they have continued to expand this mission.

Aspara, one of the first organizations set up to help Puerto Rican students improve their educational attainments, has had wholly Dominican chapters for decades now. Hostos College, Boricua College, and various programs within other colleges have served and continue to serve as entry points for immigrants with limited English ability to receive a college education.

Finally, the Puerto Rican studies programs established thirty to forty years ago in institutions of higher education throughout the city—often against the resistance of the college administrations—have all branched out to include Latin American and Caribbean studies and have hired staff from all groups. In essence, the Puerto Rican community and its leaders and allies were directly responsible for these changes, and others, such as bilingual voting; Spanish-speaking priests, ministers, and services; and countless other small, community-based organizations that fought for the rights of new and older (im)migrants in a variety of areas and for all ages.

Again, this is not to say that the newer groups have not also established their own organizations; as with all new groups, they have done so and will continue to do so. In the same way that Puerto Ricans wished to write their own histories, so, too, have more-recent immigrants to New York. But immigrants today enter a city with a past, a city where they meet others who have come to expect and to provide these dimensions of New York life. Needless to say, these institutions and characteristics of New York life would not have come about without the efforts and hard-fought battles and struggles of the earlier waves of Latinos and others. Indeed, these earlier Puerto Rican accomplishments were in themselves also influenced and facilitated by African Americans' long-standing and contemporaneous struggles for civil rights and by the battles of prior immigrants who fought for better working conditions, education, and housing.

Our failure to place these new and emerging Latino communities within their historical contexts will limit our abilities to properly understand them and their unique circumstances, as well as their historical continuities. Puerto Ricans, arriving during and after the “Long Hiatus,” found no organizations facilitating their entry into the United States. They fought long and hard to develop these and other institutions, which came to be redirected to serve the broader Latino and New York community. These organizations are not run only by Puerto Ricans today, but also by members of other Latino communities. And their orientations have also broadened to reflect the needs and cultural expressions of these groups as well.

NARROW TRANSNATIONALISM OFTEN MISSES THE PUERTO RICAN EXPERIENCE

One common perspective through which immigrants have recently been viewed is transnationalism. “Transnational” is defined by Merriam-Webster’s Collegiate Dictionary as “extending or going beyond national boundaries,” and the words “first known use” was in 1921. As an academic perspective that became popular during the nineties, transnationalism puts a positive spin on immigrants, seeing them as people who travel back and forth between their countries of origin and the one they immigrated to, and who thereby retain important associations to their countries of origin while also
gaining additional connections in their new lands. This perspective continues to offer a viable framework for studying new immigrant groups. Gone within this formulation are the earlier, problematic references to the “circulating migrations” of Puerto Ricans and claims that such back-and-forth movements prevented them from assimilating and setting down their roots in the United States so that they could progress socioeconomically (see Rodríguez 1989, 1993).

Some transnational analyses, however, do not include Puerto Ricans as a transnational group.” This tends to contribute to the “disconnect” in some of the academic literature between the Puerto Rican experience and that of more recent immigrants. The rationale for not considering Puerto Ricans to be transnational is that they were not seen as emigrating from another, independent country. Rather, they were “migrants” because they were not “foreign born” but born in a territory of the United States and they did not have to naturalize. Vargas-Ramos (2012) disagrees with this view but finds that Puerto Ricans, in contrast to other groups, display low levels of transnational practices. For example, they do not send remittances as much as other immigrant groups. However, this may reflect Vargas-Ramos’s consideration of the modern Puerto Rican community, which is dominated by second-, third-, or even fourth-generation Puerto Ricans. It may be that as time has passed, Puerto Rican transnationalism has declined with successive generations in the United States.

Others, however, describe Puerto Ricans as immigrants (Aranda 2007), and some include Puerto Ricans as a transnational group (Roth 2012, 9). Torres and Martínez, in chapter 4 of this volume, state that “the transnational character of Puerto Rican and other Latino communities reinforces the cultural ties to their homeland, abetting the retention of Spanish-language use and sustaining participation in the political and economic life of their countries of origin.” They add that “what has been noted as a distinctive quality among recent immigrants from Latin America has been a long-time feature of the Puerto Rican diaspora.” Duany (2010a) also compares the different roles that remittances play in the transnational experiences of Puerto Ricans, Dominicans, and Mexicans. Finally, DeSipio and Panoja (2007, 120) refer to the distinction often made—or the exceptionalism claimed—in the literature with regard to Puerto Ricans: “The fluidity of migration and the relative ease of access of citizenship rights of Puerto Ricans in the United States often [necessarily] an asterisk or a footnote in studies of Latino immigrant adaptation.” However, they also note that “the failure of previous immigration scholarship to theorize about and analyze Puerto Rican migrant adaptation represents a substantial gap in our understanding of the dynamics of immigrant transnational engagement in general.” They further state that “in the study of ethnic politics in the United States, the experience of the Puerto Rican migration needs to be moved to a more central position within the immigration literature (and the asterisk needs to be removed from much of our analysis).”

The omission of Puerto Ricans from many transnational analyses differs from the way in which others have viewed Puerto Ricans, that is, as immigrants (Rodríguez 1989). That is to say that Puerto Ricans were both immigrants, since they arrived as citizens, and immigrants, since they generally came speaking Spanish and not English, and with a different culture and historical experience. They were like more-recent immigrants to Britain, the Netherlands, or France (Rodríguez 1989), who come from “transnational colonial states” (Duany 2010a, 2010b) or “post-colonial colonies” (Jorge Duany, “Una Colonia Poscolonial,” El Nuevo Día, July 11, 2012) with certain rights of citizenship.

Other trends have also contributed to the relative faintness of Puerto Ricans in the migration literature. For example, the focus on citizenship, particularly in Europe, has contributed to this invisibility, certainly in the past twenty years. Because Puerto Ricans are citizens, they are left out of the debate about citizenship and immigration. However, Vargas-Ramos contends that nominal US citizenship is not sufficient for a person to be considered a full-fledged member of the polity (personal conversation, July 17, 2012). Flores and Benmayor’s (1997) concept of “cultural citizenship” was another theoretical construct in the literature that might have been more applied to the Puerto Rican experience. The argument, within this framework, was that despite the absence of formal citizenship, Mexicans had cultural citizenship in large part because of their long-term presence and their cultural, artistic, and linguistic transformations and appropriation of urban spaces. But, perhaps again because Puerto Ricans had formal “citizenship,” this theoretical construct was not applied to Puerto Ricans to any significant degree. Nevertheless, Puerto Ricans, like Mexicanos, also transformed and appropriated urban spaces in New York, making them established Puerto Rican neighborhoods.

Other authors have tended to view immigration from the policy perspective and have thus accepted the idea that there was an immigration hiatus. They, therefore, compare the post-1965 immigrants to the European
immigrants that came prior to the passage (in the 1920s) of immigration laws limiting immigration. This also contributes to the disconnect between Puerto Ricans and newer Latino groups. The current era of substantial (non-
Puerto Rican) Latino immigration to New York began with the passage of the
1965 immigration bill signed by President Johnson. The bill sought to lift quotas on southern and eastern Europeans but eventuated in facilitating the influx of many Asians and Latin Americans instead. In this "New Regime," which Massey (1995) dates from 1970 to the present, Latino immigrants, especially from the Dominican Republic and Mexico, began to arrive in greater numbers.

Many of these immigrants settled in areas where earlier groups of Latinos had established themselves. For example, Washington Heights was—until recent gentrification began—so solidly identified with the Dominican community that many referred to it as "Quisqueya Heights." ("Quisqueya" refers to Hispaniola.) Yet the Washington Heights area had previously been home to large groupings of working-class and lower-middle-class Cubans, Puerto Ricans, and white ethnics, including a strong Jewish community. The South Bronx, long identified as a large Puerto Rican community, also had, in earlier periods, substantial groupings of white ethnics and African Americans; and now has large numbers of Mexicans and Dominicans, as does the larger Borough of the Bronx, and Spanish East Harlem. In areas in Brooklyn, like Williamsburg, and in Manhattan's Lower East Side, gentrification also altered—in some cases, erased—these long-established Puerto Rican/Latino communities, and also their histories.

Gentrification has not been the only force altering these communities. As Torres and Marzán note in chapter 4 in this volume, many Puerto Ricans ("opportunity seekers") have moved of their own accord, seeking the suburban American Dream or new employment in areas outside of New York, while others were displaced "by shrinking employment opportunities and limited affordable housing" in New York.

In essence, and as Roth (2012, 8) has indicated, "Puerto Ricans are often excluded from research on immigration and thus tend to be understudied". With notable exceptions, often at the dissertation level, few works have focused on a comparison of Puerto Ricans and other immigrant groups. Many works that analyzed the new Latino immigrants to New York placed them within a transnational framework from which Puerto Ricans were omitted. They viewed them within the first-time frame, or compared them to immigrants who came from Europe at the end of the nineteenth century.

Comparative work that included Puerto Ricans was rare. Work including Puerto Ricans was also less funded and less published in mainstream outlets. This was very much in contrast to the earlier research period, when Puerto Ricans were the subject of much research (Rodriguez 1995; Rodriguez, Olmedo, and Reyes-Cruz 2003).

**POPULAR CULTURE AND A JOURNALISTIC EXAMPLE: NEW YORK MAGAZINE**

Curiously, during the period when New York's Latino population was overwhelmingly Puerto Rican, even popular culture and journalistic references tended to view Puerto Ricans—correctly or not—as immigrants and not migrants. A small, but interesting, reflection of this view of Puerto Ricans as immigrants can be seen in the text and lyrics written for West Side Story, for example, when Anita refers disparagingly to her Puerto Rican boyfriend as an "immigrant." However, in more recent times, this omission of the Puerto Rican experience in New York has not been limited to academia, but can also be seen in more journalistic or pedestrian circles. The debut of West Side Story in 1958 as a Broadway play, and then in 1961 as a major film, contested the arrival of the Puerto Rican "invaders," but it made clear that Puerto Ricans had arrived.

By 1972, there was a clear, and perhaps more positive, acknowledgment of the impact of Puerto Ricans on New York. New York Magazine, a (if not the) premier New York magazine of its time, led with a cover story on "the big mango" and focused on the "Latin impact on New York Style"; it provided a review of the best Latin restaurants, music, and nightclubs, and published a special issue dedicated to "The City's Latin Soul" (New York Magazine, August 7, 1972). Twenty-seven years later, this same magazine placed Jennifer Lopez on its cover and retitled its September 6, 1999 issue "Nueva York"—thus implying or heralding another major transformation in the cultural life of the city. Its featured lead story was "The Latin Explosion," which asked whether Hispanic Heat was a fad or the future. It added in the description of this story that "this summer, the country went crazy for all things Latino; New Yorkers, of course, get the best of all 22 worlds." This wording acknowledged the multicultural reality of the then-Latino community in New York, but it ignored the long history of this community there. It was as if Latinos had just suddenly burst on the New York scene as the city was about to enter the twenty-first century.
ALL GROUPS HAVE THEIR OWN HISTORY

To acknowledge the early history of the Puerto Rican community in New York does not imply that all Latinos are the same. Each national-origin community in the city has its own history; and each group has to write its own history. But should these histories be written using the “first-time frame”? What is to be gained and what is to be lost in taking this approach? Another example from popular culture is useful in providing part of an answer to the question of what is to be gained. Drug addiction and gang violence are seen by many to have originated with the arrival of Puerto Ricans, Mexicans, or today Central American gangs. But Martin Scorcese’s film Gangs of New York, set in nineteenth-century New York, helps a large audience see that these problems or lifestyles are not solely imported by new immigrants, but rather have clear economic, political, social, and historic underpinnings. By recognizing historical antecedents, we may also better understand the desire of the new Latino immigrants to have their own parades, and to create their own sports heroes, films, literature, music, leading entertainment personalities, and political leaders. It seems that democracy is strengthened and we all benefit from knowing the more comprehensive history of which we are all a part.

NEW YORK CITY AND IMMIGRATION

How has this history of (im)migration affected New York’s view of immigrants and immigration? Across most of the country, immigration is often seen as a threat and worse, but not in New York. For example, seven hundred thousand letters from all over the country—almost all negative—were delivered to congressmen who played a large role in the defeat of the immigration bill in 2007. In other parts of the country, however, we have seen the immigration issue flare up and result in the passage of bills such as Arizona’s SB1070 in six states and in the consideration of similar bills in at least twenty other states. Although all of these bills were eventually dropped or successfully challenged in the courts, anti-immigration views have persisted, and as of this writing, attempts at national immigration reform have not been successful (Lacayo 2012; Khan 2011). The US Supreme Court’s 2012 decision on SB1070 moved immigration from the almost-permanent back burner status it had occupied to a central issue for the 2012 and 2016 national elections. In tight economic times of 2007 to 2011, immigration became the third rail in national politics, with few national politicians wanting to address it and major pieces of anti-immigrant legislation appearing in many states. In New York, however, immigration has been less controversial; this is despite there being large numbers of immigrants in the city. In 2011, 37.2% of the population was foreign born (Lobo and Salvo 2013, 123), and in 2010 almost half of all New Yorkers spoke a language other than English at home; an estimated 200 languages were being spoken in New York. In contrast, in the country as a whole, only about 12% of the population was foreign born in 2010, with another 11% of the population having at least one parent who was not born in the United States.

NEW YORK—FOREVER AN IMMIGRANT CITY

Perhaps the New York nonchalance on the immigration issue is due, as these numbers indicate, to the fact that there are so many immigrants here; in 2010 over three million New Yorkers were foreign born. Indeed, according to one estimate from the head of the city’s planning division, immigrants and their children made up approximately 60% of the New York City population (Lobo and Salvo 2013, 198).

Or does the city have this attitude because immigrants come from so many different areas of the world, that is, Europe, Asia, Africa, and of course, Latin America? Although it may appear to the uncritical eye that all immigrants in New York are from Puebla, Mexico, or the Dominican Republic, in 2011 just 32.1% were from Latin America (i.e., South America, Central America, Mexico, and the Spanish-speaking Caribbean). This leaves 67.9% who are foreign born but not of Spanish origin (Lobo and Salvo 2013).

Or has this attitude taken hold because—contrary to our media views of immigrants as illiterate, dirt-poor wetbacks—in New York, we see and experience the fact, often on an everyday level, that immigrants are actually a very diverse group in terms of education and occupations? But then, New York has always been a mecca for the rich and highly educated from other lands, as well as for those with fewer resources but seeking greater opportunities.

But perhaps it is because New York has historically been the entry port for so many immigrants and have developed a greater—for lack of a better word—“tolerance” for immigrants. Perhaps the earlier waves of immigrants have softened and eased the entry of subsequent immigrants by creating institutions and changing laws and policies—not just in the way noted above.
with regard to Puerto Ricans, but in the earlier efforts of immigrants who struggled to make sure that workers could unionize, make a decent wage, have lunch, rest and vacation periods, and overtime pay, and so on.

Whatever the reasons, we do not see New York passing, or even considering, the same legislation to curtail the influx of immigrants or the freedoms of those already here—legislation that makes headlines in other areas. Indeed, the role of immigrants—except when politicians are seeking immigrant votes—is often muted in the general running of the city.8 Also subdued, however, is the general role that immigrants play in sustaining and servicing the city’s middle- and upper-class life styles, for example, as nannies, repair technicians, restaurant workers, and workers in new construction and renovation projects, to name just a few. So, generally speaking, the New York view of immigrants is that they continue to contribute to making New York viable and livable.

To be sure, many Latino immigrants—and nonimmigrants—have paid, and continue to pay, a price in lower wages and poor working conditions to make the city livable. Indeed, we get a glimpse of this cost when we see the large proportion of Latinos in poverty compared with white non-Hispanics. Nonetheless, Latino and other immigrants have historically made major contributions to the revitalization of the city and continue to provide many benefits to the economy. In essence, immigrants have always built this city and they will continue to do so.

MULTICULTURALISM WITHIN A GLOBALIZED WORLD: NEW YORK AND LONDON COMPARED

New York is not the only major city in the world containing immigrants whose history has often been disconnected from the history of the city’s growth. This has happened in London as well. Although many US citizens may see the capital of the United Kingdom as having a history that is ethnically homogeneous, London, like New York, has long been the “port of entry” for new immigrants and has historically been a city of immigrants. As a recent article in The Economist notes, London, like New York, was created by foreigners. The Romans invaded the Iceni tribe and established a colony in AD 43. Although this was burnt down seventeen years later, London became “a magnet for foreigner.” But the entrance of foreigners was often contested, and conflicts often arose. “Riots occurred against the Jews in the 13th century, the Flemish in the 14th, and the Italians in the 15th, and so on until the Notting Hill riots against the West Indians in 1958” (Emma Duncan, “Special Report: London on a High,” Economist, June 30, 2012, 5). So multiculturalism has strong roots in London—even though, as in New York, it has often been marred by violence when changeovers occur.

In the present, as well, London and New York are similar, though the public perceptions of them are different. Both are global cities today. Indeed, in 2010 the Wall Street Journal indicated that New York was the number-one global city and London was number two (Emily Peck, “The Top Ten Most Global Cities,” blog in Wall Street Journal, September 9, 2010). What does it mean to be ranked highly as a global city? In addition to the standard methods of evaluating the global importance of cities, which include the size of the overall economy and the concentration of support services available for multinationals, such as financial and accounting firms and efficiency and access to capital and information, this study also includes the amount of foreign direct investment that cities have attracted; the concentration of corporate headquarters; the number of particular business niches they dominated; air connectivity (the ease of travel to other global cities); the strength of producer services; financial services, technology, and media power; and racial diversity (Kotkin 2014).

New York’s growth as a global city parallels that of London, not just in the way we usually think of this, that is, in the financial, cultural, and political areas, but also in its growth as a multicultural center. We—or at least those of us who do not often visit London, and who follow its life in briefly reading headlines about royal marriages and Queen Elizabeth’s long reign—tend to think of London as the home of the British monarchy, where all is purely English. However, as the 2012 Summer Olympics intimated, and as the special report in The Economist cited above (June 30, 2012) stated, more than a third of today’s Londoners were born abroad. Additionally, the earlier waves of West Indians in the 1950s and 1960s and South Asians in the 1970s and 1980s have altered the look, landscape, and language of London, giving rise to a language that has been termed a “multicultural London English”—“a mix of Cockney, Jamaican, and other languages spoken by the young of all ethnic groups” (Duncan 2012, 7). Doesn’t this sound a lot like New York? The two cities resemble each other also in terms of socioeconomic stratification, with recent arrivals concentrated at the top as well as at the bottom.

In the same way that the history of Puerto Ricans in New York is often disconnected from the growth of the city, so too the impact of immigrations
to London in the 1960s and 1970s seems to be muted. For example, in the
case of Puerto Ricans, the critical labor that they provided to the New York
economy in the post-World War II period is seldom acknowledged. Simi-
larly, we hear little of the contributions of West Indians and South Asians
who arrived in London during the latter part of the twentieth century.

As we learn about the history of London, more similarities appear. Al-
though many of us are familiar with the idea of New York as a city built by
immigrant labor and innovation, we tend not to think of London in this way.
In the same way that London's history has contributed to its growth as a
major multicultural center, so, too, the history and experience of previous
immigrants (including Puerto Ricans) has contributed to the growth of New
York as a similar multicultural city. In other words, the multiculturalism that
many of us celebrate in New York today as a twenty-first-century innovation
actually has been a dominant theme throughout its history.

A NEW, MORE GLOBAL VIEW OF MULTICULTURALISMS

In the past, many Puerto Ricans and others fought for a more open and ac-
cepting multicultural New York. We likely did so with little awareness of,
acknowledgment of, or even, in some cases, interest in New York's previous
multiculturalism, or its relevance to us. This disconnect from the past per-
sists among the newest or latest immigrants from all countries and among
some academics, who study the current immigration as if it were related
only to great waves of immigration at the end of the nineteenth century and
the beginning of the twentieth. As we have noted, the immigration of Puerto
Ricans and Mexicans during the middle one-third of the twentieth century
(i.e., during the immigration hiatus) is often forgotten, or covered as if they
had no bearing on the contemporary communities that subsequent immi-
grants entered.

Occasionally, however, this multicultural history and its legacies to the
present are acknowledged. In this regard, I am reminded of a conversation I
recently had with a friend and colleague from Colombia, South America. He
had already grasped a sense of the role that Puerto Ricans have played in the
evolution of New York as a continually growing multicultural city. He told me
he had gone to the bank and spoken with a bilingual teller and that he had
Pantoja to thank for this. While Antonia Pantoja did not fight for bilingual
bank tellers, she (and many others that she worked with) did fight for the

rights of non-English-speaking students to be educated and taught in their
language, so that they could retain this language and also learn English.

My friend's view makes the connection, as opposed to the more com-
mon disconnect discussed above. His view may also reflect an early, growing
awareness of multiculturalism as a worldwide phenomenon in which cul-
tures are absorbed and incorporated within or from a global perspective. In
this globalized world, where many are exposed to an increased amount of
diversity, people eat "mofongo" in Puerto Rico or Miami, escargot in Paris
or Chicago; and they eat mofongo not because it is Puerto Rican or escargot
because it is French, but because they like to eat them. Because of changes in
technology, communications, and travel, we are all part of this increasingly
multicultural reality. People may reflect on the origins of these products, but
the products are not being incorporated into diets because of their origins;
rather, these tastes have been acquired because they are increasingly avail-
able and valued. For the same reason, tacos, wraps, and other "ethnic" foods
are being eaten by people with cultural heritages different from those in
which the foods evolved; they are part of a progressively more multicultural
reality. This is a reality that we all gradually and inadvertently participate in,
or will participate in, because of globalization.

In the past, becoming an American citizen may have been seen as dis-
carding one's culture, language, and previous political loyalties. However, for
my friend who recently became an American citizen, that experience was a
validation of multiculturalism. How so, I asked? It was the presence of all
these individuals from different parts of the world, he said, and the judge's
words about how my friend and these other new citizens would now be able
to contribute fully to the growth of the United States: this experience vali-
dated for him what he had come to know of multicultural New York and
multiculturalism, more generally. For him, multiculturalism today was a
worldwide phenomenon that allowed and acknowledged the contributions
of all cultures. For me, this view that embraces the past and shows its con-
nections to the global present may be the future that we seek and teach. Such
a view highlights what is common to us—as opposed to what is different. It
may also be what allows us to correct and bridge the disconnect noted above
and to prevent disconnects in the future.

Not only must we acknowledge that without the new immigration, New
York would not have recovered from its deep economic malaise starting with
the fiscal crisis of the 1970s, a point often made in the press; we must also
acknowledge how the early Puerto Rican communities, and the institutions they created and opened, significantly altered the social, cultural, and political fabric of the city. These, too, are part of New York’s cyclical existence. If we can do this, we will not only better understand the experience of new immigrants: we will also better understand how to prepare for the city’s needs in the future—as well as how it should conduct itself in its relationship with an increasingly globalized world. Immigrants will continue to make New York viable, even as the city struggles with industry shifts, poverty, fiscal problems, and its place in the ever-evolving global economy.

NOTES

1. To some degree, it has also been generally acknowledged that immigrants were themselves changed and that they changed more broadly the culture and life of Americans. Commonly cited examples are the introduction of foods, such as pizza (Italian), hot dogs (German), tacos (Mexican or perhaps burritos), and wraps (Middle Eastern) today. How many Puerto Ricans played handball before coming to New York? Who danced to salsa music before it was developed in New York?

2. References to a bodega, as a grocery store, and not as a warehouse for wines, do appear in late nineteenth-century Spanish ads.


4. See Sánchez Korrol (1983) for descriptions of these communities. See also Haslip-Viera (2010); Vega (2010).

5. By 1874, the first Puerto Rican newspaper in New York, La Voz de Puerto Rico, had already been published. By the same time, the Republican societies of Cuba and Puerto Rico had established offices in Philadelphia and New York, and the first Puerto Rican civic organization was established by 1892. Some of the travel to New York occurred through New Orleans during this early period.

6. "The great migration" refers to the period between 1946 and 1964 (Stevens-Arroyo and Díaz-Stevens 1982).

7. Sources for much of the historical overview that follows are Kullen (1992); Rodríguez-Fraticelli, Sanabria, and Tirado (1991); Sánchez Korrol (1983); and Olmo (1991).

8. The categorization of these Puerto Rican “newcomers” posed and poses a quandary for many observers (Hale din 1959). Are they immigrants (which means coming from another country) or migrants (coming from another part of this country)? Legally, Puerto Ricans were “migrants” after the 1917 Jones Act, which made them citizens, but in practically all other important aspects—i.e., they spoke another language, came from a non-Anglo Saxon culture, and were mostly Catholic when Protestantism dominated the United States—they were more like “immigrants.” That is why I refer to them as (im)migrants (Rodríguez 1989). See also Pérez y González (2000).

9. Other Spanish-speaking immigrants from the Caribbean and elsewhere also came during this period. This included some working-class Cubans and Dominicans, but they were fewer. During this hiatus, New York also was home to many African Americans who had migrated from the south and contributed to the Harlem renaissance along with immigrants from the West Indies and other parts (Watkins-Owens 1996). Given the segregated nature of life then, many tended to live in fairly segregated areas. After the Castro takeover in 1959, many middle- and upper-class Cubans arrived in the United States, but mainly settled in Florida and New Jersey. There were also smaller migrations of Colombians and other South Americans to New York during this period.

10. For reference to the contributions of Puerto Ricans to the New York City economy during this period, see History Task Force (1979, 1983).

11. Jarvis (1991, 91) examines the ethnicities and names of major stars during the thirties, forties, and fifties and finds that not only were the names WASP, but most of the stars were white Anglo-Saxon Protestants or Roman Catholics. He argues that in addition to euphony, people were trying to avoid the ordinary and the very fancy in these WASP star names.

12. The Puerto Rican migration of the fifties also coincided with a mass hysteria about juvenile crime and a national debate about the causes of juvenile crime and solutions. Again, as the lyrics to the song “Gee, Officer Krupke,” in West Side Story (1961) tellingly indicated, there was also a national debate about the causes of juvenile delinquency. Were ID’s the result of life circumstances, like drunken mothers, abusive fathers, and general poverty? Or were individuals to be held responsible for their illegal behavior? By the administrations of Presidents Johnson and Kennedy, a shift had occurred to a more liberal perspective, and a war had been declared on poverty (see Pérez 1997).

13. In this column, Luciano was responding to negative views of Nuyoricans by Puerto Ricans in Puerto Rico. See http://nymccinpolitico.com/2011/06/15/701/.


