

## Latinos in New England: An Introduction

Andrés Torres

When the United States declared war on Mexico, more than a century and half ago, did anyone imagine that this act would ultimately bond this country into a permanent relation with our southern neighbor? It was a war of conquest, supported by the logic of Manifest Destiny and by the economic interests that desired the extension of slave-owning territories. U.S. imperial might (and Mexican internal division) dictated an easy victory, leading to the appropriation of half the land formerly belonging to Mexico. To this day Mexican-Americans can claim, with a measure of historical accuracy, “we didn’t cross the U.S. border, the U.S. border crossed *us*.”

A little-known episode of the so-called Mexican War, which has ironic relevance to the present anthology, concerns the story of the *San Patricios*. This was a brigade of mostly Irish Americans who had been recruited to fight in the invading army, but who abandoned the U.S. side to join with the Mexicans. Like their putative enemy, these Irish had been colonial subjects and were Catholic. In the gateway cities of Boston and New York, the newcomers had been subjected to ethnic and religious discrimination. South of the border, they were enticed with promises of land and freedom if they joined the Mexican Army.<sup>1</sup>

When U.S. victory came, the *San Patricios* met a tragic ending, most of them executed or jailed for desertion. North of the Rio Grande history treats them as an embarrassing chapter; in Mexico City a monument preserves their names in honor for their gallantry in battle. In 1997 the Mexican and Irish governments issued commemorative stamps of the St. Patrick’s Battalion.

Decades later history would record another interesting link of a Hispano-Yankee character. José Martí, writer and freedom fighter, was a leading figure in the Cuban independence struggle. In 1869 the Spanish authorities exiled him from his homeland, after which he lived many years in Latin America and in New York City. Though he was skeptical of

U.S. intentions in the Caribbean, he was an admirer of this country's democratic ideals.

Martí was attracted to the writings of Ralph Waldo Emerson, the famous New England essayist and philosopher. A democrat and humanist, Emerson was an active Abolitionist and had opposed the U.S. war on Mexico. Martí wrote about Emerson, showing his Latin American readers that there was another side to the bellicose Giant of the North.<sup>2</sup>

In the early twentieth century, by which time the United States had replaced Spain as the dominant foreign influence in Latin America, a young Puerto Rican was studying at Harvard. His records reveal how active Pedro Albizu Campos was while living in Cambridge. In June of 1916, he wrote, "I have given lectures in Boston and other cities on Latin-American questions. This year I was invited to speak at the Convention of New England Immigration Secretaries. I spoke on the Monroe Doctrine at the Boston Social Science Club . . . [and gave] the welcome address at the reception given to all foreign students at Harvard."

Like Martí, Albizu Campos was inspired by the democratic strain in U.S. history. After this country entered World War I, he wrote in the *Harvard Crimson* of "our [Puerto Ricans'] loyalty to the United States." He was still concerned, however, that U.S. power was impeding Puerto Rico's autonomy, two decades after the Spanish-American War. "We want Americans to know the facts of our situation that they may be true to themselves and find a just solution for our relations."<sup>3</sup>

It may be that these are but tenuous connections, individual stories plucked out of the historical record. Yet I hope they demonstrate some symbolic precedence to a reality that can no longer be denied. Latin America's children—her Latinas and Latinos—are a permanent fixture in New England.

This book assembles new writings from experts who examine the Latino impact on New England, perhaps the most tradition-bound area of the United States. A "blue state" region perceived as a stalwart liberal zone, many are paying attention to this part of the country as a new testing ground for social and economic policies that will challenge the area's reputation for civil discourse and multicultural tolerance. The reality is that, in urban areas where racial/ethnic minorities are expanding their presence and asserting their rights, we observe ongoing tensions over the future direction of these cities and their populations. Latinos are increasingly a player in these dynamics.

The central inquiry of this book is this: How is the Latino community influencing New England's socioeconomic, political, and cultural life, and, reciprocally, how is the community being shaped in its interaction with the region's peoples, traditions and institutions?

An underlying premise of this inquiry is that the Latino community, though multiethnic and multiracial, generally acts as a collective identity when interacting with the larger society. Yet, under specific circumstances, each national origin group (“sub-Latino” identity) may simultaneously express its political agency, cultural identity, and economic activity differently from other national groups. Latino social action takes place along a spectrum that ranges from unified collectivity (Pan-Latinismo) to nationalistic individuality (ethnic nationalism).

There are corollary themes addressed in the chapters that comprise this volume. The contributors each deal with one or more of the following questions:

- What is the extent and what are the sources of population growth in the recent past, and what are the socioeconomic trends and conditions at the regional, state, and local level?
- What are some key racial/ethnic and class dimensions of Latino socioeconomic trends and Latino life?
- What are some examples of the host society’s response to the incursion of Latino newcomers? And the subsequent impact on Latino identity and political and social projects?
- How do the various ethnic groups in the Latino community relate to each other?
- What can we say about the relationship of ethnic identity (either country-specific or pan-Latino) to political participation and representation, social movements, and community institutions? What does the New England experience tell us about the ongoing debate concerning the viability of a pan-Latino identity?

This volume disaggregates data and information by national origin sectors, describing discrete instances of Latino community formation and conditions. It assumes that variations within the population are just as instructive as differences between Latinos and the rest of the population. Studying the Latino condition through the lens of region, state, and sub-Latino ethnicity is a major goal of this collection. Hopefully, the accumulation of several case studies—each homing in on a specific nexus of geographic and ethnic contexts—will improve our understanding of the Latino experience, in its variations and multiple expressions.

Our methodology is multidisciplinary. The chapters include an eclectic array of approaches: oral histories, case studies, ethnographic inquiries, focus group research, statistical and regression analyses, and surveys.<sup>4</sup>

## Demographic Trends, Socioeconomic Issues

Only three decades ago few people took notice of Hispanic demographics. Today the subject has permeated every aspect of American life. By now everyone recognizes three characteristics of the Latino population: its explosive growth, its geographic dispersion, and its ethnic diversity. The New England scene is no exception to these trends.

Will the long winters deter the massive influx we have seen in other parts of the country? Perhaps. Most Latin American immigrants come from regions within and contiguous to our hemisphere's tropical zone. Nevertheless, according to the 2000 census, there were close to a million Latinas and Latinos residing in the six states that make up New England.<sup>5</sup> Cold weather or not, the numbers will only grow. These immigrants, their children, and the descendants of the core Latino communities that have already been living in the region for decades will ensure a vibrant presence well into the future.

Between 1990 and 2000, the Latino population in New England grew 60 percent, from about 545,000 to over 871,000. They comprised 6.3 percent of the total New England population. The number of Latino residents (and share of population) for each state was 427,340 (6.7) for Massachusetts, 318,947 (9.4) for Connecticut, 90,452 (8.6), for Rhode Island, 19,910 (1.6) for New Hampshire, 9,226 (0.7) for Maine, and 5,316 (0.9) for Vermont.<sup>6</sup> Ninety-five percent of New England's Latinos live in southern New England: Massachusetts, Connecticut, and Rhode Island.

As elsewhere in the country, growth is accompanied by significant geographic dispersion. Cities such as Boston and Hartford, the classic hubs of Latino New England, are no longer the dominant centers of Latino population growth. For example, the Latino growth rate during 1990–2000 for these cities was 37 percent (increasing from roughly 62,000 to 85,000) and 12 percent (increasing from roughly 44,000 to 49,000), respectively.

Other cities are now taking their place alongside these. Among cities where we find fairly substantial Latino populations—say, of at least 20,000—there are a number in which Latino growth rates greatly exceed that of Boston. These include Providence (whose Latino population grew from 25,000 to 52,000, or by 108 percent), Springfield (growing from 26,500 to 41,300, or by 56 percent), and Waterbury (growing from 14,600 to 23,400, or by 60 percent). Other cities in this category are Lawrence (47 percent), New Haven (53 percent), and New Britain, (56 percent). There are also a good number of Latino concentrations in smaller towns of less than ten thousand inhabitants; some of these may appear to outsiders as having cropped up out of nowhere. To name some,

whose population at least doubled during the 1990s: East Hartford, Danbury, and Willimantic (in Connecticut), Central Falls and Pawtucket (in Rhode Island), Haverhill (in Massachusetts), and Manchester (in New Hampshire).

Another new wrinkle in the Hispanic “demographic” is the increasing variety of national origins. Latinos of Puerto Rican heritage were always the largest single component in New England, and they continue to be so. But their share has declined steadily, even as their tenure in the region continues as the longest. In 1990, 55.7 percent of all Hispanic New England originated from Puerto Rico, a U.S. territory. By 2000 that figure was 49.4 percent (about 430,000 of the 871,000 Latinos in New England). The Dominican share has doubled, officially, to almost 10 percent. This number represents a significant undercount, perhaps by as much as a quarter or a third. Postcensus examination has shown that many Latinos misconstrued the wording on the census forms. The confusion had the greatest impact on all groups that fell outside the traditional “Hispanic/Latino” identifiers of Mexican, Puerto Rican, and Cuban. The result, in the case of New England, was an estimate of 15.4 percent of Latinos (some 134,000 respondents) who identified themselves as “other Hispanic/Latino,” making this anomalous group the second largest population after Puerto Ricans. Researchers, including census officials, have recalculated the counts using other personal data on census forms to arrive at new, unofficial estimates. The result is that the “Other” category is much smaller, and the count for groups such as Dominicans, Salvadorans, Guatemalans, Colombians, and Ecuadorians is much higher.<sup>7</sup> There is no reason to expect a change in the growing ethnic diversity among Latinos.

In their population and economic profile of Latino New England, Marcelli and Granberry accentuate the positive (Chapter 1). Rapid growth of unfamiliar newcomers has always been a source of alarm for Americans, as it has been for people throughout history. Yet without these infusions this country would never have attained economic affluence. The authors demonstrate that present-day Latino demographics are of the sort that have propelled economic growth in the past, because Latinos are more likely to form families, have children and spend. A further economic advantage that they offer is their relatively low elderly population: “the Latino population is important not only because without them New England’s population would have stagnated between 1990 and 2000, but also because of an age profile that intimates future contributions to regional consumption and productivity.”

Still, the authors are cognizant that the economic position of Latinos is problematic. They show the statistical gaps between Latinos and other New Englanders in variables such as education, labor force participation,

earnings and employment, and job types. Also identified are the differences among the various Latino groups. The persistent inequalities faced by such groups as Puerto Ricans, Dominicans, Salvadorans, Guatemalans, and Mexicans, is disconcerting. It is not coincidental that many of the chapters in this volume dwell on aspects of this divergent reality.

Of the Hispanics in the region, some 30 percent were identified as foreign born by the 2000 census. A third of these are naturalized U.S. citizens, meaning that 20 percent of New England's Latino population was classified as nonnaturalized immigrants.<sup>8</sup> Compared to national levels, New England's Latinos have a lower foreign-born population and a higher rate of citizenship among its immigrant population.

Uriarte, Granberry, and Halloran examine recent immigration policies, and find them adversely affecting Massachusetts' foreign-born (Chapter 2). Groups such as Salvadorans, Guatemalans, Hondurans, and Colombians have been caught in a severe policy squeeze. The erosion of sympathy for newcomers dates back to the mid-1990s and is reflected in policy changes that have led to a "vision of immigration that ignores the social dynamics of population flows and the fundamental interaction between the origin and destination of the flow. This blind spot continues to pull policy in the direction of ever stronger border controls and punitive measures for those who succeed in entering the country nevertheless." The authors remind us that after September 11, worsening attitudes towards immigrants make it only more difficult to appreciate their contributions, and what they need to achieve success in this society.

Tightening controls and financial hardship have made it more difficult for people to see kin in their homeland, or to receive visitors from abroad. Budgetary cuts at the state level, where responsibility for immigrant benefits and services is now situated, have reduced access to basic needs, such as health care and housing. The intertwining of immigration and social policies has meant only trouble for this most vulnerable of Latino groups, according to these authors.

Looking specifically at housing and homeownership issues, Michael Stone (Chapter 3) uncovers some alarming trends. Latinos seeking housing are having an especially difficult time. The majority of Latino renters, and a quarter of Latino homeowners, lives in a state of "shelter poverty." By this he means that their rental or mortgage costs are so great that they are left with insufficient funds to cover all the other basic household needs. During the 1990s the rise in shelter poverty was greater for Hispanics, especially Latina-headed households, than for any other major ethnic group in Massachusetts. As a result, Latinos have the lowest rate of homeownership. Further compounding the problem is the existence of programs and policies that entice low-income renters into premature homeownership.

## Migration and Community

Several authors offer insights into the process of community formation in New England.<sup>9</sup> Three case studies of medium-sized cities are described: Waterbury, Connecticut; Providence, Rhode Island; and Cambridge, Massachusetts.

Ruth Glasser's portrait of Waterbury depicts an interesting case of Latino ethnic interaction outside the major urban centers (Chapter 4). The original Puerto Rican population, dating back to the 1950s, has been joined by a growing Dominican settlement. Like their predecessors from the Caribbean, Dominicans have relied on kinship and social networks to identify residential and economic niches within which to pursue a new life. Affordable rents, the relative ease of home ownership, and plentiful work in the lower occupational echelons of this old industrial town: these are the appeals of Waterbury to Dominicans, whether they be former New Yorkers seeking a more sedate environment or islanders ready to abandon the tropical warmth for a chance at economic opportunity.

Glasser situates the Dominican experience in the context of the prior history of Puerto Ricans. As the original Latino group, Puerto Ricans were instrumental in laying the groundwork for Latino community formation in Waterbury. The two groups are not quite co-ethnics (that is, they are not of the same country of origin), but anyone familiar with Caribbean history and with post-1960s migration patterns will attest to the long-standing relations and interactions between the two. It is not coincidental that Puerto Rico is a primary site for immigrants from the Dominican Republic, and that in many places where Dominicans have settled, there is a contiguous Puerto Rican *barrio*. Waterbury is another locale in which the Boricua-Quisqueyano nexus is being played out.

Rhode Island, the smallest state in the country, is home to another thriving Latino community. And though there are other sites of Latino settlement in the state, the capital city of Providence is the center of Latino activity. Providence seems to be unlike other New England cities in that there was not really a substantial Puerto Rican population base out of which a subsequent Latino community is forged. From the beginning, in the 1950s and 1960s (not to speak of earlier decades in which a smattering of Spanish-speaking immigrants had settled in Providence and other Rhode Island towns), the Hispanic presence had been comprised of a variety of Latin Americans and Caribbeans, as Miren Uriarte points out (Chapter 5).

Tracking the community's development over time, Uriarte posits that the Latino experience here varies from standard expectations about the immigrant incorporation process. Neither Gordon's "assimilationist"

model nor the “ethnic resiliency” approach, advocated by Portes and others, quite captures what is going on in the Providence scene. She argues that political activism has taken root quite early in the community’s evolution, that it has occurred despite significant exclusion from the political and economic structures, and, finally, that it is not exclusively focused on local struggles. Latino diversity, a constant feature of the community’s history from its incipient stages, has a lot to do with this trajectory of political activism.

It is fair to say that Waterbury (exemplifying Latino succession) and Providence (exemplifying Latino diversity) both represent case studies of promising futures, notwithstanding the authors’ concerns regarding Latino social and economic conditions. The city of Cambridge, on the other hand, symbolizes the case of a mature Latino community in the throes of stagnation and exclusion. In the words of a long-time community leader, Latino Cambridge is in the midst of a “quiet crisis” (Chapter 6).

Cambridge too has experienced intense Latino political activism and ethnic succession. There was an initial period of ascendancy during the 1960s and 1970s, centering on movements for civil rights and socio-economic advancement. Later in the 1980s a complex process of Latino succession occurred in which Central Americans augmented the early base of Puerto Ricans and Dominicans. The Central Americans, mostly Salvadorans, caught the brunt of America’s rightward turn in social and immigrant policy. Most recently a third cohort of newcomers has made its presence felt, a group dominated by professionals: highly educated, affluent, and including many South Americans. While this later group has made inroads in the city’s social and political elite, their success has not lifted the standing of other Latinos who arrived previously.

Deborah Pacini’s inquiry into the causes of this decline includes an assessment of changing social welfare policy, the variability of ethnic and class relations among Latinos, and the “power of place.” She reminds us that models of immigrant incorporation can hardly be expected to account for locales such as Cambridge, with an “elite economic environment” that is inhospitable to low-skill, low-wage workers. The specialized nature of Cambridge’s key industries and excessive housing costs (the city ended rent control in the mid-1990s) leave little maneuverability for Latinos and other groups on the margin of society. The story of the Puerto Ricans, Dominicans, and Salvadorans of Cambridge is not a happy one. It is the story of a community with questionable prospects for stable growth and vigorous participation in the city’s future.

Latino community formation is anything but uniform, as the chapters in this book demonstrate. The sources of immigration are multiple and varying, heavily dependent on what is occurring in the home country,



or in U.S. territories such as Puerto Rico. Internal migration leads to the emergence of new U.S. communities as older Latino populations relocate and establish newer settings: from Hartford to West Hartford, New York City to Danbury, Boston to Framingham. Settlement patterns are further consolidated as the second-generation sinks roots in the same locale pioneered by their parents. Community formation ideally leads to the successful incorporation of the second and subsequent generations. (Im)migration, settlement, incorporation: the desired scenario. Various chapters in this collection show how this idealized process is at variance with reality, often with problematic outcomes.

Camayd, Karush, and Lejter (Chapter 7) argue persuasively that in places such as Manchester, New Hampshire, Latinos are on an upwardly mobile track. They make a useful distinction between Latino enclaves and Latino diasporas, the latter representing “Latino settlement characterized by branching regional dispersal from traditional areas of concentration into new enclaves in nontraditional states and cities.” Furthermore, in less urbanized states such as New Hampshire, there is a secondary diasporic pattern of movement to suburban areas. Latino growth in Hillsborough county (where Manchester is located) was appreciable during the 1990s, and featured individuals with characteristics untypical of Latinos in the traditional settlement areas.

Compared to the rest of the region, New Hampshire’s Latinos have a higher ratio of U.S.-born status, and more of them trace their national origin to South America (as opposed to Central America or the Caribbean). Along most demographic and human capital dimensions, New Hampshire’s Latinos approximate the characteristics of the mainstream population. Their levels of income, earnings, and asset ownership are higher than for Latinos elsewhere in New England. These are signs of an “emerging middle class” and present opportunities for economic and political contributions to the region.

Up to now we have described several contributions to this volume that have depicted communities of place. Hosffman Ospino (Chapter 9) looks at an important religious community within the Latino experience. His study analyzes the terrain of encounter between the European and Latin American traditions within Catholicism in New England. Latinos are the bearers of “gifts” to the regional church. But often they face resistance to their forms of spirituality, echoing some of the tensions Latinos experience in the political and economic realms. If there is a breach separating the two traditions in the Church, it is not entirely due to mainstream resistance. Ospino suggests that Latin American Catholics may be accustomed to a different way of dealing with the hierarchy, because of “their experience with the clericalist and paternalistic structures of the

church in Latin America.” They are often surprised to find that in many U.S. congregations, lay members are encouraged to be involved in the internal decision-making process.

Latinos comprise 12 percent of the Catholic Church’s following, which is double their share of the region’s overall population. Their membership in key urban dioceses, such as Boston and Hartford, is much greater. As in other parts of the country, they embody much of the Church’s future. The manner in which this institution adapts to internal demographic change will determine how successfully it retains this important group. In a sense, the Latino Catholic experience serves as a microcosm of the larger society’s handling of newcomer “incorporation.” Will religious commonalities overcome cultural differences? The culturally sensitive practices of other Christian denominations continue to attract Latinos away from mainstream Catholicism. How will the political and theological fissures in the Church play out for Latinos? What will be the impact on Latino congregants of the controversies over reproductive rights and gay unions? Ospino’s study opens the door to consideration of these questions.

The idea that Latin American immigrants continue to maintain ties with the home country, well after they settle in the United States, has been thoroughly documented.<sup>10</sup> The New England experience offers plenty of evidence that transnational linkages are an important element in Latino community formation.

Dominican migration to Waterbury is incentivized not only by the availability of work and housing, but also by the opportunity to accumulate capital for home building back in *La Republica*. Glasser notes this pattern, described by some of her informants. Since migration from the Dominican Republic is more costly than it is from Puerto Rico, Dominicans who come to Waterbury tend to come from a higher economic stratum than Puerto Rican newcomers to the city. They tend to hail from the families of business proprietors, farmers, and ranchers. This is less the case for Puerto Ricans, who (when they arrived in large numbers during the 1960s and 1970s) generally were agricultural laborers recruited to work the fields of New England.

The selectivity of Dominican immigrants, however, did not lead them to seek housing outside of the Latino working class barrios. They preferred to live in the same areas populated by Puerto Ricans, with whom they were culturally familiar, where affordable housing could be attained. Dominicans of relatively upper-class background could stow away resources for a longer-term goal: building their retirement homes back in the Caribbean. Each year these individuals visit their homeland and, with the funds economized, augment their property: home building on the installment plan.

Transnational activity of this sort differs qualitatively from the pattern of sojourner laborers, who work seasonally in a region and often don't return to the same locale. The *bodeguero* in Waterbury is a vital member of the community, residing here throughout the year and often involved in social and political efforts. Compared to his homeland status, this individual has dropped a notch or two in class standing, but these immigrants will accept some downward mobility as part of a rational strategy for security and comfort in later years, when they return to their birthplace.

Connections with their homelands can also draw immigrant communities into the political realm. Several examples of such transnational linkages are described in this collection. During the 1980s, the Salvadoran community in Cambridge and elsewhere was at the center of solidarity movements protesting U.S. intervention in Central America. In Connecticut and Massachusetts, since the 1970s, Puerto Ricans were galvanized by the controversy over the use of Vieques island as a site for bombing practices by the U.S. Navy. In 2004 Waterbury's Dominicans mobilized compatriots to vote, using absentee ballots, in the Dominican national elections. Many Latin American countries—including Brazil—have increased the profile of their consulates in New England, offering immigration counseling and community development assistance. Countries south of the U.S. border are increasingly recognizing that the nationals who live in New England need to be attended to.

## Identity and Politics

Judging by several chapters in this volume, Latino ethnic awareness owes as much to negative experiences in the host society as it does to pride in one's cultural heritage. The idea that society's hostility toward immigrants can foment nationalistic sentiments among newcomers has a long tradition. More recently scholars have shown how this process applies equally to the Hispanic experience in America. New England provides its own examples of this process of "reactive ethnicity."<sup>11</sup>

When Massachusetts's citizens voted overwhelmingly in 2003 to vote in favor of "Question 2," a proposal to eliminate the state's bilingual education programs, Latinos and other linguistic minorities were stunned. They were shocked not so much by the outcome but by the margin of defeat. Was the chasm between Latinos (along with other linguistic minorities) and the mainstream *that* large? Outside of a few cities and towns of liberal leaning, a virtually unanimous sentiment was rendered by the state's majority-white population: it was time to end targeted educational programs for non-English speakers. In the future, after a year

of transition, foreign students would be channeled into “immersion” classrooms, where they would be expected to learn the language of the land. The fact that Massachusetts was home to the first publicly supported bilingual education program, established thirty years earlier, was not lost on supporters of English-only initiatives across the country.

Jorge Capetillo and Robert Kramer’s assessment of the referendum—based on exit polls, focus group discussions, and media analysis—examines several aspects of this contentious issue (Chapter 13). In their view, English-only proponents exploited mainstream fears of immigrants, and held out the hope that “by ending bilingual education voters might begin to mend the fractures of present day America.” Central to the defeat of the program was the expertly organized and well-financed campaign conducted by bilingual education’s critics and national figures such as Ron Unz.

It is true that bilingual education’s demise was speeded along by an effective campaign drive. Nevertheless, Capetillo and Kramer say, there was a deeper basis for the defeat: an underlying shift in the cultural mood of the majority Massachusetts population. Sympathetic attitudes towards racial/ethnic diversity have been displaced by a concern with large-scale immigration. Today, residents of the Bay State seem to be insisting that newcomers make a commitment to rapid assimilation.

Despite this policy setback, Latinos gained immeasurable experience in the political process. Voter participation increased significantly and their ethnic consciousness appears to have intensified, not waned. Latinos interpreted the vote as a rebuke to their cultural identity, not merely a desire by mainstream voters to rid the state of a costly social program.

For Amílcar Barreto, the dispute over Question 2 illustrates the dangers of mainstream myopia regarding language policy (Chapter 14). New Englanders should look northward, not southward, if they want a glimpse at the problems created by a forced monoculturalism. For decades the French-speaking Quebecois were deemed outsiders in their Canada. They responded by affirming their differences to the point, almost, of formal succession.

“Latino political activism in the northeast developed, for the most part, outside the formal party structure,” Barreto argues. The resounding defeat of bilingual education is another instance in which cultural and political obstinacy may encourage minorities to seek redress through unconventional approaches. Much will hinge on the dominant society’s attitude toward diversity. “The various forms of future Latino political participation may depend as much on the reactions of the area’s majority as on the actions of Latinos themselves.”

In his intergenerational study of Dominicans in Rhode Island, José Itzigsohn finds that Spanish-language retention among Latino youth

reflects a desire to assert cultural pride in the face of discrimination (Chapter 12). In a departure from the practices of earlier European immigrants, Itzigsohn's interviewees even declare their intention to raise *their* children (the third generation) to be bilingual in Spanish. For the children of immigrants, the Spanish language—and ethnic music, food and celebrations—are used as a “marker of identity.” In the U.S. context of discrimination, “maintaining identity symbols like language is in part a form of reactive ethnicity and in part a way of asserting their uniqueness in a plural society where a strong group identity is important for many to forge a strong individual identity.”

Dominicans of different generations seem to share a similar worldview: they want to have their children be bilingual, they are critical of U.S. society, and they exhibit “transnational attachments” to the Dominican Republic. Yet the daily practices emanating from this common outlook differ across the generations. For the U.S.-born cohort, Spanish-language maintenance and fondness for their island are symbolic expressions. These practices are less ingrained in concrete living than they are for the first generation. The original immigrants rely on Spanish as their language of birth and speak it daily, and they connect to the homeland through political and economic activities.

For the second generation, “the attachment to Spanish and to a transnational identity are part of asserting their place and identity in the United States.” The United States, which to them “feels like home,” is the main context for their daily practices, even if its values seem to be at variance with their worldview. Itzigsohn concludes that the path of second-generation Dominican incorporation “combines strong critical views of mainstream society, strong pan-ethnic and transnational attachments, and middle-class aspirations.”

Once again, we see how Latino ethnic formation emerges from both negative and affirmative forces.

Pantojas' study of Latino political opinion and behavior in Connecticut is premised on the notion that racial/ethnic minorities are aware of their politically disadvantaged status (Chapter 10). They therefore tend to be alienated regarding formal governmental structures. He draws on the “political empowerment” thesis to test the argument that, only through the election of Latinos and Latinas to public office (that is, the increase in “ascriptive representation”), will mainstream political institutions gain the community's trust and participation.

There is plenty of evidence that Connecticut's Latinos feel separated from the political system, according to Pantojas' analysis of survey data. The results reveal cynicism toward political officials and political parties, whether in their home state or in Washington, DC. “These are troubling

findings, since these orientations are often associated with political apathy or participation in other antidemocratic behaviors.”

There are two interesting additional results of this study. First, that among the state’s second-generation Latinos there is even greater distrust of government than among immigrant Latinos. Second, that cynicism toward certain political institutions is greater among those with higher levels of education. It appears that increased exposure to the system undermines confidence in it.

José Cruz provides another perspective on Latino participation in the arena of formal politics (Chapter 11). The author reports on his interviews of a dozen Latino political leaders in Connecticut. The bulk of Latino leadership is Puerto Rican, reflecting the fact that Connecticut is the state with the highest share of Puerto Rican population. In the few instances of elected officials of other Latino origins, even these were dependent on the Puerto Rican electorate, which combines citizenship status with longest residency in the area. Cruz goes so far as to say that, in the case of Connecticut, “the pan-ethnic category (of Latinos) is not much more than an artificial label for what are essentially Puerto Rican politics.”

One might assume a certain convenience in connection with this virtual dominance of a single group within the Latino polity. There would be no need for constant negotiation among the Latino partners as they try to forge pan-Latino collaboration. Cruz argues, however, that the Puerto Rican–dominated leadership has not succeeded in building an effective statewide presence. For example, the majority of his informants (all are elected officials) do not view coalition building as a requirement for political success. And he finds that there is no “systematic effort . . . to coordinate and share resources, ideas, and strategies among themselves.”

In the end, the author says, there is not much of a basis for optimism. Despite the achievements at the local level, where a number of cities and towns have elected Latinos into government, there has not emerged a coherent policy agenda or strategy for action at a broader level. This would require a deliberate and focused approach on unifying Latinos internally, and reaching out to natural allies. In the meantime, Cruz is concerned that “Latinos achieve political representation but are not able to address the basic needs of the community. . . . [They] seem unable to impact the socioeconomic status of Latinos as a whole.”

## **Inter-Latino Relations**

In their daily lives Hispanic New Englanders of varying nationalities are interacting actively with each other. Recent demographic trends have assured that there will be no single group exercising political and cultural

hegemony, as was the case of Puerto Ricans during the 1960s and 1970s. The future development of the community, including the manner of its incorporation or participation in society, is likely to be shaped by the forms of inter-Latino relations. We can reasonably posit that the stronger and more cooperative are these relations, the less likely Latinos will pursue the traditional assimilationist path. There are a number of examples of Latino interconnectivity identified in this collection.

As community-based organizations were formed in the context of the War on Poverty during the 1960s and 1970s, Puerto Ricans were the primary actors. Agencies like Concilio Hispano, based in Cambridge, were a leading force for social change and a center of Puerto Rican and Dominican activity (Chapter 6). By the 1980s, Concilio's clientele increasingly mirrored the shift toward Central Americans that was taking place in Cambridge. Reagan-era politics frowned on advocacy and forced a transformation in Concilio's original mission, from grass roots organizing to direct social service. The capacity to implement even this latter role was reduced by budgetary cuts, and with each passing year the organization faced tighter constraints.

Within the context of a single organization, the process of Latino succession was occurring. Yet it would be erroneous to imagine a sharp break between the two phases (Puerto Rican–Dominican to Central American). As long as Concilio was a “player” in city politics and could wield at least some resources, the earlier group of Latinos continued to relate to it. Until the early 2000s, for example, the board chairwoman was a Puerto Rican.

Waterbury's Puerto Ricans had established church and social clubs in the early years of the community (Chapter 4). In time Dominicans and other Latinos arrived, joining them and participating in congregations such as of St. Cecilia's. Religious celebrations gradually took on a more diverse flavor, with observation of non–Puerto Rican symbols and dates. Hosffman Ospino's discussion of Catholics in New England (Chapter 9) also illustrates the multi-Latino character of religious communities.<sup>12</sup>

As with community based organizations and churches, businesses also serve as settings for inter-Latino relations. For evidence of this claim, we can again look to the studies on Waterbury and Cambridge in this collection. In the Waterbury case, Glasser shows that as Dominicans took over Puerto Rican businesses, they astutely marketed themselves with a generic identity. For example, El Utuadeño and Borinquen Grocery were replaced by Hispano and Las Colinas. Bodegas were decorated with an array of national flags. To capture a broader, more variegated Latino demographic, businesses need to cast a wider net.

In Cambridge the Dominican owners of a travel agency and a moving company used a reverse strategy. During the 1970s, when Puerto Ricans

were the largest Latino group, they opted to give their businesses a Puerto Rican name (La Borincana).

Because they share certain affinities with Spanish-speaking immigrants, Brazilians are often included within the designation of Hispanic or Latino. Is this appropriate? Are these newcomers, who have come to populate areas of New England in significant numbers, to be considered an integral part of the Latino community? Siqueira and Laurenço review these and other questions in their assessment of the Brazilian immigration to Massachusetts (Chapter 8).

According to the authors' interviews with students and workers, Brazilians do not view themselves as "Latino" or "Hispanic." Like many, if not most Latinos, their primary reference point as to ethnicity is their nationality: Brazilians. However, they are unlike Salvadorans, Dominicans, Mexicans, and Puerto Ricans who are adopting the Latino rubric as a second-level identifier. And even though the Portuguese-speaking Brazilians find themselves working side by side with other Latinos in service and light manufacturing jobs, they tend not to enter into social relations with them.

There are several possible reasons for this cultural breach. First, and most obvious, is language. Secondly, it appears that Brazilians may want to distance themselves socially from Hispanics, whom they perceive as targets of hostility and discrimination by the dominant society. They even manifest some of the same stereotypes about Latinos that are held by the majority population. Siqueira and Laurenço also examine the Brazilians' perplexity concerning U.S. racial identification and note their resistance to accepting the "white" versus "black" dichotomy. Might it be that this resistance to being pigeonholed into U.S. racial categories is linked to avoidance of membership in the "Latino" group? After all, the logic and provenance of the latter label are likely more ambiguous to new arrivals on the U.S. scene. The authors acknowledge Brazilians wariness about accepting the Latino label, but regard this an open question that will only be resolved as the community figures out its place in U.S. society.

## **Pan-Latinismo**

There has been a virtual cottage industry generating studies on the question of Latino identity formation. Several scholars argue that movement toward a pan-Latino identity has taken hold during the last decades, inspired by a complex of political and commercial forces.<sup>13</sup> Others dismiss this trend as artificially imposed from external sources and as lacking substantive meaning at the community level.<sup>14</sup> Resistance to an umbrella term grouping Latinos is independent of political ideology. On the right



or the left can be found writers who doubt the veracity or utility of the notion.<sup>15</sup>

Skepticism is based on several arguments. The sheer diversity in nationality, ethnic/racial traits, and linguistic characteristics preclude a “Latino/a label.” Differences in class background among the various groups are too severe to allow for a common Latino identity. Variations in citizenship status are prevalent (from undocumented to legal resident to citizen), undermining a coherent political vision. Political differences among the three major subgroups (Mexican, Puerto Rican, and Cuban)—originating in differences in origin of immigration—invalidate the notion of a Hispanic voting bloc at the national level. Inter-Latino relations can be problematic in settings of intense competition for resources and power: for example, in higher education institutions, in the domains of immigration and language policy, and in local politics. In the case of Puerto Ricans, submersion into a Hispanic identity threatens a perceived historical unity with African Americans, and also implies a diminution, even elimination, of blackness from their identity.<sup>16</sup>

Despite these doubts the idea of a pan-Latino identity seems here to stay. Explanations abound. (1) Notwithstanding their internal differences, Latinos continue to embrace the “Latino” or “Hispanic” label when speaking generally of their condition and aspirations within U.S. society. Although ethnic-specific terminology (e.g., Mexican American, Chicano, Puerto Rican, Dominican) is preferred, “Latino/Hispanic” is accepted as an additional identifier. (2) The structure of North American thinking about racial identity compels Hispanic-origin peoples to define themselves in a pan-Latino sense or be dissolved ultimately into the black-white racial order. (3) Racial categorization systems used by government agencies give Latino political activists a practical reason to assert a pan-ethnic identity when making claims for a greater share of resources and representation.<sup>17</sup>

Additional explanations have been advanced in defense of the generic terminology. (4) In large metropolitan settings some groups (e.g., Puerto Ricans in New York City) have adopted an “instrumentalist use” of Hispanic identity to strengthen their political standing. (5) This phenomenon gives credence to the idea that identity formation can be fluid and situational; that it is no longer remarkable to observe Latinos living comfortably with multiple identities, since such identities are formed and transformed in dynamic engagement with America’s evolving cultural debates and with changing official definitions of race. (6) Finally, the growth of Latino diversity in an increasing number of urban settings creates the demographic basis for the forging of pan-Latino identity.<sup>18</sup>

The chapters in this book offer evidence, historically and contemporaneously, of pan-Latinismo as a vibrant force in New England. In their

daily lives—and in their social, economic, and political activities—Latinas and Latinos transcend the bounds of ethnicity and interact vigorously with each other. In their engagement with the larger society and institutions, they are forging an autonomous identity that stands intermediate between their native nationalities and the dominant U.S. culture. In their encounter with the U.S. racial order, they are staking out a territory that blurs and complicates the color line.

The sources of this pan-Latino identity are various:

- the diversity of Latino ethnicities and the lack of a clearly hegemonic group within the Latino population;
- the history of extensive inter-Latino relations and practices, strengthened and channeled by organizations and institutions which are reproduced over time;
- the dominant society's resistance to the inclusion of Latinos in the region's social and economic structures.

As mentioned above, studies have identified a number of potential obstacles to a Pan Latino identity. For the time being, however, none of these countervailing forces—class fractures, racial background, ethnic heritage, political orientation, citizenship status, differential incorporation into society—appear to threaten its continued development. These factors surely undermine any notion of Latinas and Latinos operating as a monolithic block within U.S. society. Yet cultural identity and political pragmatism seems to be overriding the centrifugal forces.

## Conclusion

Perhaps it is more useful to think of pan-Latinismo as a transitional identity, occupying a unique and temporary space within the U.S. social and racial order. It is a powerful idea, adopted by millions of people as they define and pursue collective aspirations.

And what might those aspirations be? Winning the race for socio-economic achievement, perhaps with “model minority” status? Incorporation into a vaguely defined “mainstream”? Acceptance by the mainstream society of Latino cultural symbols and political representation, even at the cost of continued class inequality and racial exclusion?

I believe the underlying assumption of most contributors to this volume is that none of these aforementioned aspirations is satisfactory. They would say, I think, that the truly distinctive achievement would be one in which Latinas and Latinos help nudge America in the direction of a society that is more egalitarian and more respectful of multicultural values. Today the people of this country, in New England and elsewhere, are

asked to choose between an “ownership society” and a “fairness” society. The forms of community life, the expressions of cultural identity, and the strategies of political action that Latinos adopt must ultimately address these competing visions of the future.

This introductory overview has discussed some of the central themes running through this volume, but not all. In the interests of brevity, I have neglected several topics that are covered in greater depth by the contributors, such as socioeconomic trends at the state and local level, social and economic policy debates and recommendations, and proposals for community development and political action. For an appreciation of these themes, and to gain a fuller sense of what is happening in New England, the reader is invited to proceed on to the next pages.

## Notes

1. Robert Miller, *Shamrock and Sword: The St. Patrick's Battalion in the U.S.-Mexican War* (University Press of Oklahoma, 1989); George Winston Smith and Charles Judah, *Chronicles of the Gringos: The U.S. Army in the Mexican War, 1846-1848* (Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press, 1968); Peter F. Stevens, *The Rogue's March: John Riley and the St. Patrick's Battalion, 1846-1848* (Dulles, Virginia: Potomac Books, 1999). Thanks to Mary Jo Marion for bringing my attention to the story of the San Patricios.

2. Lawrence Buell, *Emerson* (Cambridge, Harvard University Press, 2003), 137, 243, and 249; José Martí, *Selected Writings*, ed. Ester Allen (New York: Penguin, 2002), 116-129; Philip S. Foner, ed., *Inside the Monster by José Martí* (New York: Monthly Review Press, 1975), 30.

3. My thanks to Anthony de Jesús for providing a copy of Albizu Campos's student records, which Harvard University recently made available to the public. The letter cited, “Puerto Rico and the War,” appeared in the *Harvard Crimson*, April 14, 1917; 2, 7. For more on the life and politics of Albizu Campos see Juan Manuel Carrión, Teresa C. Gracia Ruiz, and Carlos Rodríguez Fraticelli, eds., *La nación puertorriqueña: ensayos en torno a Pedro Albizu Campos* (San Juan: Editorial de la Universidad de Puerto Rico, 1993); Ronald Fernandez, *The Disenchanted Island: Puerto Rico and the United States in the Twentieth Century* (Westport, CN: Praeger, 1996).

4. Some readers will be justifiably surprised to find that there is no chapter dedicated to Boston. On the one hand, the Boston Latino experience is inevitably addressed in the several chapters dealing with Massachusetts. On the other hand, there is a significant body of scholarship about Boston over the years, and the contributor response to the editor's original call for papers was heavily skewed toward non-Bostonian contexts. Yet there certainly is room for more work on Boston, and the editor is happily aware of new scholarship in the pipeline. Recent political developments, such as Felix Arroyo's historic victory in 2003 as the first Latino elected to the Boston City Council, call for scholarly analysis. Arroyo surprised most pundits by winning an at-large seat, essentially by tapping into a broad and progressive multi-racial constituency. In so doing, he became the biggest Latino vote-getter in Massachusetts history. Michael Jonas, “Arroyo Singing a Song of Reelection,” *Boston Globe*,

January 16, 2005. In the same year, Jeffrey Sánchez's election as a State Representative meant that Boston's Latinos would have a voice in the State House for the first time since Nelson Merced's term in the late 1980s. Sánchez's strategy, also dependent on coalition politics, offers another case study of how Latinos can gain electoral power. Despite differences in political orientation, Arroyo and Sánchez each demonstrated that success depends on a creative relationship between ethnicity, pan-Latino identity, and multiracial politics. How each approached class aspects in their program was also an important factor. Finally, it should be noted that State Senator Jarrett Barrios, the most influential Latino politician in Massachusetts, receives considerable support from Boston's Latinos. Though his electoral district is based in Cambridge and Chelsea, he is a significant figure in Boston's Latino politics. As this book goes to press, Senator Barrios is running for District Attorney of Middlesex County, often a steppingstone to a statewide office.

5. As of this writing (2006) there is no doubt that the one million mark has been passed, even if the 60 percent growth rate of the 1990s is not replicated. Projections of the national Latino population during the early 2000s estimate that the growth rate continues unabated. Roberto Ramírez, *U.S. Hispanic Population 2002* (U.S. Census Bureau, Population Division, Ethnicity and Ancestry Branch, 2003). Daniel Vásquez prepared the census profiles that give Latino population counts for the region, the six states, and some fifty cities and towns in New England. The sources for these counts are U.S. Census, 1990 and 2000, SF-3 Data. Unless otherwise noted, the discussion in this section is based on these tables, which can be consulted at <http://www.gaston.umb.edu/resactiv/index.html>.

6. Population figures for the region and states that are cited in other chapters of this book may vary slightly from these, since they may have been based on different sources within the series of the census 2000 releases.

7. The Lewis Mumford Center for Comparative Urban and Regional Research reported that the wording of the Census's "Hispanic Origin" question led to "a highly inflated number of uncategorized 'other Hispanics.'" <http://mumford1.dydndns.org/cen2000/HispanicPop/HspPopData.htm> (accessed February 16, 2005). For another estimate of the "Other" population, Roberto Suro, "Counting the 'Other Hispanics': How Many Colombians, Dominicans, Ecuadorians, Guatemalans and Salvadorans Are There in the United States?" (Washington DC: Pew Hispanic Center, May 2002).

8. Daniel Vásquez, "Latinos in New England," unpublished paper, Mauricio Gastón Institute, University of Massachusetts Boston (February, 2004).

9. This introduction uses the term *community formation* in a generic sense, to refer simply to the evolution and consolidation of U.S. Latino communities over time. This definition ignores the controversies over the contested interpretations of this and related concepts such as "community development" and "community empowerment." Useful discussions of this literature include William V. Flores and Rina Benmayor, eds., *Latino Cultural Citizenship: Claiming Identity, Space and Rights* (Beacon Press, 1997), 72–76; Carol Hardy-Fanta, *Latina Politics, Latino Politics* (Temple University Press, 1993), 99–102; Michael Jones-Correa, *Between Two Nations: The Political Predicament of Latinos in New York City* (Cornell University Press, 1998), 20–21; and George Yúdice, "Community," in *New Keywords: A Revised Vocabulary of Culture and Society*, ed. Tony Bennett, Lawrence Grossberg, and Meaghan Morris (Oxford: Blackwell Publishing, 2005), 51–54.

10. Robert C. Smith, "Mexicans in New York: Membership and Incorporation in a New Immigrant Community," in *Latinos in New York: Communities in Transition*,

ed. Gabriel Haslip-Viera and Sherrie L. Baver (Notre Dame: Notre Dame University Press, 1996); Ramona Hernández and Glenn Jacobs, "Beyond Homeland Politics: Dominicans in Massachusetts," in *Latino Politics in Massachusetts: Struggles, Strategies, and Prospects*, ed. Carol Hardy-Fanta and Jeffrey Gerson (New York: Routledge, 2002); Peggy Levitt, *The Transnational Villagers* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2001). For an explanation of why the new immigrants are likely to retain transnational attachments more so than earlier (European) immigrants to the United States, see Peggy Levitt, "Migrants Participate across Borders: Toward an Understanding of Forms and Consequences," in *Immigration Research for a New Century*, ed. Nancy Foner, Rubén G. Rumbaut, and Steven J. Gold (New York: Russell Sage Foundation, 2000).

11. "This process of forging reactive ethnicity in the face of perceived threats, persecution, and exclusion is not uncommon. . . . it is one mode of ethnic identity formation, highlighting the role of a hostile context of reception in accounting for the rise rather than erosion of ethnicity." Alejandro Portes and Rubén G. Rumbaut, *Legacies: The Story of the Immigrant Second Generation* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2001), 148. Also see Alejandro Portes and Rubén G. Rumbaut, *Immigrant America: A Portrait* (Berkeley, University of California Press, 1996), 95.

12. For a case study of a Catholic church in Willimantic, Connecticut, see X. A. Reyes, *Language and Culture as Critical Elements in Qualitative Research* (Lewiston, NY: Mellen Press, forthcoming 2006). Based in Boston, La Congregación León de Judah is one of the largest evangelical Latino churches in New England and features "a very diverse sector of the Hispanic community. . . . Practically all the countries of Hispanic America are represented in its congregation, and the leadership includes a broad range of nationalities and cultures. . . ." <http://leondejuda.org>. For an account of how Puerto Ricans and Colombians found themselves pitted against each other in different local Catholic churches (in Lowell, Massachusetts), see Jeffrey N. Gerson, "Latino Migration, the Catholic Church and Political Division" in Hardy-Fanta and Gerson, *Latino Politics in Massachusetts*, 2002.

13. Antonia Darder and Rodolfo D. Torres, "Latinos and Society: Culture, Politics and Class," in *The Latino Studies Reader: Culture, Economy and Society*, ed. Antonia Darder and Rodolfo D. Torres (Oxford: Blackwell, 1998); Richard Delgado and Jean Stefancic, *The Latino/a Condition: A Critical Reader* (New York: New York University Press, 1998).

14. Arlene Dávila, *Latinos, Inc.: The Marketing and Making of a People* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2001); Vilma Santiago-Irizarry, *Medicalizing Ethnicity: The Construction of Latino Ethnicity in a Psychiatric Setting* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2001).

15. On the right, Linda Chavez, *Out of the Barrio* (New York: Basic Books, 1991); on the left, Juan Flores, "Pan-Latino/Trans-Latino: Puerto Ricans in the 'New Nueva York,'" *CENTRO Journal* 8, nos. 1–2 (1996); in between, Harry Pachon and Louis DeSipio, *New Americans by Choice: Political Perspectives of Latino Immigrants* (Boulder, CO: Westview Press, 1994).

16. On diversity: Suzanne Oboler, *Ethnic Labels, Latino Lives* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1995). On class: Chavez, *Out of the Barrio*, Chapter 8, and Martha Giménez, "Latino Politics—Class Struggles: Reflections on the Future of Latino Politics," in *Latino Social Movements*, ed. R. Torres and G. Katsiaficas (New York: Routledge, 1999). On citizenship status: Harry Pachon and Louis DeSipio, *New Americans by Choice: Political Perspectives of Latino Immigrants* (Bolder: Westview

Press, 1994). On political differences: Rodolfo De la Garza, Louis DeSipio, F. Chris García, John García, and Angelo Falcón, *Latino Voices: Mexican, Puerto Rican and Cuban Perspectives on American Politics* (Boulder: Westview Press, 1992); and José Cruz, "In Search of Latino Politics," review of Rodney Hero, *Latinos in the U.S. Political System*, in *Latino Review of Books* 1, no. 1 (1995). On inter-Latino relations in immigration and language policy: R. De La Garza et al., *Latino Voices*. On local politics: Jones-Correa, *Between Two Nations*, Chapter 6. On Puerto Ricans and African Americans: Juan Flores, "Pan-Latino/Trans-Latino: Puerto Ricans in the 'New Nueva York,'" *CENTRO Journal* 8, nos. 1–2 (1996). On blackness in the Puerto Rican identity: Raquel Z. Rivera, *New York Ricans From the Hip Hop Zone* (New York: Palgrave MacMillan, 2003), 32–33.

17. On the openness to multiple identities: Jones-Correa, *Between Two Nations*, 117–119. On Latino identity and the U.S. racial order: Gerald Torres, "The Legacy of Conquest and Discovery: Meditations on Ethnicity, Race and American Politics," in *Borderless Borders: U.S. Latinos, Latin Americans, and the Paradox of Interdependence*, ed. Frank Bonilla, Edwin Meléndez, Rebecca Morales, and María de los Angeles Torres (Philadelphia, Temple University Press, 1998). On racial categorization systems: John García, *Latino Politics in America: Community, Culture and Interests* (Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield, 2003).

18. On "instrumentalist use": Jones-Correa, *Between Two Nations*, Chapter 6. On the fluidity of identity formation: Clara Rodríguez, *Changing Race: Latinos, the Census and the History of Ethnicity in the United States* (New York: New York University Press, 2000), 7 and following. On Latino urban diversity and social practice: Milagros Ricourt and Ruby Danta, *Hispanas de Queens: Latino Pan Ethnicity in a New York City Neighborhood* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2003); Augustín Lao-Montes and Arlene Dávila, eds., *Mambo Montage: The Latinization of New York* (New York: Columbia University Press, 2001); and José Itzigsohn, "The Formation of Latino and Latina Pan ethnic Identities," in *Not Just Black and White*, ed. Nancy Foner and George M. Frederickson (New York: Russell Sage Foundation, 2004), 197–216.

## Notes on Contributors

**Amilcar Antonio Barreto** is an associate professor of political science at Northeastern University, where he teaches international law, Latino politics, and nationalism. He is the author of three books, including *The Politics of Language in Puerto Rico* (2001) and *Vieques, the Navy, and Puerto Rican Politics* (2002).

**Yoel Camayd-Freixas** is a professor and the chair of the PhD and Advanced Practitioner Masters programs in policy at the School of Community Economic Development, Southern New Hampshire University. He is also director of the Applied Research Center at the university, where he serves as principal investigator on several sponsored research studies.

**Jorge Capetillo-Ponce** is an assistant professor of sociology at the University of Massachusetts Boston and a research associate at the Mauricio Gastón Institute. His research focuses on social theory, race and ethnicity, media, international relations, and Latino studies. His latest publication is *Deciphering the Labyrinth: The Influence of Georg Simmel on the Sociology of Octavio Paz*.

**José E. Cruz** is an associate professor of political science at SUNY-Albany and the author of *Identity and Power: Puerto Rican Politics and the Challenge of Ethnicity* (Temple University Press, 1998). He directs the New York Latino Research and Resources Network, a research consortium focusing on health, education, immigration, and politics.

**Cileine de Lourenço** is an associate professor of Latin American studies and Spanish at the Department of English and Cultural Studies, Bryant University. She has written about representations of race, class, and gender in Latin American cinemas, and she is coauthoring a book on identity construction among Brazilian immigrant women in the Boston area.

**Ruth Glasser** received her PhD in American studies from Yale University in 1991. She currently teaches in the Urban and Community

Studies Program at the University of Connecticut. She is the author of *My Music is My Flag* and *Aquí Me Quedo: Puerto Ricans in Connecticut*, and she is a coeditor of *Caribbean Connections: The Dominican Republic*.

**Phillip J. Granberry** worked with community-based organizations assisting U.S. immigrants before becoming a PhD candidate in public policy at the University of Massachusetts Boston. His dissertation is entitled “Individual, Institutional, and Environmental Determinants of Social Capital, and Its Influence on the Earnings and Health of Mexican Immigrants in Los Angeles County.”

**Megan Halloran** is a PhD student in public policy at the University of Massachusetts Boston. Her focus is on education and policy issues related to individuals with disabilities. She is a certified teacher of children with special needs and a founding member of the Aspergers Association of New England.

**Deborah Pacini Hernandez** is an associate professor of anthropology in the Department of Sociology/Anthropology and the director of the Latino Studies Program at Tufts University. Her research areas include comparative Latino studies, Latino community studies, and ethnic and racial identity in Caribbean and U.S. Latino popular music and culture.

**José Itzigsohn** is an associate professor of sociology and ethnic studies at Brown University. He studies the incorporation of Latino/a immigrants. He is working on a book on Dominican immigration to Providence. Through this case study, the book will address contemporary debates on identity formation, occupational mobility, and transnational linkages.

**Gerald Karush** is a professor of computer information systems at the Graduate School of Business, Southern New Hampshire University, and a senior research fellow at the Applied Research Center, where he is involved in several research studies. His principal areas of experience include computer technology, economic development, demography, and market and evaluation research.

**Robert Kramer** is a postresident doctoral candidate in the Public Policy Program of the McCormack Graduate School of Policy Studies at the University of Massachusetts Boston. He holds an MS in Public Policy from the University of Massachusetts Boston and an MA in Community Social Psychology from the University of Massachusetts Lowell.

**Nelly Lejter** is associate dean for administration and an adjunct instructor in sociology at the School of Community Economic Development,



Southern New Hampshire University. She is also a senior research associate at the school's Applied Research Center, where she is involved in several research studies.

**Enrico A. Marcelli** is an assistant professor of economics at the University of Massachusetts Boston and the 2003–2005 Robert Wood Johnson Health & Society Scholar at Harvard University. His research and teaching focus on the causes and consequences of Latino immigration to the United States and the social determinants of health.

**Angel A. Amy Moreno** is a professor of humanities and social sciences at Roxbury Community College. An oral historian and master photographer, he has curated fine art and photo exhibits throughout New England and Puerto Rico. His awards include the Boston Latino Best Photographer Award and the Distinguished Historian Award by the Senate of Puerto Rico.

**Hosffman Ospino** is the coordinator of academic programs in Hispanic ministry and adjunct faculty at the Institute of Religious Education and Pastoral Ministry at Boston College. He is a doctoral candidate in theology and education at Boston College. He is working on a book about Latino/a Catholics in Massachusetts.

**Adrian D. Pantoja** is an assistant professor of political science at Arizona State University. He studies Latino political behavior and public opinion, immigration, and ethnic/racial politics. His research has appeared in a variety of journals and edited volumes. He is pursuing several projects on the Dominican diaspora, transnational ties, and immigration.

**C. Eduardo Siqueira** is currently an assistant professor in the Department of Community Health and Sustainability at the University of Massachusetts Lowell. He holds a doctoral degree in Work Environment Policy from the University of Massachusetts Lowell. Dr. Siqueira graduated in Medicine at the Federal University of Rio de Janeiro, Brazil.

**Michael E. Stone** is a professor of community planning and public policy at the University of Massachusetts Boston. His book *Shelter Poverty: New Ideas on Housing Affordability* has been called “the definitive book on housing and social justice in the United States.” He is coauthor of *Housing: Foundation for a New Social Agenda* (forthcoming).

**Andrés Torres** is research associate at the Center for Puerto Rican Studies, Hunter College, City University of New York. Previously he was a professor of economics and Latino studies at the College of Public and

Community Service, University of Massachusetts Boston. He directed the Mauricio Gastón Institute from 1998 to 2005. He is the author of *Between Melting Pot and Mosaic* and coeditor (with José Velázquez) of *The Puerto Rican Movement*.

**Miren Uriarte** is a sociologist at the University of Massachusetts Boston and a senior research associate at the Mauricio Gastón Institute. She researches the Latino experience in New England and has published in the areas of demography, education, and social welfare. She has also published studies about Cuba and other parts of Latin America.