

The Movement and Settlement of Puerto Rican Migrants Within the United States, 1950-1960

by J. Hernández-Alvarez*

This article presents a concise summary of the geographic movement and settlement of Puerto Ricans within the United States from 1950 to 1960, based on data drawn from the Census taken on the latter date. The Author observes that a shift away from New York City occurred both in terms of migration from Puerto Rico and internal movements between states. This resulted in the development of major Puerto Rican communities in eight other metropolitan areas of the U.S. The Puerto Rican population was found highly mobile within the U.S., especially from neighborhood to neighborhood within the same city and usually in the direction of neighborhoods marked by out-migration of non-Puerto Ricans. The analysis is then extended to the different patterns of settlement outside New York City and the present evolution of the migrant colonies and to the diaspora of a small portion of the Puerto Rican population throughout the U.S. In the final remarks, the Author discusses the future trend of dispersion of the second generation population, especially, and the correlation between economically favored cities and the settlement of Puerto Ricans on the mainland.

Close to nine hundred thousand persons of Puerto Rican birth or parentage were enumerated as residents of the United States by the last national census, taken in 1960. That total was largely the result of migration from Puerto Rico during the post World War II period and the decade of the 1950's. For the same fifteen years, Puerto Rico's own resident population remained at a total of about two million, three hundred thousand. Since few Puerto Ricans live elsewhere, it can be said that the migrant group living on the mainland comprises approximately thirty per cent of all Puerto Ricans, in and out of the Island.

* Dr. José Hernández Alvarez is presently working with the Ford Foundation in Brazil.

The present essay attempts to present a concise summary of the geographic movement and settlement of Puerto Ricans within the United States from 1950 to 1960, based on data drawn from the census taken on the latter date. Fairly extensive information was available because in 1960 the United States Bureau of the Census considered Puerto Ricans a key segment of the national population. Although largely composed of United States citizens by birth, the Puerto Rican community was frequently distinguished from the general population, from ethnic groups of foreign birth or immediate extraction, and from the racial categories of nonwhite and American Negro.

National, regional and state figures for Puerto Ricans in the United States provided basic information about movements between these divisions and were valuable as indices of the relative position of the migrant group. However, the analysis of these sources of data had to be complemented by a study of mobility figures for metropolitan areas. A recurrent problem with the geographic and political divisions mentioned is that they lack precision in defining and describing the Puerto Rican population as a community.

Most Puerto Rican residents of the United States live in a "*colonia*" or urban nucleus marked by dense settlement, provision for manifestation of the Puerto Rican social identity and way of behavior and by frequency of internal activity and dependence. Puerto Rican *colonias* have also constituted the primary context for migration and dispersal—which usually depends on employment opportunities and the grapevine of information among Puerto Ricans.

From 1950 to 1960, the process of *colonia* formation led to the development of major concentrations in New York City, Philadelphia, Miami, the Chicago-Gary area, Northeast New Jersey and Bridgeport, Connecticut. Minor settlements took place in a few other metropolitan areas (eg. Cleveland, Lorain, Milwaukee, Buffalo and Rochester); elsewhere, the presence of a Puerto Rican in the local setting represented a rare occurrence. This meant a geographic distribution which was sharply unequal and the risk of distortion when comparing Puerto Rican settlements according to divisions larger than cities. In 1960, a single neighborhood in New York City contained more persons born in Puerto Rico than the total for twenty six of the fifty United States; and a dozen other neighborhoods in New York City approximated the same total.

Even at the level of standard metropolitan areas global studies often compare populations which do not share the same environment; also, data for an entire city may only represent measures of central tendency in a wide range of diversity. Certainly, they do not permit comparisons among the *colonias* themselves. This is particularly true of New York City, which contained about seventy per cent of the national total of Puerto Ricans in 1960.

In an effort to solve these difficulties, the metropolitan census tract was used as a supplementary unit of analysis. In 1960, persons of Puerto

Rican birth or parentage were enumerated by census tract in all of the Standard Metropolitan Statistical Areas (or SMSAs) of the United States, except in thirty-four areas of five Southwestern States (Arizona, California, Colorado, New Mexico and Texas) where they were not distinguished separately from persons of Spanish surname. Data published in the SMSA reports were largely restricted to the total of Puerto Ricans by nativity. However, in nine SMSAs, an additional table was included (Table P-5) providing selected social and economic characteristics for the Puerto Rican group according to census tracts in which four hundred or more were enumerated in 1960.

Due to the availability of such data, these nine SMSAs were selected for research; as a unit, they contained 748,022 Puerto Ricans of both generations, 83.8 per cent of the national total. By narrowing the focus of detailed study in this manner, approximately 16 per cent of the United States total was omitted. This residue comprised a small segment of rural residents (3.7 per cent); those living in the Southwest (about 3.3 per cent) and those scattered in 135 SMSAs without P-5 Tables and in smaller urban areas (about 9.0 per cent of the national total).¹

In the entire United States, there were 362 census tracts with P-5 tables; of these, 288 were located in New York City and 74 belonged to eight SMSAs: Bridgeport, Connecticut; Chicago, Illinois; Gary-Hammond-East Chicago, Indiana; Jersey City, New Jersey; Miami, Florida; Newark, New Jersey; Paterson-Clifton-Passaic, New Jersey; Philadelphia, Pennsylvania. After information concerning mobility and settlement in each tract was recorded on computer cards, processing included marginal totals, per cent distributions, means, standard deviations and correlation coefficients.

It is important to note that the type of analysis selected contains limitations of a methodological and descriptive nature. Although the data for Puerto Ricans by census tract seem to approach the sociological concept of the *colonia*, no claim is made as to the precision of coincidence between these two categories. According to the Bureau of the Census, tract boundaries are "designed to be relatively uniform with respect to population characteristics, economic status and living conditions."² Obviously, this does not preclude an overlap among tracts in terms of social organization, or the absence of a *colonia* system of social relations within a given tract. Hence, the analysis by census tract must be considered as an exploratory medium for obtaining knowledge concerning trends and tendencies. More definitive conclusions would have to be the objective of

1. These percentages were calculated on the basis of data contained in U.S. Bureau of the Census. *U.S. Censuses of Population and Housing: 1960*. Final Reports PHC (1) 19, 26, 54, 67, 90, 104, 105, 114 and 116. *U.S. Census of Population: 1960. Subject Reports. State of Birth*. Final Report PC (2)-2A, pp. 19, 172-177. *Puerto Ricans in the United States*. Final Report PC (2)-1D, p. 2.

2. U.S. Bureau of the Census. *U.S. Censuses of Population and Housing: 1960*. Final Reports PHC (1) 1-180; Introduction, p. 1.

subsequent and more detailed research based on surveys of individual *colonias*.

A. New York City vs. Outside

A major portion of Puerto Ricans living in the United States in 1960 migrated during the preceding decade. However, during the post World War II period (1945 to 1950) the flow of migration was almost exclusively toward New York City and the basic social organization of the New York community was forged in the context of this initial movement. As migration continued in the 1950's new *colonias* were added and the presence and participation of Puerto Ricans became an established part of life in the New York metropolitan area.

In the meantime, the scope of settlement had widened considerably. Puerto Rican *colonias* began to appear in other metropolitan areas of the United States, cities in which few if any Puerto Ricans had been enumerated in 1950. In these cities the influx assumed the dynamic character it had in New York City five to ten years previously. This shift appears clearly in the rates of growth of the Puerto Rican segment outside New York City; in general, the decennial increase in the hinterland was greater by about one hundred per cent. In particular areas, the contrast was even more pronounced, as in the balance of the Northeast region of the United States, where the proportional gain was more than twice that of New York City, and in the North Central States, where a similar rate of increase occurred.³

At first glance, it would seem logical to attribute this fan of settlement to geographic mobility away from New York City. Evidence gathered from the 1960 census seems to substantiate this conjecture, but it also indicates certain important variations. To begin with, the Puerto Rican population of the United States appeared to be highly mobile: only one quarter of those born in Puerto Rico and forty per cent of those born in the United States of Puerto Rican parents were living in the same house as in 1955. Among those States for which mobility data are available for Puerto Ricans, the most stable was New York, where 28.5 per cent of the first generation and 43.6 per cent of the second had the same residence during the previous five years. Outside New York, the propensity to move reached extremes; as shown in Table 1, in some cases the proportion of the Puerto Rican population changing dwellings approximated ninety per cent.

3. From 1950 to 1960, regional increases in the population of Puerto Rican birth were as follows: New York City, 234.5 per cent; Northeast outside New York City, 596.8 per cent; North Central, 542.3 per cent; South, 328.2 per cent; West, 281.1 per cent. In the entire United States, a 272.9 per cent increase occurred. U.S. Bureau of the Census. *Census of Population: 1950*. Vol. IV, *Special Reports*, Part 3, Chapter D, Puerto Ricans in Continental United States, p. 11. U.S. *Census of Population: 1960. Subject Reports. Puerto Ricans in the United States*. Final Report PC (2)-1D, pp. 92, 103-104.

TABLE 1

INDICES OF STABILITY, INTERSTATE MOBILITY AND MIGRATION FROM PUERTO RICO TO THE MAINLAND, FOR THE PUERTO RICAN POPULATION OF THE UNITED STATES AND SELECTED STATES, BY GENERATIONS: 1960

	Per cent living in same house as in 1955	Per cent living in different State in 1955	Per cent living in Puerto Rico in 1955
United States			
1st Generation	24.7	4.2	19.1
2nd Generation	39.7	6.2	1.4
California			
1st Generation	18.1	23.6	15.0
2nd Generation	24.7	22.3	0.7
Illinois			
1st Generation	10.0	5.0	25.0
2nd Generation	25.1	7.6	1.8
New Jersey			
1st Generation	15.8	11.4	30.2
2nd Generation	33.9	19.8	1.9
New York			
1st Generation	28.5	1.0	16.3
2nd Generation	43.6	1.2	1.1
Balance			
1st Generation	14.1	13.6	28.7
2nd Generation	31.6	19.0	2.5

Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census. *U.S. Census of Population: 1960. Subject Reports. Puerto Ricans in the United States*. Final Report PC(2)-1D, pp. 12-13. Percentages do not total 100.0 due to the exclusion of three categories: per cent living in same state; per cent living abroad, outside Puerto Rico. Residence in 1955 not reported.

The percentage of the Puerto Rican population in the entire United States involved in interstate changes of dwellings from 1955 to 1960 appears exceedingly low, clearly weighed down by the practical absence of interstate mobility toward New York State. When compared with the notably higher rates of interstate mobility outside New York, this finding tends to confirm the pattern of dispersal spoken of above. At one extreme, interstate mobility would seem to have been particularly operative in California, where the presence of large numbers of Puerto Ricans is a recent phenomenon. There, the number moving across states boundaries comprised about a quarter of those living in the same state in 1960, while in other divisions rates were lower, but still exceeded the same measure for New York.

The other major factor in the fan of settlement is the direction taken by the flow of migration from Puerto Rico to the mainland during the 1950's. In a manner analogous to interstate mobility, a shift away from New York State is apparent: except in California, the proportion of persons living in Puerto Rico in 1955 was much larger outside New York State. By way of illustration, New Jersey had almost twice the New York

index of migration from Puerto Rico among persons born on the Island. The same relation is visible in the case of Illinois and the balance of the United States outside New York.

Comparing interstate mobility with migration from Puerto Rico for the first generation, the latter type of movement appears to be much more common, except in California. It would seem to follow that the course assumed by *direct* migration from Puerto Rico is of greater influence in the dispersal of Puerto Ricans throughout the United States than further movements once they have reached the mainland. This conclusion must be tempered by the observation that the indices of migration from Puerto Rico conceal an unknown portion of interstate migration taking place between 1955 and the date on which the Census was taken—changes which were not considered in the Census enumeration. Another source of caution is the highly mobile character of the population; within a given five-year period many Puerto Ricans may return to the Island and migrate to the mainland again, perhaps in a different direction.

For second generation Puerto Ricans, the data concerning changes of residence from 1955 to 1960 are not surprising. Since this group is mainly composed of children and adolescents, a higher rate of stability would be expected than in the first generation, which comprises many young adults and middle-aged persons. Moreover, according to Table 1, the index of stability for the second generation in New York State was substantially higher than the same measures for the other divisions. Joined with a virtual absence of interstate mobility toward New York, this evidence suggests a shift toward other states, as in the case of the first or parent generation.

Interstate mobility seemed more frequent for the second generation than for the first, probably reflecting greater knowledge and experience concerning the possibilities of mobility within the mainland. This observation is reinforced by the geographic distribution of the two generations by age. By reducing this distribution to a ratio of residence in New York State over residence outside this state, an inverse relationship appears between generation according to age:

TABLE 2

RATIO OF RESIDENTS IN NEW YORK STATE TO RESIDENTS OUTSIDE NEW YORK STATE, PUERTO RICAN POPULATION: 1960

	Age Under							
	10	10-19	20-29	30-39	40-49	50-59	60-69	70
								And Over
1st Generation	1.50	2.77	2.59	2.64	3.42	4.07	3.68	3.61
2nd Generation	2.50	3.00	2.30	1.31	.44	.48	1.14	.74

Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census. *U.S. Census of Population: 1960. Subject Reports. Puerto Ricans in the United States. Final Report PC (2) - 1D p.2-3, 9-11.*

These data would seem to indicate that as a general pattern, residence in New York State is more frequent in the first generation with increasing age; among persons born in the United States, a contrary tendency is evident. In both generations, a tendency toward residence in New York is visible in the adolescent years, while ratios for those under ten years of age are notably lower than those for adolescents.

These differences reflect the historical evolution of the Puerto Rican migration to the United States from 1940 to 1960. Migrants settling in the original point of concentration would tend to be in later stages of the family life cycle than those who arrived more recently and settled outside New York City. It may be inferred that middle to older age persons born in Puerto Rico tend to remain in New York, immersed in the life of the *colonia*, while the second generation in the same age categories (a fairly small group in number) tends to drift away from this State. California provides an example of the latter trend; there, the number of Puerto Ricans born on the mainland approximated the total born in Puerto Rico and their median age was about twice the same measure for New York State. Within the present day context of intensive mobility in the United States, persons of Puerto Rican parentage may avail themselves of their knowledge and facility in things "American" to "disappear" in the amalgam of millions in places outside New York City. Granted this preference, it seems unlikely that many will travel to Puerto Rico and settle there, while the older first generation, oriented to New York City and probably in contact with relatives in Puerto Rico, may tend to ultimately return to Puerto Rico.

B. Local Mobility

It is interesting to note that in most areas of the United States more than half of the Puerto Rican population was neither stable nor involved in interstate mobility and migration from Puerto Rico from 1955 to 1960. This large balance, appearing in both generations, comprises those who changed dwellings within local areas, principally within the confines of the same metropolitan area. This trend is particularly evident in the data available for the Chicago and New York Standard Metropolitan Statistical Areas:

The percentage distributions just presented reflect the mobility trends which were visible in the larger United States community of Puerto Ricans: the shift away from New York City in terms of interstate mobility and direct migration from Puerto Rico, as well as the comparatively greater stability of the New York population. However, in both cases a strong tendency toward local mobility is evident. When considered as a single unit, the New York rates of mobility within the same county and between counties of the same state approximate the rate of same county mobility in Chicago. This comparison seems justified in view of the difference of political divisions in the two metropolitan areas. In contrast to Chicago, where

TABLE 3

INDICES OF STABILITY AND MOBILITY FOR THE PUERTO RICAN POPULATION 5 YEARS OF AGE AND OVER, ACCORDING TO RESIDENCE IN THE NEW YORK AND CHICAGO SMSA'S: 1960

1955 Residence	Population 5 years of Age and Over, 1960			
	New York SMSA		Chicago SMSA	
	1st Gen- eration	2nd Gen- eration	1st Gen- eration	2nd Gen- eration
<i>Per Cent</i>				
Same House as in 1960	28.9	43.9	9.9	24.1
Different House in U.S., Same County	42.2	39.6	56.7	65.0
Same State, Different County	10.2	12.8	0.2	0.6
Different State	1.0	1.1	5.7	7.4
Puerto Rico	16.0	1.1	25.1	1.9

Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census. *U.S. Census of Populations vTFJ. Subject Reports. Puerto Ricans in the United States*. Final Report PC (2)-1D, p. 93. SMSA refers to the Census Category of Standard Metropolitan Statistical Area. Percentages do not total 100.0 due to the exclusion of two categories: those living in foreign countries in 1955, and those for whom residence in 1955 was not reported.

the bulk of the population resides in Cook County, the New York SMSA includes five counties with individual totals of more than a million inhabitants. Given the high concentration of the Puerto Rican population of New York State in the New York SMSA (97.9 per cent), it seems likely that almost all of the mobility classified as "same state, different country" occurred within the greater New York City area.

Thus, by 1960 the dynamism of moving from one neighborhood or urban sector to another was a more common phenomenon among mainland Puerto Ricans than interstate mobility, migration from Puerto Rico and residence in the same dwelling: it involved about three-fifths of the population on at least one occasion during the five year period from 1955 to 1960. This dynamism took place within the context of a mobile society. Approximately one half of the general population of the United States changed dwellings during the same period, a proportion composed of close to thirty per cent mobility within the same county, and about nine per cent

each of interstate changes and movements between counties of the same state.⁴

A more detailed analysis of Puerto Rican mobility at the level of census tracts was not completed due to the absence of data concerning this characteristic in the P-5 Tables mentioned earlier. However, the mobility data available by census tract for the entire population proved to be of interest for purposes of exploring the relationship between the presence of a large number of Puerto Ricans and the migrational character of the areas in which they settled.

TABLE 4
AVERAGES RATES OF STABILITY AND MOBILITY PER TRACT,
FOR THE TOTAL POPULATION OF SELECTED CENSUS TRACTS
IN THE UNITED STATES: 1960*

Mean Rate	Same Dwelling	Change Within		Change from	
		Same	SMSA	U.S.	Abroad**
New York SMSA	52.5	37.3		3.4	6.7
Other SMSAs	42.1	42.8		8.6	6.6
<i>Standard Deviation</i>					
New York SMSA	11.8	12.1		2.3	4.2
Other SMSAs	13.1	23.2		5.4	4.3

Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census: *U.S. Censuses of Population and Housing: 1960*. Final Reports PHC (1) 19, 26, 54, 67, 90, 104, 105, 114 and 116. * Arithmetic means of stability and mobility indices for each tract in cities listed in text, pp. 3-4. **Includes mobility from Puerto Rico.

The data presented in Table 4 indicate that the neighborhoods in which Puerto Ricans settled were more stable than the mainland Puerto Rican community itself, even in census tracts outside New York, where the average stability index was clearly lower than the rate of permanence of the United States population as a whole. This relative stability is reinforced by the fact that the raw figures included the Puerto Rican segment, which would tend to lower the stability rate. Moreover, the mobility of the census tracts was strikingly slanted toward changes within a metropolis rather than a flow from outside. This is particularly evident in cities other than New York, where the average rate of local change was approximately the same as the stability index.

4. U.S. Bureau of the Census. *U.S. Census of Population: 1960. General Social and Economic Characteristics. United States Summary*. Final Report PC (1)-1C, pp. 204.

The predominance of local change in the general population of the census tracts resembles the nature of mobility on the mainland Puerto Rican community and favors the conclusion that settlement occurred in neighborhoods characterized by a fairly rapid outflow of the non Puerto Rican population. Due to a lack of precise information at the level of census tracts concerning the flow between central city and outlying areas, it is difficult to determine whether this outflow was part of a rearrangement of the central city population or an exodus toward suburbs, or a combination of both trends. It seems clear, however, that the Puerto Rican *colonia* was generally established in response to local vacancies.⁵

C. Crowding in the Colonia

At this point it is of interest to inquire whether the inflow of Puerto Ricans was associated with an expansion in the census tract or neighborhood population—the phenomenon traditionally called the “crowding” of a minority group replacing older residents. To explore this hypothesis, the percentage of a tract’s population classified as Puerto Rican in 1960 (or Puerto Rican density rate) served as an approximate measure of immigration. The per cent gain or loss of the total population between 1950 and 1960 provided a measure for the other variable. A total count was not possible, since 121 tracts in New York City had changed in area without provision for the correction of data. Among the 74 tracts outside New York City, half had been altered or belonged to cities not previously tracted.

Comparisons made among tracts with adequate figures yielded strikingly different results. When matched in a descending order of ranks with rates of population growth, Puerto Rican density figures for New York City indicated a positive correlation of .686, suggesting a strong relation between the presence of the migrant group and population increases from 1950 to 1960. In contrast, figures for cities outside New York yielded a negative correlation of .394, implying an inverse relationship. Both outcomes appeared significant at the ninety-five per cent level of probability.⁶

Perhaps this difference is due to the historical evolution of the Puerto Rican dispersal throughout the United States. Tracts outside New York City may be a decade behind in showing the impact of Puerto Rican set-

5. Herbert Arkin and Raymond R. Colton, *Tables for Statisticians* (New York: Barnes and Noble, College Outline Series, 1950), Table 21, p. 140. This table was used for purposes of evaluating the significance of the correlation coefficients presented in this article; hereafter no additional references are made.

6. Miami differed from the rest of the cities by reason of an extraordinarily high rate of mobility from places outside the metropolitan area. The presence of large numbers of Puerto Ricans in this city may be more related to rapid urban expansion than a process of neighborhood replacement. In Jersey City, Newark and Patterson, mobility toward outlying areas exceeded changes within the urban core, a fact which suggests the prevalence of a relatively strong flow of non Puerto Ricans to the suburbs. Under these circumstances, Puerto Rican settlement in central areas probably assumed the character of replacement to an even greater extent than elsewhere.

tlement and natural increase. According to this conjecture, by 1970 these tracts will have increased in population and will resemble the crowding evidenced in New York City.

A complementary explanation involves the relative saturation of a tract by Puerto Ricans. In New York City, the mean rate of Puerto Rican density per tract was 31.3 per cent, whereas 18.5 was the corresponding figure for tracts in other cities. In other words, close to one out of every three persons in an average New York City tract was a Puerto Rican, while elsewhere the ratio was one in five.

The relevance of this difference is illustrated by the range of variation for the two geographic divisions. Outside New York City only three tracts approximated the average density rate for New York. Meanwhile, in New York City, 21 tracts had 50.0 to 59.9 per cent of their population classified as Puerto Rican; 7 were in the 60.0 to 69.9 per cent category and tract 174 in Manhattan had a Puerto Rican density rate of 71.2 per cent. This means that in comparison with the situation in New York City, the Puerto Rican segment of the tracts in other cities comprised a marginal group, a condition which may explain the difference noted in crowding. Granted the absence of any other major flow of immigration, and an equal rate of turn-over, population increase would occur as the Puerto Rican segment became a larger part of the total.

D. *Summary and Conclusion*

In the present paper, a few major trends in Puerto Rican mobility and settlement have been described for the decade, 1950 to 1960:

1. A shift away from New York City occurred both in terms of migration from Puerto Rico and internal movements between states. This resulted in the development of major Puerto Rican communities in eight other metropolitan areas of the United States.

2. Within the United States, the Puerto Rican population was highly mobile. Local mobility (neighborhood to neighborhood within the same city) was much more common than remaining in the same dwelling during the decade, arriving from Puerto Rico or moving across state and county lines.

3. Where local mobility occurred, it was usually in the direction of neighborhoods marked by outmigration of non-Puerto Ricans. This process of replacement was associated with population increases or "crowding" in New York City—probably due to severe neighborhood zoning along lines of minority group identity.

4. In cities other than New York, many Puerto Rican *colonias* were established in a manner resembling earlier settlement in New York City, except that the presence of Puerto Ricans was not associated with crowding. In these instances, Puerto Ricans constituted only a marginal element of the census tract population in 1960. Possibly, during the present decade

their numbers have been increasing to the extent that in 1970 the same tracts will resemble New York City tracts in 1960.

5. A small but widely scattered portion of the Puerto Rican population of the United States (possibly 10 to 15 per cent, in 1960) does not live in the residential pattern called *colonia*. This segment could be called the *diaspora* and includes individuals living in about 38 states and 168 metropolitan areas where the total Puerto Rican population may not reach the number found in daytime on a central streetcorner in New York City or in a neighborhood block at night or at the international airport on a Sunday afternoon.

Despite this uneven distribution on the national scene, the trend appears to be toward the decline of the *colonia* and the evolution of the *diaspora*. This is already visible in the steadily increasing number of second generation adults, persons born in the United States of Puerto Rican parents. The following figures represent the ratio of first to second generation Puerto Ricans in various locations:⁷

New York City	2.31	Western and Southern Regions, U.S.	1.63
Chicago	2.55	New York SMSA, outside 5 borougs	
Philadelphia	2.37	of New York City	1.41
Bridgeport	2.67	State of California	1.19
Miami	2.79		

These figures illustrate the fact that in major settlements, persons born in Puerto Rico predominate, while the ascendancy of the second generation becomes visible in other areas. This ascendancy is likely to continue, and within time, persons born in the United States will outnumber their parents, and spread throughout the nation.

Résumé

Par la présente, on essaie de rédiger un résumé concis du mouvement géographique et de l'installation des Porto Ricains aux Etats Unis de 1950 à 1960; cette étude est basée sur des renseignements tirés du recensement de la population fait en 1960.

L'auteur observe que les Porto Ricains habitant déjà aux Etats Unis aussi bien que ceux qui viennent d'y arriver à ce moment-là s'éloignent de la ville de New York. Le résultat fut la fondation de communautés importantes de Porto Ricains dans huit autres régions urbaines des Etats Unis. On trouve que la population porto ricaine est très mobile aux Etats Unis, surtout de quartier en quartier dans la même ville et le plus souvent vers des quartiers d'où les habitants non porto ricains ont démenagé.

7. U.S. Bureau of the Census. *U.S. Censuses of Population and Housing: 1960. Final Reports PHC (1) 19; 26; 90; 104 and 116. U.S. Census of Population: 1960. Subject Reports. Puerto Sicans in the United States. Final Report PC (2)-1D*, pp. 103-104.

L'analyse de l'article traite d'abord des différents genres d'installations en dehors de la ville de New York; ainsi que de l'évaluation actuelle des *colonias* immigrantes; également, de la *diaspora* d'une petite partie de la population portoricaine à travers les Etats Unis; ensuite, d'une telle tendance pour l'avenir, en particulier en ce qui concerne la deuxième génération; et enfin, du rapport entre les villes favorisées par l'économie et l'installation des Porto Ricains dans l'Amérique continentale.

Zusammenfassung

Das gegenwärtige Essay versucht eine knappe Zusammenfassung der geographischen Wanderung und der Ansiedlung von Puertorikanern innerhalb der Vereinigten Staaten von 1950 bis 1960 zu bieten, basierend auf den Daten des Zensus, der am letzteren Datum genommen worden ist.

Der Autor beobachtet, dass ein Wegzug von New York stattfand, sowohl was den Wegzug von Puerto Rico als auch die interne Wanderung zwischen den Staaten betrifft. Dies resultierte in der Entwicklung grösserer puertorikanischer Kommunitäten in acht anderen Stadtzentren der Vereinigten Staaten. Man stellte fest, dass die puertorikanische Bevölkerung innerhalb der Vereinigten Staaten sehr mobil ist, besonders von Stadtgebiet zu Stadtgebiet innerhalb der gleichen Stadt und gewöhnlich in der Richtung von Stadtteilen, die durch Auswanderung von Nicht Puertorikanern gekennzeichnet sind.

Die Analyse des Artikels wird dann ausgedehnt auf verschiedene Siedlungsformen ausserhalb von New York City und der gegenwärtigen Entwicklung von Einwanderungs — *Kolonien* und auf die *Diaspora* eines kleinen Anteils der puertorikanischen Bevölkerung überall in den Vereinigten Staaten und ein solcher Trend für die Zukunft besonders mit Rücksicht auf die zweite Generation und schliesslich mit Rücksicht auf die Beziehung zwischen wirtschaftlich günstigen Städten und der Ansiedlung von Puertorikanern auf dem Festland.

Resumen

Este ensayo se propone presentar un resumen conciso del movimiento gráfico y del establecimiento de los puertorriqueños dentro de los Estados Unidos desde 1950 hasta 1960, de acuerdo con datos tomados del censo de este segundo año.

El autor observa un alejamiento de la Ciudad de Nueva York, ocurrido no sólo en la inmigración directa de Puerto Rico, sino también en las mudanzas entre los estados. Resultado de esto ha sido el desarrollo de las principales comunidades puertorriqueñas en otras ocho metrópolis de los E.E.U.U. La población puertorriqueña se ha mostrado sumamente móvil en los E.E.U.U. sobre todo de barrio en barrio dentro de la misma ciudad y por lo general con dirección a vecindarios caracterizados por salida de los no puertorriqueños.

Abarca el análisis de este artículo los diferentes tipos de vecindario fuera de la Ciudad de Nueva York y la evolución actual de las *colonias* de inmigrantes, la *dispersión* de una pequeña porción de la población puertorriqueña por los E.E.U.U., la corriente para el porvenir, con relación esencial a la segunda generación, y, en fin, la correlación entre las ciudades económicamente favorecidas y el establecimiento de los puertorriqueños en el continente.