

# Fall 2015 Ethnic Geography Specialty Group Newsletter

Editors: Thomas D. Boswell (University of Miami)  
and Richard N. Gioioso (Saint Joseph's University)

Fall 2015

## EGSG Officers

**Past Chair:** Heather Smith (University of North Carolina-Charlotte)

**Current Chair:** Heike Alberts (University of Wisconsin- Oshkosh)

**Vice Chair:** Madhuri Sharma (University of Tennessee-Knoxville)

**Secretary/Treasurer:** Edris Montalvo (Cameron University)

**Board of Directors:**  
 Sean Crotty, (Texas Christian University)  
 Holly Barcus (Macalester College)  
 Paul McDaniel (Immigration Policy Center)  
 Michael Webb (University of North Carolina-Chapel Hill)  
 Qingfang Wang (University of North Carolina-Charlotte)  
 Stavros Constantinou (Ohio State University-Mansfield)  
 Garciela Sandoval (Student Member, Texas State University-San Marcos)

**Webmaster Committee for EGSG:**  
 Ezra Zeitler (University of Wisconsin-Eau Claire)  
<http://www.unl.edu/ag/geography/ethnic/>  
 José R. Diaz-Garayua (University of Louisville)  
 Amelia Laurel Schubert (University of Colorado-Boulder)

**Newsletter Co-Editors:**  
 Thomas D. Boswell (University of Miami)  
 Richard N. Gioioso (Saint Joseph's Univ.)

## Table of Contents

List of EGSG Officers. . . . . 1

REP VIII Conference in Kent, OH.. . . . 1

Biographies. . . . . 2

Necrology: Susan W. Hardwick.. . . . 3

Ethnic Geography in the News . . . . . 7

EGSG Standing Committees. . . . . 28

Photo Essay: Remembering Susan W. Hardwick by Heike Alberts. . . . . 35

**Remember: REP VIII to Be Held In Kent, Ohio September 21-23, 2016**



Kent, Ohio

For more information about the 8<sup>th</sup> Race, Ethnicity, and Place Conference please go to its website at: <http://rep-conference.binghamton.edu/>

## ***BIOGRAPHIES OF TWO OF EGSG'S STELLAR MEMBERS***

### ***Biography of EGSG's Heather Anne Smith***



I am Canadian - born and raised on the edge of the Scarborough Bluffs in Toronto, Canada. My mother was a high school English and Art teacher and my father a Staff Superintendent with the Metropolitan Toronto Police Force. When thinking about college, law seemed a wise path and a university within commuting distance to home a frugal choice. However, geography intervened.

When I was 18, I was presented with the unexpected opportunity to attend the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill through the generosity of the John Motley Morehead Scholarship. Modelled after the Rhodes, the Morehead-Cain (as it is now called) provides

full-ride support to attend Chapel Hill for undergraduate study. A distinctive feature of the program was its support of summer experiences that immersed scholars in leadership development, public safety, private enterprise, and international travel. I participated in Outward Bound, worked for Pan American Airlines in New York City, explored variations of use and representation across urban public space in Western Europe, and interned for the Los Angeles Police Department based out of the South Central Division.

My experience at North Carolina was transformative. Coming from one of the most multi-cultural cities in the world, I was perplexed by the socio-spatial divisions I noticed on campus – most whites lived closest to the center of campus in the historic dorms of red brick and ivy, while most blacks lived on the other side of campus closest to the sports facilities and in high density residential towers. It was my first exposure to what segregation looked like on the ground and I sought out classes to help me better understand these dynamics. This led me to the Department of Geography and, in particular, to the classrooms of April Veness and John Florin.

The Geographers at UNC Chapel Hill took good care of me – guiding me in directions that would fundamentally transform my life and set the foundation for my career as a Geographer. Dr. Veness encouraged me to write about my experiences in Los Angeles as grounded examples of the theories I was learning in class about homelessness, race and racism, displacement, and urban inequity. Dr. Florin invited me to a departmental guest lecture by an Urban Social Geographer from the University of British Columbia. I remember vividly sitting on the floor, among a standing room only crowd, transfixed as David Ley talked about his work on gentrification in Canadian cities. The process he described was one I recognized as unfolding in the eastside Toronto neighborhood where I had gone to high school.

My passion for all things urban and geographic was solidified, but there were no further urban geography classes for me to take at Chapel

Hill. Dr. Florin suggested that I spend my junior year abroad at Bristol University in the United Kingdom. I spent a magical year in Bristol auditing Peter Haggett's spatial diffusion class and learning the foundations of urban economic geography from Nigel Thrift for whom I wrote my very first papers on London as a World City, circuits of capital, and gentrification. I still have them - written in long hand.

Queen's University in Kingston Ontario followed for my Masters – again, in Geography. Supervised by Evelyn Peters and funded by the Canadian Mortgage and Housing Corporation (CMHC) I explored the marginalization of lone parent families in suburban public housing complexes in Toronto. Under the patient guidance of Mark Rosenberg, I overcame my fear of statistics, and as a research assistant for Peter Goheen embraced the wonder of historical geography and the value of archival research.

A Canadian Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council (SSHRC) Doctoral Fellowship supported my enrollment in the PhD program in Geography at the University of British Columbia. It was under the extraordinary tutelage and mentorship of David Ley that I conducted my doctoral dissertation on socio-spatial polarization in the Downtown Eastside and served as a research assistant for the Vancouver Center of Excellence for Research on Immigration and Integration in the Metropolis (RIIM). David's and my work on concentrated poverty and immigrant settlement in major Canadian cities was the launching pad for what has become the primary research and advocacy focus of my career – immigrant settlement, integration, and receptivity. UBC was also my introduction to ethnic geography. It was through an independent study with David that I first encountered the work of some of the Ethnic Geography Specialty Group's Distinguished Scholars - Ceri Peach, Wilbur Zelinsky, Susan Hardwick, Audrey Kobayashi, Kay Anderson, Wei Li, and others. The complexities of ethnic economies; labor market segmentation; enclaves and ghettos;

assimilation, acculturation and integration; inclusion and exclusion; heterolocalism were explored in classes taken with David and Dan Hiebert. The applicability of these concepts to real-world geographies was made evident through the various seminars, workshops, community conversations and research opportunities offered through the Metropolis Project.

In the fall of 1999, I returned to North Carolina to take up a position as Assistant Professor of Geography at the University of North Carolina at Charlotte. For the last 16 years I have had the great fortune to work in partnership with tremendously talented students and colleagues both within and beyond the university on ways in which to deepen scholarly and community based understanding of the transnational dynamics of Latino migration into the US South. Together we have used concepts and tools of geography to build interventions that ensure primary care access for newly arrived Latino immigrants, that help both receiving and arriving communities understand and adjust to rapid cultural change, that provide tangible infrastructure for greater integration and inclusivity.

At UNC Charlotte my teaching, research, and outreach in the area of urban, ethnic, and immigrant geography has always been supported and encouraged. So too has my long standing involvement in the Ethnic Geography Specialty Group.

As I hope this narrative conveys, mentoring and collegueship has been a critical ingredient in my professional path and many who have shaped the more recent phases of my career are members and leaders of this very *special* specialty group. From the very first business meeting to which I was invited by Wei Lei and Carlos Teixeira, the EGSG has been an invigorating source of intellectual exchange and deeply appreciated mentoring and friendship. It has been one of the most inclusive and welcoming professional groups with whom I have had the privilege to work.

As I write, I am sitting in my flat in Kingston-Upon-Thames looking out at the river and city beyond. For the next academic year, I am serving

as the Resident Faculty Director of the UNCC-Kingston University London Study Abroad Exchange program. While my primary roles are student advising and collaborative program building between UNCC and KUL, I am also using the opportunity to develop new courses for students who will join me in future years for summer and spring break abroad courses. A key component of these will, of course, be theoretical and field-based exploration of the ethnic and immigrant geographies of British cities. Beyond that, I look forward to returning to the US equipped with new thinking about how best to use community engaged and participatory research to build more receptive and inclusive cities both at home and abroad.

***Biography of EGSG's  
Carlos Teixeira***



Carlos Teixeira

Carlos obtained his BSc and a MSc degrees in geography from the Université du Québec à Montréal, and earned his PhD in geography from York University in 1993. He is currently a Full Professor in geography at the University of British Columbia – Okanagan, in Kelowna (Canada), where he teaches introductory courses in Human Geography, and upper-level courses in Urban Social Geography, Migration and

Settlement, the Geography of Housing, and Population Geography.

His research interests in settlement and urban geography are in part a product of his biography: he is a “new” Canadian who emigrated from the Azores islands (owned by Portugal) four decades ago. Like many immigrants, he first settled in an ethnic neighbourhood, specifically the “Quartier Portugais/Little Portugal” in Montreal. Later he moved to Toronto, where he chose to reside in its “Little Portugal,” which is very close to both Toronto’s “Little Italy” and the colourful Kensington Market – which served as reception areas for more than a century for immigrants from all over the world. Living in such rich multicultural environment greatly shaped the way he perceived the impact of immigrant groups on Canadian cities and their neighbourhoods: from an early research focus on the formation and residential mobility of Portuguese immigrants in Montreal and Toronto to his current interest in immigrant subjects ranging from population and migration issues to housing and ethnic entrepreneurship. His research interests today include urban and social geography, with an emphasis on housing and ethnic entrepreneurship and the social structure of North American cities.

Since moving to Kelowna in 2005, Carlos has concentrated his research on two major projects that examined the housing experiences and coping strategies of recent immigrants, first in a mid-sized Canadian city (Kelowna) in the Okanagan Valley of British Columbia, and second in the outer suburbs of Vancouver (Richmond and Surrey). While immigrants continue to arrive in Canada’s traditional metropolitan gateway areas, recent data from the Canadian census has sparked significant interest in immigrant dispersal to new

destinations outside major urban centres, especially the suburbs and more, recently, in small/mid-sized cities. Rapid population growth and concentration of immigrants and minorities in these new destinations have led to an increasing demand for affordable housing. The evidence from his research indicates that new immigrants face numerous difficulties (e.g., high rents, overcrowding, poor-quality housing, and discrimination) in the rental housing market. The shortage of appropriate housing services and programs is also a major gap in the servicing of settlement in these regions. From 2007 to 2012, Carlos enriched and broadened his experience as a scholar and researcher by serving as the national co-ordinator for the housing and neighbourhoods research domain of the Metropolis Project. During this time, he was also the Housing and Neighbourhoods domain leader for Metropolis British Columbia. According to Carlos: “Canadian geographers like myself have tried to find solutions to the numerous housing problems that immigrants face in Canada’s rental and homeownership markets. I strongly believe that, as geographers, we need to continue doing the best research possible, but that our work should also make a difference; that is, to change the ‘real world’ and to influence public policy.” His recent publications include the following: Carlos Teixeira, Wei Li and Audrey Kobayashi (Editors) (2012). *Immigrant Geographies of North American Cities*. Don Mills, Ontario: Oxford University Press, and Carlos Teixeira and

Wei Li (Editors) (2015). *The Housing and Economic Experiences of Immigrants in U.S. and Canadian Cities*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

As active outside the university as he is inside of it, Carlos Teixeira has a record of involvement in the community. In 2003, while still in Toronto, he nominated that city’s historic Kensington Market to become a national heritage site – a designation that the federal government approved in 2007. He has received several awards since joining UBCO, including: (a) the Ethnic Geography Distinguished Scholar Award, 2011, presented by the Ethnic Geography Specialty Group; (b) two nominations for the UBC Okanagan Award for Excellence in Research (2010/2011 and 2014/2015); (c) the UBC Okanagan Provost’s Award for Public Education through Media Award 2010-2011; (d) the Medal for Professional Merit 2009 from the Autonomous Region of Azores, and (d) the Order – “Comendador – Ordem do Infante D. Henrique 2006” from the Portuguese government – one of the highest awards a Portuguese citizen residing overseas can receive for work in service of the Portuguese diaspora. He is also co-founder of the Ethnic Geography Specialty Group where he has made many friends throughout the years.

## ***NECROLOGY***

***EGSG Mourns the Passing of One of Its Most Popular and Productive Members***  
***Susan Hardwick***

***In-Memoriam***

***Susan W. Hardwick 1945-2015***

Susan Hardwick passed away on the evening of November 11 after a short battle with cancer. She passed peacefully surrounded by family in Eugene, Oregon, where she was a Professor Emerita of Geography at the University of Oregon.

Prior to her tenure at the University of Oregon, Susan held positions as an Instructor of Geography at Cosumnes River Community College, Sacramento; and as a Professor of Geography at both California State University-Chico and Texas State University-San Marcos.

During her distinguished career Susan was a prolific researcher and publisher, with a number of self and co-authored books and articles. Susan's research results appeared in such journals as the *Annals of the Association of American Geographers*, *The Geographical Review*, *The Journal of Geography*, *American Journal of Canadian Studies*, and *Journal of Geography in Higher Education*. In 2003 Susan was elected president of the National Council for Geographic Education.

In addition to her numerous academic achievements, Susan created a legacy of teaching, service, collaboration, and mentoring of graduate and undergraduate students. Her passion, radiant smile, and limitless energy supported and inspired countless people in Geography and other disciplines. Susan is survived by her husband Don, along with three sons and three grandchildren. (Written by: Tom Ptak,

Department of Geography, University of Oregon)



**Susan W. Hardwick**

***Editor's Tribute to Susan Hardwick***

I am so sorry to hear about the passing of Susan Hardwick. The world will be a little poorer without her because she was such an energetic and bright light.

Susan is one of those rare individuals who always saw the "good" in other people. I don't remember her ever saying anything derogatory about another person. In addition, she was an indefatigable scholar who got the most out of her considerable abilities.

Talk about timing, we were so fortunate in being able to feature Susan by publishing a biography of her life and career in the last issue (Spring 2015) of the *Ethnic Geography Specialty Group Newsletter*.

I will always remember the grace Susan brought to the AAG's Ethnic Geography Specialty Group. We were so fortunate to have her among us a colleague and a friend.

**News Flash:** Heike Alberts informs me that the EGSG Awards Committee has just voted in favor of awarding the **EGSG Career Award** to Susan posthumously.

(Written by: Thomas D. Boswell, Department of Geography, University of Miami, Co-Editor, *Ethnic Geography Specialty Group Newsletter*.)

**Note: Heike Alberts has assembled some photos of Susan that appear on the last pages of this Newsletter.**

### ***Ethnic Geography***

#### ***In The News***

**(Editor's Note:** Please remember that if you quote or use information from one of these articles to give credit to the author and to the journal, newsletter, or newspaper from which it came and not the EGSG Newsletter. I have freely excerpted parts of these articles for the EGSG Newsletter.)

#### ***More Mexicans Leaving Than***

##### ***Coming to the U.S.***

***Ana Gonzalez-Barrera***

***Pew Research Center (November 19, 2015)***

More Mexican immigrants have returned to Mexico from the U.S. than have migrated to the U.S. since the end of the Great Recession, according to a Pew Research Center analysis of newly available government data from both countries.

From 2009 to 2014, 1 million Mexicans and their families (including U.S.-born children) left the U.S. for Mexico, according to data from the 2014 Mexican National Survey of Demographic Dynamics (ENADID). U.S. census data for the same period show an estimated 870,000 Mexican nationals left Mexico to come to the U.S. This means that the net flow from Mexico to the U.S. is now negative, with a net loss of about 140,000 from 2009 to 2014.

A majority of the 1 million who left the U.S. for Mexico between 2009 and 2014 left of their own accord, according to the Mexican government's ENADID survey data. Six-in-ten (61%) return migrants – those who reported they had been living in the U.S. five years earlier but as of 2014 were back in Mexico – cited family reunification as the main reason for their return. By comparison, 14% of Mexico's return migrants said the reason for their return was deportation from the U.S., and only a small share (6%) gave employment reasons.

The overall flow of Mexican immigrants between the two countries is at its smallest since the 1990s, mostly due to a drop in the number of Mexican immigrants coming to the U.S. This decline is likely due to several factors, including the slow recovery of the U.S. economy after the Great Recession and stricter enforcement of U.S. immigration laws, particularly at the U.S.-Mexico border. (The complete report can be found at: [http://www.pewhispanic.org/files/2015/11/2015-11-19\\_mexican-immigration\\_\\_FINAL.pdf](http://www.pewhispanic.org/files/2015/11/2015-11-19_mexican-immigration__FINAL.pdf))

*Asians Taking Heat Off Hispanics**By Esther J. Cepeda**Albuquerque Journal (October 4, 2015)*

Have you heard the news? Asians will displace Hispanics as the largest foreign-born group in the U.S. by 2055. I, for one, am thrilled because the pressure will be off. As someone who happily lived in a time back when the "Hispanic community" was not a commodity described almost strictly in terms of its number of immigrants or consumer purchasing power, I will be delighted to see the Latino moment in the sun pass into history. I can't wait to say goodbye to the "fate of the nation rests on you" hyperbole from policymakers.

And good riddance to the "we're going to take over America" demographic glee by Latino activists reacting to years of oppressive media coverage that almost exclusively depicts Hispanics as low-income, foreign, and poorly educated.

Demographers have been talking about rising Asian immigration for several years. But the Pew Research Center's new report, which coincides with the 50-year anniversary of the Immigration and Nationality Act of 1965, got a lot of play last week resulting in breathless headlines reminiscent of those about Hispanics.

Asians are, according to different media outlets, "set to surpass Latinos" or are "on pace to overtake Hispanics," as if there were some sort of competition underway. Other publications were sunnier, saying Asian immigrants would "propel" or "prop up" the

country's population. Some took a darker tenor, noting that Asians are driving a "surge in U.S. immigrant population."

Boston College history professor Arissa Oh picked up on the tone of some of the coverage, commenting on Twitter: "Can't help but feel like these stories have subtext of 'watch out, the Asians are taking over!'"

Yep, there'll be more of that, and soon we'll see the marketing angle, too. In fact, the University of Georgia's Selig Center for Economic Growth has already started projecting the numbers: "The Asian market, comprised of 18.3 million Americans, will be \$825 billion in 2015 and grow to \$1.1 trillion in 2020." And these figures probably don't account for offensive corporate attempts to capitalize on Chinese New Year, Japan's Ocean Day, the Philippines' National Hero Day and any other cultural touchstone that might trend on Twitter or turn a buck.

In this I do not envy the Asian-American population. Once they become even more of a media sensation they'll have to endure any number of silly, poorly worded, stereotype-laden articles that will present facts about them as though they are all brand-new visitors from a far-away land.

Writing on the Latino Rebels blog, novelist Jonathan Marcantoni recently wrote about how tiresomely this plays itself out for Hispanics.

"Latino issues, as they are presented in the media and in our communities, have more or less calcified and threaten to become parody," he said.



"No matter which country you come from in Latin America, your issues are eventually whittled away until they can fit into the putrid-smelling box that is immigration. ... No matter what we do, we cannot escape the subject of us being foreigners. Here, and yet not here. The modern Latino movement is predominantly driven not just by our outsider status but by our obnoxiously overwhelming desire to no longer be outsiders."

However, we Hispanics are really not outsiders any more. As Mary C. Waters, co-author of a recent report by the National Academies of Sciences on the assimilation of immigrants, said at a recent National Immigration Forum event: "Overall, immigrants are integrating as fast or faster than immigrants did coming from Europe a century ago."

One bright spot for Asians is that stereotypes of them as "model minorities" are simplistic and not wholly accurate, they'll act as a sort of shield from the worst of the immigrant haters who like to complain about our nation taking in only poor and undereducated people.

Speaking at the same forum as Waters, Mee Moua, the Executive Director of Asian Americans Advancing Justice, told the audience: "We have a diverse group of immigrants coming from Asian countries that are at different points of readiness to contribute to this country. They're more

highly educated, they come with ready skill sets and they're coming prepared and ready to contribute to the progress of this country. And isn't that the whole point of the Immigration and Nationality Act of 1965?"

It certainly is. And if only logic and rigorous fact-checking surrounded this nation's immigration debate, our new Asian arrivals could be spared the backlash of what will inevitably degrade into hysterical rhetoric about an "Asian invasion."

***Are Criminal Justice Reforms and Immigration Policy at Odds?***

***Marisa Franco and Jeronimo Saldaña  
Fox News Latino (October 21, 2015)***

The Department of Justice recently announced a decision to release 6,000 people from federal prison. As part of that announcement, agency officials noted that 1/3 of the people released are immigrants who will be quickly deported. There is a clear and troubling pattern where policy reforms in the criminal justice system do not extend to immigrants in the criminal justice or immigration enforcement systems. The glaring question is: why not?

For some, there is a hope for reintegration, while for others there is no chance whatsoever because our immigration policy is still grounded in mass criminalization. It's time for that to change. Whether because of the human or monetary costs, lack of effectiveness, or the clear bias that runs rampant, there is a re-examination occurring of the War on Drugs and the mass incarceration system. Reforms in these domains, however, are not being

considered in the immigration enforcement system; in fact, the trend is going in the opposite direction. An act that, for citizens, may no longer warrant a criminal charge much less incarceration, for immigrants often means a double punishment of a harsh prison sentence and possible deportation. Already immigrants receive harsher sentences inside of the criminal justice system than citizens.

As sentencing reform victories are making mandatory minimums increasingly obsolete, politicians are still proposing the very same approach to enforce immigration law. (One bill proposed by Louisiana's Senator was narrowly defeated on the hill on Tuesday.) If these policies have proven to be ineffective and inhumane in drug policy, what makes anyone think they are well suited for immigration policy?

The War on Drugs has wreaked havoc both domestically and abroad. Over 40,000 immigrants are deported for drug offenses each year - resulting in more than one-quarter of a million people forcibly removed in the past seven years alone. This double standard, along with hateful rhetoric that targets 'felons not families', inflicts serious harm on countless communities.

One recent example of an effort to reform the immigration system through the lens of criminal justice took place in California, but was thwarted when Gov. Jerry Brown vetoed legislation that the *L.A. Times* called a "new approach [that] would treat potential citizens the same way full citizens are treated when it comes to minor

drug infractions." Imagine that - vetoing legislation that sought to bring Californians one crucial step closer to treating all people equal under the law. Meanwhile, thousands of families across the U.S. continue to face the brunt of our draconian drug laws.

In her groundbreaking report, U.S.: Drug Deportations Tearing Families Apart, Human Rights Watch Researcher Grace Meng notes that "even as many U.S. states are legalizing and decriminalizing some drugs, or reducing sentences for drug offenses, federal immigration policy too often imposes exile for the same offenses. Americans believe the punishment should fit the crime, but that is not what is happening to immigrants convicted of what are often relatively minor drug offenses."

Attorney General Loretta Lynch embodied that double standard in one breath when she was asked about the planned release of people from prison. She said:

"The Sentencing Commission made some changes in the way sentences would be calculated. A number of cases are being referred to judges and it will be the courts who decide if and when someone is released. Once that happens, if that happens, we expect those individuals will hopefully be able to be re-integrated into society. A vast number of them are not going to stay here; a vast number of them are eligible for deportation and will be removed."

As we near the anniversary of President Obama's immigration executive action, relief remains elusive at the federal level while millions remain ensnared in the mass deportation system. The administration continues to punish immigrants rather than implement much needed relief and reform. To ensure that emerging reforms in criminal justice that reduce prison populations are not just replaced by immigration policies that fill them, it's time for the double standard to end.

(Note: Marisa Franco is based in Phoenix, Arizona and is the co-founder of Mijente and Director of the "Not1More Deportation Campaign." Jeronimo Saldaña is the legislative and organizing coordinator for the "Drug Policy Alliance" in Pheonix.)

### ***How The World Views Migration (Executive Summary)***

***Neli Esipova, Julie Ray, Anita Pugliese,  
and Dato Tsabutashvili***

#### ***International Organization for Migration***

Negative and positive opinions toward immigration exist in every region and every country; however, certain sociodemographic characteristics are more consistently associated with favorable or opposing attitudes to immigration. This study finds that adults with a university degree are typically more likely than those with lower levels of education to want to see immigration kept at its present level or increased in their countries. Similarly, younger people generally tend to be more positive toward immigration. In contrast,

negative attitudes in relation to immigration levels are more likely found among those who are unemployed than those who are employed.

People's views about their personal and their countries' economic situations may be the strongest predictors of their views of immigration. Those who perceive economic situations as poor or worsening are more likely to favor lower immigration levels into their countries. The reverse is also true: those who perceive their individual or their countries' economic situations as good or improving are more likely to want to see higher levels of immigration.

Although people's outlooks on their national economy, personal standard of living, and household income are strong indicators of their views of immigration levels in their countries, these do not appear to be such strong predictors of people's opinions about competition between national workers and immigrants in their countries' labor markets. Public opinion as to whether migrants compete with national workers for jobs is, however, generally aligned with opinion about immigration levels: among the countries surveyed, on average, residents who do not see migrants as wanting the jobs citizens in their countries want tend to be more open to immigration in their countries.

*How the World Views Migration* provides, for the first time, an insight into public attitudes toward immigration worldwide. The findings presented here – **based on interviews with over 183,000 adults across more than 140 countries between 2012 and 2014** – represent the first steps toward

understanding the lenses through which people view immigration at a global level. Adults surveyed in *Gallup's World Poll* were asked two questions about immigration: (1) In your view, should immigration in this country be kept at its present level, increased or decreased? (2) Do you think immigrants mostly take jobs that citizens in this country do not want (e.g. low-paying or not prestigious jobs), or mostly take jobs that citizens in this country want?

Foremost among the report's findings is that in every major region of the world – with the important exception of Europe – people are more likely to want immigration levels in their countries to either stay at the present level or to increase, rather than to decrease. This contrasts with the negative perceptions of migration often portrayed in the media in certain regions of the world.

European residents appear to be, on average, the most negative globally toward immigration, with the majority believing immigration levels should be decreased. However, there is a sharp divergence in opinions among residents in Northern and Southern Europe. The majority of adults in Northern European countries – except for those in the United Kingdom – would like immigration levels to either stay the same or increase, while most residents in Southern European countries would prefer to have lower levels of immigration to their countries.

More broadly, residents in less than half of the 40 countries in the larger European

region are more likely to favor decreased immigration levels than the same or higher levels.

### **Among the Key Findings of the Report Are the Following:**

#### **Geography of Immigration Attitudes:**

- Worldwide, people are generally more likely to want immigration levels in their countries to either stay at their present levels (22%) or to increase (21%), rather than to see immigration levels decreased (34%).
- People in Europe are the most negative in the world toward immigration, with the majority (52%) saying immigration levels in their countries should be decreased.
- In seven of the top 10 migrant destination countries (United States, Canada, Australia, United Arab Emirates, Saudi Arabia, Germany and France), majorities say immigration should be increased or stay the same, while more than half of the respondents in the remaining three (Russian Federation, United Kingdom and Spain) say immigration levels should decrease.

#### **Economics of Immigration Attitudes:**

- Adults who live in countries with the highest unemployment rates are the most negative toward immigration to their countries. Nearly half of adults in countries with unemployment rates higher than 15 per cent believe immigration should decrease.
- Residents of high-income economies overall are much more likely to say

immigrants take jobs citizens do not want (58%) than that they take jobs that citizens want (18%). In all other economies, residents are more likely to say immigrants take the jobs that citizens want.

- In all top 10 migrant destination countries – which are also all high-income economies – many more respondents say that immigrants take jobs that residents do not want than say they take jobs that residents want.

#### **Demographics of Immigration Attitudes:**

- Adults with a university degree are more likely than those with lower levels of education to want to see immigration kept at its present level or increased.
- Those younger than age 44 are likely to have an opinion about immigration and they are more likely to favor increasing immigration levels.
- Compared with others in the workforce, those who are not working but actively looking for employment and able to begin work are considerably more likely to want immigration decreased (40% of the unemployed versus 33% of those not unemployed).

#### **Government Policies and Immigration Attitudes:**

- People's attitudes and government policies toward immigration seem to be generally aligned. When public opinion toward immigration is, on average, negative, government policies are aimed at decreasing the level of

immigration to their countries and vice versa.

- In the Russian Federation, however, residents' predominantly negative attitudes toward immigration (70% of respondents desire lower levels) run directly counter to the country's policies to raise immigration levels.

#### **Special Focus: G20 Economies:**

- Attitudes toward immigration in the G20 countries as a group mirror global attitudes: every fifth person in this group wants immigration to stay at the present level and every fifth person wants it to increase. Within the G20, there are clearly vast differences in opinion.
- In South Africa, the Russian Federation, the United Kingdom, Turkey, Italy and Mexico, more than half of adults would like to see immigration decreased, while in the European Union as a whole (a member of the G20 in itself), nearly half (48%) would like to see lower levels of immigration. At the same time, majorities of adults would like to see immigration increased or be kept at the present level in Japan, the Republic of Korea, Saudi Arabia, Germany, Brazil, the United States, Canada and Australia.
- Adults with a university degree are more likely than those with lower levels of education to want to see immigration kept at its present level or increased.
- Views about immigration are more positive in major cities in Saudi Arabia and in China than they are in the rest of their respective countries. In Saudi Arabia,

for example, the percentage of residents in Riyadh who would like to see higher immigration levels in the country is similar to that in the rest of the country, but adults in this city are also more likely to want to see immigration levels kept the same.

- In Istanbul, residents are more likely than the rest of their fellow Turks to want to see a decrease in immigration levels in their country: nearly two in three respondents in Istanbul (65%) would like to see lower levels, compared with 51 per cent in the rest of the country.

(Source: *How The World Views Migration*, International Organization for Migration, Geneva, Switzerland, 2015. Neli Esipova, Julie Ray, Anita Pugliese, Dato Tsubutashvili Main Authors and Frank Laczko, Marzia Rango Contributing Authors.)

***Hispanic Population Reaches  
Record 55 Million, But  
Growth Has Cooled***

***Jens Manuel Krogstad and  
Mark Hugo Lopez***

***PEW Research Center (June 25, 2015)***

The U.S. Hispanic population has been a key driver of the country's population growth since at least 1970. But the group's growth has slowed in recent years, and that trend continued in 2014, as evidenced by new figures released early today by the U.S. Census Bureau.

The Hispanic population reached a new high of 55.4 million in 2014 (or 17.4% of the total U.S. population), an increase of 1.2 million (2.1%) from the year before. However, that 2.1% rate continues a trend of slower growth that began in 2010.

Hispanic population growth had peaked earlier, in the 1990s. From 1995 to 2000, annual average growth was 4.8%, and growth has declined since then. From 2010 to 2014, the annual average growth had dropped to 2.2%. Part of the reason for this decline in population growth is the slowdown in immigration from Latin America, and in particular, from Mexico.

The Census Bureau's annual population estimates detail the nation's demographics in a variety of categories, including race and ethnicity, geography, and age. For example, the county with the largest Hispanic population by far is Los Angeles County in California (4.9 million), followed by Harris County in Texas (1.9 million) and Miami-Dade County in Florida (1.8 million).

From 2010 to 2014, the Hispanic population declined in 11 counties that have Hispanic populations of 10,000 or more, located in Alabama (Jefferson), Arizona (Santa Cruz), Florida (Hardee), Georgia (Clayton and DeKalb), New Mexico (Rio Arriba, San Juan, and San Miguel) and Texas (Duval, Hale and Willacy). The biggest decline came in DeKalb County in suburban Atlanta, where the Hispanic population was 64,279 in 2014, down 4% from 2010.

The data showed no change in ranking among the states with the highest Hispanic

populations. California still leads the list (15.0 million), followed by Texas (10.4 million) and Florida (4.8 million). Together, these three states account for more than half (55%) the Hispanic population. But their share is down from 58% in 2000, reflecting a wider dispersion of the nation's Hispanic population over the past decade and a half.

In addition, the new Census Bureau estimates show that Hispanics, with a median age of 29 years, are younger than most other racial or ethnic groups. By comparison, the median age for non-Hispanic blacks is 34; it's 43 for non-Hispanic whites and 36 for Asians. But Hispanics are growing older: In 2010, the group's median age was 27, up from 26 in 2000.

***Immigrant Population to Hit Highest Percentage Ever in 8 Years U.S. Census Bureau: 1 in 7 U.S. Residents Will Be Foreign-Born***  
***Karen Zeigler and Steven A. Camarota***  
***(April 2015)***

***Center for Immigration Studies, Backgrounders and Reports***

While they did not receive much attention when they were released last month, new projections from the Census Bureau (*Projections of the Size and Composition of the U.S. Population: 2014 to 2060, March 2015 U.S. Census Bureau.*) show the enormous impact of immigration on the U.S. population. For the first time, the Bureau projected the future size of the immigrant (foreign-born) population and

found that **by 2023** immigrants will account for more than one in seven U.S. residents (51 million) — the largest share (14.8%) ever recorded in American history.(1) Driven largely by legal immigration, not illegal immigration, the immigrant population will grow to nearly one in five U.S. residents (78 million) by 2060, the Bureau projects. The total U.S. population will grow to almost 417 million — 108 million more than in 2010.

***Among the Census Bureau's Major Findings:***

- Total net immigration (the difference between the number coming and going) will increase steadily over the next 45 years, totaling 64 million.(2)
- Absent a change in current policy, the Census Bureau projects that in 2023 the nation's immigrant population (legal and illegal) will reach 14.8 percent (51 million) of the total U.S. population — the highest share ever recorded in American history.(3)
- The Bureau also projects that the immigrant population will grow nearly four times faster than the native-born population, reaching 15.8 percent (57 million) of the nation's population in 2030, 17.1 percent (65 million) in 2040, and 18.8 percent (78 million) in 2060.(4)
- To place these numbers into historical context, as recently as 1990, immigrants were 7.9 percent (20 million) of the total U.S. population.(5)
- The nation's total population will grow to 417 million by 2060 — 108 million more than in 2010.(6) This increase is roughly equivalent to adding the combined

populations of California, Texas, New York, Florida, and Massachusetts to the country.(7)

- The new projections indicate that, absent a change in immigration policy, immigrants who will arrive in the future plus their descendants will account for roughly three-fourths of future U.S. population increase.(8)
- Other interesting findings in the projections show the rapid aging of the immigrant population. In 2015, immigrants accounted for 13 percent of the population 65 and older, roughly equal to their share of the overall population. But by 2060 there will be 25.3 million immigrants in this age group, accounting for 26 percent of all persons over 65.9

***End Notes (Methodology Used in Making These Estimates)***

1. In recent years, on average, 1.1 million green cards (for new legal permanent immigrants) have been issued annually. (Yearbook of Immigration Statistics.) As shown in (Summary Table 1 of the new projections, net immigration (the difference between those entering and leaving the country) is estimated at 1.24 million per year in 2015, rising slowly but steadily through 2060. Allowing for the out-migration of legal immigrants, net legal immigration is still roughly 800,000 a year, which means that it accounts for about two-thirds of net immigration as reported in the new projections. It should be added that DHS estimates of the illegal population of 11.4

million indicate that only slightly more than one-fourth of the total foreign-born population is comprised of illegal immigrants. The scale of legal immigration is much larger than illegal immigration and as a result it exerts a much greater impact on population projections. (Estimates of the Unauthorized Immigrant Population Residing in the United States: January 2012, Department of Homeland Security.)

2. Summary Table 1 from the new projections shows net immigration over the next 20 years. Net immigration does include the movement of native-born Americans in and out of the country, but natives exert very little influence on these figures because the departure of Americans is roughly offset by those returning to the country, as shown in Summary Table 2. The table shows, for example, that the immigrant population will grow 17 million from 2015 to 2034. Further, the number of deaths among this population, given its age and gender as shown in Summary Table 5, can be estimated at seven to eight million over those 20 years. Adding growth in the foreign-born to deaths in this population for the next 20 years comes close to total net immigration over this period of slightly more than 26 million. This means that most net immigration is among the foreign-born. This is not surprising given that many more immigrants arrive than leave the country each year, whereas this is not the case among the native-born. It should be added that the number of people arriving each year is significantly higher than net immigration, which is the balance between those arriving in the country and those departing. The Census



Bureau provides only the net figures for each year and does not report in- and out-migration separately. However, based on what information is provided in the methods statement released with the estimates, the Bureau is projecting out-migration of the foreign born of 300,000 to 400,000 a year, rising through 2060 as the foreign-born population from which out-migration occurs grows. (Methodology, Assumptions, and Inputs for the 2014 National Projections, U.S. Census Bureau.)

3. Historical numbers from the decennial censuses can be found at the Census Bureau's website – [www.census.gov](http://www.census.gov). They show that, in 1890, the foreign-born share reached 14.77 percent of the U.S. population and fell for a time, but again reached 14.70 percent in 1910. These two figures represent the highest share ever recorded. (Table 2 of the new projections shows that the foreign-born will reach 14.79 percent in 2023, making it the highest percentage ever recorded. If one rounds the percentages, then the new all-time high will not be reached until 2024, at 14.9 percent.)

4. Summary Table 2 of the Census Bureau's new projections shows that the immigrant population will grow 81 percent from 2015 to 2060, compared to growth of 22 percent for the native-born population.

5. Historical numbers from the decennial censuses can be found at the Census Bureau's website ([www.census.gov](http://www.census.gov)).

6. Summary Table 2 of the Census Bureau's new projection shows the total population, immigrant and native-born, through 2060.

7. The total is based on state populations from the 2010 Census.

8. The Census Bureau has not published different population scenarios varying the impact of immigration, so we cannot say exactly what share of total national population will be due to future immigration in these new projections. However, there is no question that future immigration must account for about three-fourths of the future increase. We can see the enormous role of immigration in driving future U.S. population increase in Summary Table 2 of the new Census Bureau projections, which shows that the foreign-born will grow by 35 million from 2015 to 2060, accounting for 37 percent of population growth. Furthermore, the Census Bureau states that there will be 39.8 million births to foreign-born women over this time period. Together, this equals 78 percent of population growth, 2015 to 2060. The birth figures can be found in *Projections of the Size and Composition of the U.S. Population: 2014 to 2060, March 2015 U.S. Census Bureau*. It should be noted that some of these births will be to immigrants already in the country and the birth figures do not include estimates of mortality among those born in the future. On the other hand, the foreign-born birth figures do not include births to descendants of immigrants who will arrive between now and 2060, which are part of the projections and represent the full impact of future immigration. There is no question that future immigrants plus their descendants will account for the overwhelming share of population growth. Prior projections also clearly indicate this is the case. Projections developed by the Center for Immigration

Studies and Decision Demographics in 2012 show that future immigration will account for 75.5 percent of population growth from 2010 to 2050 and 82 percent from 2010 through 2060. Our projection matches prior Census Bureau projections in terms in migration, births, and deaths. (Steven A. Camarota, ("Projecting Immigration's Impact on the Size and Age Structure of the 21st Century American Population," Center for Immigration Studies, 2012.) Our findings are similar to those published by the Pew Hispanic Center in 2008, which concluded that new immigrants and their descendants will account for 82 percent of population growth through 2050. (Jeffrey S. Passel and D'Vera Cohn, ("U.S. Population Projections: 2005-2050", Pew Hispanic Center, 2008.

***Latino School Segregation:  
The Big Education Problem That  
No One Is Talking About  
Separate and unequal.***

*Rebecca Klein*

***The Huffington Post (October 26, 2015)***

Nearly a decade before the Supreme Court ruling in *Brown v. Board of Education* made segregated schooling of black students unconstitutional, a group of five Mexican-American families in California fought for integrated schools in *Mendez v. Westminster*. It was in 1946. For years, the state's Mexican-American students had languished in inferior "Mexican schools" to which they were assigned based on name and complexion. Plaintiffs in the case argued that the segregation of Mexican-American

children violated their right to "equal protection" under the Constitution, noting that their schools were severely under-resourced compared to nearby white schools, and the plaintiffs' experts testified on the negative impact segregation has on children's self-esteem. Defendants in the case -- four school districts -- argued that Mexican students had poor hygiene, carried diseases, and were intellectually inferior.

The case -- which was decided in the plaintiffs' favor -- never made its way to the Supreme Court, and thus its impact was never felt on a federal level. But soon after, California became the first state to ban state-sponsored school segregation.

It's now 2015, and while much has changed in California, much has remained the same. Segregation is no longer based on official policies or law -- called *de jure* segregation -- but based on voluntary housing or schooling choices. Still, the Golden State remains the most segregated one in the country for Latino students, according to research from the UCLA's Civil Rights Project, which studies civil rights issues.

To be an average Latino student in California today means that you likely attend a school that is 84 percent nonwhite, with high rates of concentrated poverty. It means you live in a two-tiered society where only 20 percent of Latino students taking the SAT in California are deemed college-ready, compared to 41 percent of students statewide.

California's situation is extreme. Its Latino population is exceptionally large and exceptionally segregated. But the state's issues

are symptomatic of a long-term, nationwide trend of Latinos quietly becoming the most segregated minority population of students in the country, the UCLA center has found.

In 2011, the typical Latino student attended a school that was 57 percent Latino, according to the UCLA research.

Comparatively, an average black student attended a school that was 49 percent black. A typical white student attended a school that was 73 percent white.

#### WHY IS NO ONE TALKING ABOUT THIS?

There is a dearth of research on how segregation impacts Latino students specifically, although there are plentiful data on how racial isolation impacts African-Americans. As efforts to address African-American segregation have faltered, public discourse on growing Latino segregation remains elusive.

"We've been through a demographic revolution with almost no policy attention to the racial dimensions of these changes," Gary Orfield, co-director of the Civil Rights Project at UCLA, told *The Huffington Post*. "It's not exactly true that anyone is paying attention to black segregation either -- we're a third of the century into kind of doing nothing and a quarter of the century into systematically dismantling what we did earlier."

Little attention has been paid to the issue of Latino segregation because segregation has historically been a black-white issue, said Patricia Gándara, Orfield's co-director at the Civil Rights

Project. *Brown v. Board of Education* focused specifically on African-American students. In 1973, the Supreme Court ruling in *Keyes v. School District No. 1, Denver, Colorado*, recognized that Latino students also have a right to integrated schools, but the case had minimal impact. When African-American and white students were being bussed away from their neighborhood schools to help achieve racial balance, Latinos were mostly ignored. "We're stuck in a black-white paradigm that doesn't work quite the same way for Latinos," Gándara said.

Jennifer Lee, an Associate Professor of sociology at the University of Indiana, predicts that in the coming years, we will start to see more research about the schooling of Latino students. "With this increase in the Latino population I think there are lots of scholars who are very interested the Latino student community. It just takes time," she said. "We can't extrapolate studies on African-American students to Latino students."

With little research on the topic, it is difficult to come up with potential fixes. "We have to really understand what it is we're studying," said Lee. "We can't assume the mechanisms are the same across different populations -- or all Latino students."

David Garcia, an Associate Professor at Arizona State University, ran for the state's superintendent of public instruction in 2014 and lost. During his campaign, he did not hear the issue of school segregation brought up once, he said, "not even by minority groups." "The entire discussion from how we come to study it really comes out of the South and in the

'60s and blacks and whites," said Garcia. Meanwhile, Western states -- those that typically have some of the largest populations of Latino students -- are studied less frequently.

***Would You Like to Write a Book Review for the EGSG Newsletter?***

If so, please contact Tom Boswell at the e-mail address listed below. Your review should be no more than two pages single-spaced (12 point type) and should contain full bibliographic information about the book. Also, the book you review must have been published since 2010. You will have to obtain a copy of the book yourself because EGSG does not have resources to buy books. Remember, a book review is a nice CV item.

[Tboswell1@Yahoo.com](mailto:Tboswell1@Yahoo.com)

Research on the issue of Latino school segregation is also somewhat complicated by the diversity within this group of students, Garcia noted. Latino students may experience segregation differently depending on when they came to this country or where their family is from, for example. "I think first and foremost in the conversations I've had, people want to know how Latino students are doing" in school, Garcia said. "Who they are attending with does not rise to the level of public discussion."

U.S. Secretary of Education Arne Duncan largely ignored the issue of school

segregation during his work under the Obama administration, but there is some speculation that his replacement, John King, will put the issue back on the political map. King, who will start in the job in December, served as the state education commissioner in New York before spending the past few months as an adviser to Duncan.

In New York, King enacted a grant program that will use \$25 million to encourage more affluent students to attend certain high-poverty, struggling schools. In September, he emphasized the importance of integrated schools at a National Coalition on School Diversity conference.

It is now impossible to ignore the role that Latino students play in the issue of school segregation. If King does focus his attention on school diversity, it is likely that the issue of Latino segregation will receive more attention than it ever has before.

(Note: This article can also be found at: *National Institute of Latino Policy*, October 29, 2015. [www.latinopolicy.org](http://www.latinopolicy.org).)

***Latino Race and Ethnicity, and Proposed Changes for the 2020 Census***

***Angelo Falcon (June 29, 2015)***

***National Institute for Latino Policy (NiLP)***

By 2017, the Census Bureau is required to recommend questions for the 2020 Census to the Congress and among the issues that this will involve is how the Bureau plans to count race and ethnicity. The Census currently asks two questions, one of one's Hispanic identity and the other on one's race. There are currently

proposals under consideration to combine both questions into one as a way to improve the quality of these racial-ethnic data. However, this proposal has proven to be controversial in some quarters. In the recent "Fact Tank" report below by the Pew Research Center, they outline problems with the Census Bureau's current understanding of race in the Latino community.

It is interesting to note that the Pew findings on Latino concepts of race and ethnicity are nearly the opposite of those in an April NiLP survey of 345 Latino opinion leaders in the United States. Asked how they would characterize Latinos along general racial and ethnic lines, two-thirds of the Latino opinion leaders (66 percent) feel that Latinos are primarily an ethnic/national origin group, compared to only 6 percent who see it primarily as a racial group. A quarter (25 percent) thinks Latinos are a combination racial and ethnic/national origin group.

This NiLP survey is not based on a sample but is a close approximation of an Latino elite poll, raising questions of whether there is a significant difference in racial-ethnic perceptions between Latino leaders and the general Latino population. This could be based on generation, socio-economic level, and other factors and in these ways tends to complicate how the Latino community and its leaders will respond to the Census proposals to change the race and ethnic questions.

In the NiLP survey, the Latino opinion leaders were asked: "The Census Bureau is

considering changing the way it counts the U.S. population for the 2020 Census by combining the separate race and 5 Hispanic questions it currently uses into one question. Would you agree with this change?" While a plurality oppose this change (38 percent), a close 35 percent support it, with 19 percent stating they do not know enough about it to give an opinion.

There is, therefore, currently no consensus on this Census issue among Latino leaders, indicating the need for further community education on the issues involved in the proposed changes in how the Census Bureau plans to collect racial and Hispanic data in the 2020 Census. With only 4 percent feeling that the Census Bureau should not be collecting such racial and ethnic data, there is a near consensus that the Bureau should be doing so.

There were, however, some racial differences in response to this question by the Latino opinion leaders. While pluralities of those identifying racially as White (44 percent) and those identifying as some other race (40 percent) oppose combining the race and Hispanic questions into one, the largest percentage of those identifying racially as Black (42 percent) favor combining the questions into one. This last finding is surprising since the groups raising serious questions about valuable racial information that would be lost by combining these questions are largely Afro-Latino.

Further surprising is that two-thirds (67 percent) of those identifying specifically as Afro-Latino support combining the questions. Support for the combined question was

strongest among those Latino opinion leaders who considered Latinos to be primarily a racial group (55 percent in support) or partially racial (40 percent). The largest percentage (44 percent) of those who consider Latinos to be primarily an ethnic or national origin group opposed this proposal.

As the Census Bureau starts to conclude its testing of its proposals to make changes in the race and ethnic questions for the 2020 Census, the Latino community needs to fully debate the issues involved in order to express its preferences to the Bureau and the Congress. The juxtapositioning of the Pew with the NiLP findings indicates that this debate needs to take place sooner rather than later.

(Angelo Falcon is President, National Institute for Latino Policy in New York City, N.Y.)

***Is Being Hispanic A Matter  
Of Race, Ethnicity, Or Both?***

***Ana Gonzalez-Barrera and  
Mark Hugo Lopez***

***Pew Research Center (June 15, 2015)***

When it comes to reporting their racial identity, Latinos stand out from other Americans. In the 2010 census, for example, 94% of the U.S. population selected at least one of the five standard, government-defined racial categories - white, black, Asian, American Indian or Pacific Islander. But among Latinos, just 63% selected at least one of these categories; 37% of Latinos, or 19 million, instead selected only "some other race," with many offering write-in responses

such as "Mexican," Hispanic" or "Latin American."

Federal policy defines "Hispanic" not as a race, but as an ethnicity. And it prescribes that Hispanics can in fact be of any race. But these census findings suggest that standard U.S. racial categories might either be confusing or not provide relevant options for Hispanics to describe their racial identity. They also raise an important question long pondered by social scientists and policymakers: Do Hispanics consider their Hispanic background to be part of their racial background, their ethnic background or both?

A new Pew Research Center survey of multiracial Americans finds that, for two-thirds of Hispanics, their Hispanic background is a part of their racial background - not something separate. This suggests that Hispanics have a unique view of race that doesn't necessarily fit within the official U.S. definitions.

This distinctive view of race is consistent across demographic subgroups of Latino adults. For example, 69% of young Latino adults ages 18 to 29 say their Latino background is part of their racial background, as does a similar share of those in other age groups, including those 65 and older. Similar views are held among Hispanics who use Spanish as their main language (67%) and those who use English as their main language (66%).

This finding sheds light on some of the challenges the Census Bureau has faced in asking Hispanics about their ethnic and racial background in surveys. Since 1980, the Census Bureau has asked everyone in the U.S. about their Hispanic origin separately from their race,

and since 2000 it has allowed people to select more than one race in addition to their Hispanic background.

But attempts by the Census Bureau to reduce the use of the "some other race" category in the 2010 census by adding a note on the questionnaire explicitly stating that "Hispanic origins are not races" had limited impact. That year, 37% of Hispanic respondents selected "some other race," not much smaller than the 42% who said the same in 2000.

To address these challenges in preparation for the 2020 decennial census, the Census Bureau is considering asking everyone living in the U.S. about their race or origin in a combined question. In other words, the form would ask people to identify their race or origin and would include Hispanic along with black, white, Asian, American Indian and Pacific Islander.

Preliminary results from some experiments using the combined question show that when Hispanic origin is integrated into the race question, a large majority of Latinos (81% on average) mark just the Hispanic box and no other race category.

As the total number U.S. Hispanics has rapidly increased in the last few decades, the Census Bureau has been under pressure to accurately measure racial identity of Hispanics. For example, race and Hispanic origin are used in the enforcement of Equal Employment Opportunity and other anti-discrimination laws. At 54 million, Hispanics make up 17% of the nation's population, and they are projected to grow to

be 29% of the U.S. population by 2060, according to the Census Bureau. Between 1990 and 2013, the nation's Hispanic population grew faster than any other racial or ethnic group.

(Ana Gonzalez-Barrera is a Research Associate focusing on Hispanics, immigration and demographics and Mark Hugo Lopez is Director of Hispanic Research at the *Pew Research Center*.)

### ***The Asian Disadvantage (That's Being Ignored)***

***By Tanzina Vega***

***WDSU News 6 (New Orleans, LA)***

***(October 14, 2015)***

(Note: The notion of Asian-Americans as the nation's "model minority" as evidence of the declining significance of race grows as the Asian population continues to increase dramatically, but there are some problems with this model. For Latinos, who are usually unfavorably compared to Asians, this is an important debate to understand. Statement by: Angelo Falcón, President of the National Institute for Latino Policy.)

For some Asian Americans, it's a familiar yet troubling story. Recent articles in *The New York Times* ("The Asian Advantage") and *The Economist* ("The Model Minority is Losing Patience") have focused on a racial group considered to be one of the most successful in America and the numbers are compelling.

Overall, Asian Americans are more educated: More than half of Asian Americans 25 years and older (51.5%) have a bachelor's degree or higher compared to 30% of the

general U.S. population. And they earn a lot more: \$74,105 in median income versus \$53,657, according to Census Bureau's 2014 *American Community Survey*.

However, behind the numbers is another story. "When you dig a little bit it shows that we are not all doing as well as society, the government and other institutions would lead you to believe," said Christopher Kang, the Director of the National Council of Asian Pacific Americans. "We do have a very diverse population and very diverse needs."

On Monday, Kang penned a response to the *New York Times* piece by Nicholas Kristof that addressed the success of Asian Americans. Asking "Why are Asian-Americans so successful in America" is "uninformed" and "perpetuates stereotypes," Kang wrote.

Specifically, Kang referenced the lower levels of educational attainment among groups like the Cambodian, Vietnamese, and Hmong communities. In fact, US census data show that among those 25 years and older just 15.3% of Hmong Americans, 18% of Cambodian Americans and 28.4% of Vietnamese Americans have a bachelor's degree or higher.

Meanwhile, 72.5% of Indian Americans in the same age group hold a bachelor's degree or higher. And more than half of Chinese Americans and Korean Americans hold advanced degrees.

Kang also cited poverty among Asian Americans as another often ignored issue. The overall poverty rate for Asian

Americans is 12.5%, well below the national rate of 15.5%. But among different Asian American groups, the rates vary significantly. For Indian Americans, for example, the poverty rate is 7.3%; for Chinese Americans it's 15.8%. "There are still garment workers, and the people who give you your foot massage in Chinatown, there are still low wage workers," said Sylvia Chong, the director of the Asian Pacific American Studies Minor at the University of Virginia. "People don't see that. That's an economic underclass."

High household incomes among Asian Americans can also be explained by the fact that some live in multi-generational homes with more than one person earning an income, said Jennifer Lee, a sociology professor at the University of California at Irvine and the co-author of the book "The Asian-American Achievement Paradox". "In some cases you have parents, grandparents, an aunt, and some children working," she said.

Kang also counters the idea that Asian Americans are "disproportionately stars" in America as Kristof says in his piece. Asian American and Pacific Islanders represent just 2.6% of corporate board seats and 2% of executive officers of Fortune 500 companies, according to data from Leadership Education for Asian Pacifics.

Kang was not alone in his critique of the *Times* piece. Some took to Twitter to air their discontent. Arissa Oh, the author of "To Save the Children of Korea" called Kristof's column "Textbook Orientalism." Ellen Wu, the author of "The Color of Success: Asian Americans and the Origins of the Model Minority"



questioned why people were so obsessed with explaining the success of Asian Americans.

In an email sent from Nepal, Kristof said that he was glad to see the conversation his column provoked and thought readers raised some valid points. He added, however, that he "wasn't much impressed by the idea that Asian-Americans are a diverse group -- of course they are, but so are whites and African-Americans and Latinos, and yet it's still useful to look for lessons in data by ethnicity."

To his credit, Kristof re-tweeted Kang's piece calling it an "interesting critical take." According to Kristof, the larger point of his piece was to question whether racial discrimination still existed for Asian Americans despite the successes that some Asian Americans experience. "At the end of the day, many whites argue that the success of Asian-Americans proves that the age of discrimination is over," Kristof told CNN Money, "And you simply have to respond to that argument head-on rather than elide it."

In his column, Kristof cites East Asia's long Confucian emphasis on education, strong two-parent families, and an enduring work ethic as the primary reasons Asian Americans do better than other groups. But it may be better explained by history -- at least in part.

After the Immigration and Nationality Act of 1965, the United States experienced a wave of mostly highly educated East Asians, including Chinese, Korean and Japanese immigrants. Children of educated and

professional parents tend to model their parents, said Lee, of U.C. Irvine.

However, that group was followed by a second wave of Asian immigration a decade later that was comprised mostly of refugees from countries including Cambodia, Laos and Vietnam. These refugees often had much lower rates of educational attainment, little family support, and, in some cases trauma from leaving war torn countries, experts said.

But Kristof's focus on the "Confucian emphasis on education" is concerning, said Lee. "The underlying tenet is that if groups adopt "the right" cultural values and behaviors, they too can succeed," said Lee. "This argument ignores a host of legal and institutional factors that help some groups get ahead more easily than others," she added.

These assumptions often fuel stereotypes of Asian Americans like the "model minority" concept which assumes that "there must be something intrinsic about Chinese culture or Asian culture that are producing these outcomes," said Lee. "They don't understand how status and educational attainment is reproduced from one generation to the next."

Asian Americans who don't fit the mold of the "model minority" - high achieving, hardworking, good at math and science for example - can face devastating consequences, Lee said. "They feel like ethnic outliers and they feel like failures if they don't live up to the standards," she added.

(Note: This article was copied from the NiLP Report on News & Politics section of the National Institute for Latino Policy. October

15, 2015. For further information, visit [www.latinopolicy.org](http://www.latinopolicy.org).)

***Links to the Green Book:  
The Green Book and Mapping of  
Civil Rights in America  
Derek H. Alderman  
Department of Geography, University of  
Tennessee at Knoxville  
(October 2015)***

Next week begins Geography Awareness Week. This year's theme is "The Power of Maps." As you celebrate this national day for observing the importance of a geographic perspective, please consider exploring the power of maps in the context of civil rights and the history of race relations within the United States.

The *Green Book* is a good avenue for teachers and students to explore the power of maps and geographic information in the historical African American experience and the black civil rights struggle. The *Green Book* was a travel guide published during the days of Jim Crow segregation (from the 1930s to the 1960s) to assist black motorists in locating places that would not discriminate against them and where they purchase food, fuel, and food. In the words of geographers Jerry Mitchell and Larianne Collins, the *Green Book* allowed African Americans to find "safe spaces."

The *Green Book* listed African American-friendly accommodations by state, city, and street address—providing an incredibly detailed look into the geographies of racism/white supremacy but also the

geographies of black resistance and self-determination. The travel guide represented, in effect, an alternative mapping of American travel, tourism, and mobility that allowed people of color to circumvent/challenge racism by creating and using a subaltern form of geo-spatial data.

If you are interested in knowing more about the *Green Book* and possibly using it during Geography Awareness Week, please consult the links below.

- Digital copies of all *Green Books*. Try looking up your town or city and see if it had a place in the Green Book.  
<http://digitalcollections.nypl.org/collections/the-green-book#/?tab=about>
- Other online versions of *Green Book*  
[http://www.autolife.umd.umich.edu/Race/R\\_Casestudy/Negro\\_motorist\\_green\\_bk.htm](http://www.autolife.umd.umich.edu/Race/R_Casestudy/Negro_motorist_green_bk.htm)  
<http://library.sc.edu/digital/collections/greenbook.html> (includes searchable map)
- Book chapter: A Geographic Reading of the *Green Book* (by Alderman and Inwood, Teaching Ethnic Geography in 21st Century)  
[http://web.utk.edu/~dalderma/Green\\_Book.pdf](http://web.utk.edu/~dalderma/Green_Book.pdf)
- Lesson Plan: The Green Book: "Safe Spaces" from Place to Place (by Mitchell and Collins, The Geography Teacher)  
<http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/19338341.2013.854259>
- Article: Learning Activity using Green Book (by Ken Foote, Southeastern Geographer)  
<http://muse.jhu.edu/journals/south>

eastern\_geographer/v052/52.4.  
foote.html

If you are interested in the idea of civil rights becoming an official theme for a future Geography Awareness Week, please read the AAG op-ed below and consider supporting the cause by signing a petition asking for an endorsement from the White House.

<http://news.aag.org/2015/07/op-ed-make-civil-rights-a-geography-awareness-week-theme/> and

<https://petitions.whitehouse.gov/petition/endorse-geography-awareness-week-theme-focused-civil-rights>

Thanks,

(Derek H. Alderman (twitter: @MLKStreet), dalderma@utk.edu, Professor & Department Head, University of Tennessee.)

***Factors Affecting Former Residents' Returning to Rural Communities***

***John Cromartie, Christine von Reichert, and Ryan Arthun***

***United States Department of Agriculture, Economic Research Service***

***Economic Research Report Number 185 (May 2015)***

Throughout rural America, especially in remote areas lacking scenic landscapes, hundreds of communities face the difficult challenge of adjusting economically and socially to dwindling populations. High school graduates leave for college, good-paying jobs, the military, or simply to see the world, and only a small number return.

However, those who do return often bring spouses and young children back with them, along with education and skills gained elsewhere.

This study reports on the factors that influence decisions to move back to rural areas and the impacts that return migrants make on home communities. Interviews at high school reunions show that limited rural employment opportunities are barriers for those considering a move back home. Those who do return find ways to secure employment, but are primarily motivated by family considerations. Return migrants use skills and experiences acquired elsewhere, and their commitment to their places of origin, to start businesses, fill professional positions, and take on leadership roles in ways that uniquely impact rural communities.

(The full report is available online at: [www.ers.usda.gov/publications/err-economic-research-report/err185](http://www.ers.usda.gov/publications/err-economic-research-report/err185))

***Puerto Rico's Fiscal Crisis Is America's Colonial Crisis City and State (June 20, 2015)***  
***By Angelo Falcón***

Puerto Rico's fiscal perils are currently in the news, playing off of the debt crisis of Greece and forcing a comparison between the two. With over \$72 billion dollars of debt, Puerto Rico finds itself financially vulnerable, since it is neither a sovereign nation nor a state of the U.S., making comparisons with Greece or even Detroit somewhat misleading.

With an over-\$600 million debt payment due on July 1st, many informed observers

believe Puerto Rico is on the verge of defaulting. For an island with a poverty rate approaching 50 percent, a public debt that amounts to over \$20,000 per inhabitant (more than its median income of \$19,518) and nearly 95 percent of its economic output (compared to only 2.4 percent for the 50 states combined) is, well, quite unsustainable. In April, U.S. Treasury Secretary Jacob Lew let officials in Puerto Rico know that the United States would not be bailing them out, a move reminiscent of President Gerald Ford's response to New York City's 1975 fiscal crisis, which the Daily News summed up on its front page as "Ford To City: Drop Dead!"

While most of the attention in Puerto Rico's case focuses on technical issues relating to the solvency of municipal bonds and austerity measures, the history of U.S. policies that have resulted in more than three and a half million Puerto Ricans being treated as second class citizens goes largely ignored. Puerto Rico, which is consistently shortchanged in the federal budget, is currently facing looming Medicare cuts while the states receive increases-and this in spite of the fact that the people of Puerto Rico have carried the full load of payroll taxes for the program! With a poverty rate of 45 percent (more than double that of Mississippi), Puerto Rico has had serious long-term economic problems that, like its current massive public debt, have been historically papered over.

Ever since the United States took Puerto Rico from Spain in 1898, the island

### ***EGSG Standing Committees***

#### **EGSG Awards Committee**

John Frazier, Binghamton University  
Susan Hardwick, University of Oregon  
Carlos Teixeira, University of British Columbia-Okanagan (Chair)  
Elizabeth Chacko, George Washington University

Kanika Verma, Texas State University

#### **Outstanding EGSG Dissertation Proposal**

Susan Hardwick, University of Oregon  
Paul McDaniel, Immigration Policy Center  
Holly Barcus, Macalester College

#### **Outstanding Ethnic Geography Student Paper**

Fenda Akiwumi, University of South Florida  
Reuben Allen, Ball State University  
Michael Webb, University of North Carolina-Chapel Hill

#### **AAG Program Committee**

Heike Alberts, University of Wisconsin-Oshkosh  
Carlos Teixeira, University of British Columbia- Okanagan  
Graciela Sandoval, Texas State University-San Marcos

#### **Website Committee**

Ezra Zeitler, University of Wisconsin-Eau Claire (Webmaster)  
José R. Díaz-Garayua, University of Louisville  
Amelia Laurel Schubert, University of Colorado-Boulder

#### **Ad Hoc Student Committee**

Ana Sanchez, University of Binghamton  
Matt Cook, University of Tennessee  
Jennifer Hinojosa, University of Maryland  
Graciela Sandoval, Texas State University  
Kathryn Hamm Wright, University of Colorado-Boulder

#### **Newsletter Committee**

Thomas D. Boswell, University of Miami  
Richard N. Gioioso, St. Joseph's University

has existed in a political twilight zone, mired in an endless and unproductive debate over its political status. Today, its future lies utterly in

the hands of what everyone will agree is a dysfunctional United States Congress.

Although the people of Puerto Rico have been U.S. citizens since 1917, they do not have the right to vote for the U.S. President and are only represented in Congress by a single, non-voting member. In addition, bankruptcy laws available to U.S. citizens are not available to Puerto Rican residents.

In the classic play and film, *West Side Story* more than fifty years ago, the recurring migrant disagreement about the virtues of the home country versus their new life in the United States between two of its major Puerto Rican characters, Anita and Bernardo, still resonates today. As one reads the news coverage of Puerto Rico's current fiscal crisis, it leads one to wonder if the United States will be letting Puerto Rico "sink back in the ocean." But there is an interesting difference from the situation they were debating musically half a century ago: Puerto Rico's population has been growing but not within its own borders. Instead the size of the stateside Puerto Rican population is increasing well beyond that of the Island. Will this growing Puerto Rican diaspora, now a majority of the total Puerto Rican population become the key to keeping the territory afloat, playing the role of the leading Puerto Rican character Maria uniting the two gangs, the White Jets and the Puerto Rican Sharks standing in today for the United States and Puerto Rico, in a common cause of survival?

In April, the National Institute for Latino Policy (NiLP) conducted a survey of 345 Latino leaders throughout the United States. Among other things, the survey asked what the U.S. response to Puerto Rico's fiscal crisis should be. Close to two-thirds (65.4 percent) of stateside Puerto Rican respondents thought the United States should assist Puerto Rico with bankruptcy protections and financial assistance. Just 14.3 percent supported total inaction on the part of the United States, and only 5.1 percent supported a full U.S. takeover of Puerto Rico's finances. However, there appears to be much work to be done to mobilize the Latino population around this issue, not to mention the general public.

The Puerto Rican diaspora has many political assets that can assist in mobilizing for action and have done so numerous times in the past. There are four Puerto Rican voting members of Congress (two from New York and one each from Illinois and Idaho), numerous other elected officials at the local and state levels, and even an Associate Justice of the United States Supreme Court. They are not only largely concentrated in the influential region of the Washington, DC to Boston corridor but also have become a major presence in the increasingly important battleground state of Florida. This is particularly important as the 2016 U.S. Presidential election looms. The colonial paradox here is that Puerto Rico's fiscal crisis has forced a mass migration to Florida in ways that leverage its potential impact in Presidential elections.

The American colonial bureaucracy cites its lack of authority to intervene. In the

meantime, the hedge fund vultures are circling Puerto Rico, sensing a fiscal death spiral they can feed off and caring little about the consequences for nearly four million residents as they manipulate a financial system largely devoid of any social conscience.

The big question is whether this potential Puerto Rican diaspora political firepower can be mobilized effectively. There is, for example, a bill before Congress that would place Puerto Rico under US bankruptcy laws on a limited basis that would cover about two-thirds of its current debt. However, while there is a consensus in Puerto Rico across party lines supporting this measure, it is not getting much traction in Washington (so much for Puerto Rican "self-determination"! ). There are those who, in fact, feel that it does not go far enough.

The reality is that there is a need for a more comprehensive approach by the United States to address Puerto Rico's serious fiscal crisis. Besides more comprehensive Congressional action, the White House and its Treasury Department need to become more proactive and creative, all a long-shot given the existing party gridlock that exists.

A large part of the problem is the lack of recognition Puerto Rico gets from the American public, which translates into what some refer to as "selective inattention" by the federal government. The federal courts' characterization of Puerto Rico as "foreign in a domestic sense" nicely sums up its uniquely American colonial dilemma. The current thinking is that it might just be up to

the Puerto Rican diaspora in the United States, now numbering more than 4.6 million, to move the needle on resolving Puerto Rico's fiscal crisis.

The bottom line is that Puerto Rico is the United States' largest colony that it decided to take by force 117 years ago and has since treated like a resented orphan that it has consistently undernourished politically and economically. Puerto Rico's current fiscal crisis is, in this sense, really a crisis of American colonial policies. Will the United States accept responsibility for the negative consequences of its imperialist past? The irony would be if it is the Puerto Rican diaspora that finally makes the United States' accountable on this issue. (Angelo Falcón is President of the National Institute for Latino Policy (NiLP). For more information, visit, [www.latinopolicy.org](http://www.latinopolicy.org).)

### ***The Puerto Rico Debt Crisis: Why Congress Is Responsible***

#### **Guest Commentary**

***Nelson Torres-Ríos (August 4, 2015)  
National Institute for Latin Policy (NiLP)***

Puerto Rico, *la Isla del Encanto*, is in serious trouble. For decades, Puerto Rico was showcased by the United States as a successful experiment of capitalism vis-a-vis socialism during the Cold War. In 1952, the Island was offered Commonwealth status as the only option in the United States' effort to remove Puerto Rico from the United Nations' list of territories that lacked self-government.

For years, Puerto Rico enjoyed the highest per capita income in all of Latin America. The island's economy, when compared to other Latin American neighbors, was relatively strong, which prompted an influx of immigrants from many of its Caribbean neighbors. However, like all relationships that are built on ambiguity and opportunism, the symptoms of a U.S. occupation and territorial status have manifested and have become the signifiers of an urgent need for change.

In the early 2000s, the U.S. Navy's bombing in Vieques was the uniting issue for *Puertorriqueños*. Puerto Ricans from all over the world protested and finally achieved the US Navy's withdrawal from Vieques. The United States, to conceal the fact that *Viequenses* overwhelmingly wanted to oust the Navy, cancelled a referendum that would have clearly indicated that the Navy had to leave. Sila María Calderón, our first female governor, decided to run her own plebiscite, what we call in Puerto Rico, "plebiscito criollo," that made headlines all over the world. Nearly 70% of *Viequenses* favored the Navy's withdrawal and by 2003, the Navy was gone.

Undoubtedly, Puerto Rico's problems have always been a direct result of a relationship that for years the Puerto Rican electorate has attempted to modify.

#### **The Politics of the Plebiscite**

In 1967, 1993, 1998, and 2012, Puerto Ricans went to the polls and requested a

modification of the current territorial status to one that would remove the Island from the Territorial Clause, whether as an Enhanced Commonwealth that resembles Free Association, Independence, or Statehood. Congress has NEVER responded to the will of the Puerto Rican people.

Today, the Island has a debt of over 70 billion dollars and Governor García Padilla has clearly stated that the debt cannot be paid. Why is this an American problem? How did we get here?

Since the U.S. invasion in 1898, Congress has never asked the Puerto Rican people how they want to resolve the status issue. By 1898, the U.S. had already decided that the territories to be acquired were to be held indefinitely and were to be governed by the US Congress. The Supreme Court in its 1901 decision of *Downes v. Bidwell* held that Puerto Rico is a territory of the U.S. appurtenant to but not a part of the United States.

#### **The Jones Act Restrictions**

During the early twentieth century, very meticulously, Congress began to shape the way Puerto Rico would be governed. Puerto Rico is subject to the U.S. Commerce and Territorial Clauses and, as such, is restricted in how it can engage with other nations. The Jones Act of 1917 made Puerto Ricans U.S. citizens just in time to serve in World War I, while the Merchant Marine Act of 1920 (P.L. 66-261), also known as the Jones Act, prevents foreign-flagged ships from carrying cargo between two United States ports (a system called *cabotage*). In plain language,

this means that foreign ships with goods from other nations cannot stop in Puerto Rico. Instead, they must proceed directly to U.S. ports, to transfer the goods to US ships and then send them to Puerto Rico. This translates into exceedingly high prices of goods sold on the Island to cover these additional shipping costs.

Additionally Puerto Rico, unlike states in the US, can also issue bonds exempt from federal, state, and local taxes, making it a very attractive bond haven. This was all possible because Congress authorized it. However, Congress did not include Puerto Rico as eligible for Chapter 9 bankruptcy and seems unwilling to do so today.

To exacerbate the problem, under Puerto Rico's Constitution, bondholders must be paid before the government pays anyone else. As such, the current situation in Puerto Rico, if Congress fails to act, only benefits the millionaires and the hedge funds that are in line waiting to be paid. *Y los Boricuas que se jodan...* (Editor's translation: "And the Puerto Ricans get screwed.")

How has Puerto Rico responded? In its efforts to improve the island's economy, Puerto Rico has requested numerous times to be excluded from the Jones Act restrictions. To minimize and restructure the impact of the debt, Puerto Rico has increased taxes and cut local spending, but soon realized that those efforts were insufficient. Gov. García Padilla finally admitted that the debt cannot be paid and may have committed

political suicide by doing so. His proactive approach to this problem, however, is what a true leader more concerned for the future of his people does. Someone had to face Congress and shift a portion of the burden on those that have contributed to the evolution of this fiscal crisis. Congress has ruled over this Island for over a century and has left it without any economic tools or incentives to allow its economy to prosper. Puerto Rico's hands are tied.

### **The Role of Section 936**

Perhaps the biggest contributor to the economic crisis was the expiration of section 936 of the U.S. Internal Revenue Code which applied to Puerto Rico. This section provided tax exemptions for U.S. corporations that settled in Puerto Rico. Between 2001 and 2012, Puerto Rico's debt skyrocketed from 25 billion to nearly 73 billion. Many point to 1996 as the year that this snowball effect of debt began to develop, because that was the year it was decided that 936 would be phased out.

The Rossello administration (1993-2000) of the New Progressive Party, which favors statehood, expanded the debt to finance projects such as the building of one of the most expensive mass transit systems in the world, and a new health care system, without taking into account the effects of the phasing out of 936 incentive.

Many in the Island welcomed this apparent sudden boom in infrastructure. Moreover, the statehood party believed that statehood was lurking in the background, despite that many of Rossello's cabinet members, such as Victor



Fajardo, were in federal prison for fraud and misallocation of funds. The two plebiscites held in 1993 and 1998, however, clearly indicated that a majority of Puerto Ricans were not interested in statehood.

Unfortunately, the Rossello Administration did very little to combat the elimination of Section 936 of the U.S. Internal Revenue Code. In 1993, the press reported the following:

“Mr. Rossello himself has been less than enthusiastic in defending the program. Both he and the island's current representative in Washington, former Gov. Carlos Romero Barcelo, were conspicuously absent from a recent pro-936 demonstration in San Juan that attracted 100,000 people.”

Section 936 brought thousands of jobs to the island. The whole economy of the Island was dependent on this incentive. Once the incentive was gone, so were many jobs and many companies that chose to relocate to other Latin American nations. Moreover, Congress failed to put in place an economic plan to offset the effects of 936 on the island, nor was it pressured by the Puerto Rican government to do so. Unfortunately, under territorial status, Puerto Rico lacks any significant political power to attract investments; the Island is subject to Congressional action first.

### *Elimination of 936 – a Statehood Gambit*

With this background, one would then ask why did the Rossello Administration not do more to protect and advocate for Section 936? The answer is quite simple. Section 936 is not available to states. Advocating for economic incentives that would fortify the Puerto Rican economy and secure jobs under the current Commonwealth status would translate into less votes for statehood. The logic was that a spiraling downward economy, devastating job loss, and the Island being forced to borrow money to pay its debt, would turn into a massive support for statehood. By destroying Commonwealth, so they reasoned, statehood would arrive on the express train.

Even if you argue that statehood won in 2012, which it did not, who in Congress wants a state with so much debt? With a \$73 billion debt, the likelihood of statehood is slowly dissipating. Like Vieques, the current situation in Puerto Rico is a symptom of the cancer like side effects of colonial status. The island's lack of sovereignty, and political and economic tools have conspired to raise the fundamental constitutional question: Where does Congress get the power to hold a territory of American citizens indefinitely without a detailed plan for self-government and democracy? Sooner or later, Congress will have to face its own demons and the people of Puerto Rico. The time has come. Most of us are here now and we vote.

We are going to remember who opposed Chapter 9 for Puerto Rico *y vamos a limpiar la casa* (Editor's translation: "And we are going to clean house.")

(Note: **Nelson Torres Ríos** is an attorney who teaches criminal justice at CUNY's Hostos Community College in Bronx, New York. He can be reached at [ntorres1999@aol.com](mailto:ntorres1999@aol.com).)

***Want to Contribute Something to the EGSG Newsletter?***

How about telling us about something you are working on or a project you have just finished. Maybe you would like to tell us about a new innovative course you are teaching? Would you like to write a commentary on an topic dealing with ethnic or racial geography? How about commenting on any of the articles published in this issue of the *Newsletter*? If you feel so inclined, please contact:

Tom Boswell  
TBoswell1@Yahoo.com

*Remembering Susan W. Hardwick*

*Photos by  
Heike Alberts*



Susan and Jay, Chicago AAG Meeting  
Awards Luncheon



Awards Luncheon, Chicago AAG Meeting



Susan, Johannes, and Heike  
Awards Luncheon, Chicago AAG Meeting



Having Some Fun: Wei and Susan  
Awards Luncheon, Chicago AAG  
Meeting



Susan and Alan, Tampa AAG Meeting



Susan and Heike, NCGE Meeting in Dearborn



Emily and Susan, Tampa AAG Meeting



John, Wei, Susan, and John, Awards Luncheon  
Chicago AAG Meeting



Wilbur Zelinsky and Susan (Can you guess who is whom?)

***Thank You Susan for your Friendship, Scholarship,  
and Grace!!!***