

ETHNIC DISPLACEMENT IN THE INTERSTITIAL COMMUNITY:  
THE EAST HARLEM (NEW YORK CITY) EXPERIENCE\*

by

FRANCESCO CORDASCO  
Montclair State College

and

ROCCO G. GALATIOTO  
New York University

INTRODUCTION

Frederick M. Thrasher's definition of a so-called interstitial community is typical of the sociological thinking of the 1920's, a thinking strongly influenced by the University of Chicago school headed by Park and Burgess. Thrasher, loyal to the concentric circle theory of cities, maintained that an interstitial area, one that would be called today a "ghetto", is typified by deterioration, shifting population and by cultural isolation.<sup>1</sup> The work of William F. Whyte and Herbert J. Gans points out that such areas not necessarily disorganized socially and are not deteriorating in terms of social organization and integration.<sup>2</sup> However, the term "deterioration" is too crude and value ridden for serious sociological purposes. Yet, Thrasher was correct in stating that the slum is plagued by shifting population and that it is essentially isolated from the rest of society. In these two respects, East Harlem is an interstitial area, or a slum. Both terms mean the same thing within Thrasher's concept.

East Harlem is and has been a poor area and has had its share of social pathology, but it is its isolation from the rest of society that leads a slum to be known by the "outsiders" as a pathological and decadent area, simply because the subculture of the slum does not conform directly to the culture patterns of the dominant group. The dominant group does all the labelling in society.

Geographically, East Harlem is defined as the area from 96th Street north to the Harlem River. This area is divided statistically in terms of Health Areas, each of which is subdivided into Census Tracts.

TABLE I

Health Areas and their equivalent Census Tracts for East Harlem.

<u>Health Areas</u>	<u>Census Tracts</u>
16 _____	198, 196, 204, 206, 210.
17 _____	192, 194, 202.
20 _____	182, 184.
21 _____	180.
22 _____	178, 188.
25 _____	172, 174.
28 _____	160, 168.
29 _____	158, 166.
30 _____	164.

Although culturally isolated, the area is serviced by several surface line buses and several subways. The main subway that passes through the area is the Lexington Avenue Line, but it must be noted that not too long ago there was the Third Avenue "L" and there was also a Second Avenue "L". There are some physical barriers that act as social barriers: the tracks of the New York Central Railroad run elevated from 96th Street to 110th Street along Park Avenue, and at one time they separated the once middle-class Central Harlem from the lower-class East Harlem. However, as Central Harlem began to be changed into a Negro ghetto, the Jewish and Protestant middle-classes left and today these tracks serve only as physical barriers that separate the low-rent housing projects west of Park Avenue from the low-rent tenements on the East side that appear to be doomed because of the bulldozer ideology. Another physical barrier is Mount Morris Park and there is, of course, the limiting effect of the Harlem and East Rivers.

The most important street in East Harlem is 116th Street. This has been traditionally viewed as the most desirable residential area, and it still houses what remains of the professional offices of doctors, lawyers, and brokers. This street signified to the Italian population a sort of main street--equivalent to the "il corso" of their native towns and villages. It is then not surprising that old timers would remember when their dream was to move to 116th

Street where the rents were high, but where prestige was achieved. East Harlem today is predominantly Negro and Puerto Rican. A few Italians, mostly old folks, remain in some "pockets" but these are slowly disappearing. East Harlem is a typical urban slum, a kind of necessary evil that will be part of the industrial city until all discrimination and class differences are rooted out.

It is erroneous to conclude that the slum resulted from the ethnic immigrations. Anderson, in his thorough analysis of the history of the slum, shows that slums existed before the great ethnic immigrations. He observes that "As a social phenomenon, the slum seems to resist most attempts to abolish it. Whether opposed by movements of reform or rising land values, it only yields to change its locale or modify its appearance. This has been at least the characteristic of the slum in New York ... Whether tent or tenement, the slum in this city is as old as the segregation of the poor."<sup>4</sup> This is even more true today. With the building of so-called projects, an entire area will be destroyed and many of those displaced will settle in contiguous areas, thus enlarging the slum. Also, low rent housing usually "become worse centers of delinquency, vandalism and general hopelessness than the slums they were supposed to replace."<sup>5</sup>

I: EAST HARLEM AT THE TURN OF THE CENTURY

A census taken by the New York Police Department in 1895 based on political districts roughly equivalent to what is today known as East Harlem released the following figures:

TABLE II

<u>Political District</u>	<u>Male</u>	<u>Female</u>	<u>Total</u>
31	22,503	28,499	51,002
32	32,064	30,930	62,994
33	28,362	27,749	56,111
34	35,614	34,919	70,533
<b>Grand Totals</b>	<b>118,543</b>	<b>122,097</b>	<b>240,640<sup>6</sup></b>

According to the most reliable source of ethnic enumeration, The Report of the Tenement House Department of New York City, in the 1902-03 period, East Harlem was predominantly Irish and German. "The Italians who predominate today (1930), in 1903, were in the minority. This point serves to illustrate that the Italians did not settle in East Harlem until the first decade of the new century.

The nucleus of Italians was located along Second Avenue from 102nd to 116th Streets. They were more densely located in the vicinity of Thomas Jefferson Park." Between 1900 and 1910, ethnic trends in East Harlem were creating an Italian subcommunity in East Harlem which was to become the largest Italian settlement in the United States.

## II: WHY EAST HARLEM?

Around 1900, the number of Italians who left for the United States increased steadily but this immigration did not reach its apex until 1914.<sup>8</sup> Because of the economic conditions of these early immigrants (conditions aggravated by the padrone system),<sup>9</sup> they were forced to live in pockets of extreme poverty and squalor. The first Italian slum was in notorious Mulberry Bend of lower Manhattan. The conditions of this slum are best outlined by Jacob Riis in How the Other Half Lives.<sup>10</sup> This original Little Italy was so unfit for human habitation that "the only remedy was demolition."<sup>11</sup> It must be realized that in the late 1890's demolition was a rare phenomenon and the proposal made in 1884 by the Tenement House Commission in favor of demolishing the Bend was quite unusual and courageous. Nevertheless, after a long battle, the area was ordered to be evacuated and made ready for demolition by 1895.<sup>12</sup> Even after many houses had been demolished, there were some people living in the Bend under even worse conditions. If the qualitative terms used above to describe the Bend are too imprecise one should turn to Riis' How the Other Half Lives, where Riis cites vital statistics which show that the Bend's rate of infantile mortality was 139.83, as compared to the general death rate for New York City of 26.27. The general morality for the bend was 10% higher than the city as a whole.<sup>13</sup>

It is little wonder that some Italians did leave this area and settled elsewhere where they formed core communities that were to grow as additional immigrants joined them. Italians settled near their relatives and paesani, so as soon as these core communities were established the number of Italians grew not necessarily because of an exodus from the Bend but because of the large number of Italians who were entering the United States during this period. The demolition of the Bend and the moving out of Italian families who had been able to free themselves from their status of virtually indentured servants, had an effect on the ethnic make-up of East Harlem. We believe that as a result, a core community was established in East Harlem which acted as a magnet in attracting others who were arriving from Italy. There is evidence that at the turn of the century there was indeed a small Italian Community in East Harlem. By talking to some "old timers," we found that some of their relatives had come up from the Mulberry Street area at the turn of the century. So far we have answered why the Italian might have moved from Mulberry Bend but not why they settled in East Harlem. The fact that in East Harlem the houses were already old and that the area was accessible

from the standpoint of transit facilities are important. It would be better to say that East Harlem was only one of the many core communities in New York can also be explained by the fact that East Harlem was in Manhattan where dwellings were less expensive than in newer boroughs like Brooklyn. East Harlem had become a Little Italy by 1910.

### III: THE 1910-1920 PERIOD

During this period a turning point was reached since East Harlem saw a total decrease of 7,224 persons.<sup>14</sup> This may seem small but we must see this in conjunction with the fact that the influx of Italians in this area was increasing. This decrease is sociologically important since it shows that the German and Irish elements were moving out very rapidly as a result of the influx of Italians. This influx must have been traumatic to the older residents of the area and there is no doubt that the "there goes the neighborhood" syndrome became widespread. The Jews were a group that also responded to this pressure by moving out and their exodus will be outlined below. During this time, the Negro population began to increase in Central Harlem and gradually squeezed out the middle-class element in this area.

By 1920, the Italian immigration had become smaller as a result of the legal curtailments of migration from Eastern and Southern Europe, but the moving out of the older groups from East Harlem continued and a net decrease in population is recorded. Of course, it must be noted that some more mobile Italians also left the area. Cimuluca shows that<sup>15</sup> in the 1920 to 1930 period, many Italians left New York City.

### IV: THE 1920-1930 PERIOD

This period is characterized by a Jewish exodus; by a further drop in the total population, and by the stabilization of the Italian segment. By this time the Italians were definitely the largest group in East Harlem, and for the first time, some Puerto Ricans--a very small number--began to settle near the north-east corner of Central Park. Another interesting development during this period was the increasing pressure that the Negroes were beginning to exert eastward.

The increase in the Negro population can be dealt with first because it was the most obvious development in East Harlem. By 1931, there were 164,566 Negroes in East Harlem or 38% of the total population. This number has continued to increase up to the present.

The most interesting ethnic population trend during this period is the decline of the Jewish population. The 1937 Welfare Council Report tabulated the decline.

TABLE III

Jewish Population in East Harlem from 1919 to 1937.

1919	128,000
1923	122,000
1927	52,000
1932	15,500
1937	4,000 <sup>16</sup>

The decline is very significant and it is interesting to study it in some detail. The exodus of the Jewish group is of great sociological importance insofar as it points out that when a minority group has reached a certain middle-class status it regards other minority groups as a threat to the well-being of its neighborhood. This tragic but true pattern operates among most groups and signifies, perhaps, the point in which a minority "arrives." According to the Jewish Welfare Board Study of 1931, the total Jewish population in East Harlem had decreased from a high of 213,209 in 1920, to 159,927 in 1930, a total decrease of 28%.<sup>17</sup> This latter study goes on to note that, "The influx of Puerto Ricans (among whom there is a considerable Negro element) and Negroes into East Harlem has been a significant factor in displacing the Jewish population which is moving largely to the Bronx and Brooklyn."<sup>18</sup> It may be true that the rapid Jewish exodus of the 1930's may in part be attributed to the Puerto Ricans, but as we have seen from Table III, the Jewish exodus began in 1919 and as we shall see below, the number of Puerto Ricans in the 1920's was nominal and even in 1930 there were few Puerto Ricans in East Harlem. As an hypothesis of why the Jews moved out of this area we propose a kind of socio-economic thesis. First, the Jew was responding to a new middle-class ethic. The 1920's had been years of prosperity and the developing Bronx was becoming increasingly attractive. At first, the second-generation Jews, responding to the demands of the middle-class ethic, were the first to leave. The old timers at first refused to go but as time went on their ideas about East Harlem began to change. We have already noted in passing that at this time the Jewish population was being pushed by growing Negro Harlem on the west and by the east. This threatened the older Jewish community and the exodus to the Bronx was slowly completed. What we discern is a succession of new ethnic groups in East Harlem. The Negroes and the Italians pushing out the Jews while the Italian was to be in turn pushed out by the Puerto Rican who in turn was to be pushed out by the Negro. Although we differ on the explanation given in the Jewish study, the wealth of information in this report is of great value. The 1931 study is extremely useful because it outlines in detail the last large Jewish community

in East Harlem. This was specifically in the area bounded by 112th Street, 98th Street, Fifth Avenue, and Third Avenue. This area in particular saw a decrease in total Jewish population from 48,000 in 1923, to 11,000 in 1930, a drop of some 75%.<sup>19</sup> By 1940, most Jews had moved out of East Harlem, although many did not sell their houses out but became landlords whose houses were to be rented to Negroes. Many of the old Jewish merchants also remained. This made the Jew the only white man accessible to the Negro, and many of the problems of Negroes and the Jewish community are to be explained by this fact.<sup>20</sup>

#### V: THE GROWTH OF THE PUERTO RICAN POPULATION

It is interesting to note that Cimuluca states that the East Harlem area, "at the present 1930 is being invaded by Puerto Ricans; these people speak their native language which is Spanish, and they are commonly called 'spicks'."<sup>21</sup> This is a most important statement because it heralds things to come. As we shall point out below, in 1930, there was no invasion, but this term was very functional for the Italians. This is so because the Italians, who had been called by a variety of derogatory names, for the first time could transfer some of their frustration to the Puerto Ricans and the word "spick" was a good vehicle for this transfer. The sociological significance here is obvious. It is an observed fact that in the United States one minority will try to benefit at the expense of another--even if this benefit is purely a psychological one.

The growth of the Puerto Rican population in East Harlem was slow. Chenault's pioneer work, The Puerto Rican Migration in New York City, is the best source of data for this purpose. At the time of Chenault's writing there was no separate enumeration for Puerto Ricans in the Census. Chenault cites data accumulated by the United States Department of Labor, and the following table can be constructed from the data assembled.

TABLE IV

Number of Puerto Ricans in the United States at Census dates and in 1935.

Year	Number	Increase
1910	1,513	
1920	11,811	10,298
1930	52,774	40,943
1935*	58,200	5,426

\*Estimate, December 31st<sup>22</sup>

Chenault noted, "because the movement of Puerto Ricans in the United States is technically one of internal migration, there are no legal restrictions against his coming to the United States."<sup>23</sup> This made the enumeration even more difficult. However, from table IV it was obvious that the United States was not being invaded by Puerto Ricans. But this term, once applied to most of the more visible groups, was to be attached to the Puerto Ricans and was to make their problems more difficult.

The bulk of the immigration from Puerto Rico into New York City was after World War I, and before the war, "the major part of the movement of Puerto Rican people took place in the decade 1920-1930."<sup>24</sup> We have already pointed out that this was still an insignificant migration in terms of numbers but a significant one sociologically. The Italian immigration over, the need for an exploitable "green horn" group was met by the Puerto Ricans. The Depression with its high rate of unemployment put an end to the need of cheap labor after 1930; therefore after this period the number of persons from Puerto Rico dropped and did not increase until the late 1940's as Table V shows.

Chenault defined the first Puerto Rican settlement as the area from 110th to 97th Streets, up and around Central Park. As we shall see below, the increase in the Puerto Rican community in East Harlem acted as a fatal blow to the Italian population and the area began to take on Hispanic characteristics. This section on the Puerto Ricans must be concluded with some additional data on what other changes were taking place in East Harlem in the period of 1930-1940 decade. Regarding the total population of the area, the decline that began in 1910 continued. This shows that the Puerto Ricans were unable to replace all of those who were moving out as a result of the "Puerto Rican scare" first reported by Cimuluca. However, East Harlem during this period remained predominantly Italian, and in 1937 the East Harlem Study states that, "This area houses what is probably the largest Italian colony in the Western Hemisphere and also contains a major portion of the largest Puerto Rican colony in the world."<sup>26</sup> This was the largest Puerto Rican colony because there were not too many Puerto Rican colonies outside the New York area so this last sentence appears to be somewhat exaggerated.

## VI: FROM 1950 ONWARD

At a glance, three trends characterize this period. First there is the sharp increase in the Puerto Rican element, an increase which gave the area the unofficial name of Spanish Harlem. Second, there is the disappearance of the Italian group. Only some pockets



TABLE V

Movement of persons between Puerto Rico and the United States

Fiscal Year	Arrivals from Puerto Rico	Departures to Puerto Rico	Excess of:	
			Arrivals	Departures
1921	9,480	7,694	1,786	
1922	6,576	7,059		438
1923	9,036	6,829	2,207	
1924	11,512	7,231	5,281	
1925	1,279	8,136	3,143	
1926	14,055	9,212	5,243	
1927	19,161	9,728	9,433	
1928	17,034	10,808	6,266	
1929	15,911	9,462	6,449	
1930	18,617	9,290	9,327	
1931	11,517	12,625		1,108
1932	9,683	10,385		702
1933	8,700	9,953		1,253
1934	11,569	7,466	4,103	
1935	13,174	10,214	2,960	
<hr/>				
TOTAL	177,304	136,092	55,198	3,501

25

remain. The bulk of these inhabitants of Italian descent are usually older persons. They live for the most part on East 116th Street from Second Avenue to the river and along the Pleasant Avenue near Thomas Jefferson Park. Third, there is the increase of the Negro population. Also, as a continuing trend, the decline in total population continues. Table VI gives an account of the population drop from 1950 to 1957.

TABLE VI

Total Population of East Harlem.

	Total 1950*	% of Total	Total	% of Total 1957*
White	88,829	49.15%	59,264	39.71%
Non-white ) ) Non-Puerto Rican)	31,498	17.43%	26,575	17.69%
Puerto Rican	60,380	33.42%	63,575	42.60%
Total population	180,707	100.00%	149,414	100.00%

\*The 1950 figures are from the United States Census of 1950; the 1957 figures are from a special New York City enumeration. The table comes from the East Harlem Town Hall Reports June 6, 1960, p. 2.

According to the Town Hall Report, part of this drop is a result of pending housing and school construction; but this drop is, however too large and in view of the fact that this represents an almost chronic loss of population, we disagree with this report. The population loss is in keeping with a pattern of continuing decline. The area of East Harlem is in a state of decline. The old population of the area is also on the increase. This points to two important demographic factors. First, foreign immigration into East Harlem is ending. (We also include Puerto Ricans as foreigners in this respect). This is so because a migrant population is usually a young population, especially when the migration is a long distance one. This only applies to the white population coming into East Harlem. There are two reasons for this. The Negro movement into this area is largely from Central Harlem and the number of Negroes coming from the South (technically internal migration but it can be classified as a long distance migration) has declined substantially in recent years.

## VII: EAST HARLEM TODAY

According to a recent report made by the East Harlem Committee on Aging, "a breakdown of the white population of East Harlem shows 65% of it to be comprised of Puerto Ricans, 14% of Italian stock and 2% of various other ethnic origins."<sup>28</sup> The total population of the area is estimated as 170,000 of which 63% is white, 35% is Negro, and 2% falls under the catch-all category of "other races."<sup>29</sup> The report goes on to break down the white population in terms of age structure and one interesting result is that 11% of the white population is 60 Years old or over. This point serves to corroborate the statement made above in regard to the fact that the white population in East Harlem is becoming an old population.

Today, East Harlem looks just like any other slum in New York. It does have a seeming Puerto Rican dominance, but since 1957 this is slowly diminishing as the area is becoming increasingly Negro. Among the whites, only the poorest and the older have remained, while the more mobile groups and individuals go and live elsewhere. The net effect is to make the area even more poor.

## VIII: SOME SOCIOLOGICAL IMPLICATIONS

By analyzing the turnover of the various ethnic groups in East Harlem, we have noted several sociological points that need clarification. The most important point that needs emphasis is the movement of groups. One ethnic group pushes the other; this shows that no matter what our ideological tenets are, the importance of ethnicity in America inter-group life cannot be denied. Robert E. Park could not have been more wrong when he formulated his "race relation cycle." He states, quite optimistically, that "The race relation cycle, ... takes the form, to state it abstractly, of contacts, competition, accommodation, and eventual assimilation."<sup>30</sup> The "melting pot" influence is obvious in his thesis and from what the empirical reality in East Harlem is, this cycle never had a chance. This is so because the cultural differences among the various groups in this area were so strong that there was no possible way that any meaningful contact and eventual accommodation could have taken place.<sup>31</sup>

This brings us to the problem of the role of contact as a conflict reducing agent. There is little doubt that inter-group contact will reduce stereotyping and misunderstanding. But if contact is blocked because of cultural forces, there is no hope that this cycle could ever be operative. This implies, however, that East Harlem ethnic groups were and are completely isolated from each other. There is enough continuing isolation and lack of understanding that is normal for any such situation. We disagree with Sexton's analysis of the Italian community in East Harlem as an example of extreme isolation. The journalistic statements made by Sexton are unfortunate and show the difficulty of studying an area as complicated as East Harlem.<sup>32</sup>

Another point that must be dealt with refers to the role that each group has played in the elevation of the group just above it. What this seems to mean is that each group will try to advance at the expense of a group just below it. We have already pointed out that this may also have psychological rewards for a group that has been the target of discrimination and which will seek another group on which to transfer some of its frustrations. This takes us to the role of the Negro as the "last mover." The Negro is helping push the Puerto Rican out of East Harlem. The question is who will, if anybody, push out the Negro. It seems unlikely that another ethnic group will ever migrate in sufficient numbers to help the Negro break the vicious cycle which Myrdal calls "The Principle of Cumulation."<sup>33</sup> The Negro must be pushed out of the ghetto, but not by any one particular ethnic group. He must be taken out by society as a whole, by a concerted effort to break the vicious cycle.

## FOOTNOTES

\*This paper concerns itself with the sociologically complex and fascinating area of the upper East Side of Manhattan known as East Harlem. East Harlem is an interesting area. Most minority groups have lived there at one time or another; however, the ideal melting pot never melted substantially. The immediate scope of this paper is to trace the movement of the largest ethnic groups through this area from 1900 to 1960. These groups are the Italians, the Jews, the Puerto Ricans and the Negroes. The aim of this paper is to document and establish probable reasons for the change in East Harlem from a little Italy to a so-called Spanish Harlem and eventually to an extension of Negro Harlem. East Harlem housed during the 1920's the largest Italian immigrant community in the United States. We will attempt to explain and trace the growth of the Italian population and its replacement by Puerto Ricans and Negroes, with some notices of the Jewish subcommunity which slowly withdrew from the area. Most of the data used for this study was made available by Dr. Leonard Covello, the curator of the newly formed American Italian Historical Association (AIHA), and organization made up of social scientists who are interested in studying the Italian experience in America in a scientific manner. Special thanks go to Rabbi Goodman of the Jewish Welfare Center of New York at 145 East and 32nd Street, New York City, for making available much needed material on the Jewish population of East Harlem.

1. See Thrasher's classic study, The Gang (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1927); for general orientation, see David R. Hunter, The Slums: Challenge and Response (New York: The Free Press, 1964); and Marshall B. Clinard, Slums and Community Development (New York: The Free Press, 1966).
2. Cf. William F. Whyte, Jr., Street Corner Society (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1943, 2nd ed., 1955); and Herbert J. Gans, The Urban Villagers: Group and Class in the Life of Italian Americans (New York: The Free Press, 1962).
3. See Patricia C. Sexton, Spanish Harlem (New York: Harper & Row, 1965), particularly, "The Bulldozer and the Bulldozed," pp. 35-46; and Jane Jacobs, The Death and Life of Great American Cities (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1961). For commentary on Sexton, see F. Cordasco "Spanish Harlem: The Anatomy of Poverty," Phylon: The Atlanta University Review of Race & Culture, vol. 26 (Summer 1965), pp. 195-196.
4. Nels Anderson, The Social Antecedents of a Slum: A Developmental Study of the East Harlem Area (Unpublished Ph.D. Dissertation, New York University 1930), p. 16.
5. Jacobs, op. cit., p. 4.

FOOTNOTES CONTINUED

6. Reported in Salvatore Cimaluca, The Natural History of East Harlem from 1880 to the Present (Unpublished M.A. Dissertation, New York University, 1931), p. 44. The significance in terms of absolute data of Table II is questionable because of poor enumeration, and because the political districts of the period do not correspond exactly to what we know as East Harlem today.
7. Cimaluca, op. cit., p. 46.
8. See generally Robert F. Foerster, The Italian Emigration of Our Times (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1919; reissued with an Introductory Note by F. Cordasco, New York: Russell & Russell, 1968).
9. See Marie Lipari, "The Padrone System," Italy America Monthly (April 1935), pp. 4-10.
10. Jacob Riis, How the Other Half Lives (New York: Charles Scribners' Sons, 1890).
11. Stephen Noft, ed., Gli Italiani di New York. Works Projects Administration (New York: Labor Press, 1933), p. 14.
12. See Jacob Riis, The Battle With the Slum (New York: Macmillan, 1902).
13. Riis' major writings against the tenement slums are assembled in F. Cordasco, ed., Jacob Riis Revisited: Poverty and the Slum in Another Era (New York: Doubleday, 1968).
14. Cimaluca, op. cit., p. 50.
15. Cimaluca, op. cit., p. 50. See, also, Noft, op. cit., for Italian demographic shifts during this period.
- 16-
17. Jewish Welfare Center of New York. Study of Changes in the Population of East Harlem (New York, 1931); see also the Center's Supplementary Study of the Federation Settlement (1932), and an earlier study of the Jewish Welfare Board of New York, Preliminary Study of the Institutional Synagogue (1924). Note a large discrepancy between the Jewish studies and the Welfare Council Report. The Jewish studies are probably more accurate since the Welfare Council relied on Census data where Jews were enumerated by nationality. The Jews knew who their co-religionists were. Welfare Council of New York. Report on East Harlem Population (New York: The Council, 1937).

FOOTNOTES CONTINUED

18. Ibid., p. 1. The Jewish studies (footnote #17) are available at the Jewish Welfare Center of New York (145 East 32nd Street, New York City).
19. Ibid., pp. 1-2 (footnote #17). The Supplementary Study (1932) includes a detailed block by block account of the remnants of the Jewish Community.
20. Seen generally, Nathan Glazer and Daniel Patrick Moynihan, Beyond the Melting Pot: The Negroes, Puerto Ricans, Jews, Italians, and Irish of New York City (Cambridge: M.I.T. Press, 1963).
21. Cimaluca, op. cit., p. 30.
22. Laurence Chenault, The Puerto Rican Migration in New York City (New York: Columbia University Press, 1938). Considerable documentation on the Puerto Rican mainland experience is in F. Cordasco and Eugene Bucchioni, Puerto Rican Children in the Mainland Schools: A Source Book for Teachers (New York: Scarecrow Press, 1968).
23. Laurence Chenault, The Puerto Rican Migration in New York City (New York: Columbia University Press, 1938), p. 53.
24. Ibid., p. 54.
25. Laurence Chenault, The Puerto Rican Migration in New York City (New York: Columbia University Press, 1938). Chenault constructed his table from data available in the United States Department of Labor reports.
26. Mayor's Committee on City Planning. East Harlem Community Study (New York: East Harlem Council of Social Agencies, 1937), p. 16.
27. HARYOU. Youth in The Ghetto (New York: Oran Press, 1964), p. 124.
28. The Committee on Aging. Older People in East Harlem (New York: Department of Labor, Migration Division, Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, 1964).
29. Ibid., p. 26.
30. Robert E. Park, "The Race Relation Cycle" in Amitai and Eva Etzioni, eds., Social Change (New York: Basic Books, 1964), p. 377.

FOOTNOTES CONTINUED

31. Leonard Covello, principal of East Harlem's Benjamin Franklin High School for almost a quarter of a century, strove valiantly to effect community participation in the social institutions of the area (presaging the community-control conflicts presently attending the Intermediate School #201 complex in East Harlem) but without long-range success. See Leonard Covello, "A High School and its Immigrant Community: A Challenge and An Opportunity," Journal of Educational Sociology, vol.9 (February 1936), pp. 336-346.
32. See footnote #3, supra.
33. Gunnar Myrdal, "The Principle of Cumulation" in Amitai and Eva Etzioni, ed., Social Change (New York: Basic Books, 1964), pp. 455-458.