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INTRODUCTION

Migration in the Periphery of Empire

IT IS QUITE significant that in the years close to the commemoration of the centennial of the Jones Act and the grant of U.S. citizenship to Puerto Ricans by Congress in 1917, most news regarding Puerto Rico in the local, U.S., and global media is related to the worst economic crisis the island has experienced since the 1930s. While Puerto Ricans argue about the turmoil created by the Puerto Rican government’s seemingly unpayable public debt and its related financial crisis, the second news item widely debated in the local media is the continued discussion regarding the increasing number of Puerto Ricans leaving the island for the United States as a result of this economic situation. According to academic and government reports, Puerto Rican migration in the twenty-first century is comparable in terms of volume and magnitude to the one experienced during the period of the “great wave of migration” from the late 1940s to the early 1960s. At that time, an average of forty thousand people left the island for the United States; in 2014 the net migration was estimated to be sixty-four thousand.¹ In the United States, news regarding Puerto Rico is dominated by the same two issues: the economic collapse of the island and its related fiscal crisis, and the continued and increasing migration of Puerto Ricans to the U.S. mainland.²

This is not Puerto Rico’s first economic crisis since the United States occupied the territory in 1898, nor is it the first time Puerto Ricans have moved to the U.S. mainland in large numbers as a consequence of economic turmoil
on the island. But to fully comprehend the issue of Puerto Rican migration to the United States, one must understand the complexities of U.S. rule in Puerto Rico ever since the island was taken as war booty at the end of the Spanish-American War. In 1901 the U.S. Supreme Court declared Puerto Rico to be an “unincorporated territory,” a novel legal and political category in more than one hundred years of U.S. territorial expansion and incorporation. This declaration legitimized the U.S. colonial regime implanted on the island by Congress in 1900. In 1917 Congress granted U.S. citizenship to Puerto Ricans. One of the most important consequences of this act was to uphold the unrestricted entry of Puerto Ricans to the United States. Thus, colonialism, citizenship, and migration are interrelated elements of the Puerto Rican experience and have been important in shaping the lives of Puerto Ricans—whether on the island or on the U.S. mainland—since 1898.

Migration to the United States has been an integral part of the history of Puerto Ricans since the beginning of the twentieth century. The civilian colonial government established by the United States in 1900 through the Foraker Act promoted migration as a mechanism to solve what colonial administrators concluded was the island’s major problem: overpopulation. Migration to the United States increased significantly after the grant of citizenship in 1917. From the late 1940s to the early 1960s, over half a million Puerto Ricans migrated to the United States. By 2006, more than half of all Puerto Ricans lived on the U.S. mainland. Puerto Rican migration is characterized by the movement of citizens from a U.S. unincorporated (i.e., colonial) territory to the main jurisdictional boundaries of the American polity. Puerto Rican migration to the United States therefore needs to be understood as a colonial migration, that is, within the context of U.S. colonialism and citizenship in Puerto Rico.

One important aspect of this experience is the very active role that the government of Puerto Rico played in this process from the late 1940s to the mid-1970s. While the governments of many nation-states in the late twentieth century—like many in Latin America and the Caribbean—have engaged in the promotion of migration and in the incorporation of their citizens in the host society, what is peculiar to the Puerto Rican experience is that Puerto Rico is an unincorporated territory of the United States, not an independent nation-state, and Puerto Ricans are U.S. citizens. The Puerto Rican migration experience is particular, then, in that it presents a case where the government of a non-nation-state was engaged in promoting the migration and incorporation of its people to the metropolis of which they are technically citizens. To achieve its goals of organizing migration, Puerto Rico’s government formulated and implemented its own migration policy.
Puerto Rico’s migration policy was influenced by the ideas and policies adopted by civic and political institutions in the United States—particularly in New York City—toward Puerto Rican migrants, as well as by actions and ideas of U.S. and Puerto Rican policy makers managing Puerto Rico’s affairs. The Puerto Rican government played an important role in the social and political incorporation of its migrants in the United States as part of its migration project. The policies and practices of Puerto Rico’s government—the creation of the Bureau of Employment and Migration (BEM) in San Juan, the Migration Division in the United States, and the Farm Placement Program (FPP), for example—are crucial factors in understanding migration from Puerto Rico and Puerto Rican incorporation and community formation in the United States in the postwar period.

The Puerto Rican migration experience must be included in the study of the long and complex history of migrations to the United States. Recent major studies of the American migration experience do not pay due attention to the study of a colonial migration to the United States. One reason for this situation is that the Puerto Rican experience poses a set of questions that are not easy to answer, and this may lead to its exclusion from more comprehensive studies of U.S. migrations: Are Puerto Ricans internal migrants or are they immigrants? Are they traditional immigrants or transnational migrants? What is the role played by U.S. citizenship and colonialism in the migration of Puerto Ricans to the United States? If Puerto Ricans are U.S. citizens, why did the government of Puerto Rico have to play a role in their incorporation in the United States? In other words, the Puerto Rican migration experience does not fit with the traditional perspectives applied to the study of migrations to the United States.

THE STUDY OF PUERTO RICO’S MIGRATION POLICY

This book will focus on the role that Puerto Rico’s government played in the migration experience of Puerto Ricans, particularly in the development of its migration policy and its specific actions to promote the incorporation of Puerto Rican migrants in the United States during 1940s and 1950s, the period displaying the largest migration wave in the twentieth century. The study of Puerto Rico’s migration policy has not been extensive so far, although it was an important element of the Puerto Rican migration experience, as the central chapters of this book will maintain. I depart from previous studies of Puerto Rican migration policy, particularly from theories that seek to explain migration policy as a reaction to the individual decisions of migrants to relocate.
abroad, or that suggest that migration policy is simply a consequence of socioeconomic structural processes.

The former perspective—migration policy as a reaction to the spontaneous migration of individuals—was the official policy of the Puerto Rican government since the enactment of the 1947 migration law. This perspective was disseminated in the academic arena by Clarence Senior, an adviser to Puerto Rico’s government on issues of migration and director of the Puerto Rican Department of Labor’s Migration Division for many years. During and after his work with the Puerto Rican government, Senior wrote extensively trying to explain Puerto Rican migration to the U.S. public, always maintaining the Puerto Rican government’s view that “the government neither encourages nor discourages migration.” Following a traditional push and pull theory of migration, Senior argued that Puerto Rico’s migration was caused by the island’s overpopulation and lack of jobs, which forced individuals to move to the United States, where jobs were available. The government’s migration policy came as a reaction to the abuses by labor contractors or to aid individuals who migrated on their own in their insertion in the new society—that is, to manage the two migrant flows from the island: individual migrants and organized migration. Senior contended that the strong reaction in the United States to the entry of Puerto Ricans after 1947 was due to racism and a traditional antagonism toward immigrants. In that sense, he argued, Puerto Rican migration followed the traditional pattern of incorporation of previous immigrants.

In reaction to this official view of migration presented by the Puerto Rican government, a structural perspective on Puerto Rican migration emerged in the 1970s spearheaded by the work of the newly created Centro de Estudios Puertorriqueños (Center for Puerto Rican Studies) in New York City. That perspective was particularly related to the works of two scholars directly linked to Centro, director Frank Bonilla and researcher Ricardo Campos. This structural, neo-Marxist approach was first presented in the groundbreaking Labor Migration under Capitalism: The Puerto Rican Experience, produced by Centro’s History Task Force. The book posed a very critical review of the official perspective on migration, arguing that Puerto Rican migration—like all contemporary migrations—had to be understood as a consequence of the process of capitalist accumulation at a global level. Puerto Rican migration thus represented the movement of labor from one area of capitalist accumulation to another. Historical peculiarities of the Puerto Rican case—like colonialism—had to be incorporated into this analysis, but the Puerto Rican experience followed the rules of labor migration under the structure of world capitalist accumulation. In the book, only a few cursory remarks are made on the role of the Puerto Rican government in the management of the island’s
migration. It can be deduced from this analysis that politics and state policies, including migration policy, follow the dictates of capitalism.

Bonilla and Campos expanded the perspective introduced in Labor Migration for many years. They nonetheless maintained the perspective on migration advanced in the book and paid little attention to the role that the Puerto Rican government played in the management of the island’s migration. I share Bonilla and Campos’s view in explaining migration by structural forces, but I think that it is still very important to include the role played by the colonial state in the organization and management of Puerto Rican migration to the United States. Migration was not a creation of the Puerto Rican colonial state, of course. However, once it was deemed a “problem” that had to be dealt with, the colonial state played a very important role in the lives of migrants by encouraging and organizing migration, expanding the air transportation infrastructure to facilitate the movement of migrants, carrying a process of migrant selectivity, channeling them into specific locations in the United States, becoming an intermediary between laborers and contractors, facilitating their incorporation in the United States, taking their defense in labor disputes with American employers, and even confronting the federal government in defending the rights of Puerto Ricans as U.S. citizens to be treated as domestic labor with preferential access for jobs before alien workers. By focusing on the structural forces that promote migration, this perspective has placed a very limited emphasis on the important role played by the Puerto Rican government in this process.

The only work that until now has focused on the formulation of Puerto Rico’s migration policy is historian Michael Lapp’s excellent 1991 doctoral dissertation on the Migration Division in New York. Lapp’s study provides the most comprehensive study of Puerto Rico’s migration policy to date. It is, nevertheless, limited by a lack of examination of primary documents from archival sources in Puerto Rico that render a different perspective on the formulation of migration policy and the political factors that influenced this process. Furthermore, by arguing that migration policy in the late 1940s was the result of “technocratic” imperatives and policy makers, Lapp presents an inaccurate view not only as to why migration policy was formulated but also on who formulated it. By focusing on the creation and programs of the Migration Division in New York, Lapp overstates the role of Senior. For the most part, he overlooks the workings of the Department of Labor’s BEM, to which the Migration Division was subordinated and which organized and directed the movement of workers from Puerto Rico to the United States; the Division took care of migrants once they were in the United States, but always under the directives of the San Juan office. In neglecting this point, Lapp implies
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that the formulation of migration policy was not an important policy issue to the rising governing party, the Popular Democratic Party (Partido Popular Democrático—PPD). I will sustain in later chapters that migration was indeed a fundamental issue for the PPD and its main leader, Luis Muñoz Marín. It was Muñoz Marín and his inner circle (which did not include Senior) who debated, formulated, and implemented the government’s migration policy. Puerto Rico’s migration policy was originally formulated and later implemented by the Commissioner of Labor, Fernando Sierra Berdecía. For Muñoz Marín and the PPD, migration was as fundamental a government issue as economic development and the island’s political status issue. In fact, I will argue throughout the book that these three policy areas were directly related to one another.

PUERTO RICAN MIGRATION AND TRANSNATIONALISM

International migration is a central phenomenon of the expansion of the global economy and of recent changes in the relationships between states. Transnational migrations—where immigrants maintain social, economic, and political relationships with the home country—are an important element of modern global migration studies.10 A key element of the transnational phenomenon is the role played by the homeland state in the promotion of migration and in the incorporation of its citizens in the host society.11 Thus, one important aspect of the migration projects of these homeland states involves the elaboration and implementation of migration policies. Eva Ostergaard-Nielsen emphasizes the importance of migration policies by sending states: “Migration policy stands out as a policy area because it is a transnational issue which spans the borders between states, blurs the distinction between domestic and foreign policy, goes to the heart of the two-way relationship of obligations and rights between state and citizens.”12 If Ostergaard-Nielsen is right, if migration policy is a clear sign of a transnational issue by a nation-state, then how to explain the fact that the Puerto Rican government, a U.S. colonial state, elaborated and sustained a migration policy to promote the migration and incorporation of Puerto Ricans—technically U.S. citizens—to the United States? Even if the Puerto Rican migration experience is not considered as transnational, it resembles aspects that are proposed in the literature on political transnationalism with regard to the issue of migration policy and the role of the state in managing migration.13

Although the Puerto Rican case has been excluded from the comparative analysis of major scholars using the transnational perspective, some scholars
have argued that the Puerto Rican experience should be studied as a transnational case even though Puerto Rico is not a nation-state and Puerto Ricans are U.S. citizens. Well-known anthropologist Jorge Duany, for example, contends that even if the Puerto Rican case is characterized as a colonial migration, it can be understood as a transnational one. Other scholars have also argued that Puerto Rican migration and community formation in the United States must be understood as a transnational experience. The Puerto Rican case has been compared to other experiences of Latin American transnationalism in the United States.

In Puerto Rican Nation on the Move, Duany emphasizes the importance of migration for Puerto Ricans and the linkages between the island and its diaspora in the United States. He also studies the role of the Puerto Rican government in the promotion and management of migration to the United States. But Duany avoids the question of why the Puerto Rican government had to engage in such a peculiar role. Furthermore, he follows Lapp’s argument that Puerto Rico’s migration policy was mostly designed by Senior, a mistaken notion that, as I have just argued, has important historical and analytical connotations. In later writings, including his excellent Blurred Borders, Duany has expanded his framework of study of Puerto Rican migration. He has compared Puerto Rican migration to the Dominican and Cuban transnational migrations to the United States, arguing that the former is an example of “colonial transnationalism.” Making comparisons to the experience of other transnational countries, Duany points to the role the Puerto Rican government played in migration, calling it a “transnational colonial state.”

But even after Duany’s very incisive examination of Puerto Rican migration, his work still raises an important question: can a migration of citizens from a colonial territory to the metropolitan homeland be considered as transnational? The argument made by Duany and other scholars to define the Puerto Rican experience as a transnational one is that although Puerto Ricans do cross social, economic, and cultural borders, they do not cross national political boundaries. Are Puerto Ricans transnational migrants? Not in the sense that they have to cross international borders, which is the widely accepted definition in this field. But neither can they be considered as traditional internal migrants to the United States. For Puerto Rican policy makers, the island migrants, although U.S. citizens, were moving to the United States from an “ethnologically different” society, like the European immigrants before them. The goal of easing their incorporation and assimilation into American society was one of the reasons that justified the Puerto Rican government’s migration policy.
How, though, can the migration of citizens from a colonial territory parallel a transnational migration, which is supposed to involve relations between nation-states and the movement of peoples from one state to another as immigrants? As I have argued elsewhere, while it is true that some significant political aspects discussed by the transnational perspective are similar to the Puerto Rican experience, this unusual condition needs to be explained as a consequence of Puerto Rico’s and Puerto Ricans’ constitutional and political positioning on the periphery of American empire. The transnational paradigm was not developed to understand colonial migrations; there are several factors that limit the full application of the transnational framework to the understanding of colonial migrations like Puerto Rico’s (citizenship and free entry to the metropolis is one). Nevertheless, these scholars are right in pointing out that the Puerto Rican case does resemble a transnational migration in many ways. It certainly does in the role played by the colonial state in the migration experience of Puerto Ricans.

On the other hand, the role played by the colonial state in Puerto Rican migration makes this experience very different from any other internal migration in the United States. If Puerto Ricans are to be considered as internal migrants, why did Puerto Rico’s government take upon itself the role to protect its migrants in the United States and to facilitate their incorporation into American society and polity? As U.S. citizens, were not they already incorporated into the American polity? If Puerto Rican migration is to be regarded as an internal migration, then it has no parallel with other internal migrations in the United States. There is no evidence that state governments played a major role in the migration process or in the protection of their migrants elsewhere in the United States, taking actions to facilitate their social, economic, political, and cultural incorporation outside of their jurisdictions.

The role of the Puerto Rican colonial state in migration also raises questions regarding the nature of the Puerto Rican colonial state within the American polity and the nature of U.S. citizenship for Puerto Ricans. The particular arrangement of the Puerto Rican colonial state within the U.S. polity (as one representing the peoples of an unincorporated territory) and the distinct construct of U.S. citizenship for Puerto Ricans (as one diminished by the colonial territory and formulated early in the twentieth century based on the notion that these subjects were “alien” to the American polity) made them appear foreign to the United States not only culturally but also politically, thus making the Puerto Rican migration experience look like a transnational one in many ways.
I agree with Duany and others that the Puerto Rican migration experience has many attributes similar to those of transnational migrations, particularly with aspects related to political transnationalism. But characterizing it as “colonial transnationalism” does not provide a fuller understanding of this migration experience. Puerto Ricans do not move from one nation-state to another, so there is no need to acquire the host state citizenship and all that this entails in terms of incorporation, identity, and so on. There is no need for dual citizenship and all that implies in terms of relationship with the home state. There are no obstacles to returning since the homeland territory is under the jurisdiction and sovereignty of the metropolitan state, which explains the much noticed back and forth or circular migration among Puerto Ricans. While Duany underscores the transnational nature of Puerto Rican migration, one with a colonial character, I rather emphasize the colonial nature of Puerto Rican migration, one that because of the specific context of U.S. colonialism in Puerto Rico seems like a transnational migration. It is a migration that has been shaped by a specific kind of U.S. citizenship that, according to the Supreme Court in *Balzac v. the People of Porto Rico*, is limited by the colonial territory where Puerto Ricans live—a diminished and problematic metropolitan citizenship, but one that has allowed Puerto Ricans to enter the U.S. territory with no legal obstacles. This is something that transnational migrants do not experience.

Puerto Rican migration to the United States seems like a transnational migration largely due the particular construction of U.S. colonialism in Puerto Rico. The territory was defined by congressional acts and by the Supreme Court in the Insular Cases as “foreign in a domestic sense” to the United States (the unincorporated territory), a status that has persisted even after Congress granted citizenship to Puerto Ricans in 1917. The widespread notion among the American elite that Puerto Ricans were “alien” to the United States due to their ethnic and cultural characteristics and their presumed low level of civilization provided the basis for defining the territory as unincorporated and outside the boundaries of the American polity. This territorial status allowed the exclusion of Puerto Ricans from citizenship for many years. But even after Puerto Ricans became citizens, the idea that they were somehow alien to the United States remained an integral notion to the character of the citizenship that they were granted in 1917. Although other historical factors have to be considered as well, citizenship allowed Puerto Ricans unrestricted access to the U.S. mainland. But even as citizens, Puerto Ricans moving to the United States were regarded for many decades as alien or foreign in character and nature to the United States and not as full members of the American polity.
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U.S. EMPIRE STUDIES AND PUERTO RICAN MIGRATION

I argue in this book that Puerto Rican migration to the United States has to be understood as a colonial migration—that is, as a migration of U.S. citizens coming from a colonial (unincorporated) territory of the United States, which highlights the importance of understanding the relationship between U.S. colonialism, citizenship and migration in the Puerto Rican experience. Herein lies what might be the most important contribution of studying Puerto Rican migration to the United States: it is the most significant case of a migration of citizens from the colonial periphery of overseas territories to the U.S. mainland.25

Puerto Ricans and Puerto Rico occupy a liminal position within the American polity. Puerto Ricans are U.S. citizens who, because of their linguistic and cultural characteristics, are seen as foreigners in the United States. Although citizens, their territory is still defined as “foreign in a domestic sense,” according to a U.S. Supreme Court 1901 ruling. Their migration to the U.S. mainland reflects this confounding status. This might be why American academia in the postwar period was not capable of understanding the character of this migration and of the new migrants, placing their experience within the traditional framework of European migrations and concluding repeatedly that they were destined to fail in their incorporation to American society, contrary to the experience of previous “traditional immigrants.”26 Today, scholars trying to place the Puerto Rican experience within the transnational framework face a similar analytical predicament: although Puerto Rican migration presents some elements that resemble a transnational migration, it does not fit adequately within a perspective that focuses on the movement of immigrants from one nation-state to another.

Given that the framework of this book seeks to understand migration within the context of U.S. colonialism and citizenship in Puerto Rico, this book benefits from and seeks to expand the literature on U.S. empire. The hundredth anniversary of U.S. colonialism in the Caribbean and the Pacific after the Spanish-American War of 1898 and later the war in Iraq expanded the interest and the introspection of studying the United States as an empire. The works of distinguished scholars like William Appleman Williams and Walter LaFeber, among many others, point to the notable tradition of studying the American imperial venture.27 However, the emphasis of these scholars was mostly on “U.S. imperialism,” that is, a focus on the economic, political, and military expansion of the United States outside its borders. They mostly centered on the study of U.S. diplomacy and followed either the parameters of traditional history or Marxism, with its heavy emphasis on economic interests.
and the exploitation of colonies or neocolonies. But beginning in the 1990s, a new generation of U.S. scholars began to examine other factors in the character of U.S. empire: race, gender, class, and culture, among others. They also began to accentuate U.S. empire from the inside, that is, on the consequences of empire for American society.

The work that is usually cited in the resurgence of studying U.S. empire is *Cultures of United States Imperialism*, a volume edited by Amy Kaplan and Donald Pease. The book questioned the myth of “American exceptionalism,” that is, that contrary to the European great powers, the United States never became an empire. It also aimed at putting culture in its widest sense (race, gender, identity, etc.) at the center of studies of U.S. empire. Furthermore, the book challenged the distinction between the foreign and the domestic as two separate fields of inquiry in studies of American society and focused on the consequences of empire back home. But, ironically, in a book devoted to “cultures of imperialism,” there is no essay devoted to Puerto Rico or to Puerto Ricans in the United States. In addition, in a book dedicated to analyzing the relationship between the “domestic” and the “foreign,” there is no inquiry regarding colonial migrations, that is, the movement of people from the colonial periphery to the metropolitan territory as a consequence of the imperial venture.

A more recent and significant contribution to the study of U.S. empire is the volume edited by Alfred W. McCoy and Fransciso Scarano, *Colonial Crucible: Empire in the Making of the Modern American State*. Like Kaplan and Pease, they question the idea of American imperial exceptionalism and the separation between the foreign and the domestic in U.S. affairs. The basic aim of the book is to present the consequences of empire on American society, politics, state formation, and economics. The authors point to a continuum between territorial expansion at home and overseas colonial expansion, between empire inside and empire outside the borders of the American polity. Notwithstanding the greater inclusion of inquiry on the consequences of empire than the Kaplan and Pease volume, the McCoy and Scarano book does not deal with one of the most visible consequences of empire for both the colonized and the metropolitan societies, with one relationship that clearly connects the two ends of the imperial divide and eclipses the divide between the foreign and the domestic in empire: the movement of people from the colonial periphery to the metropolitan territory.

In the last two decades, several scholars have applied the perspective of U.S. empire studies to the research on Puerto Rico and its relationship with the United States, including the construction and development of the colonial state in the first half of the twentieth century and its relationship to U.S.
imperial policies;\textsuperscript{33} comparative studies of U.S. colonialism in Puerto Rico and the Philippines,\textsuperscript{34} and also of U.S. colonial policies throughout the American “imperial archipelago”;\textsuperscript{35} the reproductive policies imposed on Puerto Rican women by colonial structures and metropolitan private institutions;\textsuperscript{36} and the relationship between education and empire in Puerto Rico.\textsuperscript{37} The McCoy and Scarano volume includes essays on the consequences of U.S. empire in Puerto Rico in such areas as justice and law enforcement, education, militarization, citizenship, and national identity.\textsuperscript{38}

One area of particular interest in the study of American empire has been the field of legal studies, particularly in the Supreme Court decisions known as the Insular Cases. The role played by the Supreme Court in the rationalization and legitimization of the U.S. imperial presence in Puerto Rico has been carefully studied by several scholars.\textsuperscript{39} The status of Puerto Rico and Puerto Ricans in the American polity played an important role in the Insular Cases. Related to the latter, as it is also connected to U.S. colonialism in Puerto Rico, is the issue of American citizenship for Puerto Ricans. In this area, historians and legal scholars have examined the nature of this particular manifestation of citizenship and its relationship to U.S. colonialism in Puerto Rico.\textsuperscript{40}

With few notable exceptions, the field of U.S. empire studies has not adequately examined the subject of migration from the colonial periphery to the United States.\textsuperscript{41} Recently, several Filipino scholars have provided excellent accounts of the relationship between the construction of a colonial regime in the Philippines and the migration and incorporation of Filipinos in the United States.\textsuperscript{42} In the Puerto Rican case, Robert McGreevy has focused on the relationship between U.S. empire and Puerto Rican migration to the United States.\textsuperscript{43} This book seeks to expand on these studies of the American empire and its consequences abroad and at home, particularly as it relates to the topic of empire and colonial migrations. It sustains the importance of examining the relationship between U.S. colonialism and citizenship in Puerto Rico in order to provide a more comprehensive framework for the study of Puerto Rican migration to the United States.

**MIGRATION, COLONIALISM, AND CITIZENSHIP IN THE PERIPHERY OF EMPIRE**

The creation of a colonial periphery by the United States after it took over the island in 1898 is crucial to understanding Puerto Rican migration to U.S. mainland. Through congressional laws, executive policies, and Supreme Court decisions, the American state created a colonial periphery that subordinated
Puerto Rico and its people economically and politically and excluded the territory in important political and constitutional areas of the American polity. In 1900 Congress implemented a colonial government on the island under the Foraker Act, an act deemed legal and constitutional by the Supreme Court in *Downes v. Bidwell* (1901) under the legal guise of the unincorporated territory. In 1917, the U.S. Congress granted Puerto Ricans a citizenship that came to be defined by the colonial relationship between Puerto Rico and the United States according to the Supreme Court in *Balzac v. the People of Porto Rico* (1922).

The issue of migration has been an important element of how the U.S. citizenship of Puerto Ricans was defined and redefined throughout the twentieth century. After the United States took over the island in 1898, exclusion from citizenship for the new colonial subjects was at the center of congressional acts approved for Puerto Rico (the Treaty of Paris of 1898, the Foraker Act of 1900) and U.S. Supreme Court decisions, most importantly in *Downes v. Bidwell*. One reason for this exclusion was the fear among many U.S. policy makers that granting citizenship to the new colonial subjects would allow their unrestricted entry to the United States.

Under Article IX of the Treaty of Paris, Filipinos and Puerto Ricans (“the natives of the islands”) were excluded from both U.S. and Spanish citizenship, although *Peninsulares* (those born in Spain) retained their Spanish citizenship (and thus could become U.S. citizens through naturalization). In his influential report to Secretary of War Elihu Root on guidelines to a U.S. colonial policy, Charles Magoon argued that exclusion from citizenship could prevent the new colonial subjects from entering the United States. Senator Foraker included a clause making Puerto Ricans U.S. citizens in the first draft of his bill to create a colonial government in Puerto Rico in 1900. He later declared that he withdrew this clause from the bill in reaction to the strong opposition it generated; opponents argued that citizenship could imply “incorporation” of the territory to the United States and also limit congressional powers in ruling the newly conquered territories. The April 1900 Foraker Act excluded Puerto Ricans from U.S. citizenship and declared them to be “citizens of Porto Rico” (the name of the island was also changed).

Exclusion from citizenship was also at the center of a Supreme Court ruling that justified U.S. colonialism and became the basis for the Insular Cases: *Downes v. Bidwell*. The opinions presented by Justices Henry Brown and Edward White were very influential in shaping U.S. policy toward the new territories. Although these two opinions differed greatly in important matters, there were nevertheless two issues where both were in agreement: the right of the United States to conquer foreign territories as a necessary means
to become a great power and the exclusion from the American polity of the peoples of the newly conquered territories. For both Brown and White, the exclusion of the new colonial subjects was justified by the ideas that they were alien in nature to the American polity and that they had no right to become members of the nation.

Justice Brown believed that the “power to acquire territory” would be curtailed if the United States was forced to incorporate these “savage” and “uncivilized” peoples as citizens. Congress would not accept the annexation of foreign territory if “its inhabitants, however foreign they may be to our habits, traditions, and modes of life, shall become at once citizens of the United States.” He argued that the newly conquered territories differed from those previously annexed not only in terms of territorial contiguity but also on the differences in race and culture of its inhabitants (the latter territories had been settled by whites). According to Brown, the peoples of the newly acquired territories would have their “natural rights” (life, freedoms, property) protected but not their “artificial” or “residual rights” (like the rights of citizenship and suffrage, and others which are peculiar to Anglo-Saxon jurisprudence). It was only after warning about the nefarious consequences of incorporating alien peoples into the union that Brown’s opinion stated its well-known ruling that “the island of Porto Rico is a territory appurtenant and belonging to the United States, but not a part of the United States.”

Justice White argued that the central question in this case was this: “Had Porto Rico, at the time of the passage of the act in question, been incorporated into and become an integral part of the United States?” Like Brown, he argued that the right to conquer territory would be invalidated if its alien population was incorporated as citizens by “the immediate bestowal of citizenship on those absolutely unfit to receive it.” White affirmed “how unwarranted is the principle of immediate incorporation,” stating that it was inconceivable that a treaty “by a mere cession can incorporate an alien people in to the United States without the express or implied approval of Congress.” His opinion concluded that “while in an international sense Porto Rico was not a foreign country, since it was subject to the sovereignty of and was owned by the United States, it was foreign to the United States in a domestic sense, because the island had not been incorporated into the United States, but was merely appurtenant thereto as a possession.” Out of this opinion the doctrine of the unincorporated territory became part of U.S. jurisprudence; it has shaped the status of Puerto Rico and Puerto Ricans within and without the American polity ever since.

*Downes v. Bidwell* said nothing about curtailing the entry of Puerto Ricans to the U.S. mainland. The U.S. government tried to control the entry of Puerto
Ricans and Filipinos to the United States when it extended in 1902 the regulations of the 1891 immigration law to the inhabitants of these islands. On the basis of this interpretation of the law, the commissioner of immigration detained a Puerto Rican woman—Isabel González—and prevented her from entering New York by arguing that she would become a “public charge,” as established in the 1891 law. González not only fought the charge but argued that as a Puerto Rican, a U.S. subject living “under the jurisdiction of the United States,” she was a U.S. citizen. The U.S. government contended that it could prevent Puerto Ricans and Filipinos from entering the United States by declaring them as “aliens by birth and race” that could be excluded under the Chinese Exclusions laws approved by Congress and sustained by the Supreme Court.49 In 1904 the Supreme Court ruled in Gonzales v. Williams that Puerto Ricans, although not citizens, could enter the United States freely since they were not alien immigrants as the U.S. government argued in that case.50 After this decision, Puerto Ricans and Filipinos were acknowledged as U.S. “nationals” by the American government.

Puerto Ricans became U.S. citizens on April 1917 after a decade of debate within different sectors of the government. In 1916, Congress approved two Jones Acts, one for the Philippines and one for Puerto Rico. For Filipinos, it began a long transition toward independence during which they remained U.S. nationals. For Puerto Ricans, it entailed U.S. citizenship.51 After this congressional act, several U.S.-appointed judges on the island ruled that this grant of citizenship had incorporated Puerto Rico to the United States and that all constitutional rights must apply in the territory. In Balzac v. the People of Porto Rico, the Supreme Court—in a unanimous ruling written by Chief Justice William Howard Taft in 1922—ruled that the people living in an unincorporated territory do not enjoy all the rights guaranteed to U.S. citizens: “It is locality that is determinative of the application of the Constitution in such matters as judicial procedure, and not the status of the people who live in it.” Another important ruling in Balzac was the affirmation that the granting of citizenship to inhabitants of an unincorporated territory by itself was not a sign of its incorporation into the Union, as it had been prior to 1898. Taft reiterated one of Brown’s arguments used to deny citizenship and incorporation to territories like Puerto Rico and the Philippines: territorial contiguity and the opportunity to be settled by whites. Race and cultural difference still remained important elements in denying incorporation and thus future statehood to the colonial territories.52

Balzac presented another important pronouncement that often goes unnoticed when this ruling is discussed: that moving to the “U.S. proper” was the most important additional right that Puerto Ricans would enjoy as U.S. citi-
zens, and that once there they could “enjoy every right of any other citizen of the United States, civil, social and political. A citizen of the Philippines must be naturalized before he can settle and vote in this country.”53 *Balzac* affirms that the still-colonial subjects in the unincorporated territory would have their constitutional rights and membership in the American polity limited by Congress even though they were now citizens. That is, the restrictions imposed by the unincorporated territory on the constitutional rights of the colonial subjects remained as ruled in *Downes*. Puerto Rico and Puerto Ricans still remained “foreign in a domestic sense.” On the other hand, what was intrinsically new in *Balzac* with regard to constitutional rights, as Taft stated twice, was the idea that Puerto Ricans, as citizens, could now have access to full political and civil constitutional rights when they moved within the rightful borders of the American polity.

The Filipino and Puerto Rican migration experiences in the United States share some similar elements, at least until 1917: both groups were defined as “alien” to the U.S. polity immediately after the U.S. occupation of their territories, and both were excluded from U.S. citizenship and defined as U.S. nationals for a time. The right of Puerto Ricans and Filipinos to enter the United States freely had been acknowledged in *Gonzales v. Williams*. After Congress approved a Jones Act for each territory (for the Philippines in 1916 and for Puerto Rico in 1917), their respective paths in relation to the United States differed greatly: under the Jones Act for the Philippines, Filipinos remained as U.S. nationals, and their migration to the U.S. territory would be restricted in later decades. After the Tydings-McDuffie Act of 1934, Congress imposed extremely restrictive quotas to the Philippines, essentially ending Filipino migration to the United States at that time; furthermore, repatriation was forced on Filipinos living in the United States. As Paul Kramer has argued, in their efforts to stop Filipino migration to the United States, American nativists played a significant role in getting Congress to grant independence to the Philippines in some undefined future; while not granting immediate independence to their country, this act made Filipinos “aliens within the U.S. Empire.”54 In *Balzac*, the U.S. Supreme Court underscored the right of U.S. citizens from the unincorporated territories to freely enter the U.S. territory.55 In *Balzac*, as in *Gonzales*, the debate on the nature of U.S. citizenship for Puerto Ricans was related to their right to enter the U.S. mainland, that is, to migration. After 1917 migration from the colonial territories would be linked to the citizenship status of the colonial subjects. For all practical purposes, citizenship eventually became a requisite for migration from the U.S. colonial periphery to the metropolitan territory.
Filipino migration to the United States was greatly curtailed in the 1930s, while Puerto Rican migration increased after the 1920s. The end of World War II also marked different paths for both nationalities: while the Philippines was granted independence by the United States in 1946, Puerto Rico remained a U.S. colonial territory. On the other hand, the end of the war marked the beginning of a great wave of migration from Puerto Rico to the U.S. mainland. While Filipinos and Puerto Ricans moved to the United States as colonial subjects, since 1917 Puerto Ricans have migrated as colonial citizens. The fact that Puerto Ricans were U.S. citizens might be why the same forces in Congress—represented by Senator Millard Tydings—that pushed for the independence of the Philippines in the 1930s failed in their attempt to do the same with Puerto Rico (in 1936 Tydings submitted a bill for Puerto Rico’s independence).

If Puerto Ricans’ new citizenship did not extend to their full incorporation as members of the American polity, why, then, were they made citizens? According to José Cabranes, it was to guarantee the U.S. presence on the island and to secure U.S. strategic interests in the Caribbean, as well as to prevent any future demand for independence at a moment when separatist fervor was on the rise. For Efrén Rivera Ramos, citizenship was “imposed” on Puerto Ricans not to free these colonials subjects from colonialism but, to the contrary, to maintain colonialism on the island. To him, citizenship became the most important means of maintaining U.S. hegemony (in the Gramscian sense) in Puerto Rico.

The two Jones Acts for the Philippines and Puerto Rico might also be seen as a formal shift in U.S. imperial policy from creating a formal empire to creating one of an informal character—that is, from the goal of owning and controlling overseas colonies in the mold of European powers to a more indirect form of economic, political, and military domination over foreign countries. During this period, U.S. invasions of Caribbean and Central American countries reflected the new emphasis on gunboat diplomacy. There was never a complete agreement within the American elite on having colonial territories as the best means of projecting American economic, political, and military power abroad. Elihu Root, the architect of U.S. imperial policy as secretary of war, always opposed direct control of overseas territories; he also opposed the granting of citizenship to Puerto Ricans. In the coming decades, the United States took over other overseas territories through purchase or as spoils of World War II in the Caribbean and the Pacific. Many became unincorporated territories, and in all of these except for one, their populations became U.S. citizens, following the Puerto Rican model. All of these unincorporated territories were small islands with strategic value and relatively small populations. Puerto Rico would be the largest and most populated of all of them.
INTRODUCTION

POSTWAR MIGRATION AND THE MEANING OF U.S. CITIZENSHIP IN PUERTO RICO

U.S. citizenship has impacted all areas of Puerto Rican society—political, economic, social, cultural, and ideological—but perhaps none more than migration. If migration was fundamental in the transformation of Puerto Rican society after the end of World War II, then the transformative element of this citizenship for thousands of Puerto Ricans in their daily life has been felt nowhere more than in their right to migrate to the United States in search for jobs when none were available on the island. Citizenship guaranteed their right to free movement within the borders of the American nation-state. If economic and social factors might explain the causes of Puerto Rican migration to the United States, it is Puerto Rico’s political relationship with the United States and Puerto Ricans’ U.S. citizenship that explains the direction and the nature of their migration: the movement from a U.S. colonial territory to the metropolitan mainland by colonial subjects who happened to be U.S. citizens.

The colonial or territorial nature of U.S. citizenship in Puerto Rico influenced the way Puerto Ricans migrated to the United States and the way they were incorporated into American society. It also influenced the manner in which the Puerto Rican government intervened in the organization of migration to the United States. Perhaps nothing reflects this more than the constant efforts of Puerto Rico’s government after 1947 to have federal agencies and U.S. agricultural employers recognize Puerto Rican farmworkers as domestic labor with preference on employment over foreign labor. Although they were U.S. citizens, for many years the federal government treated Puerto Ricans as alien labor along with Mexicans and West Indians. The meaning of “foreign in a domestic sense”—as Puerto Rico was declared to be in Downes v. Bidwell—extended outside the legal-constitutional and political realm: for several decades after the end of World War II, Puerto Ricans were treated as “foreign in a domestic sense” in the American labor market mostly because they came from a territory that had been defined as foreign to the U.S. constitutionally and politically and also because they looked foreign to the United States culturally and ethnically. Puerto Rico’s government had to lobby the U.S. government intensely in order to have it recognize Puerto Rican workers as U.S. citizens so they could have preferential treatment before foreign labor in agricultural jobs.

After the end of World War II, the PPD leadership and government moved away from advocating independence for Puerto Rico and into a discourse of closer political and economic relations with the United States. In this process,
the PPD had to reinterpret its notion of the meaning of U.S. citizenship for Puerto Ricans: it was heralded as the strongest bond of “permanent union” with the United States in the Commonwealth Constitution in 1952. Migration played a part in redefining the meaning of citizenship for the poor and the working classes in Puerto Rico. The Puerto Rican masses had begun to use this citizenship right after the end of World War II in a different way than the elite: for them, a significant meaning of citizenship at that moment was their right to move to the U.S. mainland in search for jobs. It was the massive and rapid entry of Puerto Ricans to the city that created the “Puerto Rican problem” in New York in 1947, forcing Puerto Rico’s government to face this issue and later to formulate its migration policy. U.S. citizenship provided Puerto Ricans with the right to move freely to the United States and later gave the island government the tools to ease their incorporation into American society.

THE COLONIAL STATE AND PUERTO RICAN POSTWAR MIGRATION

As Taft stated in Balzac, to enjoy full citizenship rights, Puerto Ricans would have to move to “the United States proper.” And so they did, not necessarily looking to enhance their citizenship rights but in search of jobs that were not available in Puerto Rico. Citizenship had not changed the economic structure of the island, and the number of Puerto Ricans moving to the United States in search of jobs increased rapidly after 1917. Although they were now citizens, many sectors in the U.S. mainland—from policy makers to employers to landlords to white workers—still regarded Puerto Ricans moving to the United States as “citizens of Porto Rico,” that is, as culturally, racially, and politically alien or foreign to the United States, as colonial subjects that came from a territory that was still not part of the United States, and not as full members of the nation.59

Despite the Americanization policies implemented during the first forty years of American rule on the island, the maintenance of linguistic and cultural differences in Puerto Rico preserved a Puerto Rican national identity that manifested itself in the political arena. The economic and political crisis of colonialism in the 1930s was accompanied by a growing sense of cultural and political nationalism in Puerto Rico. This growing nationalism in a sense culminated in the cultural and political aspects that characterized the creation of the Commonwealth in 1952 as an autonomous political and cultural structure under U.S. sovereignty.
Although it was within a U.S. colonial state, the Puerto Rican government became the representative of Puerto Ricans during the 1940s, particularly after the electoral victory of the PPD in 1940, the election of Muñoz Marín as the first elected governor of the island in 1948, and the creation of the Commonwealth in 1952. All of these changes and reforms to the colonial structure were sought and supported by the majority of Puerto Ricans and legitimized through successive elections. Its electoral hegemony and the U.S.-supported reforms in the 1940s and 1950s allowed the PPD-led colonial government in Puerto Rico to assert a “relative autonomy” over local economic, political, and policy areas, including migration. The Puerto Rican government—even before the Commonwealth status was created in 1952—became the organizer and sponsor of migration to the United States as a mechanism to provide stability to the colonial regime in Puerto Rico as well as to legitimize its own political authority. In doing so, the Puerto Rican government assumed the representation and protection of Puerto Rican migrants in the United States and strove to facilitate their incorporation in the U.S. mainland. The Puerto Rican government extended its reach to and established government structures on the U.S. mainland to provide services to its migrants and to facilitate their incorporation in the American polity simply because at the time no other state structure cared for them. Since Puerto Ricans’ U.S. citizenship did not imply de facto inclusion or full membership in the American polity, for several decades the Puerto Rican government assumed the task of promoting incorporation and providing representation for many island migrants in the United States.

This book focuses on the formulation and implementation of Puerto Rico’s migration policy in the postwar period. Migration became an important issue for U.S. and Puerto Rican policy makers after the end of World War II. Migration policy required a relatively vast space of action for the Puerto Rican government during this period. It involved the promotion and organization of migration through bureaucratic agencies like the BEM in San Juan and the Migration Division in the United States, both under the umbrella of the Labor Department. It also necessitated reaching other areas of Puerto Rican life, like education, air transportation and infrastructure, population control policy, tourism, and economic planning. Furthermore, Puerto Rican migration policy and politics cannot be divorced from what is traditionally understood as politics in Puerto Rico, usually seen from the perspective of the island’s political status, that is, its relationship with the United States. By the late 1940s and early 1950s, migration politics was status politics as the migration issue took a central position in the status debate at this time for Puerto Rican and U.S. policy makers.
There are two issues regarding the book’s topic and perspective that call for further elaboration. First, this book focuses on the formulation and implementation of the Puerto Rican government’s migration policy, and hence its institutional focal point. I am in no way proposing or advocating a state-centric approach exclusively to the study of migration or denying agency to migrants in defining the Puerto Rican migration experience. Policy issues deal with the actions and the ideas that guide such behavior by the state, in this case Puerto Rico’s government. As such, the book must focus on (colonial) state action in the specific field of migration. By concentrating on this heretofore underappreciated perspective, I am not denying migrant agency. On the contrary, my argument throughout the book is that once this mass migration was set in motion spurred by aggregate individual actions, Puerto Rico’s government intervened to manage, organize, and regulate this flow of people to the United States. The reasons for this course of action are the substance of this book. Puerto Rico’s government decided to take a more active role in migration only after the mass movement of Puerto Ricans to New York City beginning in 1946 produced the “Puerto Rican problem” there. It was people moving on their own to the U.S. mainland (what government officials called “individual migrants”) that led the government to take action to provide a modern air transportation infrastructure, to use the public school system to organize and regulate migration, and to try to ease the incorporation of its migrants in the U.S. mainland through the Migration Division. It was migrant discontent in the beet fields of Michigan in 1950 that led Puerto Rico’s government to revise and streamline its migration policy guidelines for decades to come. All these events are examined in the book. I do pay attention to the institutional factors that influenced this migration (e.g., Puerto Rico’s political relationship with the United States, U.S. citizenship, political actors and interests on the island and the U.S. mainland, etc.) that very often are absent from the history and analysis of Puerto Rican migration to the United States. There are many good accounts on the Puerto Rican migrant experience in the United States, but there is none that exclusively examines the formulation and implementation of the Puerto Rican government’s migration policy. This is one of the contributions of this book.

Second, the book discusses the transnational perspective on migration in this introduction, but it does not provide an account or advance the theory of transnationalism. The main issue of interest and its primary focus is the role played by Puerto Rico’s government in Puerto Rican migration to the United States. The perspective or theory of transnationalism is addressed here because of the prevalence of that perspective in contemporary accounts of Puerto Rican migration, particularly by authors who point to the role played
by Puerto Rico’s government in migration after World War II. Instead I see Puerto Rican migration as a colonial migration that is defined by the particular construction of Puerto Rico as a colonial territory (the unincorporated territory) and the particular construction of Puerto Ricans as (colonial) citizens. It is because of these factors the Puerto Rican migration experience has shown elements similar to those cited commonly in the literature of political transnationalism.

As in any academic field, the theories of transnationalism, transnational migration, and transnational politics have engendered more than a few debates. Particularly significant are the debate related to the meaning and scope of transnationalism and transnational migration and the debate regarding the spaces where transnationalism is supposed to occur, whether it is defined by the actions and borders of the nation-state or by the social fields created by the actions and behavior of the immigrants themselves. Although these and other debates are significant for the field of transnationalism, they do not have any bearing on the arguments made in this book. While transnationalism as an analytical approach may inform some of the debates on Puerto Rican migration in recent decades, I take a different approach that focuses on the institutional policies implemented by the Puerto Rican government and the political and ideological underpinnings that support them.

WHAT’S AHEAD

Chapter 1 elaborates on how the role played by Puerto Rico’s government in migration after 1945 was related to the increased relative autonomy of the colonial state during this period. It traces the role played by Puerto Rico’s government in migration to the early years of U.S. rule on the island and pays particular attention to how migration was discussed by U.S. and Puerto Rican policy makers during World War II. The chapter explores how policy makers’ perception during the first half of the twentieth century that the island’s major social problem was overpopulation led them to advance migration as a solution to this important issue. It also examines how migration was linked to discussions of the island’s political status during the 1940s.

Chapter 2 analyzes the making of Puerto Rico’s migration policy in 1947, paying particular attention to how the Puerto Rican government took the issue of migration to the United States seriously only after the “Puerto Rican problem” campaign erupted in New York City that year. The chapter studies the role played by Commissioner of Labor Fernando Sierra Berdecía in the formulation of the government’s migration policy and discusses why the
official government policy—to neither encourage nor discourage migration—concealed a more active participation of the government in the management of migration. It also reviews the debates held in Puerto Rico on population control and migration during the 1940s and examines the experience faced by Puerto Rican migrants in Chicago in 1946, a precursor to the “Puerto Rican problem” in New York City and the 1947 migration law.

Chapter 3 explains how the Puerto Rican government after 1947 lobbied U.S. employers and the federal government to have island workers considered as domestic labor and given preference over foreign labor, particularly in agricultural work. This analysis shows how Puerto Rico’s government used U.S. citizenship to promote its own interests and those of its migrants when facing federal government agencies and U.S. employers. The chapter also analyzes the political and ideological foundations and workings of the Farm Placement Program (FPP), the best example of an organized migration by the Puerto Rican government. In addition, it explores how, even when the government’s migration policy was directed at promoting migration to the United States, it continued to consider possible migration plans to Latin America.

Chapter 4 examines the Puerto Rican government’s actions to provide cheap and safe air transportation for island migrants going to the United States. The government intervened with the federal government and air carriers to ensure that reasonable fares and safe travel conditions were provided. The chapter analyzes an issue that presented a real threat to the government’s migration program: the high number of air crashes from 1947 to 1952. Furthermore, I dispute here the widely accepted idea that tourism was the central factor explaining the growth of air transportation in the postwar period. Instead, I argue that migration is what led the Puerto Rican government to expand the island’s airport infrastructure, to lobby the federal government to increase the number of air carriers flying to the island, and to pressure major airlines to lower their airfares in Puerto Rico.

In chapter 5, I examine the connection between education policy and migration in the 1940s and 1950s, particularly regarding the teaching of English in public schools and the use of the public school system by the government to promote and encourage migration to the United States. The intensification of English language education in public schools after the early 1950s, an issue that had been closely related to the policy of Americanization implemented in earlier decades by the colonial government, is directly associated to the government’s migration policy. Education became part of Puerto Rico’s migration policy as migration affected all areas of Puerto Rican life and the government sought to make “every Puerto Rican a potential migrant.”
Chapter 6 discusses the upheaval and discontent of Puerto Rican workers in the sugar beet fields of Michigan in the summer of 1950. This event represents the first major incident of Puerto Rican migrant discontent in the United States and also shows how the Puerto Rican government intervened in labor disputes involving its workers and U.S. agricultural interests. The Michigan incident was the first major challenge to the government’s migration policy, both on the island and the U.S. mainland, and had important implications for its implementations afterwards. The Michigan episode is also relevant because it links migration to the island’s political status issue. Defending the Michigan sugar beet growers was Congressman Fred L. Crawford, then the Puerto Rican government’s best ally in Congress and a strong supporter of Puerto Rican migration to the United States and of Commonwealth status. The chapter also looks at how U.S. sugar politics—particularly those represented by sugar beet producers like the ones in Michigan— influenced Puerto Rican economic and political affairs after 1898, including migration.

By 1950, Puerto Rican farmworkers were already part of that class of exploited agricultural workers in the United States known as migratory labor. This was in part a consequence of the Puerto Rican government’s migration policy and programs, particularly through the FPP. Chapter 7 analyzes the status of Puerto Rican farmworkers as migratory labor in the United States and the role played by Puerto Rico’s government as a labor contractor, that is, as a provider of labor to U.S. agricultural interests. In studying this subject, I explain why Puerto Ricans were hired to work in U.S. farms even when, in many instances, they were more expensive than foreign or domestic labor, and why the FPP—central to the government’s migration policy by then—lasted for three decades. The chapter also examines how the Puerto Rican government provided labor to U.S. employers through the Migration Division’s employment program.