

California State University, San Bernardino

CSUSB ScholarWorks

Theses Digitization Project

John M. Pfau Library

1982

A comparison of the acculturation of the Chicano and the Chinese people in California at two periods in time, 1848-1880 and 1960-1970

Nellie Sehestedt

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholarworks.lib.csusb.edu/etd-project>



Part of the [Race and Ethnicity Commons](#), and the [Social History Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Sehestedt, Nellie, "A comparison of the acculturation of the Chicano and the Chinese people in California at two periods in time, 1848-1880 and 1960-1970" (1982). *Theses Digitization Project*. 228.
<https://scholarworks.lib.csusb.edu/etd-project/228>

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by the John M. Pfau Library at CSUSB ScholarWorks. It has been accepted for inclusion in Theses Digitization Project by an authorized administrator of CSUSB ScholarWorks. For more information, please contact scholarworks@csusb.edu.

A COMPARISON OF THE ACCULTURATION
OF THE CHICANO AND THE CHINESE PEOPLE IN CALIFORNIA
AT TWO PERIODS IN TIME: 1848-1880 AND 1960-1970

A Thesis
Presented to the
Faculty of
California State
College, San Bernardino

In Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for the Degree
Master of Arts
Special Major

by
Nellie Sehestedt
March 1982

A COMPARISON OF THE ACCULTURATION
OF THE CHICANO AND THE CHINESE PEOPLE IN CALIFORNIA
AT TWO PERIODS IN TIME: 1848-1880 AND 1960-1970

A Thesis
Presented to the
Faculty of
California State
College, San Bernardino

by
Nellie Sehestedt
March 1982

Approved by:


Chairman

Feb 23, 1982
Date

ABSTRACT

Through historical research, this study outlines the different methods of cultural adjustment used by two ethnic groups in an alien setting, the Chicano and the Chinese people in California. This paper reveals that both groups have been victims of discriminatory practices in every phase of life since the mid-nineteenth century at the hands of the majority society. In spite of that, the Chinese population attained one of the highest educational and occupational levels of any group in the country, while the opposite is true of the Chicano community.

In the Conclusions, the problem of the unfair social order is discussed; a method for solution of the problem, by means of changing the social order through non-violent resistance, is offered; and the probable outcome is set forth.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	INTRODUCTION	1
II.	THE CHICANOS AND THE CHINESE: 1848-1880	3
	A. Manner of Entry	10
	B. Family Structure	12
	C. The Barrios and the Chinatowns	16
	D. Employment	24
	E. Resistance	32
	F. Religion	36
	G. Politics	39
III.	THE CHICANOS AND THE CHINESE: 1960-1970	44
	A. Acculturation	47
	B. Education	56
	C. Employment	67
	D. Problems and Conflicts	74
	E. Religion	82
	F. Politics	86
IV.	CONCLUSIONS	91
V.	NOTES ON SOURCES	97
VI.	SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY	107

I. INTRODUCTION

The image of the United States as a nation of immigrants is carefully nurtured by its residents. With an inscription at its base that attests to America's benevolence and love of mankind, the Statue of Liberty stands beckoning to Europe. Since 1620 waves of immigrants fleeing poverty or conflicts in their native lands have been drawn to this country. Upon arrival, however, the foreigners with strange ways discovered that they were seldom treated with compassion.

In time some newcomers were able to fulfill their dreams but many others found that new conflicts and new problems rose to confront them. The success or failure of the individual to enter the mainstream of American society depended on such varied factors as the ethnicity, the level of skills, the attitudes and expectations which each brought with him. The impact he produced on the resident community, its acceptance or rejection, also helped determine the outcome.

This unique process, the acculturation of alien groups and the degree of assimilation they achieved, is the subject of this study. The focus of the paper will be on

two easily-identified ethnic groups in California, the Chicano and the Chinese people, at the beginning of their experience and near the present time, for the purpose of comparing the effects of acculturation on them.

Briefly, the terms for ethnic groups are used in this paper as follows: Chicano is used to designate any person of Mexican heritage living in the United States. It indicates the person's cultural identity rather than his place of birth. Mexican American and Mexican are used interchangeably with Chicano. Depending upon the context, Mexican may also signify a resident or citizen of Mexico. The early settlers from Mexico who populated the area that later became the state of California called themselves both Mexicans and Californios, and are so referred to in this study. Mexicano is applied to an immigrant who adheres closely to his ties with Mexico despite residence in this country. The word Latino is used when reference is made to data from the Los Angeles Times, whose editors have assigned this term to persons who are Spanish-speaking, or have Spanish surnames, or are of Latin American or Hispanic origin. Blacks are the American Negroes. Anglos refers to the white population in United States society, while American and Yankee are used to indicate the population of the United States at large: citizens, settlers and inhabitants, regardless of race.

II. THE CHICANOS AND THE CHINESE: 1848-1880

The history of the Chicanos, the Mexican American people, in the United States begins with the Mexican-American War of 1846-1848, at the end of which was signed the Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo. Mexico was forced to cede half its territory to the United States, including California. The Mexican population was estimated at 7,500 in California.¹

Long before this time, however, Americans traveled throughout the Spanish territory which now constitutes the Southwestern United States and published their impressions of the Mexican settlers they encountered. These travelers were a few newspaper correspondents and writers, but for the most part they were miners, traders, mountain men, trappers and sailors who may not have been qualified to assess differences in culture among people. Unfortunately, the impressions were highly judgmental and prejudicial in character, and quickly became part of the conventional wisdom of the eastern United States. In general, the judgment was that the Mexican upper class, the ricos, were a charming and hospitable people who lived in a splendid manner while enjoying many festivities. The "natives," the lower classes, were seen as backward, idle and thriftless,

therefore a poverty-stricken and degraded population.

The clash of culture values was inevitable and immediately apparent. The Yankees had an aversion toward royalty, toward the Catholic religion, toward racial mixtures, and they held the puritanical work ethic in high regard.² These were deeply-rooted, emotionally-braced values revered by the majority of the Anglo populace, and any culture that did not embrace them was held in contempt. Moreover, the myth of Manifest Destiny encouraged the Yankees to create and believe unfavorable stereotypes of the people who held the territory coveted by the Yankees.

Prior to 1848 the society of Mexican California was essentially feudal and clerical, the former consisting of a landed gentry and workers. Immediately after the Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo came the Gold Rush, bringing a hundred thousand outsiders looking for a quick fortune.³ Mexican land titles were contested by squatters, and through violence or blatant fraud, the original land grantees were robbed of their property. Two droughts, in 1862 and 1863, a drop in the price of cattle, as well as taxes and mortgages, ruined many Mexican ranchers.⁴ In 1869 the first railroad started running in California, and that brought in more land-hungry settlers from all parts of the country. By the 1870s, most of the land originally held by Mexicans had passed to the Americans.⁵

At the same time the Mexicans were losing economic control, large, capital-intensive corporations were being established which engaged in ranching, agricultural and mining operations. These giant firms replaced most of the small ranches and mines. The Californios, as the Mexican settlers were called, soon lost financial control of the society, and within a few years, they lost their political control as well.⁶

Another detriment to the Mexican population was the fact that in 1848 Mexico had been conquered so quickly and with so little effort that "it bred in the Americans a measureless contempt for all things Mexican."⁷ Americans pouring into the gold fields brought their institutions and their prejudices against the Mexicans. Their hostility found outlets in the enactment of many anti-Mexican laws and in acts of violence against them. As soon as California was admitted as a state in the Union in 1850, the Foreign Miners' Tax was passed to banish Mexican miners from the gold mines. Emboldened by this law, thousands of Anglo miners broke into a Mexican mining camp in Sonora, California, shooting at every Mexican found there. "The camp was burned, dozens of Mexicans were lynched during a week of rioting, and most of the miners abandoned their claims."⁸

In the 1850s, legislative injustice was inflicted on many minority groups in California. The Chinese were not spared, but the Anglos did not punish them for "innate immorality" as they did the Mexicans. An unreasonably high number of Mexicans

were whipped, banished, or hanged from 1849 to 1860. In 1854, the Daily Alta California, a San Francisco newspaper, stated: "It was almost a by-word in our midst, that none but Mexicans could be convicted of a capital offense."⁹ Carey McWilliams wrote: "Throughout the 1860's the lynching of Mexicans was such a common occurrence in Los Angeles that the newspapers scarcely bothered to report the details."¹⁰

During the early settlement of California by Anglos, Mexicans were exploited as cheap labor in railroads, mines, farms and in service jobs. The pattern became set; Mexicans were assigned to low-wage jobs, and Mexican immigrants who came later moved into the same low-paying occupational channels and second-class social status already established.

At the Mexican border, United States immigration controls were so lax that no records were kept from 1886 to 1893. Although this was the period of an "open door immigration policy,"¹¹ relatively few Mexican immigrants entered the United States until the twentieth century. Census figures indicate the number of Mexican-born persons in California as follows:

<u>1880</u>	<u>1890</u>	<u>1900</u>	<u>1910</u>
8,648	7,164	8,068	31,694

The actual number of Mexicans in the state was probably much higher. They avoided the census takers because they feared being harassed by them.¹²

Prior to the 1840s there was no discernible Chinese population in California. When the Gold Rush of 1849 started, many Chinese men risked the death penalty and sailed to California to look for gold, in defiance of the prohibition against emigration from China then in effect. Toishan, in Kwangtung province, was the main source of emigres, and the village became prosperous due to the remittances from the Chinese argonauts. At the end of 1850, the Chinese population was approximately 10,000 in California. Despite the hardships of a miserable voyage and the hostility from the miners when they landed, the Chinese continued to come to Gim Saan, the Mountain of Gold, as America was called in Cantonese dialect. According to estimates, by 1882 there were more than 130,000 Chinese in California.¹³

In The Unwelcome Immigrant, Stuart C. Miller states that anti-Chinese prejudice, which eventually led to the exclusion of Chinese from the United States in 1882, was not generated solely by California, but was prevalent in the East Coast long before the Chinese arrived there. Public opinion had been influenced by traders, missionaries and diplomats who had brought back mostly negative impressions of the people of China, from 1785 on. During the mid-nineteenth century, America was involved in the great controversy about whether slavery should be abolished or not. The "coolie" image of the Chinese workers became fixed in the public mind, and abolitionists

feared that ships carrying Chinese immigrants were trading in slavery and that such slavery was already beginning on the West Coast.¹⁴

Following the Civil War, an economic depression settled over the eastern United States, and settlers fled to the West. The trans-continental railroad was completed in 1869, using mostly Chinese workers. When that source of work ended, the Chinese turned to farm labor in California. Hard times also hit this state, where a racial demagogue named Dennis Kearney attracted audiences at San Francisco street corners as he fulminated against the evils of business monopolies. Using the Chinese as scapegoats, he blamed them for the high rate of unemployment everywhere, and incited violence against them.¹⁵

On October 24, 1871, Los Angeles was the scene of a Chinese massacre at the hands of Anglos. A feud between Chinese factions had become violent and many of the Chinatown residents retreated to their homes. Finally when gunfire erupted within Chinatown, a mob from the surrounding area broke in to rout the innocent Chinese from their hiding places. The mob looted stores and homes, then lynched at least ten Chinese, among them two young boys. This incident was typical of many that occurred all over the country. From 1876 to 1886, a period of intense racial persecution, Chinese were often murdered on the street.¹⁶

Harassment of the Chinese people continued through violent physical attacks as well as an incredible amount of legislation, local, state and federal, that was discriminatory. The

most prejudicial to the Chinese as a group came in 1882 when the United States passed the Exclusion Law under which immigration of Chinese laborers was forbidden.¹⁷

A. Manner of Entry

During the early history of California, differences were soon apparent in the settlement of the Mexican and the Chinese people. For the Californios in 1848, it had been an involuntary entry into the American world. The Native Americans and the Mexican people had been the original settlers in California and were now conquered people on their own land. The change that overtook the Mexicans in 1848 was a swift and bitter downgrading of their former status. They found themselves citizens of a country whose language, laws and social customs they did not understand. Within one generation the Mexican population had been overwhelmed by American settlers, had lost most of its property and means of livelihood, and was witnessing the erosion of its political power as well.

Before 1893, the Mexican emigrant could simply walk across from Mexico, since the international border was mainly an imaginary line and no official records were kept by the immigration officials. The country the Mexican migrant was leaving was similar to the land he was entering, geographically and culturally, because it had been a part of his homeland.¹⁸ If he became dissatisfied with his new situation in

California, he could return to his fatherland without too much difficulty.

The Chinese immigrant, however, came voluntarily into this country, despite the death penalty he faced for emigrating from China. He left a familiar homeland, took two weeks to cross the ocean, and established a new population in an alien territory.

The great physical boundary separating his land of origin from his land of destination could not escape his notice. . . . The nature of the physical border (its over-powering size) and the time it took to traverse it made it virtually impossible for the immigrant not to be deeply conscious of the fact that he was entering a new society and therefore, a new place within the structure of that society. This was not the case with the Mexican migrant.¹⁹

B. Family Structure

Another major difference in the early circumstances of these two groups was that the Mexican population, as settlers in the area, was composed of nuclear and extended family units, whereas few of the early Chinese immigrants brought their wives and children. Since pre-Columbian times, the most important institution of society among the Aztecs was the family, the source of protection, instruction and support for its members. Behavior was controlled by custom and religion. Rather than the accumulation of wealth, a goal among the ancient Mexicans was to attain recognition in the area of service to the public.²⁰ Later, the family continued to occupy the same important role in the life of the Mexican settlers of early California. Rich or poor, the familial unit provided emotional gratification and socialization to all its members, as well as security and refuge. If wealthy, the family would shelter its primary kin group and might also keep poor relatives, godchildren, friends and servants under its roof. If poor, the Mexican household was usually smaller, but it was nevertheless a close, supportive circle.

The Mexican father was the authority figure; every

member showed great respect and obedience toward the elders. Dishonorable actions by a member of the family brought shame to the entire family.

The Catholic custom of compadrazgo extended the family.

This is

a system whereby good friends are symbolically initiated into the family as they become godparents of one's children. To be a compadre or comadre is a great honor, for it indicates that one is 'family' even though a consanguine relationship is not present. In time of need one can count on family and compadres as well.²¹

The custom of compadrazgo also provided an opportunity for rich sponsors to bestow charity on the children of others less fortunate.

The majority of Mexican immigrants who arrived subsequently were young male workers who left the support of the family system in their own country. They suffered deprivations of all kinds, some perhaps as severe as those undergone by the male workers from China.

The male immigrants from China who were drawn to the California gold fields were sojourners, still tied to the old country. They planned to return to China when they had accumulated enough wealth to live well in their native villages. The sojourner sometimes visited his homeland, but more often he returned to work and live out a solitary life in a "Chinatown" in an American city. Within the Chinese community, the sojourner was the least acculturated of the immigrants. To

him, America meant only an opportunity to earn money. His own primary group, blood relatives and friends in China, were his main concern, and even though an ocean separated him from them, the Chinese in America focused his life on the family, his patriarchal domain. As Stanford M. Lyman writes regarding the lonely sojourner, "The Chinese ideal of family loyalty found painful expression in long term bachelorhood abroad, in the association of men of common surname in clans, and in the single-minded purposefulness of returning to wife and village to retire or die."²²

In the traditional Chinese family, great emphasis was placed on the large family, on the father-son relationship, on paternal authority, on respect to ancestors and elders, and upon bringing honor to the family. Every member was under scrutiny by family and neighbors and under pressure to do what was right.

Women traditionally remained in China, giving rise to the "mutilated family" when wives and children were separated from the male workers in America. The situation of the lonely Chinese men became more acute after 1855 when California enacted the Immigrant Tax of \$50 on each arriving Chinese passenger; in 1858 when California restricted immigration of Orientals; and in 1870 when the state further blocked the entry of Chinese females. Before these restrictions, arriving Chinese men outnumbered women more than eleven to one. In 1890, after the Exclusion Act had been in effect a few years, there were twenty-seven Chinese males for every Chinese female in this country.²³

Illegal immigration came to be justified in the early Chinese community as a form of non-violent civil disobedience. The Immigration Exclusion Act was regarded as an unjust law, so illegal entry simply broke an unjust law. Illegal immigrants into the United States could buy false papers (kah-gee). After the San Francisco earthquake and fire in 1906 which destroyed public records, many Chinese declared they had been born in this country. They returned to China, then stated to the American authorities that they had a son in China. This established immigration "slots" for an immigrant, often called a "paper son", to enter the United States.²⁴

C. The Barrios and the Chinatowns

A difference is seen in the development and purpose of the barrios and the Chinatowns of the cities in early California, the largely segregated communities of the Mexicans and the Chinese. During the Spanish Colonial period in Mexico (1521-1821), the Spaniards had established a semi-feudalistic society under the patrón and peón system. This was a paternalistic structure in which a few wealthy landowners (the patrones) ruled with benign tyranny over the workers (the peones). Although this system failed to take root in California, an order of social castes evolved among the Californios (see p. 19).²⁵ In the absence of the strong authority figure of the patrón among the Mexican settlers, the leadership role was filled by a Catholic missionary or a parish priest. By the early 1800s, the Catholic Church was the dominant force that regulated every aspect of the lives of the Californios.²⁶ As a result, no real organizational structure developed within the Mexican community; there were no social-political leaders, committees, or power cliques in the Mexican neighborhoods. Furthermore, the early barrios, consisting of a cluster of houses, a few small businesses and a little Roman Catholic Church, had residents whose

frequent unemployment, low occupational level and income prevented them from accumulating capital. Consequently, Mexican American barrios had no sources of wealth. Joan Moore pointed out in Mexican-Americans that

Between 1848 and the first large wave of immigration in the 1920s, the old-country institutions of the Mexicans were largely obliterated. It was not possible to transplant institutions that could ameliorate life in the barrios. Here again the marginality of the Mexicans in American life was demonstrated by the marginality of their institutions.²⁷

After the conquest, the Mexicans lost their property, their political power and their institutions. The poverty that engulfed them as a people prevented them from establishing others anew. Then, as now,

the colonia, for all its capacity to share its scarcities of housing, food, and employment, has no visible savings or institutions to encourage enterprise or extend charity.

28

The early Mexican population did not enclose itself within an ethnic compound, nor did it develop the diversity later seen in the Chinatowns. Instead of a rigid tier of immigrant aid associations, the Californios formed self-help societies called mutualistas. These organizations had deep roots in Mexico, dating from a period during which that country had undergone severe political convulsions. While the industrialists enjoyed the backing of the governing cliques, Mexican workers were ruthlessly exploited by the owners of the mines, cotton mills, and other industries. During the 1850s workers formed mutual aid associations to provide a measure of security through funeral funds, life insurance, medical coverage,

unemployment insurance, savings and pensions for their members. The early Mexican mutualistas were influenced by socialistic and anarchist philosophies aimed at organizing the workers to fight unjust working conditions, which led in 1865 to the first industrial strike at two cotton mills. Forty years later, Mexican federal troops under the orders of Porfirio Díaz repressed the workers and their organizations through terrorism, imprisonment and murder. Despite official opposition, the workers continued their organized resistance to injustice in Mexico and in the American Southwest.²⁹

Organizations which engaged in labor activities such as La Sociedad de Obreros, Igualdad y Progreso, established in Texas in the mid-1880s; Obreros Libres, founded in Arizona in 1906; and La Unión Federal Mexicana, formed in the early 1900s in California, were modeled on the mutual aid societies. The activities of these mutualistas often took on a strong nationalistic tone. However, some mutualistas had different purposes. For example, La Sociedad Hispanoamericana de Beneficio Mutuo was established in California in 1875 to raise funds for a hospital and other charities.³⁰ Mutualistas which were basically "fraternal orders of workingmen" spread and flourished throughout the Southwest by 1910-1920. These were organized as private social clubs which also offered insurance benefits to the members. In addition, these organizations had some political power in dealing with the outside society.³¹ After 1925 the

mutualistas continued to operate but they were seldom involved in labor disputes. The native born and more acculturated Chicanos were drawn to societies which were less nationalistic and which followed the American models more closely.³²

The economy of early California was pastoral, therefore the Mexican population had generally settled on large ranches. There were towns as well: San José, Los Angeles and Villa Branciforte, near present-day Santa Cruz, which had been decreed by law. The sites around the forts and missions also attracted settlers.³³

The rich landowner usually had a house in town as well as a large home on an isolated ranch where the extended family was sheltered. The rancher ruled with patriarchal authority.

The society of the Californios was divided into three classes: the gente de razón (meaning "persons of reason"), who were the large landowners, comprising about ten percent of the population; the working class, which was the majority of the people, composed of the artisans, small landowners, vaqueros, herders, soldiers and immigrant colonists. Being mostly mes-tizos and mulatos (persons of mixed races), they were generally illiterate and poor. At the bottom of the social order was the Indian group, which had been reduced to peonage after the secularization of the missions.³⁴

In The Making of a Chicano Community, Albert M. Camarillo states that in spite of the fact that the society was

stratified into definite social classes, it was still a cohesive, integrated body. One unifying factor was the compadrazgo relationship that often crossed class lines. Camarillo further agrees with Leonard Pitt's statement that another factor was the emotional inclination of the Californios toward social racial tolerance.³⁵

After their economic displacement around 1870, the Mexicans had to seek work as unskilled or low-skilled manual laborers with the large American employers in agriculture, in the mines, and on the railroads. Generally they were assigned to labor camps or to small isolated towns. Since the jobs paid low wages, the Mexicans were forced to settle in outlying or undesirable parts of a town. As more Mexicans settled nearby, the community developed into a barrio, a segregated shantytown. Newcomers from Mexico gravitated to the barrios in the cities to obtain help in getting established.

Leonard Pitt observes that when a settlement gets "a railroad, cheap labor and slums," it is well on its way to becoming a city. By 1876, Los Angeles had all of these. North of the plaza was "La Calle de los Negros," one of two slums, where despite its name, every occupant was Chinese, except for a few French traders.³⁶

The Chinese quickly clustered into tight ethnic enclaves, the Chinatowns that became a necessity against the persecution the Chinese suffered in the late 1800s and early 1900s. These ghettos offered the residents security, social companion-

ship and ethnic commodities from home. The Chinatown residents avoided contact with American government agencies and instead formed their own organizations to set rules for themselves, to resolve their differences, to care for their needy, and to act as liaison with the outside society. The organizations dealing with these matters at the first level were called fongs, or associations for immigrants from the same village or locality in China, a circumstance which usually involved a close kinship among them. The fongs had a small headquarters with sleeping and cooking facilities, a cardroom for social gatherings, and a cooperative banking system. The next level was the tsu, the association for family, clan or common surname (there are only 438 surnames in China for 700 million persons).³⁷ This organization provided fraternal services such as funeral expenses for the poor, help for the sick, and room and board for newcomers and members in need. The men were assessed fees to defray costs.³⁸ Another association, the hui kuan, performed similar functions but it was composed of persons who did not have strong family connections in the city where they lived, yet were from the same district, spoke a common dialect, or belonged to the same tribal group. At the very top of the organizational pyramid was the Chung wah hui kuan, the Chinese Consolidated Benevolent Association. This was a group of representatives of all the associations in Chinatown, who were usually the most successful businessmen as well. Commonly known as the Chinese

Six Companies in San Francisco, this association was the active spokesman of the Chinese community in dealing with American bureaucrats and acted as the unofficial governing body of Chinatown.³⁹ These associations have existed to the present time in Chinatowns throughout the country, but their influence and their functions have changed.

Early immigrants from Kwangtung included members of the Triad Society, China's most famous secret society. The Triad group was active in rebellions and crime for hundreds of years in China and it became the model for the secret associations, popularly called tongs, that were transplanted abroad. In the United States the operations of these secret organizations were, for the most part, centered in Chinatown and ranged from benevolent, protest, political and criminal activities. The benevolent tongs built impressive halls within the ghetto and aided their own members, widows and orphans. The societies provided sleeping quarters, mutual aid, sickness and death benefits, arbitration and mediation services, all limited to the small funds in their treasuries. The protest tongs organized resistance against the power elite of Chinatown and helped check the exploitation and control of sojourners by the clans. The tongs dedicated to political activities sought to influence the outcome of political events in China, not of this country. For example, Dr. Sun Yat Sen was supported by the overseas Chinese in the establishment of the Republic of China in 1911,

in what was perceived to be an anti-Manchu movement.⁴⁰

Some of the tongs developed into organized crime and protection rackets for the prostitution houses and the gambling interests within Chinatown. Ostracized members of the traditional clans were recruited by the secret societies to take part in feuds and criminal activities. Competition among these early outlaw tongs erupted into violence, the so-called "tong wars" that finally ended in 1931.⁴¹ These wars were confined to Chinatown and involved only matters which concerned the Chinese community. The clans fought one another, but the aggression was directed inwardly, never toward any other ethnic group. The wars served to equalize the power of the clans.⁴² These conflicts within Chinatown emphasized the in-group feeling of the residents and at the same time, tightened the bond among the warring Chinese groups against the outside society. The wars thus produced greater solidarity within the community.⁴³

D. Employment

There were differences in the Mexican and Chinese groups as work forces. During the 1860s, the economy of California shifted away from a pastoral base to that of large agricultural operations. This created a great disruption in the occupations of the Mexicans who had worked on cattle ranches. They continued to seek work that made use of their ranch-related skills, although these jobs became increasingly scarce. Mexicans avoided some jobs as being non-traditional, but the Chinese began to take menial work in agriculture and in service industries that Anglos and Mexicans refused.⁴⁴ This preference for pastoral-related work became a limiting factor for the Mexicans to enter the job market.

In order to understand the Mexican male's strong predilection for this type of work, one need only recall a bit of Mexico's history. Led by Hernán Cortez in 1519, the Spaniards conquered and occupied Mexico for three hundred years. They soon established themselves on large haciendas, landed estates, and conscripted Indians to work the lands and herds of imported livestock. The Spaniards were the patrones, the bosses, who enjoyed an enviable position in life. Spain left a vast

cultural legacy in Mexico; part of it included the image of the caballero, the gentleman. In a country which had not known horses before the arrival of the Spaniards, the figure of the conqueror borne high on the back of a huge beast became a powerful symbol.

In turn, the Mexicans became expert horsemen and soon developed distinctive clothing and implements for this calling. The vaquero was the working cowboy, but the charro dressed in a dramatic black costume trimmed in silver, wearing a wide-brimmed hat and riding a spirited horse, became a representation of virility. This would appear to be the role model of the Mexican male settlers in California during the period before the Mexican-American War. These settlers emulated the pastoral life of the Spaniards by living on large cattle ranches and by using the local Indians and Mexican mestizos for labor. Joan Moore states that

the availability of both Indian labor and cheap land worked against the development of a Mexican lower class, either on ranches or in towns.⁴⁵

As local employment became harder to get, the Mexicans fell into a pattern which persists to the present day in some segments of the Chicano working class: part-time, seasonal, migratory work. Such work in agriculture, in the mines, or on the railroads necessarily entailed traveling for the worker over long distances with other Mexicans, living in

a Mexican shantytown or in an isolated labor camp, and offering the immigrant few chances to learn American ways of business or speech through contact with Anglos. Carey McWilliams asserts that

to keep Mexicans earmarked for exclusive employment in a few large-scale industries in the lowest brackets of employment, their employers have set them apart from other employees in separate camps, in company towns, and in segregated colonias.⁴⁶

These conditions of isolation, whether self-induced or imposed on him by his employers, retarded the acculturation of the Mexican workers. As a result, as the nineteenth century drew to a close, the Mexican American working force was composed mainly of poor manual laborers with little or no skills.

During the Gold Rush in California, after being beset by attacks from hostile, racist miners as well as by discriminatory taxation, physical abuse, and exploitation, the Chinese immigrants withdrew from the mines. They sought jobs in the cities, in domestic service, in fishing, on the farms, and later, on the railroads. The Chinese had no special preference or attachment to a certain line of work, and they were willing to take jobs that others rejected. An editor, in justifying the use of Chinese workers in a shoe factory in Massachusetts, expressed his view as follows:

These 'Celestials' belong to no striking organization--do not care to be out nights--don't worry about their pay--do not presume to dictate to their employers.⁴⁸

It was generally believed in the 1870s that although the Chinese were not assimilable, "it would be foolish not to exploit their cheap labor before shipping them back to China."⁴⁹

If the Chinese were denied a job, they set up their own small businesses and became self-sufficient, protected from much abuse and exploitation. From 1850 to 1870, the Chinese established laundries and restaurants due to the lack of women to perform this work in the gold mines and in other frontier areas. The laundry required very little capital and space, and proved to be a good entry job.⁵⁰ The Chinese also raised and sold vegetables on a small scale in Santa Barbara.⁵¹

The Chinese entrepreneurs played the role of middlemen, supplying necessary services and goods to minorities and the outside society. As a sojourner, the Chinese was there to make money and save it. He would put in long hours of work, suffering deprivation to achieve his goal of going home to China. Both the laundry and restaurant businesses involved long hours of drudgery with low pay and relied greatly on the use of unpaid or low-paid labor by family members.⁵²

Throughout history, some immigrant groups have been able to achieve success through business ownership despite poor education. The Chinese, among a few others, have demonstrated great ability for small business ownership and management.⁵³ In contrast, when other areas of employment were closed to them,

the early Mexicans did not enter the field of the small businessman. There are several reasons for this:

1. Philosophically, the Californios looked at life from a completely different perspective than the Chinese. The Mexicans appreciated living in the present moment, and they sought to make it as fulfilling and memorable as possible. Octavio Paz expresses this view in Posdata, translated as follows:

The supreme value is not the future but the present; the future is a deceptive time that always says 'it is not yet time' and thus denies us. The future is not the time for love: what a man truly wants, he wants now. He who constructs the house for future happiness builds the jail for the present.⁵⁴

The people in Mexico traditionally did not engage in a competitive scramble to accumulate wealth for its own sake, nor was the worth of a person judged by the weight of his purse. Instead, relationships with family and friends, enriching experiences, emotional and other gratifications that contributed to a sense of human dignity and inner peace were more cherished than possessions.

On the other hand, the Chinese had a strong tendency toward thrift and willingly endured hardships, often postponing pleasure, in order to enjoy their money later in their home village in China.⁵⁵ In time, some Chinese immigrants were able to accumulate some capital while the Mexicans gradually lost their assets. The average early Mexican living in

a poor barrio without resources (see pp. 16-17) had no means with which to set up a business.

2. Very early in the history of their settlement in California, the Chinese were forced to flee to the cities to escape persecution. In San Francisco, Chinatown took root on upper Sacramento Street and along Dupont. The comparative security of the ghetto attracted immigrants; Chinatown grew steadily from 1850 to 1900 until it was the largest in the country.⁵⁶ These urban ghettos were sufficiently large and varied enough to sustain traditional institutions. The immigrants, most of whom were illiterate wage laborers, found work in the Chinatown restaurants, laundries, workshops or in homes as domestics.⁵⁷ Urbanization made it easier for the Chinese to start their own businesses as well.

In China, in accordance with Confucian doctrine, merchants occupied a very low social standing. Since ancient times, the nobility and the elite classes had viewed the shopkeepers with distrust. The profit motive was seen as exploitative and demeaning, conducive to moral decay, and an obstruction to social harmony.⁵⁸ Merchants were allowed to operate only within a very carefully supervised capacity and, as a class, they were subjected to discriminatory taxation. Further reducing the scope of the merchants' dealings, the government formed state monopolies in several of the more profitable commodities and industries.⁵⁹ Rich merchants were

denounced for their ostentatious dress and life styles, resulting in several laws to curb the extravagance displayed by these commoners.⁶⁰ The legal and social restrictions against the merchant class continued until the sixteenth century, when they gradually disappeared and society became more egalitarian. In time, commerce acquired a more favorable public image and delivered better returns. Wealthy families in the cities bought farmland for security and prestige, but their income was higher from commercial or moneylending ventures. Through the government examination system, wealth gave the merchant and the landholding classes access to status.⁶¹ One is left with the impression that the merchants who did not become rich remained at the low end of the social scale.

Since the elite classes, consisting of the scholars and officials, did not emigrate, the merchants in overseas Chinatowns became influential figures. A merchant's shop often became "a center for supplies, labor contracting, correspondence and communications."⁶² Moreover, if a Chinatown merchant became prosperous, he also became a moneylender, thus acquiring greater power among his countrymen.⁶³ The example of a successful Chinese entrepreneur rising to prominence in the community no doubt inspired others among his neighbors to enter the merchant class.

3. The Mexicans sought work in traditional occupations

such as mining and railroad work, but preferably in line with their experience in ranching. Washing and ironing other people's clothes for a living would not be a culturally acceptable alternative for a Mexican man. The Chinese, however, displayed no particular preference for the type of work they engaged in, and they proved to be resourceful and adaptable. Since a laundry required very little capital, it became a good entry business for the Chinese. If he had saved enough money, the Chinese man could open a restaurant or a grocery store instead.⁶⁴

4. Within the barrios the Catholic Church assumed the major guiding role and soon came to regulate the daily lives of the residents.⁶⁵ The priest became the authority figure; the allegiance of the people was to the Church. The barrio dwellers were not bound by the deeply emotional pride in group membership as were the Chinese, nor did they develop the cohesion which might have urged the Mexican residents toward enhanced striving in order to overcome handicaps. The Chinese had discovered this way to close ranks against discrimination. They faced rejection by the outer society with a grim determination and a sense of ethnic group honor. These attitudes prodded them to overcompensate and to put forth extra effort at whatever task lay before them.⁶⁶

E. Resistance

One marked contrast between the Mexican and the Chinese groups is the manner in which each reacted to the hostility of the Anglos, beginning with the Gold Rush of 1849. The imposition of the Foreign Miners' Tax in 1850, a \$20 monthly permit, caused many Mexicans to abandon the mines. This resulted in great losses to merchants in the lode area and they forced its repeal in 1851. As the Mexicans withdrew to their homeland or to the established settlements in California, the Chinese replaced them at the bottom of the social ladder. Later in 1851 the miners' tax was revived and the Chinese were taxed \$3 to \$5 a month.⁶⁷

Not all the Mexicans withdrew. Perhaps the best-known social bandit in California was Joaquín Murrieta, who was said to have spread terror in Calaveras County during 1852 and 1853. He was reported to have been a quiet Mexican miner whose claim had been jumped by Anglo miners, who also beat him, raped his wife and hanged his brother. From then on, Murrieta dedicated himself to killing Anglos to avenge his family honor. In 1853 the California legislature posted a \$1,000 reward and created

a special ranger force led by Captain Harry Love to capture Murrieta. Captain Love killed two Mexicans and brought back, in a jar of alcohol, the head of the one he claimed was Murrieta. The identity is still questioned.⁶⁸

Tiburcio Vásquez was another bandit-hero who was protected from the law by the Mexican community in California. After a killing in 1851, Vásquez began to rob stage coaches and to steal cattle. He spent time in San Quentin, but following a robbery and murders in 1873, he became notorious, with \$3000 offered for his capture. Vásquez was caught in 1874 and hanged the following year. Before he died, he left a statement explaining why he had turned to crime. Part of it reads:

A spirit of hatred and revenge took possession of me. I had numerous fights in defense of what I believed to be my rights and those of my countrymen. . . I believed that we were unjustly and wrongfully deprived of the social rights which belonged to us.⁶⁹

During the 1850s, outlaw guerrilla bands, many of which contained a hundred or more men, operated widely in California. Local county histories frequently mention such bandits as Murrieta, Vásquez, Luis Bulvia, Juan Flores, Propicio, Soto, Antonio Moreno, and Pancho Daniel, among others.⁷⁰ The Mexicans' social banditry was directed outwardly at the Anglos in revenge and as an expression of outrage against the abuses they were suffering. Very often

the bandit gangs took on a populist style, a "'Robin Hood' ideology of robbing the rich to feed the poor and an attack on civic or state officialdom who [were] regarded as intruders in the community's traditional way of life."⁷¹ A bad side-effect of this was that the bandits' activities reinforced the stereotype of violence most Anglos had of the Mexicans, who then became convenient scapegoats for retaliation by the Anglos against all Mexicans.⁷² Nevertheless, social bandits continued to be sheltered and protected for years by the Mexican community, which identified with them and supported their actions against a common oppressor.

The Chinese, on the other hand, did not resort to armed resistance against the outer society. In spite of being subjected to discrimination, they did not use confrontation or militant tactics, nor did they demand their rights or reforms. Instead, they withdrew, leaving the gold fields and the farms. Some went to the eastern states. They dispersed to seek employment elsewhere or to set up their own small businesses, keeping their contact with the hostile society to a minimum.⁷³ The violence of the tong wars (see p. 23) was confined to Chinatown where the aggression was directed inwardly, yet this produced a beneficial effect by strengthening the group. In contrast, the Mexican social bandits directed their violence outwardly at the Anglos, with a detrimental result of trig-

gering increased hostility and retaliation by the latter against the entire Mexican community.

Throughout history, the Mexican American barrios have been urban concentrations of poor people (see pp. 28, 16-17). These communities had no sources of wealth nor institutions of their own through which funds could be dispensed to help establish ethnic-owned businesses or industry.⁷⁴ The barrios were caught in a cycle of self-perpetuating poverty; there was nothing within them over which to fight. The anger and violence exploded outwardly.

F. Religion

At the time the United States annexed the Southwest, the Catholic Church in California was nearly devastated; after secularization in 1833 its properties had been expropriated or left to deteriorate. Shortages of priests and funds became severe problems when great waves of immigrants from Mexico arrived during the decades of 1910-1920s. American Catholicism, heavily Irish, probably appeared completely strange to the Mexican newcomers who were not used to supporting the Church financially, or attending Mass regularly. The Church was mainly concerned in giving religious instruction and the sacraments to the immigrants.

Because the Mexican population was at least ninety percent Roman Catholic⁷⁵ and the Anglo population in the Southwest was predominantly fundamentalist Protestant, there was a great deal of friction between them. Moreover, the Catholic Church began to promote actively the Americanization of the Mexican people, mainly to fend off Protestant missionaries and anti-Catholic public schools. During the mass repatriations of Mexicans in the 1930s, the Church made no public outcry about the illegality and injustice being

committed by the United States government. Nor was any sharp protest made publicly by the Church at the time of the "zoot suit riots" in 1943 in southern California (see pp. 75-76). The Church began a flurry of organization in the Mexican community, including classes in citizenship, English, and activities for the youth, obviously to demonstrate its desire to acculturate the Chicano congregation.

After World War II, the Church started a massive construction program of parochial schools in the Los Angeles area. Completed in 1960, the sponsors described it as a way to safeguard the Catholic faith of the Mexican Americans, but it may have also served to maintain the "cultural and social distinctiveness of Mexicans."⁷⁶

Early Chinese temples in America, known as "joss houses," were centers for the religious festivals and Chinese celebrations, following the pattern of Buddhist temples in the old country. The joss houses were maintained through donations from Chinese businessmen and Chinatown associations. Religion and superstition were used by the associations in their system of social control. The temples performed the two important functions of binding the Chinese community together and of providing comfort and entertainment to the Chinese immigrants.⁷⁷

The three main religions among the Chinese are:

1. Confucianism, which is not as much a religion as it is a collection of the teachings of Confucius, a great sage but not a divinity;

2. Taoism, a mystical religion, stressing a moral and ethical manner of living;

3. Buddhism, a religion from India that underwent changes in China.

Chinese religion embraces many gods, who are seen as dependent on the worshiper as he is on the gods. The Chinese have been able to accommodate all three forms of worship in one temple. Since there is no predominant religion among them, they tend to be tolerant of all religions.⁷⁸

During the late nineteenth century a few influential Protestant ministers led a drive for the conversion of the "heathen Chinese" in this country. Chinese missions were established that attracted Chinese as students, teachers and translators. However, the Chinese were drawn to the mission schools mainly to acquire a knowledge of the English language, seldom to learn about Christianity. These missions were perhaps the major force toward acculturation of the early Chinese.⁷⁹ In addition, the Protestant Chinese churches became a source of help to the Chinese immigrants and provided emergency services to them.⁸⁰ Many Chinese became Christian converts, at least nominally, but many others continued to worship in the traditional joss houses.⁸¹

G. Politics

Following the Mexican-American War, from 1848 to the mid-1870s, widespread disorder and violence swept through northern California as squatters and claim jumpers overwhelmed the law enforcement agencies trying to maintain order. Generally, force and suppression were used by the United States over the Mexicans, who lost their voice in government. In southern California, deemed arid and thus unattractive to settlers, less litigation arose over land problems. For nearly a generation after the Gold Rush few changes were seen, until a combination of disastrous weather and economic conditions during the 1860s and 1870s wiped out three-fourths of the Mexican ranchers. By the early 1880s, there were no persons with Spanish surnames left in political positions in southern California. The arrival of the railroad in 1869 to San Francisco and in 1876 to Los Angeles, that brought hundreds of thousands of Anglo settlers into the state, finally reduced the Mexicans to a helpless economic and political minority.⁸²

In addition to the use of violence and intimidation to suppress Mexican political activity, American hostility became institutionalized as early as 1890 through such devices as the

poll tax, economic sanctions, subterfuge, literacy tests, residence requirements and gerrymandering, some of which are still in effect.⁸³ The practice of gerrymandering has been common in the past because Mexican Americans (Chicanos) have traditionally voted in favor of the Democratic party, and the Democratic political leaders acted to disperse the Chicano vote by fragmenting heavily Chicano districts in order to ensure Democratic victories. The result has been that Chicano voting strength has been diluted and the community has been unable to elect its own candidates.

Consequently, since the turn of the century Chicanos have had a low rate of political participation. In addition, due to the poverty and lack of prestige of Mexican American residents which deterred them from entering political races, as well as the high percentage of foreign born or recent immigrants among them who were not eligible to vote, Chicanos became severely underrepresented in all sectors of government in the state. This created a stereotype of a people who are politically apathetic, an inaccurate portrayal of the Mexican American people.⁸⁴ Political organizations were in fact established early in the history of the barrios. Mutual aid societies, or mutualistas, rendered political as well as social benefits (see pp. 17-19). The Confederación de Uniones Obreras Mexicanas was formed in 1927 to help organize Chicano labor. During the 1930s, Mexican Americans were actively engaged in

the trade union movement. About this same time, the efforts to unite workers by the Catholic Church, the Industrial Workers of the World, El Congreso de Pueblos de Habla Española, and the Mexican American movement, were also obstructed by hostility from Anglos.⁸⁵

Mexicans who fled to this country during the Mexican Revolution (1910-1917) were usually disillusioned by the corruption in politics during the regime of the dictator Porfirio Díaz in that country. Due to that experience, as Miguel David Tirado explains, the word "political" was avoided in the title of Mexican associations formed in this country. Mexicans preferred to develop multipurpose organizations which served their social, economic, cultural and political needs. Thus many Mexican American associations whose titles do not indicate a political orientation may actually be heavily involved in political action at the grass roots level.⁸⁶ Examples of this may be seen in the Orden de Hijos de América, organized in 1921, which proposed to use its influence "in all fields of social, economic, and political action" in order to obtain benefits guaranteed by the American Constitution. It worked successfully to allow Chicanos to serve on juries. Later this association broke up and the dissenters founded the League of United Latin American Citizens (LULAC) in 1929. LULAC was committed to the assimilation of Mexican Americans into the

majority society and to the improvement of the Chicano's political and economic positions. The organization is still in existence. During the 1940s and 1950s, the Coordinating Council for Latin American Youth, the Unity Leagues, and the Community Service Organizations were founded in California, all with political and social motivation.

Soon after the first Foreign Miners' Tax was enacted in California, the state Supreme Court ruled in 1854 that Chinese were excluded from giving testimony in court. Renewed anti-Chinese hostility broke forth; Chinese people were beaten and robbed, sometimes killed, but they could not turn to the courts for protection.⁸⁷ Discriminatory laws against the Chinese continued to flow out of the California legislature: in 1855, a tax on immigrants; in 1858, a restriction against the entry of Chinese or Mongolians to California; in 1860, a fishing tax; and in 1862, a police tax. In 1870 the United States Senate denied the Chinese the right to become naturalized citizens, and finally in 1882 came the culmination: the Chinese Exclusion Law was passed, forbidding Chinese laborers to enter this country.

Through this institutionalized discrimination the Chinese people found they were unable to avail themselves of the judicial institutions and unable to participate in the political system so as to change the prejudicial laws. They sought insulation and protection within the Chinatowns, the ethnic

enclaves which operated under the unique social-political system of family, clan and district associations. This form of self-government, administered by their own leaders, permitted the residents to live with a measure of security and in accordance with their traditions until they were able to return to China (see pp. 20-22). Because the Chinese were unable to become citizens and thus were unable to vote, they were not recruited nor proselytized by political organizers in the cities.⁸⁸

In 1924 the United States reinforced the Immigration Act by incorporating into it previous anti-Chinese legislation. Aliens who were not eligible for United States citizenship were excluded and, furthermore, certain Chinese women were forbidden entry. In their isolation, political events in China drew more attention among the Chinese than political events in America occurring outside their doors. Mistakenly, the early Chinese appeared to be an apolitical population who chose to remain largely disengaged from the political scene.

III. THE CHICANOS AND THE CHINESE: 1960-1970

The Chicano population numbered over six million in the United States in 1973, and it is still heavily concentrated in the Southwest, the five states of California, Arizona, New Mexico, Texas and Colorado. More than twenty percent of all Chicanos live in the Los Angeles-Long Beach area. Another ten percent live in San Francisco, San Diego, San José, and in the Orange County area, all in California.⁸⁹ Preliminary figures from the 1980 United States Census indicate that in California the Latino population rose 92 percent over the last decade. In numbers, this was by far the largest increase of a minority group in the state, up from 2.37 million in 1970, to 4.54 million in 1980. About 19.2 percent of the state's population is now of Spanish-speaking origin.⁹⁰

The Chinese population is still concentrated in California. In 1970, the United States had 435,000 Chinese residents. Thirty-nine percent of these Chinese Americans lived in California, more than 88,000 in San Francisco and over 40,000 in the Los Angeles-Long Beach area.⁹¹

Both groups, the Chicano and the Chinese, have strong

language loyalty, contrary to the usual pattern of a gradual loss of old country language usage by succeeding generations in America. The retention of language is due, in part, to the segregated living conditions of these minorities and their desire to preserve their cultural identity as a means of solidarity, comfort, and a bulwark against prejudice. Also, for the Chinese who planned to return eventually to China, the education of the children in both English and Chinese schools was very important. It was felt that the American schools would provide the training useful for earning a living in China, while the Chinese language school would make it possible for the offspring to function in the parents' mother country.⁹²

For both groups the retention of language has been facilitated by the steady flow of visitors and immigrants from Mexico, Hongkong and both Republics of China, who bring a strong infusion of the cultures. In Chicano barrios in large cities, residents can avail themselves of radio broadcasts, television programs, Mexican films and daily newspapers, all entirely in the Spanish language. In 1960, Spanish accounted for 66 percent of the total foreign-language broadcasting in the United States, and 86 percent of the total in the West.⁹³ The constant input keeps the language, customs and other aspects of Mexican culture fresh in the community.

Although the Chicano and the Chinese populations continued to suffer hostility and discrimination, one hundred years

later there is a marked contrast between the economic and social conditions of the two groups.

A. Acculturation

Culture, Milton M. Gordon explains, is the social heritage of man; his values, morals, law, art and customs--in short, his beliefs and behavior acquired as a member of society. When groups of people who have different cultures come into prolonged first-hand contact, the changes that occur in the cultural patterns of any or all of the groups is called acculturation. Also known as cultural assimilation, acculturation is an adaptation of a group's or a person's behavior or beliefs to another set of behaviors or beliefs. In actual practice, the process generally occurs when a minority group arrives in a foreign setting and adapts to the core culture, or is conquered and absorbed. In the United States the core culture is WASP: White Anglo-Saxon Protestant. Cultural assimilation is the method by which immigrant people acquire the knowledge necessary to survive in the new society--the language, the dress, the rules of the community. It is a process of adaptation by the minority to the standards of the majority. Acculturation may progress steadily through one or two generations, with intervening stages, leading to complete

assimilation into the mainstream of the majority culture, or it may stop indefinitely at a certain stage.⁹⁴

Assimilation occurs when the minority group discards all its cultural traits, all traces of distinctiveness, and adopts the identity, values and behavior patterns of the majority. Not until the minority is accepted completely in the dominant society without encountering prejudice or discrimination can it be stated that assimilation has occurred.⁹⁵ Structural assimilation is achieved when the minority group has full entrance into the social institutions of the dominant society on a primary group level.⁹⁶

Amalgamation results when minority groups combine with the existing groups through intermarriage to produce a genetically and culturally new synthesis.

Cultural pluralism is the coexistence of minority groups, at peace with each other and with the majority society, each retaining its individual identity. The minority groups would have to undergo a certain amount of acculturation to be able to function satisfactorily in the new society.⁹⁷ Cultural pluralism, rather than assimilation, appears to be the most promising pattern for ethnic communities in America. The idea of cultural assimilation in a pluralistic setting appeals to ethnic groups who want to conserve as much of their cultural heritage as possible while accommodating themselves pragmati-

cally to the realities of Anglo society. As Irving M. Levine, director of the American Jewish Committee's Institute on Pluralism and Group Identity explains,

America needs a pluralism that accepts cultural and lifestyle differences. With the participation of informal support systems--self-help associations, religious groups, extended family networks and others--it can both sustain ethnic consciousness and develop a sense of American identity among our ethnic minorities.⁹⁸

The coping techniques used by each group have differed. Within the Chicano community, there are five general groups in different stages of acculturation at the present time: (1) the Mexicanos, both long-time residents and recent immigrants, the majority of whom are still Mexican citizens and still tied to the Mexican homeland; (2) the Mexican Americans, the native born Chicanos, who are becoming increasingly "politically aware, conscious of the social problems surrounding them, seeking outlets for their frustration, some young, some old activists;"⁹⁹ (3) the Mexican illegales, the undocumented workers who seek shelter in the barrios and assistance in finding jobs. These workers are typically young males who migrate without their families, with the sole aim of getting employment in this country;^{*} (4) the Chicano school dropouts who are unemployed,

^{*}This group corresponds roughly to the early Chinese sojourner in its purpose, although the illegales are more likely to return to their own country than the Chinese were able to do.

angry and alienated from the outer society. Without a good grasp of either Spanish or English and with little education or training, these restless youth are facing a bleak future. Some endure the frustration of competing with other unskilled workers for menial jobs, while others turn to petty crime in barrio gangs, whose activities often escalate into violence. (5) Among the Chicano middle class, one sees a situation similar to that of the Chinese middle class. Most of the Chicanos who have achieved professional or managerial status have moved from the barrios to more desirable residential areas. Many still maintain ties with the barrio through relatives or friends who remain behind.

Native born Chicanos who have openly rejected their Mexican heritage are called vendidos, meaning those who have "sold out." This term is pejorative and denotes a sense of betrayal and contempt felt by the Chicano community toward someone who discards his culture and values. A vendido may also be a Tío Taco, also a derogatory epithet, indicating an individual who aligns himself with the dominant society in ethnic disputes.

A curious parallel is seen in the derisive labels which the foreign born and the native born of the Chicanos and the Chinese apply to each other. The American born Chinese are called jook-sing, meaning the hollow part of a bamboo stalk, with the implication that they are empty of the cultural tradi-

tions of China. The foreign born Chinese are called jook-
kock, which means a bamboo joint that is stiff and unyielding.¹⁰⁰
The same situation existed in the Chicano barrios a generation
or so ago between the native born Chicanos, who were called
pochos, and the Mexican born, who were called cholos, both
derisive slang terms. The expression cholo has come to mean a
"chuke," or pachuco, a Chicano neighborhood youth, not neces-
sarily a member of a gang. These slang terms are not widely
used outside the barrios. Replacing them are the more accept-
able Mexicano and Chicano to indicate persons who are foreign
born or native born. There is a growing tendency among Chi-
canos to classify themselves as members of a cultural identity
rather than as persons who were born in a certain place. Chi-
canismo and its variants of the idea of brotherhood among all
people of Mexican ancestry, carnalismo and La Raza, have had a
unifying effect. Joan Moore wrote, "Chicanismo emphasizes the
concept of la raza--and it rejects materialistic standards of
individualistic self-achievement. Rather, collective orienta-
tion based on la raza are more valuable standards."¹⁰¹ This
perception of brotherhood, together with an aggressive demand
for economic equality, social justice for all Chicanos and, at
times, a militant nationalism, are elements of the Chicanismo
movement.

For the Chinese, acculturation progressed in identifiable stages. The first stage was that of the sojourner. This immigrant wanted to remain Chinese, therefore he surrounded himself in a Chinese world in order to preserve his culture intact. He usually lived, worked, and found recreation in Chinatown.¹⁰² The next stage of acculturation was the bound individual, who served as liaison between his culture and the outside world, but was still dependent on his own kind for his sustenance and for his social needs. Next came the emerged person, who adapted to the American society but still retained his own culture. The final stage, the converted, was the native born individual who had fully assimilated into the American mainstream. However, as Betty Lee Sung observed, "for the Chinese in the United States, the unalterable factor of physical differentiation is the impediment to the normal process of assimilation."¹⁰³

Beginning in 1943, United States immigration restrictions were relaxed to allow a quota of 105 Chinese to enter once more. The number of Chinese family units increased and traditional values became a force in Chinese American society. Among other values, the Chinese prize educational achievement most highly. The young were exhorted to study hard and aim for college, and thus they would be prepared when opportunities presented themselves.

The Chinatown population contains four groups: (1) the old bachelors who live in poor quarters, who are often ill with tuberculosis, and who commit suicide at an alarmingly high rate; (2) the owners of businesses who ply the tourist trade; (3) the new immigrants from Hongkong and Taiwan who, having neither trade skills nor a knowledge of English, are unable to enter the American job market and so become trapped in the ghetto. Angry and militant, they challenge the power cliques of Chinatown in a struggle for independence and identity; (4) the native born Chinese school dropouts who are estranged from their foreign born peers by customs and language. Their own lack of education keeps them from achieving success in or out of Chinatown.¹⁰⁴

Generally, the second and third generations of Chinese Americans who are well educated and have good positions or professions, have left the Chinatowns for the suburbs. Today, the Chinese who have joined the American middle class can live in the finer neighborhoods.¹⁰⁵ Due to the gradual process of acculturation, a difference of social outlook has split the Chinese community into roughly three factions. Those who live within Chinatown as well as those who have moved out are divided into traditionists, modernists, and activists. Melford S. Weiss points out that as used by other social scientists, these terms usually refer to generational categories: the traditionists as immigrants and the modernists as native born.

Weiss uses these terms to refer to cultural identity, rather than to generation, age or residence. The traditionists then are those Chinese who are most concerned with the preservation of Chinese heritage and who adhere to the Chinese way of life. Their associations support the Chinese language school, events which depict Chinese history and identity, and they sponsor the showing of Chinese language films on a regular basis. Many of these active traditionists are foreign born and speak Chinese primarily.

The modernists include Chinese who have achieved success in the American economic world while working within the system and who are following an American life style. Their organizations are concerned with maintaining both an American and a Chinese identity, and are centered around the members' social and recreational needs. The activists, usually college students who are not comfortable with either the traditionist or modernist philosophies, can join Asian-American groups. These young adults are ethnically marginal individuals; they are the most acculturated group yet they stress pride in their Chinese heritage and they seek to expose discrimination against their race. They have worked to establish ethnic study courses at universities, provided financial help for students and interpretation aid for immigrants, and they are involved in many other cultural activities. These activists have rejected the values of their forebears, and the elders in turn resent the

"lack of respect" of the young and their tendency to stir up controversies. As to the future of the activists, Weiss says it is difficult to predict.

These groups have but a brief social history and their growth and development will be dependent upon changes in the university and in the larger society. An educated guess is that. . . they will grow in numbers. 106

B. Education

The Chicanos drop out of high school at the highest rate of any ethnic group in the nation. According to the estimates of the United States Commission on Civil Rights of 1971, only sixty Chicano children will graduate from high school out of every hundred who enter first grade, while sixty-seven Black and eighty-six Anglo youngsters will graduate.¹⁰⁷ Documented charges that have been made against the schools are: suppressing the Spanish language, channeling Chicano children into vocational training instead of into college preparatory courses, using culturally-biased tests, underfunding of barrio schools, neglecting Chicano studies, denigrating Chicano culture, and in general, pushing Chicano students out of school.¹⁰⁸ A student who has been a victim of such school tactics as these has a high probability of developing a negative self-image. He may drop out of school to escape the stressful environment, only to fall into the traps of unemployment or of barrio youth gangs (see pp. 49-50 and 76). After being pushed out of school and into this cycle of defeat, a barrio youth would be led to believe that education has no value at all.

The educational picture of the Chicano is slowly improving. In March 1976, the following percentages of Chicanos of both sexes had completed one or more years of college, according to age:¹⁰⁹

<u>Age</u>	<u>Total in 1,000s</u>	<u>Percentage</u>
14 and over	4,215	10.3
14-19	876	1.9
20-24	637	19.9
25+	2,701	10.8
25-34	979	17.7
25-29	564	18.6
30-34	415	16.5
35-44	691	9.7
45-64	802	5.8
65+	230	1.9

The statistics above indicate that in 1976, nearly one-fifth of 637 thousand Chicanos between the ages of twenty and twenty-four had completed one or more years of college. The percentage figures remain in double digits to the age of thirty-four, showing an encouraging picture of young Chicanos who continued on to higher education. After the age of thirty-five, however, the rate plummets all the way to 1.9 percent for those sixty-five years of age and older. This reflects the fact that the older generations, today's grandparents and great-grandparents, seldom enrolled in college.

In a category titled "Persons of Spanish language or Spanish surname," the 1970 United States Census enumerated people whose origins were in any of the Spanish-speaking countries, including Mexico. In California the population of

Mexican origin far outnumbers the others within this classification. Bearing this in mind, the following compilation offers a comparison of the educational attainment in California of persons of both sexes, twenty-five years or over, in 1970:¹¹⁰

	<u>White</u>	<u>Persons of Spanish language or Spanish surname</u>	<u>Chinese</u>
Total number of persons:	9,852,177	1,358,628	88,307
Less than five years elementary school:	4.0%	14.9%	18.5%
High school, four years or more:	63.6	40.9	21.7
College, four years or more:	13.8	5.7	21.2

While the Chinese population has the highest percentage of college graduates, it also has the highest percentage of persons with less than five years of elementary school. Betty Lee Sung offers the explanation that this may be due to the majority of older immigrants born in China when only the wealthy could afford to educate their children. Scholars and learning are viewed with deep respect by the Chinese people, and they have always urged their children to excel in their studies and to plan for college. In earlier times, Chinese children attended daily American public school, then they went to a Chinese language school for two hours of daily instruction, including Saturday mornings. After six years in Chinese school, children could read Chinese, and they had some knowledge of Chinese

history and culture.¹¹¹

The disparity in the scholastic achievement between the Chinese and the Chicanos raises some questions: How were the Chinese students able to overcome the obstacles created by discrimination against them in school? What impelled them to stay in school and continue on to higher education? Why were the Chicano students not able to attain as high an educational level as the Chinese? The following observations are based on the historical and cultural differences of the two minorities, and although there may be other factors or variables which also contribute to the differences, the main points of comparison occur in (1) the time lapse between the urbanization of the two groups; (2) the degree of control of their schools by the two communities; (3) the importance of role models; (4) the results of affluence and the effects of poverty and racism.

1. The Time Lapse Between the Urbanization of the Two Groups

When the Chinese were driven out of the mines and farms by racist attacks, they fled to the cities and enclosed themselves in ethnic ghettos which came to be called "Chinatowns" (see pp. 20-23). Following the customs of their villages in China, they established a complicated mesh of clan associations, which in the new setting served as a form of self-government. In this manner the Chinese were left alone to form their own institutions and more importantly, to retain social control of them. San Francisco's Chinatown developed at a steady pace

from 1850 to 1900.¹¹² By 1970, 97 percent of the Chinese Americans lived in urban areas.¹¹³

Urbanization occurred much later for the Mexicans. During the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, immigrants from Europe to America usually found their way to the cities and obtained jobs in industry. In contrast to this pattern, Mexican immigrants gravitated to the rural areas and to agricultural work.¹¹⁴ Before World War II, immigrants from Mexico were heavily concentrated in migratory farm work. This work was seasonal, over routes that extended the length of California. A large percentage of the Chicano migrant workers moved from place to place in family units, a custom seldom seen among other ethnic groups.¹¹⁵ Naturally, these seasonal migrations disrupted the children's attendance at school. Mexicans were also drawn into mining and railroad work, which often required living in isolated areas with its attendant problems (see pp. 25-26). Although during the 1920s Mexicans moved to the cities in substantial numbers, the mass movement of Mexicans into urban areas did not occur until the period between 1950 and 1960, almost a century after the Chinese had settled into central city ghettos.

The importance of urbanization of an ethnic group in the United States lies in the fact that the cities offer a greater variety of social services and increased opportunities for acculturation. Generally, jobs are more plentiful and

wages are better than those found in rural areas. With the experience of one hundred years of urban living, the Chinese community became aware of which occupational and educational avenues they should pursue to upward mobility and its benefits. During the same one hundred years, however, a significant part of the Mexican population remained in the relative isolation of the rural outskirts.

2. The Degree of Control of Their Schools
by the Two Communities

The Chinatowns became very tightly-knit communities under the firm control of the Chinese Benevolent Association and its web of subordinate organizations. Merchants and associations contributed to projects for the improvement of the community, and in short order, Chinese language schools were founded within the ghettos. Having settled in urban locales, the Chinese were able to ensure that their children would attend both American public school and their own Chinese language school with regularity. The Chinese schools were supported financially by the Chinese Benevolent Association, with additional help from the tsus (the family associations), private donors, and from fund raising events.¹¹⁶ In this way, no Chinese youngster was refused instruction in the Chinese school because of his family's lack of funds.

For the Mexicans, the situation was quite different. In the frontier areas, the prevalent attitude was that formal education was not a matter of high priority. Priests and missionaries provided a basic schooling for the children of the prominent families. During the early nineteenth century a few public schools were established in California, but they soon closed because teachers were scarce.¹¹⁷ Very few Mexican-administered Spanish language schools existed, and these were in isolated places. Moreover, the government had little inclination to install social state services in the regions where the Mexicans settled.¹¹⁸ Years later, therefore, in the barrios of rural areas, segregated and inferior public schools were the general rule. Often the urban barrio schools were little better. These inequities went uncorrected for decades because the barrios had developed without leadership or resources (see pp. 16-17, 28), and thus the Chicano community had no power base from which to confront the outer society and obtain redress.

3. The Importance of Role Models

Historically, China has held scholars and learning in great reverence. The Han Dynasty which emerged in 202 B.C., led by a commoner, Liu Pang, marked the rise of scholarship. To justify its rule, this dynasty compiled a body of established doctrines which contained the teachings of Confucius and included opinions on morals, manners and government. Over

the centuries this canon produced respect for learning and the scholar became identified with the gentleman. Another result of the canon was a rise in power of the huge bureaucracy of scribes which dominated Chinese life and thought until modern times. Learning became the tool of the rulers.¹¹⁹ Familiarity with the classical texts was an absolute requirement for members of the ruling classes of China. The government examinations, forerunners of the modern civil service examinations, determined who could hold high office and be accepted into elite status. Candidates had to belong to the aristocracy and had to be knowledgeable about classical dictates dealing with religious, ceremonial and political matters. After the T'ang Dynasty (618 to 907 A.D.), commoners were allowed to compete in the government examinations as well; however, only the wealthy could afford to educate their children.¹²⁰ Education was therefore seen as a privilege and an honor. The scholar became the ultimate role model for Chinese men and his sons. Although most of the immigrants from China were poor people without learning, they came imbued with the certainty that education was the key to success in life.

In contrast, history did not provide Mexico with a strong role model for scholars as developed in China. During the Spanish Colonial period (1519-1821), the Roman Catholic Church built and administered the schools in Mexico, its main

purpose being the propagation of Catholicism. In 1551 the University of Mexico was founded, the first on the North American continent, but the school system throughout Mexico remained inadequate. The Indians were encouraged to develop their talents in the visual arts rather than in intellectual pursuits, thus the Church architecture flourished while the literacy rate remained low. Education was removed from the control of the Church in 1824, but it was not until Presidents Benito Juárez and Alvaro Obregón actively promoted secular education that it made some headway against the problems of illiteracy and lack of school attendance. In 1958 the government calculated that at least three million children (40 percent of the total number), were not attending school. In 1960, the literacy rate of the Mexican population was 62 percent--nearly four out of every ten persons in Mexico were unable to read or write.¹²¹

4. The Results of Affluence and the Effects of Poverty and Racism

The Chinese American graduates, after obtaining good positions, seldom lost time in leaving Chinatown to disperse into the better residential districts. In these good areas, their children attended schools which offered superior facilities, good curricula and adequate staffs for the predominantly Anglo student bodies. The Chinese students entered a superior learning environment and with guidance from their

education-oriented parents, they responded fully. The high percentage of college graduates of Chinese descent attests to that fact (see p. 58). Third and fourth generation Chinese Americans have set a pattern of aiming for professional status and affluence through higher education. Notwithstanding the small percentage of Chinese American youth who drop out of school and become delinquents (see pp. 53, 79), there is no reason to doubt that the majority of their children will continue to follow the more worthy example before them.

Poverty has been pervasive among the Chicanos of the Southwest for at least one hundred years, and all sources indicate that it will continue to afflict the lives of most Chicanos for some time to come.¹²² Poor barrios are allocated poor facilities, such as inadequate schools and health centers. Poor people often suffer from malnutrition and this can affect a child's learning ability; diets which are low in caloric content reduce a child's energy. Observations that Chicano children are "inactive, compliant, and silent" may indicate the effects of malnutrition¹²³ rather than traits common to all Mexican Americans. Poverty that forces children to be put to work in order that the family can survive economically, and racism, in the form of inferior and segregated schools, play a large part in pushing the Chicano students out of school. Four out of ten Chicanos drop out before they complete high school, only to become

trapped in a lifetime of occupational dead-ends. The irregular school attendance and the high dropout rate of Chicano students have led to an erroneous conclusion that Mexican Americans do not place a high value on educational achievement. The causes of these failures appear to be rooted in poverty and in the adverse effects of racism, and not in a cultural assumption that education is of little value.

C. Employment

The following is a comparison of education, employment and income of selected ethnic groups in the United States in 1970, according to the Bureau of the Census: ¹²⁴

	<u>Total Population</u>	<u>Anglo</u>	<u>Chinese</u>	<u>Mexican</u>
<u>Population, all persons, in 1000s:</u>	203,212	87.4% 177,749	0.2% 435	2.2% 4,532
<u>Median years school completed</u>				
Persons 25 years old and over:	12.1	12.1	12.4	8.1
Persons 25-44 years old:	12.4	12.4	13.0	9.4
<u>Non-workers to workers ratio:</u>	1.45	1.42	1.23	2.04
<u>Income in 1969</u>				
Median family income:	\$9,590	103% \$9,961	110% \$10,610	72½% \$6,962
Families below poverty level:	10.7%	8.6%	10.3%	24.4%

Of the three ethnic groups above, the fact that the Mexican community lags far behind in the number of school years

completed is reflected in its lower family income, while the reverse is true regarding the Chinese population. The lowest percentage of families below the poverty level is in the Anglo group, but nearly one-fourth of the Mexican families is below the poverty line. Bleaker still is the plight of the rural Chicano families, whose income was \$5220 compared to \$7390 for urban Chicano families in 1970. Although the vast majority of the Chicanos have been urban dwellers for several decades, they continue to be over-represented in agricultural work. Six percent of California's Spanish surnamed wage earners were engaged in farm work, while only two percent of the workers in the state's general population held jobs in agriculture, as shown in the 1970 Census figures. This situation existed nationwide that year (see p. 69), and to the present time, the majority of the farm workers in California are Chicanos.

The average level of education of the Chicanos hinders them greatly in the employment field. The trend in job opportunities in business is toward salaried management positions, but the educational requirements restrict the number of Chicanos who can fill these jobs.¹²⁵ Since the 1940s, Chicanos have improved their education and training. They are slowly entering into white collar work as well as into the crafts, the best paid of the manual occupations.¹²⁶ Nevertheless, the gap remains wide between the Chicano and the worker in the general population in the top positions, as illustrated by the following comparison in the occupational field:¹²⁷

Total Employed Persons, 16 Years
Old and Over, in the United
States, March 1976

	<u>Total Population</u>	<u>Mexican</u>
	154,094,000	3,906,000
 <u>Occupation (%)</u>		
<u>White collar:</u>	50.8%	27.3%
Professionals	15.7	5.7
Managers	10.8	4.7
Sales	6.3	3.0
Clerical	18.0	13.9
 <u>Blue collar:</u>	 32.6	 49.9
Craftsmen	12.8	13.4
Operatives	15.1	26.7
Non-farm laborers	4.7	9.8
 <u>Service workers:</u>	 13.9	 16.4
 <u>Farm laborers and managers:</u>	 2.9	 6.3

As demonstrated above, while half of the American workers are in the white collar positions, the Mexican workers are concentrated in the blue collar field. In nearly every major field of employment, Chicanos tend to hold less desirable jobs, those which pay less and have lower prestige. Even when they work in the same occupations, with identical job classifications within these occupations, the Chicanos' salaries are usually lower than those of Anglos.¹²⁸ This occurs not only in California, where in 1969 the Chicano's income was 73 per-

cent of the Anglo's, but in the entire Southwest, where the Chicano's income was 66 percent of the Anglo's income. This is explained in part by the employee selection process known as the "queuing theory of worker allocation," described as follows:¹²⁹

Mexican Americans are disproportionately employed in low-wage or marginal firms. Firms which offer high or standard wages tend to reject job applicants from this group either because of their ethnicity or because the applicants are unable to meet job qualification standards--usually educational standards. Thus, the employee selection process shunts disproportionate numbers of Mexican-American job seekers to businesses in highly competitive industries, to non-union employers, and to small firms. These three types of employers . . . pay typically lower wages and offer less security of employment.¹³⁰

While the participation rates of male Hispanics and Anglos in the labor market were similar, the rate at which Chicanas participated was much lower than that of Anglo women in all cases, rural or urban dwellers, and at all ages. Cultural factors tended to keep Chicanas, as well as Chinese women, at home, but since the 1960s both groups of women have been entering the work force in increasing numbers. In the Southwest, the unemployment rate in 1970 was from 25 to 100 percent higher for male Mexican Americans than for Anglos, however, for Mexican American women the unemployment rate was higher than for the males.¹³¹

Further complicating the field of employment for Chicanos is the fact that undocumented workers from Mexico arrive at a rate which has been estimated at 600,000 per year.¹³² Actually, in 1976, 870,000 undocumented workers were caught by the

United States Immigration Service; 90 percent of the aliens were Mexican.¹³³ Although these are short-term workers (Mexicans stay an average of 2.4 years; one-third of them stay three to twenty years),¹³⁴ the fact remains that this stream of people from Mexico is composed mainly of unskilled or low-skilled laborers who lack knowledge of English. In the border towns there is the additional competition from the "green carders," Mexican workers with green identification cards, whose status is that of legal immigrants entitled to work in the United States. An estimated 50,000 to 70,000 of these commuters cross the border daily to their jobs in this country. Commuters with white cards are restricted to visits of 72 hours within 25 miles of the border, and they are enjoined from working in the United States. However, violations of these restrictions are frequent.¹³⁵

For the Chinese, a totally different picture emerges in the employment area. World War II helped open some doors for them, and by the late 1960s, Chinese were found in high level positions in American industry, government and education. According to the 1970 United States Census, more than one out of four employed male first generation Chinese were in the professional category. This compares with the general population, of which one employed male out of seven was in the professions. Among first generation Chicanos, the figure was one in every thirty.¹³⁶

Compared below are the percentages of Anglo and Chinese employed persons of both sexes, 16 years and older, according to occupation in the United States in 1970:¹³⁷

United States Employment, 1970

<u>Occupation (%)</u>	<u>Anglo</u>	<u>Chinese</u>
<u>White collar:</u>	51%	56.2%
Professionals	15	25.3
Managers	11	8.5
Sales	7	4.6
Clerical	18	17.8
<u>Blue collar:</u>	34	22.3
Craftsmen	14	5.0
Operatives	17	15.0
Non-farm laborers	4	2.3
<u>Service workers:</u>	11	20.5
<u>Farm laborers and managers:</u>	4	.6

These figures indicate that a majority of Chinese workers were in white collar jobs in 1970, in a higher percentage than Anglo workers. There were proportionately more Chinese than Anglo workers in service jobs in this country. During the same year in California, the numbers of Anglo and Chinese persons employed in professional and administrative positions were as follows:

California Employment, 1970¹³⁸

	<u>Anglo</u>	<u>Chinese</u>
Total number of persons employed, 16 years or older:	6,753,659	72,739
Professional, technical:	1,200,874 17.78%	15,732 21.63%
Managers, administrators, except farm:	664,791 9.8%	5,976 8.2%
Median income of families in California, in all types of employment:	\$11,550	\$10,920

These statistics illustrate that the Chinese population placed over one-fifth of its employed members in the professional field in this state, in contrast to less than eighteen percent of the Anglo residents. In turn, the latter group had a slightly higher proportion of the administrative and managerial positions. In 1970 the unemployment rate for Chinese in the United States was well below the national average.¹³⁹

D. Problems and Conflicts

Chicanos live in badly overcrowded conditions. When the norm of more than one person per room is adopted as an indication of over-occupancy, the rate of overcrowding among the Spanish surnamed group in 1960 was more than four times the Anglo rate. Overcrowding is due to two factors: one is the large size of Chicano families and, second, Chicanos tend to live in smaller housing units.¹⁴⁰ Discrimination in housing, too, plays a part in preventing Chicanos from obtaining better living quarters. Chicanos with dark skin are more likely to have problems buying or renting than those who have lighter skin. The discrimination against Chicanos is generally not as severe as that suffered by Blacks.¹⁴¹

Social services are inadequate in Mexican American communities. For example, it was not until 1967 that the Los Angeles County Department of Mental Health established a regional mental health service in East Los Angeles to serve a population of over 341,000, of which 76 percent were Spanish surnamed at that time.¹⁴²

Law enforcement officers have found that they are more likely to find a law breaker if they search for him in the poor neighborhoods. Therefore everyone who is poor, or who looks poor, comes under suspicion. The stereotype persists that the Chicano is not only poor but is also inclined toward violence and consequently is dangerous.¹⁴³ The result is perceived in the barrio as undue harassment by the law.

In 1969, Chicanos comprised only 3.3 percent of the patients in California mental hospitals, a very low proportion of the population. Yet in the prisons and jails, 8,000 out of 40,000 adult parolees and prisoners in California were Chicanos, the majority for narcotic offenses. Armando Morales explains that this does not mean Chicanos use narcotics more than other groups. "These symptoms are defined by society as criminal for the poor and re-defined as medical problems for the affluent."¹⁴⁴

Among other causes of serious problems in Chicano neighborhoods, Leonard Pitt observed that

Lack of education among Mexican American youths weighs down upon most of them like an incubus and prevents them from competing for decent jobs. . . Serious crime and law enforcement problems still strain the mutually exclusive patience of youth and of officers of the law. Young men and women still feel displaced, resentful at the dominant group and thus inclined toward occasional irrational outbursts.¹⁴⁵

Early in the 1940s a youth gang became highly visible in the barrios of Los Angeles. They were the pachucos, who were mainly a group who socialized together and wore distinctive zoot

suits. In June 1943, the pachucos were attacked by Anglo servicemen and the police during a bloody week of street riots. This display of vigilantism was a result of racial prejudice, stimulated by police acts and by inflammatory newspaper articles. In more recent times, some barrio gangs have turned to violence, gang against gang, and occasionally against a bystander as well. Data compiled by the Sheriff's Department show that Los Angeles County had 351 gang-related homicides in 1980 and 292 in 1981. Sixty-nine of the eighty-nine street gangs in the city of Los Angeles were Hispanic, another seventeen were Black, and three were Asian, according to the Los Angeles Police Department.¹⁴⁶ Concerned citizens have initiated projects that will involve the gang members in more worthwhile activities in order to reduce the violence.¹⁴⁷

In the system of justice, glaring inequities continue. The report of the United States Commission on Civil Rights issued in March 1970, called "Mexican Americans and the Administration of Justice in the Southwest," found evidence of physical and verbal abuse of Chicanos by police, inadequate protection of Chicano neighborhoods, interference with Chicano organizational efforts, under-representation of Chicanos on juries, deprivation of their rights to bail, counsel and interpreters, and exclusion of Chicanos from full participation in law enforcement agencies.¹⁴⁸

A report on a study titled "The Hispanic Victim," based on Census Bureau interviews with more than 60,000 households during a six-year period ending in 1978, showed that in the United States Hispanics are victims of more robberies, burglaries, household larceny and auto thefts than non-Hispanics, and by a substantial margin in each case. A Justice Department official said that police chiefs were aware of this situation, but "economic and political clout determine who gets the extra police manpower and financial resources."¹⁴⁹

The Chinese people constructed a myth about their Chinatowns, promoting the idea of "social propriety, communal self-help, familial solidarity and a low crime rate" among its citizens, all designed to counteract the vicious stereotypes about the Chinese. They substituted a favorable image for an unfavorable one, and thus maintained the community's privacy. The San Francisco city fathers believed that Chinatown had its problems under control, and relaxed their attitude toward the largest Chinatown in the nation.¹⁵⁰

The truth is that the Chinese family structure and sub-cultural values are in transition. Although Chinese children are usually well behaved, strains have developed between parents and offspring as the process of Americanization has progressed. Marginality and conflicts over strict parental control have caused stress. The fact that mothers were beginning to work outside the

home and had less time to supervise their children, resulted in flare-ups of rebellion among the young.¹⁵¹ Some of the college age Chinese reject the middle class dream of the previous generations, and juvenile delinquency is on the rise.¹⁵² Other problems hidden in the ghetto are that many of the Chinese immigrants are aged, and most of the elderly have very low incomes. There are three men to one woman over sixty-five years of age. Prior to 1960, the old sojourners had a very high rate of narcotic addiction.¹⁵³

Housing is extremely crowded. As an example, the Chinatown in San Francisco has a density greater than in any part of the city and second only to Manhattan. In Chinatown there are 120 to 179.9 persons per gross acre compared to 24.6 persons per gross acre citywide. Most of the buildings are nearly fifty years old, 77 percent of them are substandard, and 60 percent of the housing lacks bathrooms. Many are without heat, natural light, or cooking facilities. Medical facilities in Chinatown are inadequate and some are substandard. Chinatown has the highest suicide and tuberculosis rates in the nation. There are an estimated 120 to 180 garment sweatshops in the San Francisco Chinatown, isolated from unions, city regulations and inspectors. All these conditions are enclosed in the ghetto, sheltered from official eyes by a power ring that is not found in any other ethnic community in the United States.¹⁵⁴

During the 1940s and 1950s, juvenile delinquency was very low among the Chinese. This was partly due to the fact that there were few adolescents in Chinese neighborhoods in this country as a result of the immigration exclusion laws. After the entry restrictions were lifted, more children began to appear, with concomitant problems. Although relatively low, juvenile delinquency among the Chinese in San Francisco is rising, and the offenses are of an increasingly serious nature.¹⁵⁵

A view of this situation in the 1960s is offered in the essay, "Red Guard on Grant Avenue: The Rise of Youthful Rebellion in Chinatown," by Stanford M. Lyman. It points out that juvenile delinquency was on the rise in San Francisco, where gangs of underemployed, unskilled youth, native and foreign born, have formed. These Chinese youngsters are mostly of deprived backgrounds. From the late 1950s to the early 1960s, they engaged in all forms of theft, assault and battery, as well as other offenses within Chinatown. By the middle of the 1960s, the gangs had begun to operate outside Chinatown. Despite the formation of an organization called Leway that sought to prevent crime, the violence increased through 1968 and 1969. After Leway folded, the Red Guard gang of juveniles was formed, patterned after the Black Panthers and advocating chaos and revolution. Red Guard sought power instead of material rewards, and it challenged the power structure of Old Chinatown and the

outer society. Other gangs such as the Brothers Ten, the Country Club Boys, Project 895s, Project 880s, and the Drifters (the latter a group of about twenty young motorcyclists), have formed since the late 1960s and are also involved in rebellion and petty criminality. The Hwa Ching, a loosely-knit group of mostly Hongkong-born youth, was formed in 1967. Its membership fluctuated between 25 to 300 young men who gathered at an espresso house in San Francisco's Chinatown. The native born Chinese gangs called the Hwa Ching members "Chinabugs," and attached them in gang fights. In 1968 the Hwa Ching group requested funds from the Chinese Six Companies and from public agencies to start an educational training program for immigrant youth, but they were turned down. The Hwa Ching disbanded in 1969; some members returned to street crime, while most of the others joined two powerful secret societies, the Suey Sing and Hop Sing Tongs. Traditionally, these tongs would "buy the muscle to keep control of their own interests."¹⁵⁶

During the 1970s, San Francisco's Chinatown could no longer ignore nor deny the fact that it had a "youth problem." William Albert Allard states in his article, "Chinatown, the Gilded Ghetto":

Gang wars flare among a few hundred young Chinese immigrants, drawn into Chinatown's web of gambling. They quarrel over jobs and money handed out by an older underworld establishment--and themselves bear the brunt of the bloodshed. . . Street gangs with members as young as 12

have been heavily involved in crime, and in open warfare among themselves; more than 35 young people have died by such violence since 1973.¹⁵⁷

In a bloody climax on September 4, 1977, several foreign born Chinese teenagers burst into the Golden Dragon Restaurant seeking revenge on a rival gang. They opened fire on the crowd, killing five bystanders and wounding eleven others in the worst mass murder in the city's history.¹⁵⁸ Four members of the Joe Boys' gang were convicted of murder in the case.

E. Religion

Generally, the Roman Catholic Church has not been able to mediate or improve matters between Anglos and Chicanos. It has displayed a lack of interest in the social welfare of the parishioners in California. The strongest social moves of the Church have been made on behalf of the farm workers, beginning around 1954, and later during the organizing efforts of César Chávez and his United Farm Workers. Consequently, the Catholic community felt a rising concern with the manner in which the Church functioned in rural and city barrios. In 1969, PADRES, an association of Spanish-speaking priests, was formed to voice that concern.¹⁵⁹ Another source of grievance is that the Church did not exert much effort to bring Chicanos into the institution; Mexican Americans are greatly under-represented in the priesthood. This led to several protests in 1969 and 1970 in Los Angeles by a Chicano activist group, Católicos por La Raza, and by an Anglo organization, Concerned Catholics, seeking that more Mexican Americans be allowed into the clergy and placed in offices within the Church.

On November 4, 1981, Father Alfonso Gallegos, the fifth bishop of Spanish-speaking background, was appointed in Califor-

nia. The others, Juan Arzube and Manuel Moreno of Los Angeles, Gilbert Chávez of San Diego, and Joseph J. Madera of Fresno, had been elevated to the bishopric previously. Only one Latino, Bishop Madera, is head of a diocese in California. Since this state has twenty Catholic bishops in all, it appears that the pace of appointments of Latinos by the Vatican is increasing.¹⁶⁰

Another vehicle for religious and social commitment, the Cursillo Movement, began in Spain in 1947 and was introduced in this country a decade later. It allows priests and lay persons to meet for three-day sessions of religious re-dedication, in quiet settings far from daily problems. Men are recruited first to help overcome the Latin male's traditional coolness toward involvement in religious matters. Most Cursillo participants appear to be action-oriented Catholics who become motivated toward social activism. César Chávez and other prominent Chicanos are Cursillistas. Through this movement, greater help can be generated inside and outside the Church toward the goal of social justice for the poor.¹⁶¹

In present Chinese society, there are no serious religious divisions such as are found in the Anglo community, according to Stanford Lyman. Among its members, a family may find Confucians, Taoists and Buddhists as well as Christians.¹⁶² The Catholic Church recruits members among the Chinese, but perhaps not as aggressively as the various Protestant churches. Melford Weiss counted five Chinese Christian churches in Valley

City, California, all Protestant: Reformed Church of America, Methodist, Baptist, Southern Baptist, and Gospel Mission. The churches work independently and regard themselves in closer alliance with the denominational headquarters than with the local Chinese community. Each church attracts a different sector of the Chinese population, principally on the basis of social class. The working class enjoys the emotional, fundamentalist services, while the wealthier and more acculturated Chinese prefer the socializing aspect of the church over the religious doctrine. The Chinese Christian churches are very flexible and thus are able to appeal to modernists and traditionalists as well.¹⁶³ While Weiss believes that the growth of the Chinese Christian churches indicates an increase in the acculturation of the Chinese people, Betty Lee Sung observes that these churches have been criticized because they tend to retard the assimilation of the younger Chinese. She believes that no matter how completely a Chinese American may be acculturated, he will never be entirely accepted due to his physical differences. She says,

He needs people of his own race to round off his feeling of belonging and security, and if the Chinese Christian church can provide this sense of security in a healthy, religious surrounding, its existence is well justified.

164

Until recently the Roman Catholic hierarchy has been more interested in the propagation of the faith than in getting

involved in matters concerning the social welfare of the Chicanos. In similar fashion, the spiritual leaders of the Chinese American people have remained aloof from social problems, and have restrained from promoting social programs which might benefit their followers. Today the majority of Chicanos remains within the Catholic faith while the Chinese community continues to embrace its three main religions and, in some cases, accepts Christianity also. Thus Chinese persons at different levels of acculturation can be accommodated within the variety of doctrines offered. However, the social ends sought by the Chicanos and the Chinese through the means of their churches differ in degree and orientation. The Chicanos are urging, with some success, that the Catholic Church address itself to issues of social justice and give greater recognition in the clergy to the Spanish-speaking minority. The Chinese have not made public demands of this kind upon their religious leaders. At any rate, the churches of both groups provide their members with a sense of security and belonging, which is an important positive value of these institutions.

F. Politics

After World War II many other Chicano organizations were formed throughout the country in reaction to incidents of discrimination. The Viva Kennedy Clubs and the Mexican American Political Association in California were openly political. After 1965 the Black civil rights movement gave further impetus to Chicano activists. Ethnic leaders emerged, such as César Chávez, who endorsed unconventional methods (including religious pilgrimages, fasts and other forms of non-violent resistance), to obtain their ends. In 1967 student associations sprang up: United Mexican American Students, Mexican American Youth Organization, Brown Berets, Mexican American Student Association, the Mexican American Student Conference, el Movimiento Estudiantil Chicano de Aztlán; all activist groups that joined the Chicanismo Movement (see p. 51). Some groups used confrontation tactics while others favored mass demonstrations and walkouts over the traditional styles of political action.

This new militancy has had a major effect on the Chicano community. There is an increased awareness of issues,

problems and possible solutions, as well as a growing sophistication in political matters at all levels. The Hispanic community now equals nineteen percent of the population in California, making it the largest ethnic group in the state, yet it has less than five percent representation in the California legislature and in the United States Congress.¹⁶⁵ Edward R. Roybal, the only Mexican American Congressman from California, has been in the House of Representatives since 1962. Before that, he had served on the Los Angeles City Council since 1949.¹⁶⁶ Roybal has helped bring much-needed health facilities to East Los Angeles, and among his constituents his popularity is high. Rubén S. Ayala, Alex P. García and Joseph Montoya are in the State Senate. In the Assembly are four Chicanos, among them Art Torres, Chairman of the Assembly Health Committee, and Richard Alatorre, Chairman of the Assembly Committee on Elections and Reapportionment. The latter will be a vitally important position when the legislature begins the task of drawing up new districts for Congressional and state representatives, based on the 1980 census figures. Reapportionment is a sensitive issue to Chicanos, and the call is now going out to the Chicano community to put pressure on the state government for a fair redrawing of legislative district lines.

The Democratic Party can no longer take the Chicano vote for granted. In the 1980 general election, only 70 per-

cent of the Latinos nationwide voted for Jimmy Carter, the lowest vote from the Spanish-speaking community for a Democratic presidential candidate in over twenty years, and in California, 30 percent more Chicanos voted with the Republican Party than in 1976.¹⁶⁷

As for the Chinese, it was not until 1943 that President Franklin D. Roosevelt repealed the Immigration Exclusion Law, allowing a quota of 105 Chinese persons to enter annually. In a move just as important, he restored the constitutional rights of the Chinese who were lawfully in the United States.¹⁶⁸

After the Communists took over the Chinese mainland in 1949, the Chinese in the United States were no longer able to visit their ancestral homeland. The rate of acculturation increased. Until recently, however, the Chinese were acutely aware that they might be associated in the public mind with a Communist country and they might one day suffer the fate of the Japanese Americans who had been sent to relocation camps during World War II.¹⁶⁹ The resumption of friendlier relations between America and the People's Republic of China has no doubt helped ease those fears among the Chinese Americans.

In July 1975, Mrs. Anna Chennault spoke in San Francisco at the National Chinese Conference, sponsored by the Chinese Historical Society of America. She urged the Chinese audience to become more active politically, to unite and create political pressure in order to solve the problems of neglect

and discrimination the Chinese have long suffered in silence.

In the past decade most of the Chinese-Americans in this country preferred not to be involved or they were afraid to be involved in politics or other social movements. . . . Some minority groups prefer to demonstrate and protest but we Chinese are a more peaceful people. We prefer to work quietly and wait for recognition. . . . Chinese men and women have begun to realize unless we move into some of the policy making positions we will have nothing to say to determine our future. . . . Don't be afraid to be involved in politics at all levels.

Despite the fact that the Chinese had Senator Hiram L. Fong of Hawaii in Washington, California State Senator A. Song and March Fong Eu in high government office in California, Mrs. Chennault said, "That's not enough. We have been moving too slowly."¹⁷⁰

In the Los Angeles City primaries of April 14, 1981, a young Chinese American, Michael Woo, challenged an incumbent for a seat on the City Council and forced her into a run-off election. Speaking at a fund-raising event, Mr. Woo stated,

It's about time we had an Asian on the City Council. . . . We have been remarkably successful in business and the professions. . . . but now the time has come to translate economic power into political power.¹⁷¹

Mr. Woo did not win, but at another meeting of Asian ethnic groups held later, an activist stated more forcefully:

As far as we have come, we are not fully integrated into society. It's no longer a question of getting our foot in the door. Now we want to kick it open.¹⁷²

Although both minorities were kept politically impotent by the Anglos for many years through a variety of techniques, it is clear that both the Chicanos and the Chinese

American citizens believe the time has come to raise their voices and to increase their representation in California.

IV. CONCLUSIONS

The Chinese people in the United States have attained an educational level that is among the highest in the nation, surpassing that of the Anglo residents. In addition, the Chinese have reached an enviable professional and economic status. Despite the evidence of job discrimination against them, the benefits now enjoyed by the Chinese are the results of their constant drive for a better education, their tenacity and sheer hard work. They deserve a national salute in recognition of their achievements, won in the face of overwhelming adversity.

The Chicano people are on the opposite end of the educational-economic scale. The tremendous scholastic gap between the Chicano population and the rest of society signals an anomaly that demands reform of the schools themselves. In addition to better quality and more advanced education, several other factors must change before the economic outlook can improve for the Chicano. There must be less discrimination against the Chicanos and there must be fewer undocumented Mexican immigrants.¹⁷³ This is stated with great compassion for both the immigrants and the Chicanos, after consideration of

the following: if there were fewer immigrants from Mexico, the resident Chicano population would possibly see its average income rise, and its image as a foreign and "lower-class element" would improve. The gap would be reduced between the Chicano and the Anglo populations in their levels of education, English language usage, and skills.¹⁷⁴ The popular concept of the Chicano community would also be enhanced if its middle class--its professionals, merchants, white collar workers, and students--were more visible instead of being overlooked due to the great numbers and problems of the unskilled aliens entering the barrios. In the minds of most of the majority society, there is no differentiation between the immigrants and the resident Chicano population. The fears created by the "silent invasion" of undocumented workers tends to increase discrimination against the entire Mexican American community. In the past, this alarm has led to restrictionist and racist legislation. The ideal solution to the problem of undocumented workers would be if Mexico's new oil wealth were to generate enough industry to create attractive jobs for its citizens, and thus make their dislocation unnecessary.

These proposed changes, however, would be mere palliatives, a temporary treatment of the symptoms and not a cure for the disease. The study of the Chicano and the Chinese people in this country reveals a history of continuous hostility and

rejection by the American core society. Although there are signs of a mitigation of the onerous conditions that afflict the minorities, the root cause of the inequities, the discrimination practiced by the dominant group, remains clearly in view. Prejudices, the attitudes based on stereotypes of the ethnic groups or on the ethnocentrism of the majority society, have become entrenched in the minds of many generations of Anglos. Discriminatory practices, which are the expressions of prejudice, are now institutionalized throughout the political, economic and social systems, and constitute the network of oppression of the underclass. From its vantage point, the majority group enjoys not only a sense of power but economic rewards as well through exploitation. Only when the body of beliefs, customs and laws that have kept the core society in mastery are removed will the minorities find relief from oppression.

The problem is one of obstruction: the majority group has blocked the ethnic groups from access to equal opportunity by withholding social acceptance and by hindering them economically and politically. The solution, therefore, would be to remove the means of obstruction by one segment of society against another; to shift the basis for social domination away from racial lines in order to establish a more rational standard for the judgment of an individual's worth.

In this way a more equitable system would prevail that would allow the minorities to avail themselves of all their rights. In short, the solution would be to change the present social order. Since there is no incentive for the dominant group to alter the existing state of affairs, the minorities who find the present conditions intolerable must activate the change themselves. Two of the channels for effecting changes in the social system are: (1) through violence, and (2) through non-violent resistance.

1. Violence

The underclass can become so desperate and so bereft of hope that it may burst into rebellion, with the possibility that the uprising could escalate into anarchy and nationwide revolution. This upheaval would be incalculably costly in loss of lives and in property damage, and the turmoil would extend into all phases of society for years. This is a destructive measure, to be considered only as a last resort.

2. Non-violent Resistance

This alternative proposes to change the social structure through the non-violent activism employed in the campaigns organized by César Chávez, the late Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., and M. K. Gandhi. Also known as civil disobedience, this method relies greatly on public sympathy for support of its causes, and the matter of heightening public awareness about an issue or changing public opinion is often an expensive and time-consuming

process. Another difficulty with this plan is that since the minorities lack power, they must rely on great numbers for leverage. The Chicano people, for example, would first have to consolidate into a bloc, mending divisions within the group caused by the differences in acculturation, education, and the financial conditions of its members. Next the Chicano unit could join forces with all the other ethnic minorities--the rest of the Spanish-speaking people, the Blacks, the American Indians and the Asians--the several million people who have grievances in America. This growing crowd could align itself with sympathetic liberal organizations such as the environmentalists, labor unions, progressive churches, voters' and civil rights leagues, consumer protection associations, and liberal political action groups. In addition, there are groups in the country whose rights have long been ignored and who could make common cause against the establishment, such as the handicapped, the elderly, the feminists, the Vietnam War veterans, and the homosexuals.

Many of the above-mentioned organizations have conducted political battles for years and have acquired valuable experience through fund drives and public demonstrations. Guided by the expertise of the activists, the numerical strength of the disaffected groups could be translated into political power. In support of its goals, the huge coalition could use

such tactics as consumer boycotts, marches, voter registration drives, and mass indoctrination of the electorate on specific issues. Notwithstanding the fierce opposition that the majority would mount, the alliance could elect legislators committed to its causes, and laws could be enacted to ensure economic parity and justice for all residents of this country.

A display of massive and effective action such as this, from a segment of the population that had been devaluated in the past, would cause the dominant majority to alter its perception of it; in time, its attitudes toward all minorities would have to improve. In a setting now made propitious for social harmony, cultural pluralism would surely flourish. Most important of all, these changes, which at present constitute the dreams of the underclass, would redound in the greatest benefit to the entire nation.

V. NOTES ON SOURCES

¹Leo Grebler, Joan W. Moore, and Ralph Guzmán, The Mexican-American People: The Nation's Second Largest Minority (New York: Free Press, 1970), p. 44.

²Leonard Pitt, The Decline of the Californios: A Social History of the Spanish Speaking Californians, 1846-1890 (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1970), p. 14.

³Matt S. Meier and Feliciano Rivera, The Chicanos (New York: Hill and Wang, 1972), p. 77.

⁴Pitt, pp. 96, 103.

⁵Rodolfo Acuña, Occupied America: A History of Chicanos 2d ed. (New York: Harper & Row, 1981), p. 104.

⁶Grebler et al., pp. 47, 53.

⁷Carey McWilliams, North from Mexico: The Spanish Speaking People of the United States (New York: Greenwood Press, 1968), p. 129.

⁸Alfredo Mirandé and Evangelina Enríquez, La Chicana (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1979), p. 69.

⁹Pitt, p. 70.

¹⁰McWilliams, p. 130.

¹¹Grebler et al., p. 63.

¹²Rodolfo Acuña, Occupied America: The Chicano's Struggle Toward Liberation (San Francisco: Canfield Press, 1972), p. 131

¹³Joan London and Henry Anderson, So Shall Ye Reap (New York: Thomas Y. Crowell, 1970), pp. 7, 8.

¹⁴Stuart C. Miller, The Unwelcome Immigrant (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1969), pp. 7, 15, 151-154.

- ¹⁵Betty Lee Sung, Mountain of Gold: The Story of the Chinese (New York: MacMillan, 1967), pp. 37-57.
- ¹⁶Cheng-Tsu Wu, "Chink! A Documentary History of Anti-Chinese Prejudice" (New York: World Publishing, 1972), p. 146.
- ¹⁷Howard M. Bahr, Bruce Chadwick, and Joseph Stauss, American Ethnicity (Lexington, Mass.: D. C. Heath, 1979), p. 82.
- ¹⁸Rodolfo Alvarez, "The Psycho-Historical and Socio-economic Development of the Chicano Community in the United States," in Chicanos: Social and Psychological Perspectives, 2d ed., Carrol A. Hernández, Marsha J. Haug, and Nathaniel N. Wagner, eds. (St. Louis: Mosby, 1976), p. 44.
- ¹⁹Ibid., p. 45.
- ²⁰Ruth S. Lamb, Mexican Americans: Sons of the Southwest (Claremont: Ocelot Press, 1970), p. 16.
- ²¹Mirandé and Enríquez, p. 107.
- ²²Stanford M. Lyman, The Asian in North America (Santa Barbara, Calif.: ABC/Clio Books, 1977), p. 14.
- ²³Bahr et al., p. 82.
- ²⁴Sung, Mountain of Gold, pp. 95-99.
- ²⁵Meier and Rivera, p. 44.
- ²⁶Ibid., p. 51.
- ²⁷Joan W. Moore, Mexican Americans (Englewood Cliffs, N. J.: Prentice-Hall, 1976), p. 78.
- ²⁸Ernesto Galarza, Hermán Gallegos, and Julián Samora, Mexican-Americans in the Southwest (Santa Barbara, Calif.: McNally & Loftin, 1969), p. 74.
- ²⁹Acuña, 2d ed. 1981, pp. 191, 193, 194.
- ³⁰Ibid., p. 116.
- ³¹David J. Weber, ed. Foreigners in Their Native Land: Historical Roots of the Mexican Americans (Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press, 1973), p. 216.
- ³²Acuña, 2d ed. 1981, pp. 256, 309.

- ³³Meier and Rivera, p. 42.
- ³⁴Ibid., p. 44.
- ³⁵Albert M. Camarillo, The Making of a Chicano Community: A History of the Chicanos in Santa Barbara, California, 1850-1930 (Ann Arbor: University Microfilms, 1977), pp. 22-23; Pitt, p. 205.
- ³⁶Pitt, pp. 264.
- ³⁷Sung, Mountain of Gold, p. 135.
- ³⁸Ibid., pp. 133-139.
- ³⁹Lyman, pp. 47-49, 106, 190.
- ⁴⁰Ibid., pp. 107-109.
- ⁴¹Sung, Mountain of Gold, p. 137.
- ⁴²Lyman, pp. 107, 113-114.
- ⁴³Bahr et al., pp. 528-530.
- ⁴⁴Camarillo, pp. 148-153.
- ⁴⁵Moore, p. 19.
- ⁴⁶McWilliams, pp. 214-215.
- ⁴⁷Camarillo, pp. 148-149.
- ⁴⁸Miller, pp. 195-196.
- ⁴⁹Quoted in Miller, p. 159.
- ⁵⁰Sung, Mountain of Gold, pp. 187-201.
- ⁵¹Camarillo, p. 152.
- ⁵²Edna Bonacich, "A Theory of Middleman Minorities," American Sociological Review Vol. 38 (October 1973), pp. 583-594.
- ⁵³Grebler et al., p. 215.
- ⁵⁴Octavio Paz, Posdata (México, D.F.: Siglo Veintiuno Editores, 1976), p. 101.

- 55 Bonacich, p. 585.
- 56 Andrew F. Rolle, California: A History (New York: Thomas Y. Crowell, 1969), p. 385.
- 57 Melford S. Weiss, Valley City: A Chinese Community in America (Cambridge: Schenkman Publishing, 1974), p. 39.
- 58 Charles O. Hucker, China's Imperial Past (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1975), pp. 58, 187; Edward H. Schafer, Ancient China (New York: Time-Life Books, 1976), p. 36.
- 59 Hucker, pp. 187-191.
- 60 Schafer, p. 51; Hucker, p. 187.
- 61 Hucker, pp. 329, 338-339, 346.
- 62 Bettie Kan, "Seattle's Chinatown," in The Life, Influence and the Role of the Chinese in the United States, 1776-1960 (Chinese Historical Society of America, San Francisco:n.p., 1976), p. 122.
- 63 Weiss, Valley City, p. 39.
- 64 Sung, Mountain of Gold, pp. 189-190, 207, 240.
- 65 Meier and Rivera, p. 51.
- 66 Bonacich, p. 583.
- 67 Pitt, pp. 64-69.
- 68 Meier and Rivera, pp. 81-82.
- 69 Weber, pp. 226-227.
- 70 McWilliams, p. 130.
- 71 Lyman, p. 182.
- 72 Meier and Rivera, pp. 80-81.
- 73 Sung, Mountain of Gold, p. 240.
- 74 Galarza et al., p. 74.
- 75 Moore, p. 87.

- 76 Moore, p. 90.
- 77 Weiss, Valley City, p. 41.
- 78 Sung, Mountain of Gold, pp. 214-232.
- 79 Weiss, Valley City, pp. 41-43.
- 80 Sung, Mountain of Gold, pp. 214-232.
- 81 Weiss, Valley City, pp. 62, 63.
- 82 Moore, pp. 19-20.
- 83 Ibid., pp. 139-142.
- 84 Ibid., p. 141.
- 85 Ibid., p. 145.
- 86 Miguel David Tirado, "Mexican American Community Political Organization," in La Causa Política, ed.: F. Chris García, (Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 1974), pp. 105-127.
- 87 Wu, p. 145.
- 88 Bahr et al., p. 528.
- 89 Ibid., p. 118.
- 90 Bryce Nelson, "Latinos Rise 92%, Blacks 30% in State," Los Angeles Times, March 27, 1981, p. 1.
- 91 Bahr et al., pp. 82-83.
- 92 Lyman, p. 20.
- 93 Grebler et al., pp. 429-432.
- 94 Milton M. Gordon, Assimilation in American Life: The Role of Race, Religion and National Origins (New York: Oxford University Press, 1974), pp. 30-31, 61-66, 77.
- 95 Ibid., p. 63.
- 96 Ibid., p. 71.
- 97 Bahr et al., pp. 530-533.

⁹⁸"Splintered America: Peril or Promise?" U. S. News & World Report, July 7, 1980, p. 34.

⁹⁹Armando B. Rendón, Chicano Manifesto: The History and Aspirations of the Second Largest Minority in America. (New York: Collier, 1971), pp. 27-28.

¹⁰⁰Sung, Mountain of Gold, p. 268

¹⁰¹Moore, p. 152.

¹⁰²Lyman, p. 15.

¹⁰³Sung, Mountain of Gold, pp. 267-268.

¹⁰⁴Lyman, p. 57.

¹⁰⁵Ibid., pp. 56, 181.

¹⁰⁶Weiss, Valley City, pp. 233-243.

¹⁰⁷Mirandé and Enríquez, p. 131.

¹⁰⁸Mario Barrera, Carlos Muñoz, and Charles Ornelas, "The Barrio as an Internal Colony," Urban Affairs Annual Reviews, Vol. 6, Harlan Hahn, ed., (Beverly Hills: Sage, 1972), p. 487.

¹⁰⁹Mirandé and Enríquez, pp. 126-127.

¹¹⁰U. S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of Census, 1970. Data for White and Persons of Spanish Language or Spanish Surname in Table 51, General Social and Economic Characteristics, California, PC(1)C6-391; Betty Lee Sung, Statistical Profile of the Chinese in the United States; 1970 Census (New York: Arno Press, 1978), Table 4, p. 25.

¹¹¹Sung, Mountain of Gold, pp. 126, 274.

¹¹²Rolle, p. 385.

¹¹³Bahr et al., p. 83.

¹¹⁴Grebler et al., p. 95.

¹¹⁵Ibid., p. 88.

¹¹⁶Weiss, Valley City, p. 194.

- 117 Meier and Rivera, p. 52.
- 118 Moore, p. 78.
- 119 Schafer, p. 17.
- 120 Ibid., pp. 141, 144.
- 121 Henry Bamford Parkes, A History of Mexico (Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1969), pp. 189, 279, 376, 439.
- 122 Moore, p. 73.
- 123 Amado M. Padilla, "Psychological Research and the Mexican-American," in Chicanos; Social and Psychological Perspectives, eds.: Hernández et al., p. 155.
- 124 Bahr et al., Table 7-1, p. 155; Table 7-2, p. 156.
- 125 Grebler et al., p. 216.
- 126 Vernon M. Briggs, Jr., Walter Fogel, and Fred H. Schmidt, The Chicano Worker (Austin: University of Texas Press, 1977), p. 75.
- 127 Mirandé and Enríquez, Table 1, p. 122.
- 128 Grebler et al., p. 22.
- 129 Briggs et al., pp. 59, 71-72.
- 130 Grebler et al., p. 22.
- 131 Briggs et al., pp. 26-27, 30-32; Sung, Mountain of Gold, p. 184.
- 132 Otis Graham, Jr., "Illegal Immigration," Center Magazine, Vol. 10 (July 1977), p. 57.
- 133 Acuña, 2d ed., 1981, p. 170.
- 134 Edwin P. Reubens, "Aliens, Jobs and Immigration Policy," Public Interest, Vol. 51 (Spring 1978), p. 117.
- 135 Briggs et al., pp. 83-85.
- 136 Bahr et al., p. 162.

137 Bahr et al., data for Anglos, Table 7-5, p. 163; Sung, Statistical Profile for Chinese, Table 6, p. 75.

138 U. S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census, 1970. Data for White Persons in Table 54, General Social and Economic Characteristics, California, Vol. 6, p. 397; Sung, Statistical Profile of the Chinese, Tables 6 and 8, pp. 77, 107.

139 Bahr et al., p. 161.

140 Grebler et al., p. 250.

141 Ibid., p. 267.

142 Marvin Karno and Armando Morales, "A Community Mental Health Service for Mexican-Americans in a Metropolis," in Chicanos: Social and Psychological Perspectives, eds.: Hernández et al., p. 237.

143 Grebler et al., pp. 529-530.

144 Armando Morales, Ando Sangrando (Forest Grove, Ore.: International School Book Services, 1973), pp. 38-39.

145 Pitt, p. 295.

146 David Johnston, "Gang-Related Killings Fall 16% in County, Data Shows," Los Angeles Times, January 26, 1981, p. 1; "Another Crack at the Gangs," Ibid., August 17, 1981, Ed., p. 2; Bob Barker, "Culture and Crime Play Role in Gangs," Ibid., November 14, 1979, p. 1.

147 Beth Ann Krier, "Rival Gangs Coexist at Barrio Holiday Party," Los Angeles Times, December 24, 1979, p. 1; Laura Miller, "One Man's War Against the Gangs," Ibid., December 25, 1979, p. 1.

148 Report of the U. S. Commission on Civil Rights, "Mexican Americans and the Administration of Justice in the Southwest," March 1970, pp. 88-89.

149 Lee May, "Study Says Hispanics Suffer More Crime," Los Angeles Times, July 28, 1980, p. 6.

150 Lyman, pp. 197-198.

151 Sung, Mountain of Gold, pp. 179-186.

- 152 Lyman, pp. 181-182.
- 153 Richard A. Kalish and Samuel Y. Yuen, "Americans of East Asian Ancestry: Aging and the Aged," in Asian-Americans, Psychological Perspectives, eds.: Stanley Sue and Nathaniel N. Wagner (Palo Alto, Calif.: Science and Behavior Books, 1973), pp. 239, 242.
- 154 Lyman, pp. 195-197.
- 155 Kenneth A. Abbott and Elizabeth Lee Abbott, "Juvenile Delinquency in San Francisco's Chinese-American Community: 1961-1966," in Asian-Americans, Psychological Perspectives, eds.: Sue and Wagner, pp. 179-180.
- 156 Lyman, pp. 177-199.
- 157 William Albert Allard, "Chinatown, the Gilded Ghetto," National Geographic, Vol. 148 (November 1975), pp. 630, 639.
- 158 "America's Chinatowns Feel Shock Waves," U. S. News & World Report, March 5, 1979, p. 53.
- 159 Moore, p. 91; Grebler et al., pp. 449-468.
- 160 John Dart, "Fifth Latino to Become Bishop in California," Los Angeles Times, Sept. 12, 1981.
- 162 Lyman, p. 217.
- 163 Weiss, Valley City, pp. 228-231.
- 164 Sung, Mountain of Gold, p. 224.
- 165 "Group to Push for More Latino Representation," Los Angeles Times, April 27, 1981.
- 166 Grebler et al., pp. 561, 562.
- 167 Richard Santillán, "For Chicanos, a Louder Voice," Los Angeles Times, March 5, 1981, p. 7.
- 168 Sung, Mountain of Gold, pp. 10-20.
- 169 Weiss, Valley City, pp. 250-251.
- 170 Chinese Historical Society of America, The Life, Influence and the Role of the Chinese in the United States, pp. 125-127.

¹⁷¹Judith Michaelson, "Stevenson Ignores Foe but He's Hardly 'in a Corner'", Los Angeles Times, April 5, 1981, p. 1; and Judith Michaelson, "Stevenson Facing Runoff; April 14 Was Not a Party," Ibid., April 16, 1981, p. 1.

¹⁷²Patrick Lee, "Asians Feel the Perils of Racism," Los Angeles Times, July 17, 1981.

¹⁷³Briggs et al., p. 43.

¹⁷⁴Grebler et al., pp. 76-77.

VI. SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Acuña, Rodolfo. *Occupied America: A History of Chicanos*. 2d ed. New York: Harper & Row, 1981.
- _____. *Occupied America: The Chicano's Struggle Toward Liberation*. San Francisco: Canfield Press, 1972.
- Allport, Gordon W. *The Nature of Prejudice*. New York: Doubleday Anchor Books, 1958.
- Bahr, Howard M.; Chadwick, Bruce; and Stauss, Joseph. *American Ethnicity*. Lexington, Mass.: D. C. Heath, 1979.
- Briggs, Vernon M., Jr.; Fogel, Walter; and Schmidt, Fred H. *The Chicano Worker*. Austin: University of Texas Press, 1977.
- Cabrera, Ysidro Arturo. *Emerging Faces: The Mexican-Americans*. Dubuque: William C. Brown Co., 1972.
- _____. *A Study of American and Mexican American Culture Values and Their Significance in Education*. San Francisco: R. & E. Research Assoc., 1972.
- Camarillo, Albert M. *The Making of a Chicano Community: A History of the Chicanos in Santa Bárbara, California, 1850-1930*. Ann Arbor: Xerox University Microfilms, 1977.
- Chao, Rose. *Chinese Immigrant Children*. New York: City University of New York, 1977.
- Galarza, Ernesto; Gallegos, Hermán; and Samora, Julián. *Mexican-Americans in the Southwest*. Santa Barbara: McNally & Loftin, 1969.
- Galván, Roberto A. and Teschner, Richard V. *El Diccionario del Español Chicano*. Silver Spring, Md., Institute of Modern Languages, 1975.

- García, F. Chris (ed.). *La Causa Política*. Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 1974.
- Gordon, Milton M. *Assimilation in American Life: The Role of Race, Religion and National Origins*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1964.
- Grebler, Leo; Moore, Joan W.; and Guzmán, Ralph. *The Mexican-American People: The Nation's Second Largest Minority*. New York: Free Press, 1970.
- Hernández, Carrol A.; Haug, Marsha J.; and Wagner, Nathaniel N. (eds.). *Chicanos: Social and Psychological Perspectives*. 2d ed. St. Louis: Mosby, 1976.
- Hucker, Charles O. *China's Imperial Past*. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1975.
- Lamb, Ruth S. *Mexican Americans: Sons of the Southwest*. Claremont: Ocelot Press, 1970.
- The Life, Influence and the Role of the Chinese in the United States, 1776-1960*. Chinese Historical Society of America. San Francisco: n. p., 1976.
- Light, Ivan H. *Ethnic Enterprise in America*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1972.
- London, Joan and Anderson, Henry. *So Shall Ye Reap*. New York: Thomas Y. Crowell, 1970.
- Lyman, Stanford M. *The Asian in North America*. Santa Barbara, Calif.: ABC/Clio Books, 1977.
- McWilliams, Carey. *North from Mexico: The Spanish Speaking People of the United States*. New York: Greenwood Press, 1968.
- Mangold, M. M. (ed.). *La Causa Chicana: The Movement for Justice*. New York: Family Service Association of America, 1972.
- Meier, Matt S. and Rivera, Feliciano. *The Chicanos: A History of Mexican Americans*. New York: Hill and Wang, 1972.
- Miller, Stuart C. *The Unwelcome Immigrant*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1969.

- Mirandé, Alfredo and Enríquez, Evangelina. *La Chicana*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1979.
- Moore, Joan W. *Mexican Americans*. Englewood Cliffs, N. J.: Prentice-Hall, 1976.
- Moquín, Wayne with Charles Van Doren. *Documentary History of the Mexicans*. New York: Bantam Books, 1972.
- Morales, Armando. *Ando Sangrando*. Forest Grove, Ore.: International School Book Services, 1973.
- Parkes, Henry Bamford. *A History of Mexico*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1969.
- Paz, Octavio. *Posdata*. 10th ed. México, D.F.: Siglo Veintiuno Editores, 1976.
- Pitt, Leonard. *The Decline of the Californios: A Social History of the Spanish-Speaking Californians, 1846-1890*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1970.
- Rendón, Armando B. *Chicano Manifesto: The History and Aspirations of the Second Largest Minority in America*. New York: Collier, 1971.
- Rolle, Andrew F. *California: A History*. New York: Thomas Y. Crowell, 1969.
- Schafer, Edward H. *Ancient China*. New York: Time-Life Books, 1976.
- Sue, Stanley and Wagner, Nathaniel N. (eds.). *Asian-Americans: Psychological Perspectives*. Palo Alto, Calif.: Science and Behavior Books, 1973.
- Sung, Betty Lee. *Mountain of Gold: The Story of the Chinese*. New York: MacMillan, 1967.
- _____. *Statistical Profile of the Chinese in the United States: 1970 Census*. New York: Arno Press, 1978.
- U. S. Commission on Civil Rights. *Mexican-Americans and the Administration of Justice in the Southwest*. Washington, D. C.: Government Printing Office, March 1970.
- Weber, David J. (ed.). *Foreigners in Their Native Land: Historical Roots of the Mexican Americans*. Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press, 1973.

Weiss, Melford S. Valley City: A Chinese Community in America. Cambridge: Schenkman Publishing, 1974.

Wu, Cheng-Tsu. "Chink!" A Documentary History of Anti-Chinese Prejudice. New York: World Publishing, 1972.

Periodicals

Allard, William Albert. "Chinatown, the Gilded Ghetto." National Geographic 148 (Nov. 1975) 5:627-643.

"America's Chinatowns Feel Shock Waves." U.S. News & World Report 86 (March 5, 1979):49-53.

"Another Crack at Gangs." Los Angeles Times, August 17, 1981, p. 2.

Barker, Bob. "Culture and Crime Play Role in Gangs." Los Angeles Times, Nov. 14, 1979, p. 1.

Barrera, Mario; Muñoz, Carlos; and Ornelas, Charles. "The Barrio as an Internal Colony." Urban Affairs Annual Reviews 6, Harlan Hahn, ed., Sage, Beverly Hills (1972):465-499.

Bonacich, Edna. "A Theory of Middleman Minorities." American Sociological Review 38 (Oct. 1973):583-594.

Dart, John. "Fifth Latino to Become Bishop in California." Los Angeles Times, Sept. 12, 1981.

Graham, Otis L. Jr. "Illegal Immigration." Center Magazine 10 (July 1977):56-66.

"Group to Push for More Latino Representation." Los Angeles Times, April 27, 1981.

Johnston, David. "Gang-Related Killings Fall 16% in County, Data Shows." Los Angeles Times, Jan. 26, 1982.

Krier, Beth Ann. "Rival Gangs Coexist at Barrio Party." Los Angeles Times, Dec. 24, 1979.

Lee, Patrick. "Asians Feel the Perils of Racism." Los Angeles Times, July 17, 1981.

- May, Lee. "Study Says Hispanics Suffer More Crime." Los Angeles Times, July 28, 1980.
- Michaelson, Judith. "Stevenson Ignores Foe but He's Hardly 'in a Corner'." Los Angeles Times, April 5, 1981.
- _____. "Stevenson Facing Runoff; April 14 Was Not a Party." Los Angeles Times, April 16, 1981.
- Miller, Laura. "One Man's War Against the Gangs." Los Angeles Times, Dec. 25, 1979.
- Nelson, Bryce. "Latinos Rise 92%, Blacks 30% in State." Los Angeles Times, Mar. 27, 1981, p. 1.
- Reubens, Edwin P. "Aliens, Jobs and Immigration Policy." Public Interest 5 (Spring 1978):113-134.
- Santillán, Richard. "For Chicanos, a Louder Voice." Los Angeles Times, March 5, 1981, p. 7.
- "Splintered America: Peril or Promise?" U.S. News & World Report 89 (July 7, 1980):33-37.
- United States Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census, 1970. Statistical Abstract of the United States, 1979; California, General Social and Economic Characteristics, 1970. Vol. 6. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C.