Chapter 12

People of Asian and Pacific Island Origin

Asia includes so many varied peoples that this chapter deals only with those from the eastern and southern portions of the continent. People from what is now the Soviet Union are treated in the chapter on Eastern European origin and those from Southwest Asia are covered in the Middle Eastern-origin chapter.

Immigrants from the largest Asian countries first arrived in either California or Hawaii in the 19th century, mostly to work as miners, general laborers, or agricultural workers. Discovery of gold in California in 1848 triggered the first migration of thousands of Chinese to what they called the Golden Mountain, but the Chinese were also escaping the poverty, floods, and increasing turmoil of an old empire crumbling, partly from attack by Europeans.

After the Chinese were ousted by whites from most good gold-mining operations, they took low-paying farm and general laboring jobs in the western states. In the 1890s the Japanese did much of the same work, as did Asian Indians, along with some Koreans, during the early 1900s. Sources of Asian cheap labor changed over time, partly because of restrictions on the immigration of certain ethnic groups and partly because of the success of some groups in moving out of unskilled labor jobs. By the 1920s many Filipinos were being hired, especially for agricultural work in California. They became the most important source of California farm laborers other than people of Mexican origin for the next half-century. Additionally, there were a few students and professionals from Asian countries who immigrated to America in the early 20th century.

The earliest people in Hawaii were Polynesians. These Hawaiians were the only settlers until whites arrived in the late 18th century. The outsiders increased their control of the islands in the early 1800s, and some organized the development of plantations for growing and processing sugar cane. The labor needs of these enterprises led to the later importation of a series of different ethnic populations. After the Chinese came the Japanese, the largest in number. Then after 1908 came Koreans, Portuguese, Puerto Ricans, a few Norwegians and Spanish, and lastly, Filipinos.

Like many Europeans at that time, nearly all these laborers thought of themselves as sojourners: they expected to work hard for a short time, then return home with the money. Although some were forced into contracts, most agreed in return for their passage to work for a stated few years or pay back a specific sum of money. Many did return to their Asian homes, although most did not.

The 1965 amendments to our earlier immigration laws eliminated the system of annual quotas that strongly favored northern and western Europe. Under the new law the people permitted to immigrate were to be close relatives of American citizens or immigrants already here, with additional spaces allotted for people in certain occupations that were needed in America. Since 1965 the immigration of people from Asia has increased dramatically, with particularly large flows of Chinese, Filipinos, Koreans, and Asian Indians. The more recent arrivals from such countries have included many well-educated, middle-class professionals, often engineers, doctors, and nurses. Many U.S.-born people of Asian origin have also been occupationally successful, so that in 1980 Asian Americans in comparison to whites had higher incomes and were more likely to be employed in a professional or managerial capacity (Census 1983b).

Complete count

Reported Ethnic Population

806,640

Edited sample

812,178

Counties with Largest Chinese Population**

New York City, NY

124,764

Los Angeles, CA

93,747

San Francisco, CA

82,480

Honolulu, HI

50,814

Alameda (Oakland), CA

32,177

Counties with Highest Percentage of Chinese in Population**

San Francisco, CA

12.15

Honolulu, HI

6.93

Alameda (Oakland), CA

2.91

San Mateo (Palo Alto), CA

2.75

Hawaii (Hilo), HI

1.82

* County statistics, map, and text interpretation are based on complete count data.
** Major cities or towns may be indicated in parentheses.

The major early period of Chinese immigration was from 1850 until the early 1880s, when anti-Chinese feelings culminated in legislation that sharply reduced the flow. Those who came to America during most of the century after 1850 were
primarily from one small part of China — the Pearl Delta area of Kwangtung Province on the southeastern coast — from which they brought their characteristic Cantonese speech. For almost a century Chinese communities in America were very homogeneous in their regional cultural origins, in great contrast to the diversity present in the 1970s.

Settlements: 1850–1950

The West: Initial Dispersal. The California gold rush brought gold seekers from around the world, and for several years the Chinese, like others, worked their claims in the Sierra Nevada foothills. However, frustrated whites drove most Chinese miners off their claims. Although the Chinese remained the largest foreign-born group in the mining counties for three decades, often working abandoned claims, they ultimately moved into other occupations and other areas. Many returned to San Francisco. There, labor gangs were organized for construction projects throughout the West, including work for the railway. The Chinese were in great demand because they worked well but accepted wages that were generally less than half what white people expected. Chinese men also worked in Chinatown in small shoe, cigar, and garment factories, some of which were owned by fellow Chinese. Others ran hand laundries, and some went after shrimp, abalone, and ocean fish from nearby villages.

Mining, construction, agriculture, and manufacturing jobs distributed Chinese men widely across the western states for a few decades. Railroad owners were interested in Chinese laborers in order to undercut the labor demands of white workers but were worried that the Chinese were too small to handle railroad construction (Saxton 1971). One experiment in 1865 showed that the Chinese were ideal workers — industrious, peaceable, and ready to learn. They were soon building railroads in central California and digging water diversion trenches in Nevada (Barth 1964). Chinese also reclaimed much of the Sacramento Delta and lower Salinas Valley wetlands. The biggest early job was done by over 10,000 Chinese workers who built the Central Pacific part of the transcontinental railroad in the late 1860s, from Sacramento east to Utah. They blasted, picked, shoveled, and loaded the Sierra granite in this hazardous undertaking. The ties and rails were finally laid, and America celebrated. A dozen years later the Chinese were at work on the Northern Pacific line through Montana and the Southern Pacific route across southern Arizona and Texas.

News of gold strikes in other western states attracted many Chinese, who typically took up abandoned placer claims or worked in various laboring or mill jobs connected with mining (Rohe 1982). Several thousand men went to Oregon, primarily for mining jobs. In 1870 the Chinese, mostly at Butte and Helena, constituted 9 percent of Montana's population; in Idaho they represented nearly a third of the population and over half the miners. However, there were few Chinese miners in Arizona and New Mexico, where Mexicans had control of most abandoned deposits.

Chinese men also mined coal in Utah and Wyoming, picked cotton and cut cane in parts of the South, and helped industrialists squelch labor demands in Pennsylvania, New Jersey, and Massachusetts.

The West: Retrenchment after 1880. The Chinese, who had been appreciated at first when the West needed labor so badly, came to be seen as threats to the wages of white workers. Bullying and violence, as well as discriminatory laws and regulations, took their toll on those already here. In 1882 Congress halted the immigration of Chinese laborers, and highly restrictive legislation remained in effect until 1943.

By the turn of the century the competition from the Chinese had been eliminated in most jobs desired by whites. For example, in the 1890s Chinese farmworkers in several parts of California were driven from farms and orchards by mobs, in effect leaving only the asparagus in the Sacramento Delta country for Chinese workers (Lyman 1974). Humboldt County, in northern California, actually expelled virtually all its Chinese in 1886 (Carranco 1973). From then until the early 1950s there were few if any Chinese in the county. The 172 reported in 1980 represented several families new since 1950 plus students at the local state university.

Most Chinese in small towns throughout the West packed up and moved, either back to China or to a large city, especially to San Francisco. The Chinese Exclusion Act of 1882, together with the return of many to China and the lack of wives and families among the Chinese laboring men who remained here, meant a dwindling population in America. From a numerical high of 107,000 in 1890 Chinese numbers on the U.S. mainland dropped to about 62,000 between 1920 and 1940.

In Oregon, the Chinese gravitated to the Portland area, where over three hundred of those employed as laborers, laundry workers, cooks, dishwashers, or servants (Corbett and Corbett 1977). Most of the workers who had built the Southern Pacific line in West Texas in the early 1880s later moved to El Paso, which soon had 13 Chinese-owned restaurants and a Chinatown (Rhoads 1977).

However, a few Chinese remained near the scattered work sites, sometimes becoming market gardeners or opening laundries, grocery stores, or cafes. The cafes, usually close to the railroad stations in towns where train crews changed, served both railroad workers and the public. Presumably most small-town Chinese in 1980 were descendants of the early settlers who persisted in those places, but so few were left in places like Elko and Carlin (Elko County), Nevada, and Milford (Beaver County), Utah, that they do not appear on the map.

Louisiana and Texas. In 1867 Chinese laborers were brought to work on cotton plantations in Louisiana's Natchitoches Parish (Cohen 1984). Those who remained usually married black or white women. Many of their descendants still lived in the area but were not necessarily among the 27 people who identified as Chinese on the 1980 census.

Most of those who had constructed railroads or picked cotton in several Southern states dispersed to other areas of the South, either after their work was completed or when the employer did not pay as agreed. Those former farm or railroad workers who moved to New Orleans joined other Chinese who had become importers, often running branches of commercial houses based in San Francisco.

A few hundred Chinese who had built railroads in East Texas became sharecroppers and field hands on Brazos Valley cotton farms, especially in Robertson and Wharton counties (Rhoads 1977). In 1870 that county had more Chinese than any other in the state, but by the 1940s only a few Chinese-white people remained and the 1980 census reported no one identifying as Chinese.
About 1911 a labor force of 35,000 Chinese had been assembled in Mexico, especially in Sonora (Hu-de-Hart 1980), but harsh labor conditions and anti-Chinese sentiment drove many north of the border over the next two decades. The several hundred Chinese who arrived in San Antonio (Bexar County) in 1917 were some of these refugees, who provided the nucleus for what during the mid-20th century was the largest Chinese settlement in Texas (Rhoads 1977).

Delta Chinese in Mississippi. The most persistent of the Chinese settlements in the small-town South have been in the Delta Region of northwest Mississippi and just across the river in Arkansas. Chinese who had come to the area around 1870 to pick cotton found sharecropping unsatisfactory and soon managed to open grocery stores, serving especially local blacks (Loewen 1971). The Chinese population grew, and descendants have remained in the grocery business almost completely. Their stores became scattered through the black sections in many small towns and cities, especially in Bolivar and Washington counties (Quan 1982).

Family-centered communities developed because wives of Chinese merchants were often permitted to join their husbands despite the exclusion of laborers by the 1882 act. Most Delta Chinese became Christians, especially Southern Baptists. Although they served predominantly black shoppers, their economic success enabled them to move from a not-quite-black status to an almost-white status, especially in the smaller towns, where whites have treated them better (Loewen 1971). Despite much out-migration, especially of young preprofessional women, Delta Chinese have often married other Chinese from the area and their numbers in northwest Mississippi and the nearby Memphis (Shelby County), Tennessee, area have grown in recent decades.

Hawaii. A few Chinese businessmen and artisans had come to Hawaii in the early 19th century, and sugar was first produced commercially by Chinese investors and workers (Glick 1952). Hawaiians steadily took control of the land and sugar operations. When native Hawaiians declined to harvest the cane or work in the mills, Chinese workers were imported on contracts. By the early 1880s the Chinese constituted a quarter of the population on the islands. The proportion of Chinese in Hawaii then decreased, mostly because growers imported other peoples and because after 1900, when Hawaii became a U.S. territory, the Chinese Exclusion Act became applicable.

Independent Chinese farmers controlled rice growing in Hawaii in the last half of the 19th century and later grew most of the fresh produce for Honolulu (Glick 1980). Others peddled goods in rural areas or became hawkers or shopkeepers in towns.

After completion of their contracts, the Chinese typically left the plantations, moving to some extent to nearby towns but primarily to Honolulu or across to California. Honolulu remained a quarter Chinese until the turn of the century, and in the 20th century it had a large, ethnically mixed Chinatown for a few decades (Glick 1980). In 1920 the island of Oahu, where Honolulu is located, held 72 percent of Hawaii's Chinese; by 1980, 94 percent of the state's Chinese lived on Oahu.

The East. Although the Chinese arrived on the West Coast, not all who left the mining camps and small towns went to San Francisco. Many found less prejudice and discrimination in the midwestern and eastern cities. Whereas the Chinese population in most western areas declined substantially between 1880 and 1940, that in the East grew. Settling in slum areas because of the low rents, the Chinese became traders, laundrymen, or garment workers, and later opened restaurants, barbershops, and other small businesses. Boston's Chinatown was next to South Station, where trains made contact with distant friends and relatives not too difficult (Murphy 1952). Chicago had several hundred Chinese in the 1960s, but New York City's Chinatown on Manhatten's Lower East Side became the largest concentration in the East.

Increasing Diversity Since 1965

The U.S. Congress decided in 1943 that China, as our ally in World War II, should not have to bear a special exclusion regarding immigration. Over the next decade came many wives of Chinese already here and an increasing number of students on special visas for college attendance. During the 1960s immigration increased from both Taiwan and Hong Kong, although the majority of the later may have been refugees from nearby areas in the (Communist) People's Republic of China (Sung 1980). Many people arrived first as students and later became legal immigrants.

In the 19th century the United States was just one of many destinations for Chinese emigrants. Hundreds of thousands of Chinese went as laborers and merchants to tropical countries that were being developed as colonies by the British, French, or Spanish. Because of this dispersal, and often later immigration to America, the Chinese population in 1980 had unusually varied origins. Although ostensibly Chinese, the immigrants have been to some extent culturally differentiated by their experiences in different countries.

The proportion of recent Chinese immigrants from various countries has been difficult to determine because until 1982 immigration statistics included both Taiwan and the mainland (People's Republic) in one total. However, in 1982 and 1983, 58 percent of all the immigrants from those countries plus Hong Kong had been born in the PRC and 29 percent in Taiwan (U.S. INS. 1985). Other Chinese left Cuba when Fidel Castro took over, and more recently, unreported in Jamaica and Trinidad prompted others to immigrate (Sung 1980). In addition, many Chinese from Southeast Asia and a few from Brazil and Canada have moved here.

Ethnic Chinese from Southeast Asia. The largest overseas Chinese settlements have been in Southeast Asia. Most Chinese immigrants to the United States from that region have a dual identity in terms of both Chinese ethnicity and their home country in Southeast Asia. Because of the arrival in America of so many ethnic Chinese from Vietnam after 1975, the question of how Chinese from Southeast Asia identified themselves on the 1980 census is especially crucial for interpretation of the race data. The census data from the 5-percent Public-Use Microdata Sample (PUMS) file of households can shed some light on this, although the extent of intermarriage cannot be distinguished from identification differences in these data.

Most ethnic Chinese from Southeast Asia labeled their race in terms of their Southeast Asian identity. In California, there were an estimated 12,800 people of Vietnamese race but with Chinese as part of their multiple ancestry. Only an estimated 640 people indicated their race as Chinese and an ancestry that included Vietnamese. In New York the preference for Vietnamese race identification was even more pronounced, although the comparable figures for Texas indicated people reporting Vietnamese race outnumbering those of Chinese race by only 7 to 1. A similar situation occurred among Chinese-Filipinos. In California people of Filipino race and a Chinese multiple ancestry were estimated to total 5,300 compared to 1,600 of Chinese race and Filipino multiple ancestry.

All this means that the ethnic Chinese population in America was substantially larger in 1980 than that reported as Chinese in the race data.

Metropolitan Growth Since 1965

The Chinese population here in 1980 was almost ten times its 1920 size, and 63 percent of the Chinese in America in 1980 had been born abroad. The immigrants have settled almost exclusively in metropolitan areas, especially the larger ones. This pattern, in combination with that of descendants of older immigrants, resulted in a 1980 distribution that was 97
percent urban and 96 percent metropolitan — extremely high compared to other ethnic groups. In 1980 the three largest metropolitan concentrations of Chinese accounted for over half the Chinese in America. The San Francisco Bay area, including as far south as San Jose, had more Chinese than any other, but the numbers in New York City and adjacent Nassau and Suffolk counties were almost as high. Los Angeles and Orange counties comprised the third largest center.

New York City has become the most important city destination for immigrants, however, with a foreign-born Chinese population of 60,000 — almost twice that of either San Francisco or Los Angeles. Immigration plus the movement of Chinese from Hawaii to the mainland has meant that those islands, which contained 28 percent of America’s Chinese in 1920, held only 7 percent in 1980.

Chinatowns and Suburban Dispersal

The Chinatowns originally established by the early Cantonese-speaking immigrants have become predominantly shopping areas, though many of the poorer Chinese live in them. Merchants in Chinatown have prospered by attracting the tourist trade, but most serve primarily their metropolitan Chinese community, whose members travel in frequently from outlying areas for news, food, and other supplies. Increased immigration plus large investments by immigrants and others from Hong Kong and Taiwan have rejuvenated the large Chinatowns, with many new restaurants and stores added. In the 1970s so many immigrants of origin in northern China entered that since then, Chinese languages and cuisine have become much more varied. Also, many Chinese from Vietnam have opened businesses, as on the south side of the established and prosperous Chinatown in Los Angeles. They have preferred it to the ethnic Vietnamese commercial developments in Orange County, but there have been tensions. Chinese from Hong Kong and Taiwan have often resented the different ways of the Vietnamese-Chinese (McMillan 1982).

Within metropolitan areas there has been increasing residential dispersal because few of the professionals have settled in Chinatowns. Although New York City’s Chinatown has expanded somewhat into formerly Italian and Jewish sections of the Lower East Side, less than half the Chinese in 1980 lived in Manhattan. An area of especially rapid growth due to immigration has been the Houston (Harris County) area in Texas, home to half the Chinese in the state. A new, rapidly expanding Chinatown has appeared and additional Chinese shopping centers were being built in the 1980s near Houston’s western edge.

In Los Angeles the traditional Chinatown has grown too, but more dramatic changes have taken place in the older suburban cities just to the east. Following the lead of one immigrant Chinese developer who envisioned the city of Monterey Park as a suburban Chinatown, Chinese from Hong Kong and Taiwan, fearing the uncertain future of investments in those places, have eagerly bought property and business here (Arax 1987a). In Monterey Park, Alhambra, and nearby cities the impact of apartment construction, new Chinese enterprises and shopping centers, and a large influx of Asian immigrants has resulted in ethnic tensions and a major transformation since the mid-1970s.

San Francisco. This reception center for 19th-century immigrants later became the major urban focus of Chinese life in America. It has been the refuge and home of many retired Chinese laborers who chose to remain in America despite discrimination and poverty, and San Francisco’s Chinatown has been the symbolic geographical center of the Chinese American experience. The area contains numerous shops, restaurants, teahouses, grocery stores, and banks, with Grant Street as the major commercial focus. But there have also been Chinese schools, temples, theaters, small factories, and residences. In the 12-block area that was the heart of Chinatown in 1980 (bounded by Kearny, Clay, and Stockton
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streets and Pacific Avenue) 95 percent of the residents were Chinese. Adjacent tracts to the north, west, and south—also part of Chinatown—were over 80 percent Chinese.

With the arrival of so many immigrants during the 1970s the residential section of Chinatown has expanded into the North Beach area from its traditional location south of Broadway. As in other metropolitan areas, dispersal of younger generations from Chinatown's cheap apartments has been frequent, and the more affluent new arrivals have never had to establish residence in Chinatown.

In 1980 the approximately 26,000 Chinese who lived in the Chinatown area represented about a third of the Chinese in the city and county of San Francisco. Another 17 percent, mostly non-Cantonese, occupied the newer homes in the Richmond area, north of Golden Gate Park, leaving approximately half the city's Chinese residents scattered in other areas.

However, San Francisco's Chinatown has been similar to other large Chinatowns in that many residents have remained poor, uneducated, and lacking facility in English (Wong 1971; Tsi 1980). People who spoke no English have continued to seek work in the garment industry's sweatshop factories. Despite the glittering, festive image purveyed to the tourists, Chinatowns have typically suffered from high rates of unemployment, crime, illness, and drug abuse, but until the late 1960s the difficulties of the residents were ignored or masked in efforts to encourage tourism. Moreover, there has been little support or respect among new immigrant suburbanites for the older immigrants in Chinatown, who are viewed as having lost their Chinese culture without gaining the culture of America.

### Japanese

**1980 Summary Statistics***

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Report Ethnic Population</th>
<th>Complete count</th>
<th>700,974</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Edited sample</td>
<td>716,331</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Counties with Largest Japanese Population***

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County</th>
<th>Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Honolulu, HI</td>
<td>189,628</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Angeles, CA</td>
<td>116,543</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawaii (Hi), HI</td>
<td>24,476</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Clara (San Jose), CA</td>
<td>21,807</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orange, CA</td>
<td>20,086</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Counties with Highest Percentage of Japanese in Population***

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hawaii (Hi), HI</td>
<td>26.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kauai, HI</td>
<td>25.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honolulu, HI</td>
<td>24.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maui, HI</td>
<td>22.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malheur, OR (Oregon)</td>
<td>2.70</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* County statistics, map, and text interpretation are based on complete-count data.
** Major cities or towns may be included in parentheses.

### Hawaii

Beginning in 1885 thousands of Japanese were recruited for work on Hawaii's sugar plantations, replacing and supplementing the Chinese who had been apt to leave plantation work when their initial contracts were completed. Although the workers had fully expected to stay in Hawaii for just three years, most were not able to save enough money to return to Japan with pride (Wilson and Hosokawa 1980). Thus, the majority of the Japanese recruited remained in Hawaii, and the Japanese became the islands' largest ethnic group. As of 1980 Japanese still outnumbered whites and constituted 25 percent of the island population, if U.S. military personnel and their dependents are not included (Schmit 1982).

In Hawaii in the 1890s the Chinese had become shopkeepers and importers, and nearly all the Japanese were plantation laborers. In the first decade of the 20th century, as many Japanese moved off the plantations, the Hawaii Sugar Planters' Association began to bring other ethnic groups in as workers. One such group were Okinawans, of whom about 30,000 came to Hawaii (Wilson and Hosokawa 1980). For several decades the Okinawans were considered by Japanese in Hawaii to be almost a separate ethnic group, inferior to those from main islands of Japan (Matsumoto 1982). However, they have since come to share the increased socioeconomic status experienced by the Japanese in general. In 1980 an estimated one-sixth of Hawaii's Japanese were of Okinawan origin.

The sugar planters wished to prevent those who had completed their contracts from leaving for the mainland, but when Hawaii became a territory in 1900, the Japanese could migrate to the mainland without any immigration formalities. West Coast businesses needing labor encouraged them to come, and so many men did so that the net Japanese migration to Hawaii in the early 20th century was predominantly female. By 1920 families and communities had been established, and over a third of the Japanese in Hawaii were children under age 15. During World War II very few of Hawaii's Japanese were moved to internment camps, and after the war their socioeconomic position began to improve substantially. Increased military and, later, tourist spending, together with labor union successes and the rise of the Democratic party, came to weaken the previously indomitable oligarchy of white plantation owners.

Ever since 1900 Japanese have been moving from Hawaii to the mainland, typically to California. The PUHS data show that over two-thirds of all Hawaii-born Japanese living on the mainland in 1980 resided in California.

### Mainland Settlements Before 1942

**Early Transiency and Dispersal.** Beginning in the 1890s, the Japanese who had crossed from Hawaii as well as migrants direct from Japan took over many of the unskilled laboring jobs that had previously been done by the Chinese. The early Japanese in the West usually did outside laboring work, most commonly working on farms or in railroad sections. They helped build many of the later railroad lines, such as the Denver and Rio Grande's route across the Colorado Rockies, and dominated many track maintenance crews as far east as the Dakotas.

Other laboring jobs, particularly in the Pacific Northwest and Wyoming, Utah, and Colorado, introduced the highly migratory workers to other parts of the West. San Francisco, Seattle, and to a lesser extent, Tacoma and Portland became the bases from which gangs of Japanese labor were hired to pick sugar beets, mine coal, and work in salmon canneries and some sawmills and logging camps. However, those years of menial labor were short for most Japanese, as
they often lived frugally in order to become farmers or open small businesses. A few railroad employees worked their way into better positions, but advancement in most occupations was generally not allowed.

In 1907 the Japanese government acceded to U.S. wishes and ceased issuing passports to Japanese wishing to emigrate for the first time as laborers. This gentlemen’s agreement was prompted by the rapidly increasing anti-Japanese feeling on the West Coast. The humanity born of race prejudice and resentment at the competitive success of many Japanese, Japane
cese immigration was immediately reduced, but the men already here were able to marry because so many women entered as “picture brides.” Thus, permanent communities were formed.

Communities Based on Intensive Farming or Small Business. Former railroad and logging workers became the dairymen and vegetable and fruit farmers in western Washington and the Portland (Multnomah County), Oregon, area (Wilson and Hosokawa 1980). By 1920 Japanese farmers raised most of the strawberries, raspberries, and vegetables in eastern Multnomah County, while those in Hood River County marketed their apples and celery through their own grocers’ associations.

The Japanese section of Seattle, on the edge of Skid Row, bustled with trade as shipbuilding geared up during World War I (Miyamoto [1939] 1984). In 1920 it was the second largest Japanese city in the United States, with the Japanese owning 47 percent of the hotels and 25 percent of the grocery stores (Light 1972). However, the optimism of those days soon vanished with passage of a state anti-alien land law and 1924 restrictions on the entry of wives of Japanese men (Miyamoto [1939] 1984). These events were, of course, followed by the Great Depression and internment.

Although many Japanese who had worked in the Intermountain West had returned to West Coast cities by the 1930s, some remained in Denver, Salt Lake City, and smaller towns in Washington and Idaho with which they had become acquainted. In southern Idaho and adjacent Malheur County in Oregon, some of the Japanese who had persisted in building the Oregon Short Line in the 1890s despite much harassment by locals remained to become the key work force picking sugar beets for the new factories (Sims 1978). Many later became beet growers or restaurant owners, resulting in more long-term Japanese communities in many of the same localities.

Although some of the Japanese who settled in the larger West Coast cities became domestic servants, dishwasher, or kitchen helpers, a large proportion were able to begin small business operations such as shoe repair and barber shops and grocery stands (Imm. Com. 1911 [n. 1]). They also frequently ran laundries, pools, barbers, auto shops, and restaurants. In general, these small businesses were located in a Japanese enclave and served a Japanese clientele.

Where there were large Japanese populations, as in Los Angeles and Seattle, such business ventures provided a collective economic base that was substantially independent of the larger, white-controlled economy (Light 1972; Bonacioc and Modell 1980). The resources generated within the Japanese ethnic community were then invested in other Japanese-owned businesses, thus enhancing both prosperity and ethnic solidarity.

After an initial period as farm laborers, most Japanese in California wished to enter some aspect of intensive farming. However, state laws, beginning in 1913, declared that foreign-born Japanese could not own land. Because in the early years the immigrants had initially thought of themselves as sojourners, many were satisfied to work out some land-leaseing arrangements, and subsequent additional restrictions on ownership were not a great hardship. However, the great majority of Japanese residents in Los Angeles by 1980. Although some Japanese responded to this situation by moving to cities, many continued as farmers. Many chose to live in the Central Valley, particularly around Fresno, or the Central Coast area (San Luis Obispo County). Others remained in parts of Los Angeles, which had by 1920 become the largest Japanese settlement on the mainland.

Japanese employment in Los Angeles by the 1930s was highly concentrated in vegetable and flower production, wholesaling, and retailing (Nishi 1985). Japanese farmers almost monopolized the production of snap beans, celery, peppers, and strawberries, and grew most of several other crops. Growers in the Central Coast towns could have their produce sold in Los Angeles through a Japanese marketing agency. Southern California’s climate promoted such rapid growth of plants and animals that maintained a wide variety of food could be profitable to a people whose entry into many occupations was limited by white prejudice. In 1931 Japanese fishermen in San Pedro, the port of Los Angeles, wielded and handled about a third of the total fish catch. By 1940 there were 7 different clusters of Japanese in Los Angeles, with downtown’s Little Tokyo functioning as the leading commercial and cultural center.

Internment and Mainland Changes Since World War II

With the bombing of Pearl Harbor, many white Americans and military leaders were concerned about the possible loyalty of ethnic Japanese, including those born here who were U.S. citizens. The federal government forcibly removed all Japanese from the western sides of California, Oregon, and Washington, Alaska and southern Arizona. Although in some cases white friends safeguarded some property until the Japanese owners could return, most Japanese had to abandon homes, shops, and land or sell these at a fraction of their value. The people, almost two-thirds of whom were U.S.-born and citizens, were sent to various relocation camps in isolated desert areas of the West. There they remained behind barbed wire, in most cases for three years.

Life in the camps was boring and depressing, but many felt so devastated and humiliated that it was decades before they were even willing to discuss the events and feelings with their own grandchildren (Kashima 1980). The justification for the government’s abrupt denial of the civil rights of the citizens and their confinement for years has been found wanting by historians and U.S. courts.

Some Japanese were released from the camps in 1943, with the proviso that they not settle in the Far West. Many moved to midwestern and eastern cities. Beginning in 1945, however, Japanese returns to the West Coast to start life again, and the distribution of Japanese there became similar to what it had been in 1940. Nevertheless, only in 1952 were foreign-born Japanese allowed to become citizens and own land in California.

Others, especially those who had been born in the U.S., decided to remain away from the Coast, where prejudice had seemed especially strong. A few thousand settled in Colorado, where perhaps 40 percent became farmers, especially on the piedmont north and south of Denver. Others headed for New York, New Jersey, or Pennsylvania.

By far the largest number who moved eastward after internment settled in Chicago, which immediately became the largest Japanese center east of the Rockies. Chicago seemed more open and less hostile to the Japanese than did the West Coast (Ozaka 1981). Most found jobs as craftsmen, as factory operatives, hotel workers, or seamstresses, and two major residential concentrations developed. However, with increasing education and diligence, the American-born Japanese were able to get white-collar and professional positions and move to more widely scattered suburbs. For them, the move into these white, middle-class areas was an indicator of upward mobility and successful assimilation.

At the same time these successes, together with high rates of intermarriage, meant a decreasing interest in and a subsequent weakening of local Japanese ethnic communities. This pattern was typical of the larger metropolitan areas like Chicago and Cleveland that were far from the West Coast. Moreover, an intermarriage rate of over 50 percent in Honolulu and major California cities (Kotaro 1980) and the shift of younger people toward professional careers suggest a weak-
ening of ethnic solidarity in even these places of traditional strength.

Since 1950 there has been a net flow of Japanese to the West Coast. Some migrants from eastern states have had the same motivations as other Americans, but the larger, more cohesive ethnic communities on the West Coast may have provided a special attraction for Japanese wishing to affirm their ethnic identity and live in a milieu where they could be more fully accepted. Also, the migration from Hawaii to California has continued vigorously. In fact, as is indicated on the map of lifetime migration, the net flow between these two states represented over 4 percent of all U.S.-born Japanese in 1980.

Investment by Japanese companies in America has been massive (Nishi 1985). In Los Angeles, such investments have sparked the redevelopment of the once-blighted Japanese enclave (Nishi 1985). Little Tokyo's senior-citizen housing, cultural and community center, Buddhist temple, new hotel, offices, and shops have turned that area into an attractive showcase.

There has been much less immigration from Japan since 1965 than from China, the Philippines, or Indochina. However, the temporary assignement of Japanese personnel to offices and factories here has resulted in a new type of Japanese sojourner, who typically has had little contact with the established American-born Japanese. Also, small numbers of Japanese could be found in 1980 in counties where army posts are located. Most of these were wives of American servicemen and their children.

Filipinos

1980 Summary Statistics*

| Complete count | 774,652 |
| Edited sample  | 781,894 |

| Counties with Largest Filipino Population** |
| Los Angeles, CA | 99,043 |
| Honolulu, HI | 97,505 |
| San Diego, CA | 48,658 |
| San Francisco, CA | 38,205 |
| Cook (Chicago), IL | 32,695 |

* Counties with Highest Percentage of Filipinos in Population**

| Kauai, HI | 26.19 |
| Maui, HI | 18.92 |
| Hawaii (Hilo), HI | 13.81 |
| Honolulu, HI | 12.79 |
| Kodiak Island, AK | 6.28 |

** Countyle statistics, map, and text interpretation are based on complete count data.
** Major cities or towns may be indicated in parentheses.

Hawaii Settlements

Almost all Filipinos came to the U.S. after our country took over the Philippine Islands in 1898. Hawaiian sugar growers began importing Filipino plantation workers after 1907, when the supply of new Japanese laborers was cut off. A total of 125,000 Filipinos were recruited, mostly between 1910 and 1931, but another 7,300 came in 1946 (Anderson 1984). By 1935 nearly one-half of those who came first on contract had moved back to the Philippines, but 20,000 had moved on to the mainland, a migration that has remained large in recent decades.

Filipinos on the sugar and pineapple plantations were generally very isolated, especially before World War II, but some moved to towns and cities after their contracts were completed. Jobs connected with the military during World War II improved opportunities somewhat, and successful unionization and strikes around 1947 and political efforts led to the weakening of the control of the sugar planters (Tedoro 1981). In the 1950s, as Japanese and Chinese moved into better occupations, Filipinos took their jobs as gardeners, truck drivers, waitresses, and hospital workers. And after 1965 wives and children of workers were able to immigrate, permitting a more normal family life in those towns.

But probably because they were the last ethnic group in the islands, they have had less socioeconomic success, less choice of residence off the plantations, and more concentrated settlements than the other groups (Lind 1980). Some plantation towns have disappeared and others have been remade into suburban communities, but almost half the people living in plantation camps around 1980 were Filipinos (Anderson 1984). Filipinos made up over a quarter of the population of Molokai (Maui County) because of the history of pineapple production there, and the island of Lanai (Maui County), whose economy has been based almost completely on pineapple production, was 51 percent Filipino in 1980. Because plantations had been established on all the larger islands, the county distributions (based on the islands) do not distinguish such areas.

Net migration in the islands has been strongly toward Oahu (Honolulu), where the preferred plantations were usually located and where life and jobs have always been more varied though the low-rent housing was old and crowded. In the 1970s the Hawaii-born Filipinos, who typically have not remained in the plantation towns, have often found work connected with the military or with tourism. Many others have sought better opportunities on the mainland.

Recent immigration from the Philippines has also added to Honolulu's population, though getting a job has often been difficult (Anderson 1984). Because professionals have found that certification requirements protected those already resident from competition by newcomers, immigrants who were not relatives of people in Hawaii have been especially likely to move to the mainland.

Early Mainland Settlements

California. On the mainland the earliest Filipinos to arrive were students, attempting to pursue college work here but finding so many obstacles in their path that most were forced to take farm labor or other menial jobs. In the 1920s and 1930s California growers found much of their labor supply in the larger communities and the men who had been working in Hawaii. The Filipinos took seasonal jobs wherever they could be found, but because there were so few women, the communities tended to be transient. Migration from the Philippines was fairly easy until restrictions were introduced in 1934 because Filipinos, as residents of a U.S. territory, were considered nationals of this country.

Many Filipinos who worked seasonally in the Central Valley later settled in one of the valley's farm labor towns. Stockton (San Joaquin County) was the largest single center, from which workers were often shipped out to various cultivating or harvesting tasks in nearby areas. Near the south end of the valley is Delano, another focus of Filipino farm workers in the Kern and Tulare counties area.

Just as whites in the West had denied decent treatment and rights to earlier Asian immigrants, in the 1920s riots and state legislation forced Filipinos who were not farmworkers to retreat to urban shelters in the few little Manilas or in Chinatowns.

In several states Asians were not allowed to marry white women and were barred from citizenship and the purchase of land, these laws being overturned only in 1948 and the early 1950s. Although some Filipinos organized in order to better their demand for fair treatment from growers, debts from gambling and purchases at company stores, as well as lack of
knowledge of English and American ways, helped keep most Filipinos in poverty and a dependent status into the 1970s. By 1980, however, immigration had led to more diverse Filipino populations in the agricultural counties of the Central Valley, including many younger people, most of whom were in more skilled or even professional occupations.

**Alaska and Other States.** Beginning in the 1920s many Filipinos came to the coast of Alaska as low-paid spring and summer workers in the scattered salmon canneries (Cordova 1983). Those "Alaskeros" were usually farmworkers from California, drifers, or students, who were shipped north from Seattle each year. Some chose to remain in Alaska, often marrying local Indian women, and a year-round Filipino community existed in Juneau as early as 1935. Older Filipinos who were living in that state in 1980 may have once worked in the fishhouses.

In the continental U.S., some Filipinos worked in canneries along the coast of Washington. A few others headed to Seattle, where they found that many employers accepted them only for menial work like dishwashing in restaurants. In New Jersey, however, some became chemical workers, mechanics, truck drivers, accountants, or teachers (Melendy 1980).

The Filipinos who settled in Chicago in the 1920s were mostly high school graduates who had come to pursue higher education, but they ended up working as railroad porters and attendants for the Pullman Company (Posadas 1981). These men typically married working-class white women, often after meeting them in taxi-dance halls, and lived in the few racially mixed apartment buildings. Other Filipinos worked for the post office or the Navy's Great Lakes Naval Training Station (Melendy 1980).

**Recent Mainland Settlements.** Immigration from the Philippines has increased dramatically since 1965. Up to 20,000 immigrants have been permitted under the quotas for each year, but spouses and unmarried minor children of U.S. citizens have been able to enter without being included in this quota. The result has been that, for most years between 1966 and 1980, there were 30,000 to 40,000 immigrants from the Philippines—more than from any other country in the world except Mexico. Some of these Filipinos were ethnic Chinese, as explained in the Chinese section earlier. In California, for instance, 5,300 people of Filipino race had Chinese as part of a multiple ancestry in 1980.

As has been the case with people from many countries, some Filipinos who managed to convince a visa officer in Manila that they deserved to enter America briefly as a tourist, but later decided to stay to beyond the limits of the visa.

Those who qualified as immigrants have generally done so because they had close relatives already living in America, as citizens or legally resident aliens. Many of these relatives had been trained professionally or technically, as doctors, nurses, engineers, optometrists, and the like in the Philippines. Others who have not had sufficiently close relations have often entered because they could provide a specific training that the American government certified was needed in our country. Job openings for such people have tended to be greater in the larger metropolitan areas, which have understandably become the destinations for most immigrants.

**Metropolitan Areas.** Some Filipinos had lived in Los Angeles and San Francisco before the mid-1960s, but most of the Filipinos living in those metropolitan areas in 1980 represented recent immigrants and their children. However, the fact that a Filipino community with close ties, and the climate and easy connections to Manila, has attracted newcomers to most California metropolitan areas. The greater Los Angeles (including Orange County) and San Francisco Bay (including as far south as San Jose in Santa Clara County) areas have developed numerous Filipino communities, based partly on region of origin in the islands, which have resulted in easier adjustments to America than could be found in smaller places. Each of those sprawling areas had over 100,000 Filipinos in 1980, and 46 percent of the entire nation's Filipinos lived in California at that time.

For these reasons most Filipino professionals have probably preferred to settle in metropolitan California. However, in order to find jobs other than menial ones like dishwasher or janitor, they have often had to migrate to metropolitan areas in the East and Midwest. Doctors and others in healthcare have often had difficulty in passing examinations for licensure in California, and there have been generally many more such jobs in the eastern and midwestern cities (Allen 1977). Government-supported hospitals in cities like Newark (Essex County) and Jersey City (Hudson County) in New Jersey have often established requirements less strict than California's, so a similar case.

The Filipino population of metropolitan areas like Chicago, Detroit, and greater New York City has grown rapidly. Because the immigrant professionals have been familiar with English, the adaptation has not only been easier but also quicker. Most cities have no concentrated Filipino section, although in Chicago there are large Filipino settlements near the major North Side medical facilities (Carlson 1983) and in North Chicago (Lake County), where hospitals, Abbott Laboratory, and the Great Lakes Naval Training Station are located. In a major city like Cleveland and Detroit the majority of Filipinos are suburban. Thus, in addition to the migration from Hawaii to the mainland, there has been an eastward shift of the mainland Filipino population. This flow does not appear on the map of net migration of U.S.-born Filipinos because the eastward movers were mostly born in the Philippines.

**Naval Installations.** Several hundred or more young Filipino men have come to America each year under a special program for foreign enlistment with the U.S. Navy (Quinnsat 1976; Allen 1977). Since 1901 high school graduates have competed for positions as Navy stewards, and during the Vietnam War period this program provided such an opportunity for about 1,500 men annually. Men associated with this program have usually accounted for between 10 and 15 percent of the male Filipino immigrants, apart from the wives, children, and parents permitted to enter later because of family relationships with the servicemen.

The men who signed on as stewards have generally served meals, washed dishes, or done similar tasks in the Navy or Coast Guard and some have acted as servants to high-ranking officers and their families. After the initial tour of duty, they have typically reenlisted for specialized training for more advanced positions. At some point in his career with the Navy, most have married women from the Philippines, resulting in the presence of thousands of Filipino families associated with Navy ports and other facilities. These Navy-related Filipino communities have grown rapidly in the last 20 years (Allen 1977).

Many locations of Filipinos in 1980 are best understood as Navy-related, although some Filipinos in all such places had no connection with the Navy. In large metropolitan areas, where recent Filipino immigrants have been apt to settle, only a small portion of the Filipinos may be connected with the Navy in spite of large Navy operations. This is probably the case in Seattle (King County), Washington, and in San Francisco and Los Angeles counties in California. However, the unusually large number of Filipinos reported in San Diego was due greatly to the numerous Navy operations associated with that port. Bremerton (Kitsap County), Washington, was a similar case.

On the Atlantic coast, Norfolk, Virginia, had an especially large Filipino population because of the numerous Navy operations located there. Likewise, the submarine base at New London, Connecticut, was probably explained by the Filipino settlement there. Naval installations at Pensacola (Escambia County) and Jacksonville (Duval County), Florida, and Virginia Beach, Virginia, are other examples.

In California's Central Valley, where many Filipinos...
were farmworkers, the presence of Lemoore Naval Air Station in Kings County has meant an obviously different Filipino population. Some Alaskan Filipinos in 1980 may have been associated with the Navy’s operations on Kodiak Island and in the Aleutians.

Koreans

1980 Summary Statistics*

| Complete count | 354,503 |
| Reported Ethnic Population | 357,303 |

Counties with Largest Korean Population**

| Los Angeles, CA | 60,618 |
| New York City, NY | 23,257 |
| Cook (Chicago), IL | 17,323 |
| Honolulu, HI | 16,880 |
| Orange, CA | 11,538 |

Counties with Highest Percentage of Koreans in Population**

| Honolulu, HI | 2.21 |
| Geary (Junction City; Fort Riley), KS | 1.90 |
| Fairfax, VA | 1.12 |
| Copperfield (Fort Hood; Copperas Cove), TX | 1.06 |
| Bell (Killeen), TX | 1.02 |

* County statistics, map, and text interpretation are based on complete-count data.
** Major cities or towns may be included in parentheses.

Pre-1965 Settlements

Hawaii. The earliest large Korean immigration to Hawaii occurred from 1903 to 1905, when workers were recruited for labor on the sugar plantations. The planters found themselves short of labor, as poor conditions had led earlier workers either to desert, not renew contracts, or to strike (Choy 1979). A total of about 7,200 Koreans landed in Hawaii at that time (Hurh and Kim 1984). Most were men, intending to stay only temporarily, but fewer than 1,000 had returned by 1910. However, another 2,000 had moved to the West Coast. Most of those who remained on the islands moved toward Honolulu, where they did manual labor, the savings from which often led to their opening small produce stands, grocery stores, laundries, and other family-run businesses. Later some entered real estate or other larger ventures or became professionals, so that most Koreans in Hawaii were living comfortably in the 1970s. Koreans, with three-quarters of their marriages to non-Koreans, epitomized the mixing of ethnic populations that has come to characterize Hawaii (Lind 1970).

Because Protestant Christian missionaries had persuaded most of the early Koreans to emigrate for better opportunities in a more developed and Christian country, Korean immigrants were apt to be Christians. In Hawaii the first Korean church was organized within half a year (Choy 1979). The Protestant churches became the major focus of their plantation and, later, urban communities.

The Mainland. Some of those who came to the mainland first worked on railroad construction. However, most were soon raising vegetables and later developing orchards, nurseries, and vineyards, as far away as Nebraska and Colorado, but more likely in California (Kim 1981). Also, between 1910 and World War II the U.S. accepted unofficially perhaps 2,000 Korean refugees from Japanese domination of their country as well as several hundred students. Despite their education, most had to take menial service jobs like hotel and restaurant work, but some later pooled their resources and developed businesses, often in farming in California’s Central Valley.

In the years after the 1910 annexation of Korea by Japan the only Koreans allowed to emigrate officially were about 1,100 “picture brides” who had been selected as wives by Korean men already here. Those whose husbands remained in Hawaii helped reshape the islands’ former bachelor-dominated Korean population into a more family-oriented community, with an even balance of males and females in 1920. The others who settled on the mainland found a variety of conditions. A few such women even spent many years on primitive farms in Oregon and Montana, but managed to survive and raise children despite their isolation from other Koreans (Sundoo 1978).

In 1920 the 1,200 Koreans living on the mainland were mostly in California. Most were farmworkers, picking oranges, grapes, or sugar beets and living in farm towns near Los Angeles. By 1950 they had surpassed San Francisco as the leading center of Koreans in the state (Yim 1984).

The next group of immigrants to the continent were the 6,400 “war brides” and 5,300 Korean War orphans who arrived between 1951 and about 1965 (Yu 1983). The orphans, about 60 percent of whom represented racial mixtures, were adopted by widely scattered American families (Hurh and Kim 1984). These families were typically middle-class, white, and Protestant in religion. Because most lived in rural areas or small cities, the youngsters grew up with few if any contacts with other Koreans, and most have remained isolated from the Korean communities which have been developing during the last two decades (Yu 1983). The women who became the wives of American servicemen stationed in Korea represent a distinctive and largely separate Korean population in America.

Additionally, during the 1950s and early 1960s several hundred Korean physicians attended American universities in New York, Philadelphia, and Boston, and elsewhere for internships or residency training (Kim 1981). These medical doctors, plus some of those who switched into business careers, ultimately assumed leadership in the rapidly growing Korean communities of the Northeast.

Post-1965 Immigration and Settlement

Since the 1965 changes in the immigration law, Koreans have come to this country in greater numbers than any other Asian group except Filipinos. In the early 1980s, when few Koreans were eligible as relatives of U.S. citizens, over 70 percent of those who qualified for admission did so on the basis of the occupations they could offer (Yu 1983). As more of these professional and technical people became permanent residents and citizens, their own relatives became eligible without regard to their occupational skills.

Protestant Christians have continued to be a large segment of Korean immigrants, and nearly all ethnic community activities take place in the numerous churches (Kim 1981). Also, perhaps a fifth of recent immigrants have been refugees from North Korea, predominantly Christians, who fled to South Korea in the early 1950s (Yu 1983).

Los Angeles has become the major port of entry of Koreans to America, and in 1980 Koreans in Los Angeles and Orange counties made up 20 percent of the total Korean population in the country.

Professionals in Large Metropolitan Areas. Many of the immigrants have been professionals, often physicians, scientists, teachers, or engineers, some of whom, together with Korean students, have been affiliated with colleges and universities. Others have worked for major corporations. People with these backgrounds and occupations have typically located in the larger metropolitan areas where job opportunities have been greater. In addition, some wealthy Koreans have entered the U.S. as tourists or investors, and because they bought and operated a business here, under certain conditions, they have been able to gain immigrant status (Kim 1981). However, the Koreans living in upper-middle-class metropolitan suburbs in 1980 were most apt to be physicians.
Most health professionals have found that job availability has concentrated them in the older, more central parts of northeastern cities. Because so many American-born doctors and nurses have chosen not to work in the city and state hospitals that serve the local black and Hispanic minorities, those institutions have largely filled their ranks with foreign-trained people such as Koreans. Another large employer of immigrants has been the Veterans Administration hospitals (Kim 1981). Half the Korean doctors in America were located in the greater New York City area in 1976, but most of them were in the lower-status public hospitals in the inner cities. In contrast, immigrants trained as pharmacists, dental or X-ray technicians have often found employment more easily.

Even before Congress tightened regulations on the entry of foreign health professionals in 1976, many immigrants trained in Korea and other countries were having trouble passing licensing examinations. These were often the people who opened small shops or took jobs that were below their level of education and training. At the same time, many Koreans have continued to be employed as service-station attendants, garment workers, or the like.

Small Business Developments. A great many Koreans have followed this route, usually after a stint as a factory worker, an unsuccessful search for a professional position, or disappointment over lack of advancement. In Atlanta Koreans reported that they entered business because they recognized that their inadequate knowledge of the English language and American customs, as well as racial prejudice, made professional careers difficult (Min 1984). Also, North Korean refugees may have been particularly imaginative and aggressive in business, but certainly the familiarity with American business practices that many Koreans learned over the last quarter century of close economic ties has stood them in good stead (Yu 1983). The businesses that Koreans have moved into could be successful in many American places; they permitted the Koreans to settle near their relatives and in places they perceived as congenial, whether they be large or small, in the North or South or West.

In 1980 an estimated 30 percent of the Koreans in Los Angeles had their own businesses (Yu 1983). Some immigrants began with food, magazine, or cassette tape stores or real estate, accounting, or travel agencies that served the Korean community (Kim 1981). Later they often moved into lines that attracted a non-Korean clientele, specializing in such items as fruit and vegetables, hamburgers, handbags, wigs, shoes, clothing, stationery, and auto supplies. Some have worked their way into garment or electronics manufacturing. In Atlanta the characteristic Korean-import businesses of the early 1970s have dwindled in importance compared to the groceries, fast-food shops, restaurants, dry cleaners, coin laundries, and other businesses that serve local populations, both white and black (Min 1984).

In the largest cities many of these Korean-operated businesses are located in minority ghettos, barrios, and racially mixed areas with high crime rates. There, aging white shopkeepers have usually been anxious to sell their small grocery, liquor, or discount stores. In the late 1960s and early 1970s wigs were in fashion, especially among blacks and Puerto Ricans in New York City (Kim 1981), and because Korea had become a major center for wig manufacture, Korean merchants and peddlers with good supply connections found that specialty item highly profitable during those few years. Beginning in 1971, a few Koreans in New York tried selling fruit and vegetables (Kim 1981). They were so successful that many others there and in Philadelphia followed. By about 1979 Korea's neighborhood fresh produce stores and stores developing this enterprise in suburban Long Island, Westchester County, and New Jersey. They competed successfully with the supermarkets by utilizing family workers, driving themselves to the wholesale market each day, and charging higher prices in return for allowing customers to smell and handle the produce (Young 1983).

Residential Dispersal. Within large metropolitan areas like New York, Chicago, and Los Angeles most immigrants were living some distance from Korean commercial neighborhoods, although many people came to those Koreatowns temporarily when they first arrived. In New York Koreans were most apt to be living in ethnically mixed and predominately white, lower middle-class sections in northern Queens (from Sunnyside to Flushing), but there were Koreans in Lower Manhattan and the South Bronx and a few in Scarsdale (Kim 1981).

Koreatown in Los Angeles, originally centered in the Olympic Boulevard and Western Avenue area, was formerly important as a residential area for Korean immigrants. By 1980, however, the Korean population of the suburbs was growing faster, and although Koreatown had expanded in area, especially northward into Hollywood, it had become increasingly commercial (Yu 1983). Only about 30 percent of the county's Koreans lived there in 1980, and Koreans remained a small minority among the mixed working-class white, Chicano, and Asian population of the area.

Army Posts. The large number of Koreans found at major Army posts is a distinctive aspect of the 1980 distribution. These are evident because most posts are in rural areas with few attractions for those Koreans not connected with the military. In 1980 over 15,000 Koreans were living in those predominantly rural counties that contained or were next to an Army post.

Most of those reported were probably wives of American servicemen, although the parents of the wives and other relatives were probably significant in numbers and an unknown number of the racially mixed children were recorded as Korean. Some other Asian wives, especially Japanese, immigrated in the 1950s, at the time of the Korean War and American occupation. However, Koreans tended to come in more recent years—especially the 1970s (Kim 1977). The adjustment to life in the States has been difficult: the wives have felt isolated by English-language difficulties and at the same time have had little contact with other Koreans.

The majority of the 40 counties with the highest percentages of Koreans in their populations had major U.S. Army forts. The Fort Hood, Texas, area had over 2,000 Koreans; Fort Bragg (Cumberland County), North Carolina, and Fort Sill (Comanche County), Oklahoma, were each the focus of over 900 Koreans. Most other Army posts, like Fort Knox (Meade and Hardin counties), Kentucky; Fort Polk (Vernon Parish), Louisiana; and Fort Gordon (Richmond County) and Stewart (Liberty County) in Georgia, can be identified in the data by the several hundred Koreans in the local county. Probably some Koreans in the small towns associated with these Army posts have gone into business, too, just as the Koreans in university towns no longer are just in positions with those universities.
Vietnamese are the largest population in America with an origin in Indochina—the mainland area south of China and east of India and Pakistan. Other people from Indochina in the United States are Cambodians (Khmers), Thai, and Lao, the latter including both ethnic Lao and Hmong. Vietnamese as an identifier can refer to either a country or the largest ethnic group within that country.

Of people who formerly lived in Vietnam, the major minority group was the Chinese, frequently referred to as Vietnamese-Chinese or the ethnic Chinese from Vietnam. Because the race question on the census forced responses of this minority into either the Chinese or the Vietnamese category and because immigration and refugee data are collected only in terms of countries, the size of this population has been difficult to measure. The PUMS data from the 1980 census permit an examination of people who reported both Chinese and Vietnamese as responses to different questions (race and ancestry). The figures, presented near the beginning of the Chinese section of this chapter, indicate that Vietnamese-Chinese were much more apt to identify their race as Vietnamese. The Vietnamese-Chinese in California represented 15 percent of the state’s Vietnamese population in 1980. Compared to most Vietnamese, the ethnic Chinese in the early 1980s were more apt to settle in New York City or Los Angeles County than in other places (Hung 1985), suggesting an increasing proportion of Vietnamese-Chinese in those two areas.

Refugee Origin
The Vietnamese are one of the newest populations in the United States, since prior to the war in Vietnam there had been few ties between the two countries. During the early years of the war in the 1960s immigration was still small, but from 1971 through 1974 an average of 3,000 Vietnamese immigrated each year. These were mostly the wives and children of troops stationed in Vietnam.

After April of 1975, however, most Vietnamese arrived as refugees. The American military was forced out of Vietnam at that time and Saigon fell to the Communists. In the rushed and confused evacuation the U.S. government took tens of thousands of Vietnamese to Guam and the Philippines, and some private American companies brought out their Vietnamese employees and dependents. Thousands more escaped on their own in fishing boats. By the end of 1975, approximately 130,000 refugees had passed through the temporary camps in the U.S. and had been resettled here. But the exodus of those forced out of the country by the new Vietnamese government was just beginning.

Ethnic Chinese predominated in the next wave of refugees. During the last century the Chinese in Vietnam lived primarily in the towns and cities of southern Vietnam and constituted in many ways a separate society that controlled the commerce of the country (Whitmore 1985). Once the French were defeated in Vietnam in 1954, ethnic Vietnamese remained en masse to resist the Chinese and remove pressures and restrictions on the Chinese. After the 1975 Communist takeover, the Chinese in Vietnam found themselves being further squeezed and pushed into the countryside, as had happened a few years earlier in Cambodia. In late 1978 and 1979 most of the ethnic Chinese decided to flee, either by land to China or by boat to whatever shore they could find. Perhaps half of the “boat people” made it to shore in Thailand or Malaysia, from which most had been resettled in the U.S. or some other country.

Resettlement Programs and Adjustment
Those who arrived in the U.S. as part of the first wave were sent to one of four military installations so that arrangements could be made for their resettlement. The federal government provided funds for the programs in the camps, but resettlement was to be handled by several voluntary agencies experienced in refugee adjustment. The policy was to seek individual American sponsors for each Vietnamese family, with each sponsor helping the family adjust to American ways and find jobs, to become self-supporting as quickly as possible. Many sponsorship offers were made by Americans who wanted the cheap labor of dependent workers, but other sponsors supported their Vietnamese family during most of the early months, often at considerable personal sacrifice. By the end of 1975, 60 percent had been found for each family, and the camps were closed.

The policy of the federal government in 1975 was to try to disperse the refugees so that they would not be highly visible or threatening as a group but would have closer contact with Americans and our culture. Most sponsors did not want large extended families characteristic of Vietnamese society; these were broken up into the nuclear families typical of American society.

The first years of adjustment were especially difficult, partly because the refugees had not planned to move permanently to America. The sense of loss at leaving home and family in Vietnam was combined with the pressure to adjust to the strange ways of Americans. Moreover, many of the men in the 1975 wave had the additional difficulty of initial loss of job status: those who had been managers, professionals, or businessmen found that the only jobs available for them here were low-paying jobs as laborers, busboys, dishwashers, and janitors. Since those early years, many have been able to move into positions that pay better and use their talents and skills more effectively. Some of these people became professionals, but the largest number have opened small businesses. Others, however, especially the more recent arrivals in the 1980s, have lacked the skills that would have prepared them for good jobs here and have found only dead-end jobs, with few prospects for advancement. Accepting welfare has seemed better than taking jobs with low pay and no future.

As of September 1986 the 505,300 Vietnamese who had entered the U.S. as refugees comprised 63 percent of the total number of Southeast Asian refugees in this country (Gordon 1987a, b). During the 1980s additional thousands of Vietnamese came to America as immigrants rather than as refugees.

Evolving Distributions
The map of Vietnamese in 1980 shows much of the early dispersal that had been the 1975 policy, although many counties not indicated on the map had between 30 and 50 Vietnamese. Sponsors had been found in widely scattered parts of the country, but soon after resettlement the Vietnamese began to reunite their extended families, resulting in numerous secondary migrations within the U.S.

A shift to California was just beginning. In the initial 1975 resettlement 21 percent of the refugees had been placed in California. The 1980 census showed 22 percent of the country’s Vietnamese living in California, but by 1984 an estimated 40 percent of all Southeast Asian refugees had settled in that state (U.S. Office of Refugee Resettlement 1985b). Thus, the 1980 distribution reflects an early transitional stage toward greater concentration, primarily in California.
Initial Dispersal. In 1980 there were still higher-than-usual proportions of Vietnamese refugees close to the four military installations that processed the 1975 refugees: Camp Pendleton (Orange County, California); Fort Chaffee (Sebastian County, Arkansas); Fort Indiantown Gap (Dauphin County, Pennsylvania); and Charleston Air Force Base (Escambia County, Florida). These foci developed when the Americans who staffed the camps and the volunteers from nearby cities often later acted as sponsors of families they had befriended (Kelly 1977). In the western states California became the major area of initial resettlement, with many sponsorships for the unusually large group of refugees who passed through Camp Pendleton (Orange County) arranged in the local Los Angeles and Orange counties area.

The small, scattered clusters of Vietnamese indicate the location of sponsors, these depending to some extent on the resettlement agencies' connections with churches and other organizations in different areas. For example, a meatpacking plant in Wichita (Sedgwick County), Kansas, originally sponsored 42 refugees (Kelly 1977), but that community had increased substantially by 1980. Vietnamese fishermen settled at several points along the Gulf Coast from West Florida through Texas. They were especially evident in the Rockport area (Aransas County) and Seadrift (Calhoun County) in Texas. There, in the early years there were numerous difficulties in adjusting to the American ways of fishing and some understandable resentment at the Vietnamese intrusion. Farther up the coast the Vietnamese based in Kemah (Galveston County) and Seabrook (Harris County) have come to own most of the shrimp and oyster boats on Galveston Bay. Another group first located near the mouth of the Mississippi (Plaquemines Parish in Louisiana), but 40 families of fishermen and shrimpers were pressured to leave and many moved to Biloxi (Harrison County), Mississippi (Arden 1981). They were joined by others to resettle in the community they had known in Vietnam. The refugees generally have done well in Gulf Coast fishing, partly because of their skill and hard work and partly because they would take on less attractive jobs like oyster shucking or work the less productive fishing grounds that Americans avoided. By 1980 in West Florida alone the Vietnamese fishing fleet totaled 60 boats (Starr 1981).

In the Monterey Bay area of California (Monterey County), the first Vietnamese fishermen learned the local ways as crew members on American boats before operating boats of their own, and because most have fished with a different language and for different species than the American fishermen, potential conflicts between the two groups have been eased (Orbach and Beckwith 1982).

Vietnamese Catholics, many originally having fled to South Vietnam in the 1950s, made up an estimated 40 percent of the Vietnamese refugees in 1979. Vietnamese priests played major roles in reuniting Catholic families and communities. The concentration of Vietnamese in New Orleans developed because the resettlement agency (Associated Catholic Charities Air Force Base) located in Florida. These foci developed when the Americans who staffed the camps and the volunteers from nearby cities often later acted as sponsors of families they had befriended (Kelly 1977). In the western states California became the major area of initial resettlement, with many sponsorships for the unusually large group of refugees who passed through Camp Pendleton (Orange County) arranged in the local Los Angeles and Orange counties area.

The small, scattered clusters of Vietnamese indicate the location of sponsors, these depending to some extent on the resettlement agencies' connections with churches and other organizations in different areas. For example, a meatpacking plant in Wichita (Sedgwick County), Kansas, originally sponsored 42 refugees (Kelly 1977), but that community had increased substantially by 1980. Vietnamese fishermen settled at several points along the Gulf Coast from West Florida through Texas. They were especially evident in the Rockport area (Aransas County) and Seadrift (Calhoun County) in Texas. There, in the early years there were numerous difficulties in adjusting to the American ways of fishing and some understandable resentment at the Vietnamese intrusion. Farther up the coast the Vietnamese based in Kemah (Galveston County) and Seabrook (Harris County) have come to own most of the shrimp and oyster boats on Galveston Bay. Another group first located near the mouth of the Mississippi (Plaquemines Parish in Louisiana), but 40 families of fishermen and shrimpers were pressured to leave and many moved to Biloxi (Harrison County), Mississippi (Arden 1981). They were joined by others to resettle in the community they had known in Vietnam. The refugees generally have done well in Gulf Coast fishing, partly because of their skill and hard work and partly because they would take on less attractive jobs like oyster shucking or work the less productive fishing grounds that Americans avoided. By 1980 in West Florida alone the Vietnamese fishing fleet totaled 60 boats (Starr 1981).

In the Monterey Bay area of California (Monterey County), the first Vietnamese fishermen learned the local ways as crew members on American boats before operating boats of their own, and because most have fished with a different language and for different species than the American fishermen, potential conflicts between the two groups have been eased (Orbach and Beckwith 1982).

Vietnamese Catholics, many originally having fled to spread in the garment industry of southern California, has resulted in a large underground cash economy in that state.

California. In general, Vietnamese who have settled in California have liked the climate, the generous government assistance program, and the many shops serving various Asian communities (Desbarats and Holland 1983). Although these have been factors in later migration decisions, Vietnamese have also said that their most important reason for leaving the area of sponsorship has been to join relatives. Vietnamese have lived their lives as members of extended families rather than as individuals, and those who found themselves resettled in scattered small groups far from their families felt understandably depressed and moved as soon as possible to rejoin them. Also, relatives and friends already in America have become the sponsors of nearly all new refugees, accentuating the California concentration.

Orange County has come to have more refugees than any state except California itself (Desbarats and Holland 1983). Within that county Vietnamese were found in loose residential clusters in several cities, particularly in Santa Ana, Garden Grove, and Westminster. In 1980 some remained near their original sponsors, but most new arrivals have tried to find rental housing of moderate cost near relatives, friends, schools, and areas of Vietnamese shops. Some refugees have not gotten jobs, but others have found work in factories, such as in electronics assembly, or in services like restaurants. Vietnamese have also opened small businesses. A stretch of about 200 small businesses along Bolsa Avenue in Westminster has been built up just since 1978, with markets and shops selling noodles and herbal medicines, and with restaurants, pharmacies, gift and fabric shops as well, and offices for doctors, lawyers, and others. Some call "Bolsa" the Vietnamese capital in America—a place where Vietnamese can feel almost at home and to which those far away can make occasional pilgrimages (Day and Holley 1984).

In contrast, Vietnamese-Chinese have typically not settled in Orange County but have preferred instead the Chinese sections of Los Angeles, particularly Chinatown, and the suburban cities like Monterey Park that are just east of Chinatown (McMillan 1984; Arax 1987a).

In northern California, the San Jose area (Santa Clara County), better known as Silicon Valley, contained the largest number of Vietnamese in 1980. Most who were employed there were technicians or assemblers in the electronics industry (Finan 1981). The prestige of good technical jobs where previous math and science training could be useful and the opportunities for advancement in a growing industry have made the hard-working Vietnamese in this area both proud and successful.
Most people of Cambodian ancestry have been primarily Khmer, the dominant ethnic population in the country of Cambodia, although Chinese members and other ethnic groups may have also reported this ancestry (Ebihara 1985). During the 1970s Cambodians suffered from war, starvation, a reign of terror from 1975 to 1979, and invasion by Vietnam in 1979, each devastation resulting in waves of Cambodians fleeing to nearby Thailand. Some Cambodians spent years in large refugee camps in Thailand before they were accepted for settlement in some country like the U.S.

Refugees from Cambodia arrived in America somewhat later than did those from Vietnam and Laos. Although over several thousand came in 1975 and 1976 when so many Vietnamese did, Cambodians have arrived primarily since 1979 because rigid controls prevented most escapes until that year. Although in 1980 there were relatively few compared to people of Laotian ancestry, from 1981 through 1985 the U.S. received more than twice as many refugees from Cambodia as from Laos (Gordon 1987a, b). By the end of September 1986, when most potentially acceptable refugees from Cambodia had already entered the U.S., the 138,900 Cambodian refugees who had come constituted a sixth of all the Southeast Asian refugees in this country.

In the United States the city of Long Beach (Los Angeles County) has been the premier Khmer center since first settled by the 1975 refugees (Holley 1986). The community has developed a commercial center on 10th Street, with Cambodian markets, tailors, and jewelry stores; but their homes and institutions—Christian churches, a Buddhist temple, various organizations—have been scattered throughout the city. Ethnic Chinese from Cambodia, however, have been more apt to settle in Chinatown or areas other than Long Beach.

Program of Resettlement in Planned Clusters. Because Southeast Asians were by 1980 becoming increasingly concentrated in California and few Cambodians had relatives already here, in the early 1980s the government instituted a program designed to disperse new Cambodian refugees in 12 cities outside California (Gordon 1987a). In contrast to the earlier unsuccessful attempt to assimilate the 1975 refugees by dispersing them in small groups, it was now recognized that extended families and sizable ethnic communities were important for the well-being of refugees. Forced immersion in American society had been found to produce more unhappiness and stress than adjustment. Cambodians without family already here were to be settled in clusters of between 300 and 1,200, and members of any one extended family have been resettled at the same site so that secondary migrations for family reunification would be much reduced (Gordon 1987b). The planned cluster program has been generally effective, so that the cluster sites
of Rochester, New York; Richmond, Virginia; Jacksonville, Florida; Cincinnati and Columbus, Ohio; and Phoenix, Arizona, as well as those in larger metropolitan areas, have received Cambodian populations.

Adjustment to America has usually been difficult for people who a few years ago had been rice farmers. In New York City, for example, Cambodians established a temple and cultural center in the Bronx, but still most have settled in low-rent areas, often in dilapidated apartments (Howe 1985). As among other refugees, those settled in planned clusters may be motivated to migrate to California or elsewhere if the problems of unemployment, low income, poor housing, or crime become too severe.

Laotian Ancestry

1980 Summary Statistics*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Single ancestry</th>
<th>Reported Ethnic Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Orange, CA</td>
<td>3,716</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Diego, CA</td>
<td>3,030</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ramsey (St. Paul), MN</td>
<td>2,042</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multnomah (Portland), OR</td>
<td>1,580</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>King (Seattle), WA</td>
<td>1,369</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Counties with Highest Percentage of Laotian Ancestry in Population**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County (City)</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tillman (Frederick), OK</td>
<td>.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missoula, MT</td>
<td>.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potter (Amarillo), TX</td>
<td>.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comanche (Lawton), OK</td>
<td>.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ramsey (St. Paul), MN</td>
<td>.44</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* County statistics, map, and text interpretation are based on single-ancestry data only.
** Major cities or towns may be indicated in parentheses.

The Laotian-ancestry population in the U.S. is composed primarily of two distinct ethnic groups: the ethnic Lao and the Hmong. In the country of Laos the Lao have inhabited the lowlands, especially the towns and farm villages along the Mekong River. In northeastern Laos and adjacent Vietnam the Hmong have lived in the highlands, where they have traditionally been swidden (shifting) cultivators. Other highland peoples have also entered the U.S. but in much smaller numbers.

Nearly all people from Laos who ended up in the United States were refugees from war. From the early 1960s until 1975 a chaotic struggle for power in Laos reflected the larger war in Vietnam. Right-wing Lao fought against a Vietnamese and Communist takeover, and the Hmong from Laos supplied many thousands of men in the American effort to defeat North Vietnam. When American forces withdrew from South Vietnam, both ethnic Lao and Hmong fled to neighboring Thailand. Because so many Hmong had joined the C.I.A.-trained guerrilla army, they feared—with ample justification, it turned out—especially intense reprisals by the Communist regimes (Mason 1981; Dunnigan and Olney 1985). As of 1980 over 50,000 Lao (Van Esteen 1985) and 100,000 Hmong (Dunnigan and Olney 1985) were in refugee camps in Thailand.

Many people spent years in the camps prior to being accepted by some third country, most commonly the United States. A total of 162,000 refugees from Laos had come to America as of September 1986 (Gordon 1987a, b). About 38 percent of these have been members of hill tribes, the great majority of whom were Hmong (U.S. Office of Refugee Resettlement 1985b).

Evolving Settlement Patterns

As with the Vietnamese, the 1980 Laotian distribution was mostly determined by the voluntary resettlement agencies and location of churches and American individuals who were sponsors of refugees. For example, both Vietnamese and Laotians were settled in the Amarillo (Potter County), Texas, area by Catholic Family Services (Allston 1984). CFS arranged housing and jobs, usually with IBF (Iowa Beef Processors) or Levi Strauss or other employers, and as of 1984 the majority of employed Lao were still working at the meat-packing plant.

However, the recency of settlement here and the fact that 1980 and 1981 were peak years of Laotian arrival meant that the 1980 distribution was but an early stage in an evolving pattern. Because the refugees have had hardly any ties to particular places, they have moved readily and the distribution has changed substantially since 1980. For example, 45 families left Dallas, Texas, en masse in 1979 because of racial tensions in their low-income project but after finding no work in Lawton (Comanche County), Oklahoma, moved again to Tulsa (U.S. Office of Refugee Resettlement 1984).
The destinations of most refugees arriving during the 1980s and the internal migrations of people already here have been based primarily on the location of family and clan members and the refugees' perception of job and government assistance opportunities (U.S. Office of Refugee Settlement 1985a). In addition, because many Hmong have also wanted to return to a farm-based way of life, some of their redistribu-tion has involved movement to rural areas and smaller towns, where some have gardened or worked as farm laborers.

The major destination has been California, where many people already had relatives. In addition, welfare benefits remained greater in California than in most other states after the 1982 reduction from 36 to 18 months in the period of eligibility for federal cash assistance (U.S. Office of Refugee Resettlement 1985a).

**Hmong Settlements**

Missoula, Montana, has had ties to Hmong families since the early 1970s, when a few teenage boys came to study there, probably because of contacts made with American men who had graduated from the smoke-jumper school at Missoula and were flying on the CIA's supply missions to the Hmong (Maxwell 1980). Beginning in 1975 some individual Americans assisted in settling Hmong refugees in the Missoula area, whose mountains seemed almost a touch of home to the refugees. The chain migrations were further developed when a popular Hmong general chose to settle in the area and brought with him over 100 members of his extended family. In 1980 the largest Hmong communities outside California were in Portland (Multnomah County), Oregon, and in Saint Paul (Ramsey County) and adjacent Minneapolis (Hennepin County) in Minnesota. The Twin Cities had initially attracted many Hmong because of prominent Hmong leaders and opportunities for employment, job training, and special welfare assistance (Dannigan 1982). However, employment was at unskilled minimum wages, and underemployment and welfare dependency have been common. In the 1980s many Hmong moved away. Also, 90 percent of the Hmong in Oregon in 1981 left that state at the time of the change in welfare eligibility and the economic recession in Oregon.

Out-migration during the 1980s may have been some-what less from places where most adults have been employed (U.S. Office of Refugee Resettlement 1985a). In Providence, Rhode Island, for instance, the Hmong have worked steadily at the most menial jobs in the very low-paying jewelry industry and other metal manufacturing. Although proud of their self-reliance, the refugees have found economic survival to be difficult and some have moved.

Some refugees who were determined to be self-suffi-cient migrated from California and other states to the Fort Smith (Sebastian County), Arkansas area, where a trusted white advisor had relocated (U.S. Office of Refugee Resettlement 1985a). There the Hmong, who included people who had been government officials, military officers, and nurses in Laos, had hopes of establishing an independent commu-nity of farmers and businessmen. Some did manage to pur-chase and clear some land for pasture and to buy some cattle. However, almost the only work the Hmong were hired for was cutting, trimming, and deboning chickens for low pay under poor conditions. Around 1983 most moved again, many to the Atlanta, Georgia, area for better pay.

Linguistic and cultural barriers are the major reasons that refugees have found such little occupational advancement, have resorted to welfare, and have remained socially isolated in their ethnic communities. Although all ethnic groups among Indo-Chinese refugees have had birth rates substantially above the American average, the Hmong have had exceptionally high fertility, which seems to have been closely related to their welfare dependency and their difficulties in adjusting to America (Rumbaut and Weeks 1986).

**California's Central Valley.** Although refugees have fre-quently come to California because of that state's welfare system, beginning in late 1980 many specifically chose a Central Valley location because they hoped to establish themselves in farming (U.S. Office of Refugee Resettlement 1985a). An estimated three-quarters of the Hmong who left Portland, Oregon, came to the Central Valley. With numer-ous families and clans participating in this unplanned sec-ondary migration from various older settlements, the Hmong population of Stockton, Fresno, Merced, and nearby areas rose exceptionally rapidly during the first half of the 1980s.

By the mid-1980s the area had the largest Hmong concentration in America (Oney 1986), and over 10 percent of the population in the smaller city of Merced was Hmong (U.S. Office of Refugee Resettlement 1985a). Large-scale commercial farming in the valley was beyond the reach of most Hmong, although perhaps 10 percent of the families have raised vegetables and strawberries on land they rented. Some people have worked as farm laborers, picking straw-berries and vegetables in competition with Chicanos and
Thai Ancestry

1980 Summary Statistics*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Single ancestry</th>
<th>Multiple ancestry</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>52,324</td>
<td>11,700</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Counts with Largest Thai-Ancestry Population**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City, State</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Los Angeles, CA</td>
<td>8,484</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York City, NY</td>
<td>2,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cook (Chicago), IL</td>
<td>2,418</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honolulu, HI</td>
<td>951</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Bernardino, CA</td>
<td>816</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Counts with Highest Percentage of Thai Ancestry in Population**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City, State</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Okaloosa (Fort Walton Beach), FL</td>
<td>.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sarpy (Bellevue), NE</td>
<td>.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wayne (Goldsboro), NC</td>
<td>.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coconino (Sierra Vista), AZ</td>
<td>.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horry (Conway), SC</td>
<td>.18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* County statistics, map, and test interpretation are based on single ancestry data only.
** Major cities or towns may be indicated in parentheses.

Few people of Thai ancestry immigrated to the U.S. before the middle 1960s, when American armed forces began to use Thailand as a base for the war against the Communists in Southeast Asia. Thais became much better acquainted with individual Americans and more aware of the U.S. as a potential migration destination. By marriage to American citizens or entry as students or visitors on temporary visas, Thais in small numbers began the process that has led through family ties to a growing Thai population in the U.S., including parents and children of immigrant Thai women. In contrast to other countries in Indochina, no people whose original homes were in Thailand have entered the U.S. as refugees.

Most of the Thai-ancestry population have been ethnic Thais, although a group of refugees (the Thai Dam) whose origin was not in Thailand were coded in the data as Thai and are treated as such in this section. Also, ethnic Chinese, who appear to comprise as much as 50 percent of Los Angeles' population of immigrants from Thailand, may well have identified their ancestry as Thai (Desbarats 1979).

Settlements

**Los Angeles.** By far the largest Thai-ancestry concentration in 1980 was in Los Angeles. That city has become a special magnet for new immigrants and so can be expected to see its Thai-ancestry population grow especially rapidly (Desbarats 1979). It has also attracted an especially large number of people who have overstayed their temporary student or other visitor visas, suggesting perhaps a substantially larger number of Thais than was recorded in the census.

Although Los Angeles Thais have found homes in many parts of the city, Thai businesses and residences have been concentrated in Hollywood—between Hollywood and Olympic boulevards near Western Avenue (Desbarats 1979). Thais have owned banks, gas stations, beauty parlors, travel agencies, grocery stores, and especially Thai restaurants. Immigrants themselves have become more dispersed in their residential pattern as they have learned more of the English language and American culture.

**Military Installations.** The most distinctive aspect of Thai immigration to America during the mid-1970s has been the fact that wives of American citizens have made up about 40 percent of the immigrants (Desbarats 1979). The great majority of the women had married men in the Air Force who had either been stationed in Thailand or vacationed there while on active duty elsewhere in Southeast Asia.

By 1980, there were so many Thai wives and children that the distribution of the Thai-ancestry population was strongly associated with U.S. military installations, primarily Air Force bases. Between 50 and 100 people of Thai ancestry were reported in many such counties, ranging from Aroostook County (Loring Air Force Base) in Maine to Bossier Parish (Barksdale A.F.B.) in Louisiana and New Mexico's Curry County (Cannon A.F.B.).

A few counties in which the military presence has been large had over 200 Thais:Sarpy County, Nebraska, where the Strategic Air Command has been headquartered at Offutt
A.F.B. and Solano County, California, home of Travis A.F.B. Other large Thai concentrations associated with the Air Force were in Davis County, Indiana, with Hill A.F.B.; Okalona County, Florida, where Eglin A.F.B. has been located; and Wayne County, North Carolina, home of Seymour Johnson A.F.B.

In addition, Thai-ancestry populations were found in counties in which there were special U.S. Army training centers, which may have had major operations in Thailand during the war in Southeast Asia. These were Cumberland County, North Carolina, where the Army's Fort Bragg and its special warfare training center has been located, and Cochise County, Arizona, where the Army has had its major intelligence school at Fort Huachuca.

Thai Dam in Iowa. This ethnic group from the mountain valleys of northern Vietnam and Laos were the first of several refugee groups welcomed to Iowa, and Des Moines (Polk County) has been their major settlement in this country (Gordon 1980). As with other refugees elsewhere, most of the Thai Dam and other Southeast Asian refugees in Des Moines have had to cope with problems of housing, crime, social isolation and depredation. Although there has been a low rate of unemployment among Des Moines refugees, most of them have continued to work in low-paying and monotonous jobs that promise little advancement in the future (Bailey 1984).

Asian Indians

1980 Summary Statistics*

| Complete count | 361,531 |
| Edited sample | 387,223 |
| Counties with Largest Asian Indian Population** |
| New York City, NY | 40,945 |
| Cook (Chicago), IL | 23,052 |
| Los Angeles, CA | 18,562 |
| Harris (Houston), TX | 9,745 |
| Du Page (Elmhurst; Wheaton), IL | 6,381 |

| Counties with Highest Percentage of Asian Indians in Population*** |
| Sutter (Yuba City), CA | 4.95 |
| Fort Bend (Rosenberg), TX | 1.01 |

Du Page (Elmhurst; Wheaton), IL | 97
Montgomery (Silver Spring), MD | 94
Colusa, CA | 87

* County statistics, map, and text interpretation are based on complete-count data.
** Major cities or towns may be included in parentheses.
*** Complete census data.

Most Asian Indians have arrived in the U.S. since liberalization of the immigration law in 1965. However, there were settlements of Asian Indians in parts of California that date back to the early 20th century.

Pre-1965 Settlements

The first quarter of this century saw the arrival of small numbers of professionals, traders, religious leaders, and students, many of whom went to New York. Although few in number and often scattered, these Indians initiated Indian settlement in eastern states. By the 1930s some Indians were working in factories, including those in Detroit's auto industry, but among those in New York were scholars and scientists (Mendy 1977). However, this early population remained small because between 1917 and 1946 India was part of the Asian zone from which most immigration was barred. After 1946 a quota of 100 was still highly restrictive but wives and children could and did enter outside that quota.

California's Central Valley. The greatest concentration of Asian Indians before 1965 was in California. The men who formed these ethnic communities were Punjabi—immigrants from the Punjab region and speakers of the Punjabi language who came to North America as laborers. Most were members of the Sikh religious group, but some were Muslims and a few were Hindus.

The first of this group entered the U.S. after working in British Columbia, to which they had been recruited by Canadian railroad companies (Hess 1974). Hostility and, later, restrictions forced them south into Washington. In 1906 they were joined by some of the rougher, heavier work in sawmills and lumberyards, particularly in Bellingham, and a year later a group replaced striking railroad workers in Tacoma (Irm. Com. 1911n). Some continued in railroad construction, but nearly all worked their way into California, where in 1910 they were joined by immigrants directly from India.

Work on the farms of the Central Valley of California became their major occupation, ultimately leading to farm operating and owning and permanent settlements in the Marysville (Yuba County), Yuba City (Sutter County), and Chico (Butte County) areas. The men picked fruit on orchards on the mountain foothills; grew rice on the flatlands; and planted, hoed, and picked beans, asparagus, and other vegetables in several parts of the state. Some settled near Stockton (San Joaquin County), which had a Sikh temple by 1912 and was the focus of Sikh activities in America until many moved from the area after World War II. However, of the workers who did not return to India, most remained unskilled and uneducated and perhaps half never married (La Brack 1982).

The Sacramento Valley Punjabi population slowly aged and diminished in strength into the mid-1960s. Also, the former common Punjabi ethnicity was substantially replaced by religious identities, with the distinction between Sikhs and Muslims reflecting some of the tensions between those groups in India and Pakistan since 1947.

A dramatic rejuvenation of the Marysville-Yuba City (Sutter County area) Punjabi community occurred in the 1970s with the arrival of thousands of new immigrants (La Brack 1982). Many of the younger generations have moved to California cities, often for commercial or professional jobs. Among those who remained, however, the Sikhs especially have found their identities and traditions invigorated by the newcomers. Many Sikhs in the Sutter County area have become prosperous farmers and increased their land holdings, especially in peach orchards. By the mid-1970s Sikhs owned over 7,000 acres of farmland in the area. Family members help with various tasks in the orchards, and frugal living and modest homes make possible substantial savings.

Several hundred families have moved to the Fresno area, often taking up grape growing and many owning their own land (La Brack 1982). Some young men have worked in a poultry processing plant until they have saved money to buy land. In 1980 Sikhs in the Central Valley constituted a flourishing and largely separate social community—one with close ties to Sikh communities on many continents.

California's Imperial Valley. In the early 20th century Punjabi farmworkers also lived in the Imperial Valley (Imperial County). This hot desert area near the Mexican border bloomed because of irrigation water from the Colorado River, developing into a major agricultural section. Sikhs had worked on that land reclamation and picked those first crops of cotton, and in later years they moved into more varied lines of work. A few tried Arizona's Salt River Valley, where some became successful producers of vegetables.

Those Punjabis in California who married often chose Mexican women, in whose names land had to be owned after 1923. Their children became mostly absorbed into local Mexican communities, although awareness of Sikh identity has often remained. Marriage to Mexican women was particularly common in the Imperial Valley, where by 1980 the descendants represented only scattered individuals and no ethnic community (Leonard 1982).
Post-1965 Settlements

Because India has had a large population of educated and technically trained individuals who lacked jobs commensurate with their training, the immigration law that provided for the entry of some immigrants based on their occupation skills helped many Indians come to America. Probably even more came originally as students, often for advanced training after undergraduate work in India, and were able to obtain good jobs here afterwards (Saran 1985). Once a few people became immigrants, then the laws that favored the unification of families permitted many relatives to follow. These post-1965 immigrants have far outnumbered the earlier immigrants and their descendants. The majority of Asian Indians in 1980 were Hindus, reflecting the situation in India. Muslims and Sikhs and a few followers of other Indian religious groups have also immigrated, in contrast to the Sikh predominance in early 20th century immigration. The population in the Asian Indian race category probably also includes most people of Pakistani ancestry.

The post-1965 immigrants who came as single men have almost always returned to India to be married, so that the various Indian language and religious groups have become recretated in America. Because most young adult immigrants speak English, they can socialize with those of other regional or religious backgrounds. Caste has been less important in America than in India, but social bonds among immigrants have been closer within each of the different language and religious groups. In the New York area, and probably elsewhere in America, Hindus have viewed the varied composition of Asian Indians primarily in terms of region of origin within India, with food preferences strongly associated with regional identities (Fisher 1980). Non-Hindus (Muslims, Sikhs, Jains, Christians), on the other hand, have typically described fellow immigrant Indians in terms of their religious identities.

Professionals. In 1980 among people over age 24 who immigrated during the 1970s, Asian Indians had a higher percentage (63 percent) who had completed four years of college than other Asian groups (Census 1984b). Many immigrants have been able to get good positions as engineers, doctors, university professors, or the like.

Opportunities in such fields have generally been located in the larger metropolitan areas, where in 1980 most Asian Indians were found. One study of Indian medical specialists practicing in America found that virtually all located where they did because of job availability (Baker, Broe, and Kumar 1984). Because many American doctors have echoed in their migrations a preference for living in the South or West, many medical positions in the Northeast and Midwest have not been occupied by American-born specialists. These have been the openings that Indian doctors have filled. At one time 48 percent of the 414 physicians on the staff of Chicago's Cook County Hospital were Asian Indian immigrants (Tyner 1981).

Because of opportunities in medicine and other fields and subsequent chain migrations, the New York metropolitan area has become by far the largest center of Asian Indians. Newer suburban counties near other large American cities often had relatively high percentages of Indians because the high incomes of professionals permitted so many to live in the suburbs. Du Page County, just west of Chicago, and Fort Bend County, which has received much of Houston's expansion, are examples.

Among these Asian Indians, some of the engineers have been associated with the advanced industries in such places as Silicon Valley (Santa Clara County), California; Houston (Harris and Fort Bend counties), Texas; or Charlotte (Mecklenburg County), North Carolina. Indian students have continued to enroll at American universities, adding to the numbers, for instance, in Whitman County, Washington (Washington State University); Douglas County, Kansas (University of Kansas); and Montgomery County, West Virginia (West Virginia University).

Entrepreneurs. Many Asian Indians in southern California and elsewhere have become small businessmen. Some have served primarily the local ethnic community as travel or insurance agents or sellers of spices and Indian foods (Mossain 1982). Others have run dry-cleaning plants or managed such franchise businesses as 7-Eleven stores and fried chicken or car rental outlets.

A large number of Asian Indian families have purchased motels and some hotels, usually in rural areas and small towns across much of the warmer part of America (Indian 1985). Indians have frequently disliked the winters in the North, and such work permitted them to choose their place of residence more easily than if they worked for a large organization. Thousands have switched to this work even after earning advanced degrees, but others continue their work while their wives run the motels and children assist (Thaker 1982). Where parents could speak little English, their children often adapted quickly and learned to check in the guests.

Most motel owners have been Patels, members of a Hindu caste specializing in business, and in the larger populated in the Gujarat region of northwest India (Thaker 1982). With characteristic low levels of consumption in America, Indians have been able to save much of their salary from professional work, but many Indian motel owners used money brought from India or from previous rooming house operations in Britain. Some Indians, like wealthy people from many other countries, later qualified as immigrants outside the normal channels and quotas because they invested in an American business. After arriving here as visitors, they have been able to change to permanent resident status after having made a down payment of at least $10,000 (after 1975, $40,000) for a motel or other business and fulfilled certain related conditions.

Probably the majority of Indians who were not living in metropolitan areas or university communities were motel operators. They have been especially common in California, where in 1979 Patels alone ran an estimated 15 percent of the hotels and motels (Thaker 1982). They owned perhaps 80 percent of such operations in the area around Stockton. It has been said that every exit of I-75 in Georgia had an Indian-owned motel (Indian 1985). Small towns like Globe, Arizona and Socorro, New Mexico, had Indian motelkeepers in 1980, but the numbers were so few that they do not even appear on the map for the appropriate counties.

The net geographical effect of all these varied opportunities has been a concentration in larger metropolitan areas plus an additional wide dispersal to many small towns in warmer parts of the country.

Pakistani Ancestry

1980 Summary Statistics

| Single ancestry | 22,615 |
| Multiple ancestry | 3,348 |

Counties with Largest Pakistani Ancestry

| New York City, NY | 3,567 |
| Chicago, IL | 2,282 |
| Los Angeles, CA | 1,102 |
| Harris (Houston), TX | 931 |
| Fairfax, VA | 609 |

Counties with Highest Percentage of Pakistani Ancestry

| Fairfax City, VA | .56 |
| Sutter (Yuba City), CA | .20 |
| Arlington, VA | .16 |
| San Joaquin (Stockton), CA | .14 |
| Yolo (Davis), CA | .14 |

* Country statistics, map, and text interpretation are based on single-ancestry data only.
* Major cities or towns may be indicated in parentheses.
At the time of its creation in 1947, Pakistan comprised the two major Muslim regions within former British-controlled India. However, about 1970 tensions between the two geographically separated halves of the country erupted in revolution, and what had been East Pakistan became in 1971 the independent country of Bangladesh. Because of that split, people whose origin had been in the area that became Bangladesh have been likely to identify in terms of their Bengali language or their new country rather than Pakistan. The Pakistani distribution in 1980 represented only those people whose origin lay in the former West Pakistan or what has since 1971 constituted the entire country of Pakistan.

Most people of Pakistani ancestry in 1980 were recent immigrants or their children, and immigration from Pakistan has increased since 1980 (U.S. INS, 1985). The distribution and socioeconomic characteristics of Pakistanis in America have been much like those of post-1965 immigrants from India (Ghayur 1980). People from both countries have generally had high educational and occupational levels and a preference for living in large metropolitan areas. The location of the major Pakistani settlements in the New York, Chicago, Los Angeles, Houston, and Washington, DC, areas is similar to the pattern of other recent immigrant groups of equivalent educational backgrounds. At the same time some immigrants have not been able to adjust successfully to life in America and have worked in various unskilled jobs in New York, Chicago, and Houston.

**Punjabi Muslims in Central California.** After the partition of British-controlled India in 1947 few Sikhs remained in the new country of Pakistan, but Muslims became even more concentrated there. Tensions between religious groups in South Asia have to some extent divided the Punjabi-speech community in California so that most Punjabi Muslims and their descendants have come to identify themselves as Pakistani rather than as Punjabi. Because 1980 ancestry responses of “Punjabi” were coded as Indian rather than Pakistani ancestry, the Pakistani-ancestry concentrations in California's Central Valley clearly indicated the Muslim portion of the established Punjabi communities as well as recent immigrants from Pakistan.
least one great-grandparent was Hawaiian (Schnitt 1982). The history of very common ethnic intermarriage makes measures of the Hawaiian race group total quite arbitrary, if not almost meaningless. Because 115,500 residents of Hawaii categorized their race as Hawaiian in the census, it appears that two-thirds of the part-Hawaiians subjectively identified with the Hawaiian ethnic heritage. This represented 12 percent of the islands’ total population.

Because Hawaiians would not work on the early sugar plantations, owners began to import Chinese and, later, other workers. Sugar took over most large areas of potential agriculture. However, by about 1900 the less accessible islands and sections still did not have plantations and had received few newcomers (Lind 1980). In such areas the native Hawaiian people remained dominant in many local populations, though new pineapple plantations led to in-migration of non-natives. By 1950 there were fewer places where Hawaiians represented a majority, and these districts represented remote areas much less connected with the modern economy. Such places have permitted Hawaiians to retain some control of their lives, though at some economic cost. For example, on the Big Island (Hawaii) there were various such retreats, often based on subsistence farming and fishing or cattle ranching (Lind 1980).

The island of Molokai, with a total population of less than 6,000 and part of Maui County, has had a high percentage of Hawaiians, partly due to the 1920 Hawaiian Homes Commission Act. This law has permitted people whose background was at least one-half Hawaiian to obtain free sites for homes and 40 acres for farming on the island. In the largest town, Kaunakakai, Hawaiians constituted 37 percent of the population in 1980, outnumbering whites by almost 3 to 1. The most purely Hawaiian island, however, was Ni‘ihau (Kauai County), a privately owned island with a population totaling only 226, nearly all of whom were of unmixed Hawaiian background. Ni‘ihau’s economy has been based mostly on cattle ranching, but there have been no police, electricity, or hospitals (Morgan 1983). Because guests of the residents have been the only visitors permitted, the old Hawaiian ways have been better preserved there than elsewhere on the islands.

The Kalaula Peninsula (Kalawao District) on the north shore of Molokai was 40 percent Hawaiian in 1980 but had only 144 people. Although the equivalent of a county, it represented a unique situation. Extremely isolated from the rest of the island by steep cliffs, the area was the site of the well-known 19th-century leper colony. In 1980 Kalawao was administered by the Hawaii Department of Health, and its mostly elderly population was composed of people afflicted with leprosy and the staff to care for them.

The islands remained home to 69 percent of U.S. Hawaiians in 1980, but another 14 percent lived in California. The wide scattering in other states was mostly in metropoli-
tan areas. In addition, Hawaiians and their dependents could be found in counties associated with major U.S. Army installations. At Fort Bragg (Cumberland County), North Carolina; Fort Hood (Bell County), Texas; Fort Leonard Wood (Pulaski County), Missouri; and Fort Riley (Geary and Riley counties), Kansas, their numbers were small but the proportions high compared to most other mainland counties. Mormon interest in and conversion of Hawaiians began over a century ago, and was evident in 1980 in the over 750 Hawaiians in the greater Ogden—Salt Lake City—Provo (Weber through Utah counties) area of Utah.

**Samoans**

**1980 Summary Statistics**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Complete count</th>
<th>41,948</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Edited sample</td>
<td>39,520</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Counties with Largest Samoan Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Honolulu, HI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Angeles, CA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Diego, CA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orange, CA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Francisco, CA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Counties with Highest Percentage of Samoans in Population**</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Honolulu, HI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Mateo (Palo Alto), CA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Francisco, CA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Diego, CA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawaii (HI), HI</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* County statistics, map, and text interpretation are based on complete-count data.
** Major cities or towns may be indicated in parentheses.
Samoa is a group of South Pacific islands that have been divided since 1899 into two parts. Western Samoa, formerly German territory, more recently administered by New Zealand, has been an independent country since 1962. The other islands to the east constitute American Samoa, which has been U.S. territory. Probably at least 80 percent of people who identified as Samoans in 1980 came from American Samoa (Shore 1980). However, in the 1960s people frequently migrated for jobs and better wages to American Samoa from Western Samoa (Lewthwaite, Mainzer, and Holland 1973), and since the middle 1960s a few hundred Western Samoans have entered the U.S. each year as immigrants (U.S. INS 1985).

Settlements

Christian Communities. Samoan migrants to America have recreated as much as possible the society and culture of the islands, with both extended families and Christian religious organizations especially important in their adjustment to the U.S. (Ablon 1971). Most Samoans have been Protestants, representing several denominations, but some are Catholics and another group are Mormons. Although the first Samoan migrants to various places usually attended local churches of their denomination, Samoans soon established their own churches. Religious group membership has continued to shape social communities, especially in the larger Samoan settlements in California.

Most of the first Samoan migrants to Hawaii were Mormons, who settled as early as the 1920s at Laie (Hawaii County), where the Mormons had built a temple especially for Polynesian members (Lind 1980). In recent decades many more Mormons have come to Hawaii, and Mormon migrations to the mainland are evident in the Samoan populations in the Salt Lake City—Provo area of Utah and in Independence (Jackson County), Missouri, where since 1969 there has been a Samoan colony at that special Mormon center (Lewthwaite, Mainzer, and Holland 1973).

Early U.S. Navy Employment. More important, however, as a stimulus for out-migration have been ties with the U.S. Navy and Marines, established during World War II. Many Samoans became construction workers or longshoremen in Honolulu, often specifically at Pearl Harbor’s shipyards (Lewthwaite, Mainzer, and Holland 1973). However, migration to both Hawaii and the mainland U.S. surged upward in the 1950s, prompted initially by the Navy’s shift of its large operations from Samoa to Pearl Harbor in 1951. Some 1,300 Samoan Navy personnel and dependents were involved in the transfer (Lind 1980).

Facing bleak employment prospects in Samoa, more young people joined the Navy and still more made their way to Hawaii or the mainland in search of jobs (Lewthwaite, Mainzer, and Holland 1973). Over 6,000 migrated during the 1950s, at which time Honolulu often represented a stage in an ultimate migration to the mainland. As in Hawaii, mainland Samoan populations were often located at or near naval installations. In the 1950s the Navy decided to transfer many of its Samoans from Hawaii to mainland facilities. Because the Navy kept nearly all of these transfers on the West Coast, these moves helped establish Samoan settlements in Ocean-side and National City in San Diego County, at Oxnard and Port Hueneme (Ventura County), in the San Francisco Bay area, and near Seattle, Washington.

Civilian Employment and Settlements. By the 1960s the Navy connection was of decreasing importance, and the migrants, now coming directly from Samoa, included many more females (Lewthwaite, Mainzer, and Holland 1973). Certain nursing homes and hospitals near mainland Samoan communities made use of the migrants’ social networks in the hiring of aides and ended up with predominantly Samoan staffs. Other Samoan women have been maids or fish-canning workers (Shore 1980). Men have commonly been employed in construction, on assembly lines, or as security guards or janitors, especially at shipyards or airports. By 1980 in Hawaii only 10 percent of Samoans in the labor force were in some branch of the military, and in California the figure was less than 7 percent (Census 1983b).

A somewhat separate group of Samoans have been the young people who have sought higher educational opportunities, as at the University of Washington and Seattle University (Kotchek 1978). However, the distribution of students has been determined more by the particular university that accepted them than by the presence of extended family locally.

The largest center of Samoans on the mainland has remained in the San Francisco area and in southern Los Angeles County. From earlier concentrations in low-income housing projects Samoans in the Bay Area dispersed since the mid-1960s into single-family dwellings (Ablon 1971), from San Francisco and Daly City into cities of the Peninsula (San Mateo County) and San Jose (Santa Clara County). In South-
ern California, Long Beach and the city of Los Angeles were major centers in 1980, but the city of Carson near the Los Angeles and Long Beach harbor areas still held the largest number of Samoans.

Hawaii’s Samoans have remained migratory and low in economic status (Lind 1980), and many have found life there more difficult than on the mainland (Shore 1980). Also, in contrast to the general residential dispersal within mainland metropolitan areas, Samoans in Hawaii have been much more visible because of their concentrated settlements around Honolulu.

Guamanians

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1980 Summary Statistics*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Reported Ethnic Population</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complete count</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edited sample</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Counties with Largest Guamanian Population</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Diego, CA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Angeles, CA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alameda (Oakland), CA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Clara (San Jose), CA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honolulu, HI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Counties with Highest Percentage of Guamanians in Population</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solano (Vallejo), CA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kitsap (Bremerton), WA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monterey (Salinas), CA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Island (Oak Harbor), WA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Diego, CA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* County statistics, map, and test interpretation are based on complete-count data.
** Major cities or towns may be indicated in parentheses.

Guamanians are people from the island of Guam, the major economic and population focus of the Mariana Islands, part of Micronesia in the western Pacific. However, the traditional language of the Marianas is Chamorro, and probably most people from the Marianas have identified themselves ethnically as Chamorros. In the 1980 census a response of Chamorro was coded Guamanian.

Chamorros have been predominantly Roman Catholic and have had some mixture with Spanish and Filipino people as a result of Spanish influences in previous centuries. However, the U.S. gained Guam and the other Marianas after Spain’s defeat in the Spanish-American War, and since 1950 Guamanians have been U.S. citizens and able to travel without restriction to the States. As with the Samoans, people who migrated to the U.S. from Guam had previously moved in from one of the smaller islands, which in 1976 became the Northern Marianas, politically distinct from Guam but still essentially under U.S. control.

Even more than has been the case with Filipinos and Samoans, enlistment in the U.S. armed forces has been a major route by which young men could leave Guam and earn much more money than was possible on the island. With the economy of Guam based primarily on operations at major nuclear submarine and Air Force bases, the military was an obvious employer.

Unlike the other Pacific Islanders, however, Chamorros did not settle especially in Hawaii because they had never been recruited as farmworkers nor had there been any major transfer of Navy operations for them to follow. Nevertheless, the military brought many to Hawaii, and in 1980 a quarter of the Guamanians in Hawaii’s labor force were in the armed forces (Census 1983b).

Connections with the military lay behind much of the dispersal of Guamanians across the country. Some counties with large Army posts—Cumberland County, North Carolina, home of Fort Bragg, and Bell and Coryell counties in Texas, with Fort Hood—had over 250 Guamanians in 1980. Numerous other counties with Army installations had smaller numbers of Guamanians. Also, in Colorado the major focus of Guamanians was in El Paso County because of the Air Force Academy located near Colorado Springs. On the mainland Guamanians have also settled near the large naval shipyards at Mare Island in Vallejo (Solano County), California, and the Puget Sound Naval Shipyard at Bremerton (Kitsap County) in Washington.

Guamanians have moved in small numbers to many metropolitan areas around the U.S. In California, where over half the Chamorros in the States lived in 1980, the settlements have been in metropolitan areas and industrial and port cities. Work for the Navy brought Guamanians originally to San Diego and the Long Beach area of Los Angeles County, but in 1980 only 6 percent of employed Guamanians in the state were serving in the armed forces (Census 1983b). As with other ethnic populations, there has since been substantial geographical and occupational dispersal.