April 17, 2006

Migration of Workers to the United States in Historical Perspective

by Dan La Botz

[Dan La Botz is the author of several books on labor in the United States, Mexico and Indonesia and a longtime Labor Notes collaborator. He is active in an immigrant rights groups in Cincinnati, Ohio.]

The United States is in the middle of a great debate over immigrants and their rights. The debate is not a new one but has been going throughout our nation's history. I have written this short (pamphlet length) history of U.S. immigration for work in the hopes that it would provide sound information for those currently engaged in this debate. My own position is one of strong support for immigrants' rights believing that without rights they will become a class of workers subject to greater exploitation abuse. I hope this pamphlet will help to better inform those engaged in the debate and the struggle for immigrants'.

Migration in the modern world, while usually a voluntary decision of an individual, has been a mass phenomenon, and generally arisen from the dislocations caused by the rise of capitalism, the industrial revolution, imperialism, colonialism, and war. Necessity, usually economic necessity, is the mother of migration. People migrate and look for work. [1]

Contrary to national myth and popular belief, the principal motor of migration has always been economic as people seek economic opportunities, which for most today means wage labor at higher pay. Economic inequalities drive most migration as people leave one country to seek an improvement in their standard of living in another. Many are driven by the lash of scarcity in their own country to seek, if not abundance, at least subsistence in another. While some people did in the past and do at present in increasing numbers migrate to escape war, civil war, political or religious persecution and repression, as well as for adventure and novelty, the driving force of migration has usually been economic opportunity.

Since the end of slavery and indentured servitude, most migrants have been farmers in search of land and workers in search of jobs. But frequently the farmers, without resources to purchase land, became laborers in search of work. In many cases, of course, the political and economic situations may combine to push people out of one country and pull them to another. An excellent account of contemporary Latino immigration to the United States bears the telling title *Harvest of Empire*, suggesting that the United States' historic military intervention, support for dictators, and the "free trade" economic policies of an imperial United States have devastated certain regions, peoples and classes in Latin America, and are largely responsible for the enormous contemporary Latin American immigration to the United States.[2] But even where political repression or religious persecution may be the motor of migration, the migrant immediately faces the issue of earning a living, and the matter becomes economic. Most people migrate, for work, and even those who don't usually soon need work.

The International Labor Market

The most useful way to analyze and to discussion migration is in terms of what Lydia Potts called "the world market for labor power." That world market for labor power, she argues, emerged several hundred years ago, but became "a universal structure." The structure was forged by the rise of capitalism, imperialism, and colonialism, which on the one hand destroyed traditional societies, and on the other created an international market for labor in the core modern industrial societies. She suggests that the world labor market created one after another of international labor

systems: American Indian slavery and then forced labor, African slavery, Asian coolie labor, the great European and Asian voluntary migrations of the nineteenth century, and the intercontinental brain drain of the late twentieth century.[3]

The world labor market can be analyzed and periodized in terms of economic regimes and labor regimes. Economic regimes (for example, merchant capital and mercantilism, plantation slavery, industrial capitalism, mass production and consumerism) and labor regimes (such as artisan production, commercial farming, slavery, indentured servitude, debt peonage, contract labor, and wage labor under Taylorism or Fordism) created the conditions under which migrants moved, left an old country, and established themselves in a new one, found work and labored. The uneven character of capitalist development, and the resulting differences in wages, income, and standard of living, give rise to the economic and social differences that encourage individuals to make decisions to move, and set in motion the massive flows of migration. People pursue a higher price for their labor on the market. The market for labor is the principal motor of migration. The laws and policies governing labor and migration of the sending and receiving countries shape the flows. Polices and laws are like sea walls or levees attempting to hold back the tides of economically driven migration.

While other factors, such as communal violence, political repression, religious persecution, natural disaster, and war play a major role, the market remains the dominant motor of migration. With the rise of the United States to preeminence and more recently to global dominance, American capitalism became a major factor in the world labor market. Already in 1926 Harry Jerome suggested in Migration and Business Cycles that American capitalism's boom and bust cycles functioned like a kind of pump, drawing in or pushing out potential migrants and laborers as dictated by the market.[4] "Write if you get work," both expresses the vicissitudes of the erratic capitalist pump, and suggests the phenomenon of chain migration that pulls one after another immigrant out of a village in Michoacan, Mexico and draws him or her to a meat packing plant in the Midwest.

As common sense would suggest, most migrants come neither from the better off classes nor from the very poorest groups. Those who have a comfortable situation, have little inducement to migrate. Those who form the very poorest groups in any society will usually not have the wherewithal to migrate. During the great peasant migrations of the nineteenth century, for example, those who migrated usually needed money enough for their passage, and that eliminated the very poorest. Forced migrants, such as slaves and prisoners, do not conform to these generalizations, nor do desperate exiles and refugees who are forced to flee their homeland.

The economic processes and social crises driving labor migration, as well as the political policies shaping it, affect both men and women. In 1885 E.G. Ravenstein, the founder of immigration theory, wrote, "Woman is a greater migrant than man. This may surprise those who associate women with domestic life, but the figures of the census clearly prove it."[5] Throughout the world, women migrate at about the same rate as men. Men and women both immigrate to the United States, women at about the same rates of men in general, though this varies among different ethnic and national groups, as we will see below. In many immigrant groups men have immigrated first and women have come later to unite families, but it is also the case that some women migrate alone, and, in some ethnic and national groups, more women migrate than men.[6] While many women in the past migrated for work, many also migrated to do the domestic work of the family. Women's ability to find work has always been the most important factor in determining whether or not they would migrate and whether or not they would migrate more or less than men.[7]

Migration is gendered in part because women leave work in one place and find work in another based on an international sexual division of labor. Women may leave low-paying agricultural, service or industrial work in their homeland to take jobs as domestics, garment workers, or factory workers. Labor

markets in the homeland and in the United States still tend to be segmented, with women excluded from certain occupations. Women of color may face yet other limitations.[8] Economic pressures tend to be refracted through the international sexual and racial division of labor. In general, however, we can say that economic pressures that drive immigration move entire nations and the social classes within them, classes made up of men and women. Women, by and large, do not migrate for different reasons than men. For women too, migration is primarily economic.

The Demographic Catastrophe and Labor Scarcity

The primary factor shaping immigration to British North America and later to the United States was labor scarcity. The British colonists in the South invested in the creation of plantations that required labor to make a profit. For a variety of reasons, the North American Indians could not serve the labor needs of the British colonists, who turned instead to indentured servitude, the transportation of convicts, kidnapping of children and eventually to slavery. Labor scarcity drove the ruling merchant and planter elite to experiment with different alternatives, and those alternative labor systems shaped the immigration. The turn to indentured servitude and slavery, however, may be said to have started with the "failure" of the Indian to serve the needs of the British.

When the Europeans arrived, it is estimated that between 50 and 100 million Indians lived in North America, 40 million in Mesoamerica (Mexico and Guatemala), and about five million in what is today the United States and Canada.[9] With the arrival of the Europeans, the Indians, were either enslaved, removed, exterminated or died from contagious diseases to which they had no immunity.[10] The Indians were descendants of Asian peoples who had migrated across the Bering Straits from Asia. Living for thousands of years in the Americas did not have the same endemic diseases and thus did not have immunity to European diseases, consequently their exposure to alien microbes led to a demographic catastrophe that is believed to have killed at least six out of ten Indians in the Americas, and perhaps more.[11] While many Indians, despite their often fierce resistance, were killed in warfare or worked to death, most succumbed to disease. One might suggest that the first and worst environmental and occupational exposure of the New World was simply exposure to the Europeans or Africans who carried new and deadly diseases, as remained the case in the late twentieth century in isolated parts of Brazil, where gold prospectors carry disease and death to unexposed native populations.

The English Foundational Culture

British Protestant ministers offered prayers of thanks to God for thus removing the Indians, and making way for the English. Those that God had not eliminated, the English themselves annihilated, laying the basis for settlement and labor immigration.

In a certain sense we can say that the original English colonization and settlement was the most important immigration, since English immigrants planted the seed of the future American culture. While the indigenous peoples, the Spaniards, French and Dutch, and Africans were present in various areas of North America and in the future United States before or at the same time as the British, it was the latter who established the foundational culture. The British North American colonists, or more properly their ruling elite, established the English language, English law and concepts of property, Protestant Christianity, the British version of patriarchy, the notion of white supremacy over Indians and Africans, and capitalist economic relations as the fundamental cultural basis the future United States. While English government and society did maintain some notion of both representation and rights, still English political culture was not democratic, but rather extremely elitist and hierarchical. The questions of representational government, democratic and civil rights, labor rights, and, of course, immigration policy, were matters that would be shaped and determined by social and political struggle over the next 400 years.

Colonial Immigration and Indentured Servitude

The colonial immigration to British North America was predominantly English, Welsh, Scotch-Irish, German and African, and some four million Europeans and one million African-Americas resided in the United States by 1790. The English elite first attempted to solve the labor scarcity problem by the use of indentured labor, attracting migrants already moving in internal migration streams in the British Isle or on the European continent. Of all colonial white immigrants to British North America, it is estimated that half were indentured servants, while many were transported convicts, and a significant number were adults or children "spirited away," the victims of kidnapping.[12] Seventy-five to 85 percent of the 130,000 English who went to the Chesapeake in the seventeenth century were indentured servants. Three-fourths of them were men between 15 and 24 years of age.[13] Most indentured servants everywhere in the colonies were young, single males in their teens or twenties, traveling alone. Indentured servants signed contracts of from four to 10 years (the latter usually for unskilled minors), and typically for seven years. Indentured servants usually signed those contacts in England and were sold upon arriving in the colonies. But others without contracts were sold according to "the custom of the country." Some were "redemptioners," usually family groups from Europe, who were sold as servants to payoff the unpaid balance of their passage.[14]

Working conditions on the plantations were so terrible that two-thirds of indentured servant working on them died before regaining their freedom. The discipline was harsh to say the least. Men could be fined, branded, whipped for insubordination, and executed for other offenses. Women who became pregnant, as 20 percent did (sometimes by their masters), could be punished, and have more time added to their indenture. Some had their children taken and sold.[15]

When indentured servants did survive and become free, their insistence on rights and representation, their desire for land, and their ambitions to live like the gentry made such white workers dangerous competitors who threatened to upset the colonial tobacco cart, challenging the seigneurial elite or provoking wars with the Indians. White labor's claims on rights to land and a share in political power made its continued employment problematic for the elite by the 1670s.[16] The answer was to turn to laborers captured in Africa and transported by trading companies to work in the British colonies. The first African servants brought to labor in the British colonies in 1619 were not yet defined in law as slaves, something that did not happen until the 1660s.

Slaves as Immigrants

The African Americans brought as slaves to the British North American colonies and later to the United States were involuntary immigrants brought to provide labor, mostly for plantations. Altogether it is estimated that more than nine million slaves were brought from Africa to the New World in the period between 1500 and 1850.[17] The total number of slaves living and laboring in the American slave system (that is throughout North and South America) reached over six million in the 1850s, making it probably the largest slave system in world history (that is, exceeding the number of slaves of the Roman Italy).[18]

Of the almost 10 million slaves brought to the Americas only 427,300 were brought to the future United states (British North America and Louisiana), or not quite 4.5 percent. However their population grew to become one of the most significant in the Americas. While slaves in some British and French Caribbean colonies often died off without issue, slaves on the North American continent survived and reproduced. The slave trade imported more than a majority of young men, yet by 1820, before the official end of the slave trade, the population had through natural increase become sexually balanced at 890,000 black males (50.7 percent) and 873,000 black females (49.3 percent).[19] By the time of the Civil War, the African American slave population had reached four million.

The Atlantic slave trade was intimately tied up with the rise of capitalism in Europe, particularly in England and in the British colonies. The Portuguese, Dutch, British and American slave trading companies became the first great multinational corporations, the slave ships became floating factories, the sugar mills early prototypes of industrial production, and the textile plants which absorbed the slave-produced cotton laid the foundations of industrial capitalism in Europe and North America. [20]

The Atlantic system of plantation slavery differed fundamentally from other and earlier systems of slavery because virtually all slaves were destined for intense manual labor, with much less chance of freedom. Ninety percent of the African (and later African American) slaves worked on plantation. The plantations used gang-labor in the production of staple crops such as tobacco, cotton, sugar, rice, and indigo for sale on the world capitalist market. Slaves typically worked 12 hours a day, and since they could produce their own keep in two days, the system was extremely profitable.[21] Slaves (by the nineteenth century) probably received a better diet than most workers and peasants, and most owners provided some medical care.[22] While it is true that the slavery in Catholic Latin America differed from slavery in North America or the Caribbean, for example by forbidding the break up of families, everywhere slavery was based on conquest and subjugation, maintained by violence (chains, whips, guns, beatings, rape and murder), and accompanied by race prejudice.

Primarily a labor system, slavery engendered new concepts of race and racism. The Spanish in the Reconquista of the Penninsula from the Moslems, and the English in the conquest of the Irish had already developed notions of racial and religious superiority. But the conflicts with the Indians and Africans led to new and perhaps even stronger notions of ethnic superiority. While skin pigment originally served fundamentally as a badge of slavery, the slave owners gradually developed ideologies that also linked color (and other characteristics) to concepts of the inherent inferiority, even sub-humanity of the slave of African descent. At the same time, "white," European, Christians had already developed a notion of their right to rule, to own, and to command.[23]

The African slave population in North America came almost entirely from West Africa, but from many different regions and peoples with a variety of religious practices and languages. Still the slaves managed to preserve some African practices, and, joining those with the English Christian culture, created a new African American slave culture which served to cohere a community and to resist their oppression and exploitation.[24] Slaves engaged in many forms of resistance at work on the plantations, or fled to Spanish territory in Florida, and, though the geography of British North America made it difficult, periodically rose in armed revolts and rebellions, all of which were violently suppressed.[25] Nevertheless that resistance and those armed rebellions, combined with the work of African American and white abolitionists in the North may be said to have contributed to bringing about the Civil War and the end of slavery.[26]

Immigration, Race and Citizenship in the New Republic

The United States Constitution adopted in 1788, and the Naturalization Act passed by Congress in 1790, provided the first laws on race, immigration and naturalization. The 1790 Naturalization Act offered naturalization, that is citizenship, to "free white persons" who had been in the United States for two years. Thus immigrant blacks and Asians were not permitted to become citizens. The citizenship of free blacks born in the United States (from native or immigrant parents) depended on state law: some states gave free blacks citizenship, some did not.

What about Indians? The U.S. Constitution, Article 1, Section 8 had empowered Congress "to regulate commerce with foreign nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian tribes." In the Supreme Court case of Cherokee Nation v. Georgia (1831), Chief Justice John Marshall's decision described Indians tribes as "domestic dependent nations," and therefore aliens. Being non-whites, they

were therefore not eligible for citizenship. Nevertheless, some state and local governments did in practice treat assimilated Indians as citizens, permitting them to vote and run for office. Not until 1924 did Congress confer citizenship on all native-born American Indians.[27]

Nineteenth Century Immigration

During the period between 1776 and 1815 there was little recorded immigration to the United States because of the Revolutionary War, the political instability of the early Republic, and then the War of 1812 (to 1815). We usually periodize nineteenth and early twentieth century immigration as extending from 1820 to 1924, the date of restrictive immigration legislation, which can conveniently be broken up into the eras before and after the U.S. Civil War, after which comes the great burst of industrialization. That period is followed the hiatus of the Great Depression and World War II, a twenty year stretch (1824 to 1945) during which there is little immigration, and some significant emigration. After that we have the post-War immigration, and the contemporary immigration from 1965 to September 11, 2000. The period since September 11 will likely have to be considered a new period, with new characteristics determined by the war on terrorism, a series of imperial international wars, and a deepening crisis of American capitalism.

1820-1924: A Peasant Immigration

In the period under discussion (1820-1924) there is a steady and constant increase in immigrants with four notable exceptions: the U.S. Civil War from 1861-1865, the long depression of the 1890s, World War I from 1914 to 1918, and the 1920s, because of the restrictive immigration legislation. But, with those exceptions noted, this was a period of massive immigration, with almost 36 million immigrants entering the United States between 1820 and 1924. During this period the population of the United States grew form less than 10 million in 1820 to more than 100 million in 1920. While most immigrants came from Europe, they also came from North America (Canada), Asia and Latin America, principally Mexico.

Who were these new immigrants? What drove this massive immigration of millions to the United States? The precondition of this migration was an enormous and unprecedented expansion of the population of Europe in the late 18th and 19th centuries. Between 1750 and 1845 Europe's population grew from 140 to 250 million.[28] But it was not simply more people that produced migration. This great peasant migration was set in motion by the capitalist transformation of Europe, Latin America, and then Asia in the nineteenth century, a transformation that created new capitalist enterprises and markets, and powerful new capitalist states. For, while people of many walks of life come to the United States over that 100 year span-businessmen, professionals, artisans and workers-these were overwhelmingly peasants whether from Ireland and Italy or Russia and China. In this process money and markets, railroads and steamships, political parties and governments-some of them created by revolution-gradually undermined "the old order"-whatever old order that might have been. The penetration of commercial agriculture, the sale of factory-made consumer goods, and the introduction of a money economy corroded the pillars of tradition, eroded the foundations of authority, disrupted the traditional patterns of property holding and set in motion millions of peasants, first as migrants within Europe, Asia or Latin America and then in great international overseas voyages. The railroad train and steamship, and the pre-paid ticket, made this migration possible for millions. By 1906 the price of a ticket from Naples to New York was $30.00 and took only two weeks.

The "twin revolution," the industrial revolution in England and the bourgeois political revolution in France, transformed all of Europe and eventually the world, and everywhere it overturned the traditional social and labor relations on the land. The bourgeois revolution ended feudalism and serfdom to create capitalism and wage labor. The French Revolution abolished feudalism and brought land reform to most

of Latin Europe by 1800, as well as to the Low Countries, Switzerland and Western Germany. In Prussia, in the mid-nineteenth century, the Junkers proclaimed themselves no longer feudal lords, but now capitalist landlords, and "liberated" their serfs to become wage laborers.[29] In Italy changes in land tenure, loss of communal rights, and the resulting hunger and starvation drove peasants from the Alpine and pre-Alpine zones, from the Po Valley, and from the Mezzogiorno, particularly Campania, Calabria and later Sicily.[30] A similar process took place in Mexico where Benito Juarez led a revolution that took the land from the Church in the 1850s, to be followed by Porfirio Díaz and los científicos who took the land from peasants and Indians in the 1880s. In Europe and China peasants became a vast pool of labor conveyed by the railroads to the harbors and propelled from Europe or Asia to the United States (and other destinations such as Latin America or Australia). In Mexico, the railroads sufficed by the 1880s to carry former peasants North to work in the fields of California, the mines of Arizona, or the factories of Chicago.[31] But whether he or she came from Ireland, Italy or Germany, from China or India, from Mexico or Cuba, the nineteenth century immigrant most often came as a peasant to be transformed into a worker.[32]

The rise of industrial capitalism and imperialism involved profound economic and social transformations, political upheavals, international wars and revolutions, and man-made famines that one contemporary writer has called "the late Victorian Holocausts."[33] The British enclosure of Ireland and the dispossession of the Irish peasants helped to create the Irish potato famine that would drive 1.6 million Irish overseas, the majority of them to the United States. The British Opium War in China 1839-1842, followed by the Great Taiping Rebellion of 1851-1864, disrupted political power and economic life, beginning a process of massive emigration that would see some 2.5 million Chinese leave China between 1840 and 1900. Eventually almost 400,000 came to the United States. In many countries economic and social upheaval led directly to political revolution. The Mexican Revolution of 1910, the Chinese Revolution of 1911, the Russian Revolutions of 1905 and 1917 may be said to represent the culmination of these political upheavals in the period under discussion. Those revolutions too propelled millions of peasants into the churning waters of the international labor migration.

While it was the rise of capitalism in Europe, and later in Asia and Latin America, that set the peasants in motion and pushed them to emigrate, it was the powerful expansion of American capitalism that pulled them into the United States. The American Civil War of 1861-1865 represented a victory of the North's industrial capitalist system over the plantation slavery of the South. The war gave a tremendous fillip to the banks, manufacturers and commercial farmers of the North, and opened up the South as a region for internal military occupation, political revolution, and economic colonization. The war destroyed the Southern planter class, freed the four million slaves and turned them into sharecroppers and frequently into debt peons. The North's victory resulted in what was fundamentally a new Constitution and a new Federal government now principally at the service of the bankers and industrialists.[34] After this second American Revolution, capitalism expanded enormously and by the 1890s the United States had surpassed the industrial production of England. Now the "workshop of the world," the United States became a giant pump drawing in millions of peasants from Europe, Asia and Mexico, and transforming them into a new industrial working class.

The Early 19th Century Migration

The early nineteenth century immigration was traditionally called the "old migration," though that term and the rigid division of the century into two periods and two separate and different migrations has now been rejected. Immigration historians now see one continuous process of migration, with the gradual shifting of dominance from one region to another.[35] The immigration began with Northern and Western Europe and involved many different nationalities, among them the Irish, German, Scandinavians from Sweden, Norway and Denmark. We look here very briefly at immigration and labor characteristics of the two most important groups in terms of size: the Irish and the Germans.

Irish Immigration

The nineteenth century saw waves of European immigrants, mostly from Western and Northern Europe at the opening of the century, and more from Southern and Eastern Europe toward the end and into the early twentieth century. The Irish, driven by the potato famine and the plagues that accompanied it, were among the first to come. Eventually 4.5 million would immigrate to the U.S. between 1820 and 1930.The earliest Irish immigrants had been mostly males, while the famine immigrants were made up of males and families, though some single women also came.

The Irish famine migrants, with few economic resources and often with few skills, moved into American cities, and most of them became common laborers, domestic servants, and in some areas factory workers. Perhaps because most already knew some English, the Irish succeeded more rapidly than other ethnic groups would, in entering other occupations and professions.

Most Irish were Roman Catholic, though not all were practicing Catholics, and faced discrimination in Protestant America. At the same time their immigration transformed the American Catholic Church, especially after the appointment of Irish Bishops. Often facing discrimination in the United States, these Irish immigrants who had been viewed as non-white and even sub-human by the British, became "white" once they immigrated. Since most were at the bottom rung of the economic ladder, they frequently found themselves in competition with African Americans for jobs, housing, and status, and many consciously joined other white Americans in adopting the ideology of white supremacy and then reaped the privileges of their new "white" identity.[36]

While we usually think of the famine Irish immigrants, in fact, most Irish came after 1860, some 2.6 million. Many were still single males, and families, but after 1880 more women than men immigrated to the United States. Irish men had greater mobility and became policemen, firemen, streetcar drivers and conductors, and skilled crafts such as plumbers, steam fitters, and boilermakers. Some Irish became bosses or foremen over Southern and Eastern European immigrants. But still about 20 percent of Irish worked in unskilled laborer jobs. During the late 19th century, Irish immigrant women worked as domestic servants, laundry workers, and in the worst jobs in the New England textile industry. However, if married, they left the workforce to tend home and children when they became pregnant.

The Irish, concentrated in the Northeast, became active in big city politics, and later often important cogs in the Democratic Party machines. From the Molly McGuires to the organization of the Congress of Industrial Organizations (CIO) the Irish played leading roles in the organization of unions. The Irish were present in every stage and every wing of the American labor movement, from Terrence V. Powderly, leader of the Knights of Labor, to Elizabeth Gurley Flynn, an organizer for the Industrial Workers of the World, from Michael J. Quill leader of the New York Transport Workers Union to Dan Tobin, for decades head of the Teamsters, are four of the most famous, but there were thousands of other Irish local, state and national labor leaders.[37]

German Immigrants

Germans made up the largest single group of the 1820-1924 migration, sending some 5.9 million people to the United States in those years. While U.S. immigration authorities recorded nationality, they did not record religion, but historians estimate one third were Catholic, and about 250,000 were Jewish. The rest were Protestant, with Lutherans making up the largest group among them. While many German immigrants were displaced peasants, the immigrants were a diverse group including business people, professionals, skilled workers and laborers as well.

Two-fifths of Germans settled in urban areas, but many lived in small towns or rural areas, and about 25 percent became farmers. More than a third of German workers in the late 19th century were skilled workers employed in jobs such as brewing, distilling, cigar making, or as machinists. German workers tended to be concentrated in the service sector, working in hotels, bars, laundries and hospitals, rather than in factories or clerical jobs. German women were less likely to enter the labor force than either native born American or other immigrant women.[38]

Everywhere the Germans went they created the most elaborate social infrastructure of perhaps any immigrant group: churches, schools, newspapers, social clubs, labor unions, and even political parties. While most Germans, Protestants and Catholic alike, may have been rather conservative, a significant group became involved in progressive social causes. Like the Irish, Germans also played a leading role in the labor movement, bringing to the United States their socialist political and labor unions experience. German anarchists led the movement in Chicago associated with the Haymarket events of Chicago 1886 that gave rise to May Day as international labor day. German socialists organized the powerful labor unions and Socialist Party in Milwaukee.[39]

The Later 19th Century Migration

The late 19th century migration, traditionally referred to as the "New Migration," involved peoples from Southern and Eastern Europe, China and Latin America, particularly Mexico. Those from Southern Europe included Italians, Greeks, Christian Arabs, while the Eastern Europeans comprised Poles, Jews and Hungarians. Armenians, also a significant group of immigrants, came from Southwestern Asia. Yet, even as these new groups came, significant numbers continued to arrive from North and Western Europe as well. We look here briefly at five of the largest groups that began to arrive around 1880: Italians, Poles, Jews, Chinese and Mexicans.

Italian Immigrants

Some 4.1 million Italians entered the United States between 1880 and 1920, more than any other group in so short a time until the contemporary Mexican immigration. Two million entered in the decade of 1900 to 1910 alone. They were mostly males, three men to every woman, and many did not stay. The Italians had one of the highest return rate of any group of immigrants, with historians estimating that between 30 and 50 percent returned home.

Most of these immigrants were peasants from the Mezzogiorno and Sicily, the poorest, most backward regions of Italy. But in the United States, they became one of the most urbanized immigrant groups, with about 85 percent settling in big cities. While some Italians settled in California and took up agriculture, the vast majority became workers in cities in New England or the Middle Atlantic states. They became unskilled laborers in New York, Philadelphia, Boston, Chicago, and New Orleans. In the cities, the Italians often recreated their home villages, a phenomenon called campanilismo, gathering together immigrants from a village in Italy into a neighborhood in Chicago or New York. The new urban villages often maintained the festas of the old village in Italy. While almost all were Catholics, there was also a strong anti-clerical tradition among Italians nationalists who identified the Church and priests as enemies of the risorgimento and nationalist ideals. In general, Italians did not become active in American politics.

In the early years, Italians got jobs through the padroni, labor contractors, usually Italians themselves, who acted as intermediaries between the immigrants and the American employers. The padroni took advantage of their countrymen, demanding a kickback for jobs, or taking a cut of the wages, especially in some industries, such as longshore. Later immigrants probably tended to find work more frequently through family and friends. As unskilled laborers, Italians did not move quickly into the

craft unions of the AFL, but some Italians did become leaders of the International Ladies Garment Workers Union and the Amalgamated Clothing Workers. Italians anarchists and syndicalists such as Joseph J. Ettor and Arturo Giovannitti became leaders of the Industrial Workers of the World (IWW), while two others, Nicola Sacco and Bartolomeo Vanzetti became symbols of anarchism and the failings of American justice.[40]

Polish Immigrants

Polish immigration presents a special case, because between 1795 and 1919 there was no Poland. The Germany, Austrian-Hungary, and Russia had carved Poland up, and Poles lived under those three empires. Historians estimate that 45 percent of Poles came from Russia, 35 percent from Austria-Hungary, and 20 percent from Germany. Their immigration began with the German Poles in the 1850s, continued with the Austria-Hungarian Poles from Galicia between 1890 and 1914, and the Russian Poles mostly in the twentieth century.

Because immigration statistics were by nationality, and Poles had no nation until 1919, we have no immigration statistics for them. The 1910 census which recorded national origin and mother tongue tells us that there were 418,370 Polish speaking Russian immigrants, 329,418 Polish speaking Austrian immigrants, and 190,096 Polish speaking German immigrants living in the United States in that year. In 1920 Chicago had 400,000 Poles, New York some 200,000 and Pittsburgh 125,000, and several other cities had between 50,000 and 100,000 Polish residents.

While Poles of various social classes migrated, they were overwhelmingly peasants, and settled in the cities to become mostly laborers. The Poles were almost entirely Roman Catholics, generally loyal to their priests, pious. They did not move quickly into American politics, and it would be a long time before Polish Americans achieved elected office. The two large Polish organizations-the secular Polish National Alliance (PNA) with 220,000 members in 1920 and the Polish Roman Catholic Unions (PRCU) with 188,000 members in the same year-were based on attitudes toward Poland's possible future, rather than toward the situation of Polish Americans.

Polish immigrants found low paying industrial jobs in mines, steel mills and factories, and in general did not enter the labor movement until the rise of the Congress of Industrial Organizations (CIO) in the 1930s, though some had been members of the United Mine Workers (UMW) before that.[41]

Eastern European Jewish Immigrants

Jews were a people with no nation, and consequently were not counted in the immigration statistics. Nor do immigration or census statistics record religion. Estimates of Jewish immigration must be based on "mother tongue" as reported in the 1910 census. The census that year reported that foreign-born Yiddish or Hebrew speakers of Russian origin amounted to 838,193 and Austrian 124,588. Yiddish or Hebrew speakers of "foreign stock," that is of the second generation, were 1,317,157 and 197,153, respectively for the name nationalities. There were also another 250,000 foreign-born and foreign-stock Yiddish or Hebrew speakers from other Eastern European nations. Altogether it is estimated that three million Eastern European Jews entered the United States in the late 19th and early 20th century.

These Jews immigrants fled Russia's shtetls because of the repression that began in the late 1880s and increased after the Russian-Japanese War of 1904, culminating in a series of terribly violent pogroms in 1905 and 1906. Most of these were poor Jews, though a number were skilled workers and about one in twenty had been involved in commerce of some sort. While Jewish men often came first, their wives and daughters often joined them, and 45 percent of the Jewish immigrants were women.

Both because of the repression and violence in Russia, and because they united their families in the New World, Jews had one of the highest rate of permanence. Only one Jew in 20 returned to Europe.

Some 60 percent of the Eastern European Jews settled between Boston and Baltimore, the largest group being in New York, mostly on the Lower East Side. Other settled in cities such as Cleveland and Chicago. Jews made up a quarter of New York City's population, and a tenth of Cleveland, Newark, Boston, Baltimore, and Philadelphia, and just under a tenth of Chicago. Because they settled in large numbers in these cities, Jews often lived in a Jewish society where everyone spoke Yiddish.[42] The Eastern European Jews formed organizations called landsmanshaftn, made up of people from the same town or district of the old country. They were at first sometimes anshe, or Jewish congregations, but later usually secular organizations with English names like First Kalisher Benevolent Association. Through the landsmanshaftn, based on their origins in the old country, the Eastern European Jews offered each other mutual support in the new.

When the Eastern European Jews first arrived and began looking for work, they found it easiest to deal with the German Jews who had come half a century or more before them. German Jews involved in the clothing industry hired Eastern European Jews to work for them making garments. A survey in 1890 found that 12,000 of 25,000 Jews who were gainfully employed worked in the garment industry. Based on a system of manufacturers, contractors and sub-contractors, the work, usually piecework, was tedious, intense and low paid, and the working conditions were unhealthy.[43] Later some Eastern European Jews rose to become contractors and even manufacturers themselves, but many, perhaps the majority, of Eastern European Jews remained low paid wage earners into the 1930s.

Eastern European Jewish workers, women and men, were instrumental in founding and leading labor unions such as the International Ladies Garment Workers Union (ILGWU) and the Amalgamated Clothing Workers (ACW). Jewish workers in other trades-iron work, baking, teamsters, and so on-organized local unions and united in the United Hebrew Trades. These Jewish labor unionists fought bitter battles around 1910 to win recognition from Jewish employers. Eastern European Jews also joined Jewish socialist organizations, and also in disproportionately large numbers became members and leaders of the American Socialist and Communist parties.[44] Most Jews by the 1930s have moved via the New York Labor Party into the Democratic Party of Franklin Delano Roosevelt.

Asian Immigrants: The Chinese

Asian immigrants began to come to Hawaii and the United States in the mid-nineteenth century. Chinese, Japanese, Koreans, Indians and other groups went to Hawaii, California or Washington to work in agriculture, lumber, mining, and many other industries.[45]

Fleeing war and looking for new economic opportunities, some 2.5 million Chinese left China between 1840 and 1900. Some 46,000 of them went to Hawaii in the second half of the nineteenth century, and about 380,000 to the U.S. mainland between 1849 and 1930. Most of the migrants came from Guangdong (Kwangtung) Province, either fleeing the turmoil caused by the British Opium War and peasant rebellions, or because they had lost their land. Those who went to Hawaii generally went as contract laborer. The planters' brokers offered them "free passage" in exchange for an agreement to work for five years in exchange for wages, shelter, food and medical care.

The first Chinese came to the United States to prospect for gold in California, or simply to seek work in the boom of the rush. They came under the credit-ticket system, having taken out a loan to buy their passage, a loan they would later repay with interest out of their earning in America. That is, the Chinese in the United States were not "coolies,' laborers who had been kidnapped or forced into service, and then shipped to foreign countries. While coolies were shipped to Peru and Cuba, the Chinese who

came to the United States were voluntary migrants. Workers from the Canton area were often recruited by "China bosses" who housed and fed them, supervised and paid them, and were also noted to chisel and cheat them. Most Chinese immigrant laborers in the United States ended up working on plantations and farms, in railroad construction, mining, factories, and in canneries. They entered a dual labor market where Chinese were paid lower than white workers, and as non-whites they were legally ineligible for citizenship, so they could hope to exert no political power.

Most of the Chinese migrants to Hawaii and to California were single men from peasant background, though some small numbers of merchants also migrated. Those going to Hawaii were more likely to take women with them than those going to California. In 1900, for example, 13.5 percent of the migrants were women, while in California only 5 percent were female. In the late nineteenth century some girls and women who had been sold into prostitution also migrated to California, perhaps as many as two-third of them women who went. The Page Law of 1875, passed to exclude prostitutes, was used to exclude all Chinese and other Asian women. California employers wanted a mobile, male workforce, and did not want responsibility for women and families.[46]

Like other workers the Chinese sometimes organized and struck for better wages or conditions, but neither the Knight of Labor nor the American Federation of Labor would have them as members.[47] On the contrary the labor movement's League of Deliverance carried out an "abatement campaign" to remove all Chinese from mines, lumber camps, and ships and replace them with white workers.[48] White workers and unions drove the Chinese from many areas of employment, forcing them try to earn a living through the operation of small business such as stores and laundries. But that only provoked the anger of white business competitors. A violent anti-Chinese movement developed in the 1870s and burned, looted and murdered Chinese especially in California and throughout the far West. Under pressure for nativist organizations and the American Federation of Labor, Congress passed the Chinese Exclusion Act in 1882, ending Chinese emigration until 1943. No other immigrant group faced the kind of exclusion and rejection that the Chinese experienced, as finally codified in the Chinese Exclusion Act.[49]

Latin American Immigrants

In the 1820-1924 period Latin American immigrants came to the United States particularly from Mexico and Cuba. With the Spanish-American War, the U.S. made Puerto Rico (changing its name for a time to Porto Rico) a colony, and Cuba a virtual colony with the passage of the Platt Amendment. Puerto Ricans became citizens, and as such there was no legal obstacle to their free migration to the United States, and some few immigrated to the United States in the period under discussion, and many more beginning in the 1940s. Many Cubans also immigrated into the United States, particularly to Florida where they worked in the cigar making industry in towns like Ybor City. Here we look at the experience of the numerically most important groups, the Mexican immigrants.

The Mexicans

Not all Mexicans, of course, are immigrants. The secession of Texas in 1836, its incorporation into the United States in 1846, the U.S-Mexico War of 1847, and the Gadsden Purchase of 1854, together took about half of Mexico's territory and brought tens of thousands of californios, New Mexican hispanos, and tejanos into the United States, as well as unnumbered Indians. As Chicano activists of the 1970s said, "We didn't cross the line, the line cross us." The first Mexican Americans were a conquered people, often soon deprived of their land, stripped of their rights, and exploited as a labor force. Nationality, race and immigration became complicated in the Southwest where Western white supremacy, with its anti-Chinese and anti-Mexican attitudes, met Southern white supremacy with its anti-African American ideology and practices such as lynching. In Texas white immigrants from the South at first rejected the tejanos, but then later turned to them as a reliable workforce. The tejanos,

U.S.-born Mexicans sometimes won toleration of the dominant white group, but those earliest Mexican Americans then in turn sometimes discriminated against the new immigrants from Mexico, who threatened their new found social status.[50] During the years between 1854 and 1880, hundreds of thousands of Mexicans migrant laborers moved in and out of the United States in the Southwest.[51]

Mexican immigration into the United States in even larger numbers began in the 1880s as the result of several related phenomena. First, in Mexico the dictator Porfirio Díaz and his científicos supported the new, modern exported oriented haciendas in dispossessing the Mexican peasants, turning them into a class of agricultural laborers, jornaleros. At the same time, Díaz built a national railroad system with lines that reached from Mexico City to the U.S. border, making it possible for those landless peasants to seek work in the United States. While we have no exact statistics, tens of thousands probably came.

Then came the Mexican Revolution of 1910-1920, a decade of violent upheaval that disrupted the economy, leading about a million Mexicans to seek refuge in the United States. With a million Americans conscripted for military service, those Mexican immigrants readily found jobs in agriculture, mining, and even manufacturing.[52] In the next decade of the 1920s, as a result of violence and economic disruption in Mexico, particularly the Cristero Rebellion, about 600,000 Mexicans immigrated legally into the United States, and perhaps another one million illegally.[53] Thus between 1880 and 1929 about 2.8 million Mexicans found work in the fields of California, the mines of Arizona, in the steel mills of Chicago, and the railroads of Pennsylvania.[54]

Mexicans were attracted to the United States by economic opportunity, meaning jobs at higher wages. At the turn of the last century, Mexican agricultural laborers on the haciendas made about 12 cents a day, while in Texas they could make 50 a day clearing land, a dollar or two a day as a railroad worker, and a sure two dollars a day as a miner.[55] Mexicans got this work because the Chinese Exclusion Act had made the Chinese unavailable for that work, and with the so-called "Gentlemen's Agreement" between the United States and Japan of 1907-98, Japan no permitted emigrants to go the United States. At the same time the outbreak of World War I in 1914 made Europeans unavailable until 1918, and then in 1924 the restrictive immigration law cut them off. Mexicans, despite the U.S. immigration authorities' new literacy examinations and fees, continued to immigrate legally and illegally in massive numbers. With all other groups excluded, the job fell to the Mexican.

Mexicans in the Southwest worked principally in agriculture, mining, railroad construction and maintenance, building construction, and in low-paid and unskilled work. Mexican immigrants often moved back and forth, between Mexico and the United States, especially along the border. The Mexicans brought with them their labor union and political experience garnered in the years just before and during the revolution. Some of these immigrants had been members of the anarchist Mexican Liberal Party (PLM) which had attempted to launch the Mexican Revolution in 1906. Some had been involved in the House of the World Worker (Casa del Obero Mundial - COM), the anarchist labor federation a section of which eventually allied with the Constitutionalist forces of the Revolution. Others had joined the Industrial Workers of the World (IWW) either in Mexico or the United States, for that radical syndicalist labor federation operated on both sides of the border. Some immigrants had fought in the revolutionary armies of Francisco Madero, Pancho Villa, Venustiano Carranza, or Alvaro Obregon, or one of the other lesser figures of the great rebellion. All of this to say that partly because of the proximity of their homeland, and partly because of the radical events unfolding there, Mexican immigrants brought a unique social consciousness to their experience as exiles, refugees, or simply economic immigrants. Mexicans participated in and sometimes took the lead in many of the bitter battles between miners and the corporations in the 1910s, and participated in union organizing drives and strikes in agriculture, construction and on the railroads.[56]

The New Immigrants' Experience

The immigrants of the 1820-1924 period shared some common characteristics. First, they were overwhelmingly peasants whether they came from Germany, Italy, Ireland, Russia, China or Mexico. Some groups, Germans, for example, settlers and farmers in large numbers, while others became skilled workers. But most of these immigrants were thrown on the labor market, and took jobs low-paying unskilled jobs in American industry, usually doing the hardest, hottest, most dangerous jobs in agriculture, construction, factories, mills and mines. We should mention that, while they were not immigrants from abroad, the African Americans who migrated North between the outbreak of World War I in 1914 and the end of World War II in 1945, were in many ways similar. They were also peasants, dispossessed and displaced by the transformation of Southern agriculture, attracted to economic opportunities, and seeking freedom from political oppression and racial discrimination in the South.[57]

Many of these European immigrants were "unwilling migrants…resolved to return home." The return rates for immigrants between 1880 and 1924 were between 30 and 50 percent, with the exception of the Irish and Eastern European Jews. The movement in and out of the country was dominated by the business cycle, sucking migrants in during period of expansion and blowing them out during period of contraction. While two-thirds of all immigrants stayed, they often did so believing that they were temporary sojourners, saving to return. Even low paid workers saved a large proportion of their wages, and remittances to Europe by postal money order totaled hundreds of millions of dollars during the late 19th and early 20th centuries.[58]

Throughout this period, immigrants faced nativist reaction, that is, rejection by native-born Americans who found the immigrants to be unacceptable because of their nationality, ethnicity, race, religion or politics. The nativist movement of the 1840s saw native-born Protestants attack Irish Catholics, their schools and churches, and produced events such as the Kensington Riot. The Know Nothings emerged in the 1850s, a nativist political party that waned because of the larger struggle over slavery, and eventually the Civil War. In the 1880s and 1890s a revived anti-immigrant movement attacked Catholics, Jews, and Chinese workers, and succeeded in excluding the latter. At the same time, the government and society became concerned with Socialists, anarchists, and, after 1917, with Communists. During World War I and immediately afterward, the government deported foreign radicals, while vigilante groups beat and sometimes killed them. During the 1920s, nativist groups, including the second Ku Klux Klan, succeeded in building a powerful movement that passed the restrictive immigration legislation of the 1920s. The same era saw the rise of "scientific racism," and eugenics used to justify both Jim Crow in the South, and the restriction of immigration in the North. Finally, Prohibition (1920-1933), the banning of the sale of alcoholic beverages, was aimed at foreigners whose habitual drinking was perceived to undermine Protestant morality and the capitalist work ethic. While some sectors of American society did welcome and embrace most immigrants (except the Chinese), many immigrants faced exclusion, rejection, persecution, and sometimes violence.[59]

Immigrants entered a dual labor market where native-born workers generally performed skilled work and were paid more than foreigners who worked as unskilled laborers. In this world of work jobs and tasks on the job were often segregated by ethnic group, even within the same factory.[60] Employers consciously hired and assigned workers of different ethnic groups to promote division among them and prevent solidarity and unionization. The bosses pursued a divide and conquer strategy, often using immigrants as strikebreakers.[61] Immigrant laborers did organize on the basis of ethnicity, in the informal work group, and in the tavern, and sometimes struck successfully to end abuses, improve conditions or get higher wages.[62] But, working in heavy industry or in mass production, they found that their efforts to improve their situation through the organization of labor unions or strikes were met with the most violent repression by employers and the state in the half-century between 1877 and 1935. No Federal law guaranteed workers the right to organize until 1935, and throughout this period state and local courts

readily handed out injunctions and called out the police or the national guard to protect scabs, break strikes, and destroy attempts at industrial union organization.

During the 1910s and 1920s large corporate employers organized systems of welfare capitalism, often involving Americanization programs, intended to uplift the immigrant worker and family, and to integrate them into American society, as well as to win the loyalty and insure the obedience of the largely immigrant workforce. The corporate "social welfare departments," supplemented with system of industrial espionage known as "the labor spy racket" and the use of "muscle" or employer security forces or gangsters to break up union organizing drives, continued until the outbreak of the Depression. With social welfare, Americanization, and brass knuckles, immigrants' aspirations for self-organization and self-assertion were held in check.

The immigration that began in the 1880s came to a close with the Immigration Law of 1924 based on the national origins system. The law, a result of pressure by the Ku Klux Klan and other nativist organizations, provided that new immigration would be by quotas, based on the immigration rates of 1890, in this way reducing the number of Southern and Eastern Europeans (and thereby of Catholics and Jews). The goal was to encourage Nordic European immigration from England, Germany and Scandinavia. The law also tightened up the exclusion of Asians; while the Chinese had been excluded since 1882, the new law excluded the Japanese as well. The national origins system became the basis for all other immigration law up to the passage of the 1965 Immigration Act.

The Long Pause: 1924-1945

The period between the restrictive immigration laws of 1924 and the end of World War II represented a long pause of twenty years, an entire generation, during which relatively few new immigrants came to the United States. After the immigration law of 1924 came the Great Depression lasting from 1929 to 1939, during which immigrants were less interested in coming to the United States. In fact, from 1932 to 1935 emigrants exceeded immigrants, though there were more immigrants for the decade as a whole. In the 1930s about half a million Mexican immigrants were deported or repatriated, "voluntarily," through coercion, and sometimes by force. When capitalism contracted, Mexican workers were pumped out, just as earlier they had been pumped in. The Depression was followed by World War II, lasting from 1938 to 1945, a period in which war on land and sea made emigration from Europe or Asia impossible for many, while an economic boom in Latin America made immigration less necessary or desirable for many. However, tens of thousands of Mexicans came in under a "bracero" plan discussed in detail below.

Some historians have argued that this long pause, breaking links between immigrants and the old country, allowed for the assimilation many immigrant groups to mainstream American culture, while at the same time that mainstream culture was being modified by their deeper engagement with it. Without the constant influx of new comers from the Old World, the mother tongue gave way to the new English language, and old customs gave way to the new consumerism. The historic pause in immigration coincided with the rise of mass production, the invention of the radio, and the new talking pictures which conspired in the indoctrination of the immigrant in a new American consumer culture.[63]

The pause in immigration also meant that for once the American working class did not face constant competition from new waves of low-wage immigrant workers, but while the mass unemployment of the depression existed, that relative advantage was negated. While the Great Depression undermined workers' bargaining power and made many reluctant to fight, it also undermined the confidence of the ruling elite and corporate managers, and created desperate conditions that drove some into action. In the fifth year workers went into action, beginning with the great strikes of 1934, and culminating in the organization of the Congress of Industrial Organizations (CIO). In many respects, the

CIO was the immigrants' labor union, made up of those very Eastern and Southern European unskilled workers-as well as Mexican Americans and African Americans-who had been exploited by the employers and excluded by the AFL.

When the CIO joined the AFL, the corporations, and the U.S. government in the effort to win World War II, it quickly became transformed into a junior partner in American capitalism, and gradually shucked off the ideals of social transformation once espoused by its organizers. Yet through the CIO Southern and Eastern European immigrants won higher wages, and some of the first health and pension plans, while many of their children not only finished high school but went off to college. After the AFL and CIO merged in 1955, the new merged federation, the AFL-CIO, opposed further immigration. But we have gotten ahead of our story.

World War II: Ignoring the Jews, Japanese Internment and the Bracero Program

War, particularly modern war, profoundly transforms society, centralizing political power in the state, particularly in the executive, and frequently trampling on the human and civil rights of citizens and immigrants alike. So it was in the United States in the era of World War II, a period in which the U.S. government studiously ignored the plight of the German and other European Jews and threw 120,000 Japanese in concentration camps. At the same time, a modern nation at war must find adequate labor for agriculture, industry, and the production of munitions. So the United States, working with Mexico, established a special recruitment and contracting program, the bracero program for Mexican workers.

No Asylum for Jews

After Hitler came to power in 1933, the United States government did not attempt to offer refuge to European Jews fleeing Nazism. There were a number of reasons for this. The 1924 immigration law had no provision for refugees, anti-Semitism was widespread, especially among the economic and political elite, and by the time of the American entry into World War II in 1941, the U.S. government feared that German refugees might include spies. So the Franklin D. Roosevelt administration demonstrated its indifference to the fate of Jews in Nazi Germany, and certainly condemned to death in the holocaust many who might have been saved.[64]

Japanese Internment

At the beginning of World War II, there were about 125,000 Japanese living in the continental United States. After the Japanese attack on Pearl Harbor on December 7, 1941, General John L. DeWitt of the Western Defense Command pressed for a mass removal of Japanese Americans from the West Coast of the United States. He did so against the advice of Naval Intelligence and the FBI. But local and state politicians, The Los Angeles Times, the American Legion, and West Coast farm organizations joined the chorus calling for Japanese removal, a campaign marked by vicious racist language, and crude appeals to make the West Coast white man's country. Because they were a small minority of the population, because they were not needed as laborers, and because many white American farmers viewed them as competitors, the Japanese Americans were particularly vulnerable to attack.

Receiving a written request from Gen. DeWitt, Pres. Franklin D. Roosevelt, against the advice of Attorney General Biddle, and in clear violation of the U.S. Constitution, issued an executive order on Feb. 19, 1942, calling for the evacuation and internment of the Japanese. The U.S. military rounded up 120,000 Japanese and put them in ten rapidly and crudely constructed concentration camps where some of them stayed for almost four years. With some few exceptions, German Americans and Italian Americans were not similarly treated, nor were the Japanese on Hawaii, where their labor was essential and the local economy and the military could not have functioned without them. Over 40 years later, in

1988 the Congress issued an apology and authorized a $20,000 payment in compensation.[65] The internment of the Japanese in concentration camps represents a unique experience of immigrants to the United States, a violation of human rights comparable to the exclusion of the Chinese and the coerced repatriation of the Mexicans.

Bracero Program

During World War II, the Mexican and United States government agreed to establish "a program unprecedented in the history of both nations; the large-scale, sustained recruitment and contracting of temporary migrant workers under the aegis of an international agreement."[66] The "bracero" program, as it came to be known, was eventually extended, with various modifications, from 1943 through 1964. Altogether some 4.2 million Mexican migrant workers, virtually all men, entered the United States under the program, the majority working in agriculture, though some also worked for the railroad industry. Between 1943 and 1946, about 49,000 workers came each year; between 1947 and 1954, about 116,000, and between 1955 and 1964, about 333,000 annually. The year of highest immigration was 1956 when 445,197 workers were issued contracts according to U.S. authorities.

While the U.S. and Mexican governments worked to enforce the contract provisions protecting workers during the war years, in the post-War period this was simply a labor service for agricultural employers. Mexico had had some leverage to protect conditions during the war, but lost its bargaining position afterwards, and could no longer effectively bargain for and protect Mexican workers. Also the Mexican political elite began to see Mexican emigration for work to the United States as a safety valve protecting the Mexican state from social upheaval. At the same time, in the United State agribusiness became the dominant force in shaping the program, while other forces, such as labor unions, lost influence.

The bracero program tended to institutionalize the earlier Mexican migrations of the era of the Porfiriate (1870-1910), the Mexican Revolution (1910-1920), and the Cristero Rebellion (1926-1934) when millions of Mexicans fleeing political instability, revolutionary violence, and economic disorder and poverty had come to the United States. The bracero program tended to stimulate both legal and illegal migration to the United States, and to develop the migration routes and patterns that persisted after the program ended in 1964. The bracero program and illegal migration tended to substitute for each other at different times.

At the same time, at its height in the 1950s, the bracero program coincided with "Operation Wetback" organized by the border patrol under the leadership of retired Army General Joseph Swing, a friend of President Dwight D. Eisenhower, and the INS Commissioner. Under Swing, the Border Patrol conducted a "military-style" operation that caught in its dragnet 865,318 "deportable Mexicans" in 1953, and 1,075,168 in 1954. Through the period from the 1930s through the 1950s, the United States alternated between period of mass expulsion, followed by mass legalization, sometimes accompanied by further mass expulsion.

When the bracero program ended in 1964, the Mexican and U.S. government developed the maquiladora or in-bond plant program, establishing an industrial export zone on the U.S.-Mexican border. The maquiladora program was intended to provide jobs for the Mexican workers who would not longer be employed in the United States. However, while the bracero workers had all been men, the early maquiladora workers were 80 percent women. At the same time, the U.S. government created the H-2 Guest Worker program to continue to provide Mexican workers for U.S. agribusiness. This was "essentially a unilateral bracero program." But most important, illegal immigration by undocumented workers-often a tolerated illegal immigration-would become the substitute for the bracero program.[67]

Post-World War II and the Contemporary Immigration

After World War II, the immigration to the United States represents a "harvest of empire." We often in talk in immigration of "push and pull factors," and in modern times the United States has frequently caused the push out and at the same time exerted the pull in. The United States' economic, political, and military policies and practices have driven both much of foreign emigration out of the homeland, as well as attracting immigration to the United States. World War II brought refugees and "displaced persons" (DPs), the Korean and Vietnam Wars brought new Asian immigrants, the U.S. role in Central America in the 1970s and 1980s brought a harvest of new Latin American immigrants, and U.S. economic policies such as the North American Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA) that went into effect in 1994 both altered and intensified Mexican immigration.

The Immigration Law of 1965 - A Landmark

The Immigration Law of 1965 was a landmark of Civil Rights legislation, together with the Civil Rights Act and the Voting Rights Act, one of the three great pieces of civil rights legislation of the twentieth century.[68] The 1965 Act represented an important shift in immigration policy, one that dramatically altered the patterns of migration into the United States, with an enormous increase in Latin American and Asian immigration.

Why did the U.S. government change this law? There were several reasons. First, the Cold War and the struggle against Communism made it unseemly that the leader of the Free World would have laws that excluded Asians and denied them the right to naturalization. Second, the rising Civil Rights movement challenged the domestic system of racism embodied in Jim Crow, and that in turn undermined the ideological justification for a racist immigration policy. Third, World War II and post-World War II concessions to the Chinese, to European displaced persons, and to refugees from Communism in Latin America and Asia had already undermined the national origins policy in practice. All of these pressures combined led President Lyndon B. Johnson and the Congress to write a new law based on different principles, though no one foresaw the profound changes that would result.

The 1965 law threw out national origin, and replaced it with hemispheric caps on visas, originally 170,000 to persons from the Old World, and 120,000 to persons from the New. Under this law there were no restrictions on Asian immigration or naturalization. In addition the law continued previous non-quota immigration opportunities for political refugees and other groups. The central emphasis of the new law was on the unification of families, allowing citizens to bring in family members. The result of the law was a huge increase in the number of immigrants, and a shift in their countries of origin from Europe to Latin America and Asia. The number of legal immigrants grew from a million in the 1940s, to 2.5 million in the 50s, to 3.3 million in the 1960s, to 4.5 million in the 1970s, and then to 6 million in the 1980s. The new law represented the most fundamental change in immigration policy in the nation's history.[69]

After World War II, U.S. immigration policy was largely shaped by the Cold War, and many immigrants arrived from either countries that had fallen into the Soviet sphere of influence in Eastern Europe or had Communist revolutions such as Cuba and Vietnam, or had been the scene of related East-West conflict, as in other parts of Indochina. In the immediate postwar period, the United States admitted about 450,000 displaced persons from Europe between 1948 and 1952, and another 205,000 as refugees between 1953 and 1956. Between 1962 and 1979 the United States also accepted 692,0219 Cubans, and between 1975 and 1979 about 400,000 Indochinese (through 10 separate programs.)[70] In addition there were another 140,000 Cubans from the Mariel boat lift. The total Cuban immigration of about 830,000 people represented the largest single national group admitted in this period, and added to the growing American "Hispanic" population.[71]

The Asian population has been one of the fastest growing groups since 1965. The Asians and Pacific Islander population of the United States number 10.9 million and made up 4 percent of the population in March 1999. Asian immigrants represent an extremely diverse group in terms of nationality, ethnicity, language, culture, and social class. While taken as a whole Asian immigrants are generally better educated and have higher incomes than other immigrants and native-born Americans, it is also the case that many Asian immigrants are working class people, and 13 percent of them are poor, as compared to 8 percent for non-Hispanic whites in the U.S.[72] While many Chinese immigrants generally have high educational attainment, still about a quarter of them have not gone beyond the seventh grade.[73] Generalizations about Asian immigrants, or even specific national or ethnic groups, often do not prove very useful, and each national or ethnic group must be analyzed in class terms.

The Japanese were once the largest Asian American immigrant population in the United States, but their growth has slowed, and they are now far down the list behind several other nationalities, such as Filipinos, Chinese and South East Asians. Chinese immigrants have been among the fastest growing group, though we have some difficulty counting all of the Chinese immigrants because they come not only from China, but also from Taiwan and Hong Kong, as well as from several nations in Southeast Asia. While many Chinese become entrepreneurs, administrators, and professionals, others become industrial or service workers, some employed in sweatshop labor.

Asian immigrants have a long history of labor organization in the United States. Chinese workers involved in railroad construction in the 1860s walked off the job over wages and working conditions, they struck orchards in the 1880s, and stopped work on plantations in Hawaii in 1900. In 1937 Chinese workers in San Francisco's Chinatown formed the Chinese Ladies Garment Workers as a branch of the International Ladies Garment Workers Union.[74] Japanese workers in agriculture in California at the opening of the 20th century joined labor unions and struck, sometimes in alliance with Mexican immigrant workers.[75] Filipinos played an important role in the organization of farm workers in California, created the predecessor of the United Farm Workers union lead by César Chávez. Of course Asians have been involved as individuals in many unions from cannery workers, to letter carriers, to the teachers unions.

More recently, Asian Americans and Asian immigrants have been active in the labor movement, both through the AFL-CIO and particular unions, and through the new "workers' centers" that emerged as an important development in the 1990s. Since 1992 there has been an Asian Pacific American Labor Alliance acting as an advocate for Asian Pacific workers' interests and concerns within the AFL-CIO.[76] Since 1979 the Chinese Staff and Workers Center in New York has acted as an advocacy group and organizer among restaurant and other workers who found that labor unions either could not or would not organize them.[77] Since 1992 Korean workers in Los Angeles have organized through KIWA, the Korean Immigrant Workers Advocates. KIWA has organized among Korean restaurant and garment workers, something working Anglo-American and Latino organizations.[78]

IRCA and Amnesty

In the early 1980s Congress and American society debated immigration reform, and in 1986 Congress adopted the Immigration Reform and Control Act or IRCA. IRCA did not change the fundamental immigration law of the country (that of 1965) but inste4ad focused on regularizing the status of undocumented immigrants and penalizing employers who hired undocumented workers. IRCA had four principal provisions: 1) amnesty for man undocumented immigrants; 2) requirements that employers verify the status of all new hires; 3) penalties for employers who hired illegal aliens; and, 4) special provisions for the importation of agricultural workers. The law provided that undocumented immigrants who had been in the United States continuously since December 31, 1981 could apply for amnesty. Others could apply under easier terms for those working in perishable agriculture. By the time of

statutory eligibility had ended 3.1 million immigrants had applied. Between 1989 and 1992 some 2.6 "former illegal aliens" gained permanent resident status under IRCA.[79] Since immigrants can bring in other relatives to unify families, the impact of IRCA continues to be felt.

NAFTA and Hold the Line

In an attempt to compete more effectively with Japan and the European Common Market, in 1994 the United States entered into a treaty with Canada and Mexico called North American Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA). While the NAFTA treaty facilitated the movement of capital and commerce across the international borders, and permitted some increase migration for managers and professionals, it did not provide for the freer movement of workers. In particular it did not make it any easier for Mexicans to migrate to the United States in search of work.

At the same time, President Clinton's Attorney General Janet Reno and the INS developed a new strategy to restrain illegal immigration across the Mexican border. Beginning in 1994, at the same time as the implementation of NAFTA, the Border Patrol began to establish a series of programs-Operation Gatekeeper in San Diego, Operation Hold the Line in El Paso, Operation Rio Grande in McAllen, and Operation Safeguard in Tucson-to tighten control at the U.S.-Mexico border.[80] Many critics have characterized these policies as the militarization of the border, and human rights organizations such as Amnesty International have been highly critical of the INS and Border Patrol, alleging many human rights violations.[81] The operations reduced apprehensions in the urban areas where they were enforced, but drove more migrants to attempt to cross the Rio Grande (Rio Bravo) River, or to trek through the mountains and deserts. The BP policies have resulted in the deaths of almost 3,000 migrants from Mexico, Central America and other countries crossing the U.S.-Mexico border.

Enslavement of Immigrants

A CIA report cited in the *New York Times* in 2000 said that 100,000 workers from Asia, Africa and Latin America were forced migrants working as slaves in domestic work, agriculture, factories, and sex work.[82]

The Recent Situation to September 11, 2001

Legal immigration to the United States continues vigorously, under the terms of the modified 1965 Immigration Law. Altogether between 1991 and 2000, some 9,095,417 persons legally immigrated into the United States. In fiscal year 2001, 1,064,318 persons became lawful permanent residents of the United States, up from 849,8007 in fiscal year 2000. Of those, 65 percent were family sponsored immigrants, while17 percent were admitted under employment preferences, and 10 percent were refugees or asylees. Mexico continued to be the leading country of origin, with 206,426 new legal residents. India, with 70,290 immigrants passed China with 56,426, both of them followed by the Philippines with 53,154 and Vietnam with 35,531.[83]

Illegal immigration also continued to grow rapidly, perhaps more rapidly, though the INS no figures on illegal immigration.[84] The Border Patrol reports that in FY 2001 its agents apprehended almost l.2 million persons for illegal entry into the United States. Since 1994 the BP has apprehended more than 11.3 million nationwide.[85] The INS estimates that 5.0 million undocumented immigrants were residing in the United States in 1996, with a range of about 4.5 to 5.4 million.[86]

Of all immigrant groups, the most significant numerically are the Hispanics. In 2000, 32.8 million Latinos resided in the United States, some 12 percent of the population, or about 1 in every 8

Americans. Of those, 66.1 percent were Mexican.[87] In January of 2003, the U.S. Census Bureau announced that Hispanics now numbered 37 million nationally, 13 percent of the U.S. population, a larger percentage than African Americans.

Foreign immigration particularly affects the workforce, because most immigrants are workers. One study concludes that foreign immigration has been responsible for creating half of the new wage workers in the United States in the 1991-2000 decade. According to this study 8 out of 10 new male workers were immigrants who arrived during that period. Still 86 percent of the workforce is born in the United States.[88]

Since September 11, 2001

September 11, 2001 may date a new era in American immigration policy, even though Congress has not passed any new immigration law. Shortly after the terrorist attack on the World Trade Center and the Pentagon, President George W. Bush announced that the U.S. was launching an international war on terrorism. As part of the measure of the war on terrorism, the President issued a series of directives, and the Congress passed a series of laws that tightened up border security, and moved the INS into a new Department of Homeland Security (DHS) that came into existence on January 24, 2003. Most recently, following the September 11 attacks, there have been new shifts in U.S. policy and practice and in public attitudes. The Department of Homeland Security consolidated 22 agencies and 180,000 employees into a single agency described as "dedicated to protecting America from terrorism." The Immigration and Naturalization Service (INS) ceased to exist and became part of DHS, with its investigative and enforcement functions becoming part of the Immigration and Customs Enforcement (ICE). The Border Patrol and INS Inspectors, were combined with US Customs Inspectors into the newly created U.S. Customs and Border Protection (CBP).

Even before the creation of DHS, the INS launched "Operation Tarmac," aimed at increasing security at the nation's airports. Operation Tarmac resulted in more than 350 arrests at 13 airports by April 24, 2002.[89] In Seattle SeaTac airport, for example, 20 food preparation workers at a company off the airport were arrested and 12 later deported.[90] At the same time agencies such as the Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI) issued an order that field supervisors count the number of mosque and Muslims in their area, as part of the anti-terrorism effort.[91] The new security measures, ostensibly adopted as part of the war on terrorism, will tend to reduce immigrants' rights.

In addition to the changes coming from the executive and legislative branches, the judiciary has also taken positions that reduce immigrants' rights. The U.S. Supreme Court ruled on March 27, 2002 in Hoffman Plastic Compounds, Inc. v. NLRB, No. 00-1595 (S. Ct.), that the National Labor Relations Board (NLRB) lacked authority to order back pay to an undocumented worker, José Castro, who was laid off from his job because of union activities. While immigrant workers, legal and undocumented, still enjoy all the labor rights extended to citizens, the fact that the employers cannot be penalized will tend to undermine the laws enforcement, to deter worker organizing, and in general to have a chilling effect on the exercise of their rights by immigrant workers.

Conclusion

Over 50 million immigrants have come to the United States and many have found economic opportunities and greater political liberty. But at the same time the immigration experience has often involved terrible economic, social, legal and political situations. Many of the first migrants came as indentured servants, followed by involuntary migrants as over 400,000 African slaves brought to do the work on the plantations. The great peasant migration of the nineteenth century brought workers from Europe, China and Latin America, especially Mexico, but they often faced onerous conditions, racism,

extreme exploitation, and frequently political repression. In the twentieth century, as the United States rose first to become a major world power, and then to world dominance, immigration became a "harvest of empire," a result of U.S. political, military, and economic policies that wreaked havoc in much of the world, while sustaining relative prosperity in the United States.

While economics drive immigration, politics attempts to shape it. U.S. government policy has been broad and generous at some times, narrows and spiteful at others. Several situations in that period stand out as particularly horrendous offenses to human rights: 1) the Chinese Exclusion Act of 1882, making the Chinese the only national and ethnic group ever completely excluded from the United States by law; 2) the failure to offer asylum to hundreds of thousands of Jews who might have been saved from the Nazi holocaust in Europe 3) the coerced repatriation of half a million Mexicans or Mexican Americans to Mexico in the early years of the 1930s; 4) the internment of 120,000 Japanese in concentration camps for almost four years during World War II. What is striking about this list is that, in every case, racism and religious intolerance played a large role leading to very fundamental violations of human rights.

The Movement of 2006

The United States, as is so often said, is a nation of immigrant. But reading this history of U.S. immigration, it is clear that immigrants have had to struggle through their ethnic associations, labor unions, and social and political movements to win rights. Today immigrants, in this case millions of undocumented immigrants, struggle to be accepted as a legitimate part of American society.

During March and April of 2006 hundreds of thousands of Latino immigrant workers across the United States have taken to the streets to protest against repressive immigration reform proposals and to demand the right to work and live in the United States, with the option of becoming U.S. citizens. These workers seek to escape from the shadows, to win civil and political rights and they constitute a new Civil Rights movement. The success of this movement would make possible the building of a new labor movement and a more democratic society in the United States.

Notes

[1] Roger Daniels emphasized the economic character of migration both in his lectures and in his book Coming to America: A History of Immigration and Ethnicity in American Life, Second Edition (New York: Harper Collins, 1990, 2002), 18, 28, and many other passages. I rely on Daniels Coming to America for much of the factual material in this article, as well as for many of its interpretations of events. The same point is also made in John Bodnar, "Immigration," in: Eric Foner and John A. Garraty, eds., *The Reader's Companion to American History* (Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1991), 533-538. Thomas J. Archdeacon, Becoming American: An Ethnic History (New York: The Free Press, 1983), page xii, also points out the "mythology" of the U.S. as a political and religious refuge, one he says must be tempered by other factor.
[2] Juan Gonzalez, Harvest of Empire: A History of Latinos in America (New York: Penguin, 2000).
[3] Lydia Potts, *The World Labour Market: A History of Migration* (London: Zed Press, 1990), see her introduction and conclusion for her theory. Also, Dick Hoerder, "International Labor Markets and Community Building by Migrant Workers in the Atlantic Economy," in: Rudolph J. Vecoli and Suzanne M Sinke, eds., *A Century of European Migrations*, 1830-1930 (Chicago: University of Illinois Press, 1991), 78-110. While limited to Europe and the United States, it presents a theory similar to Potts. Gabriel Kolko, Main Currents in Modern American History (New York: Pantheon, 1976, 1984), made a similar case in Chapter 3, "The American Working Class: Immigrant Foundations," 67- 99, see page 68. The starting point for this discussion is: Frank Thistlethwaite, "Migration from Europe Overseas in the Nineteenth and Twentieth Centuries," XI. Congrès international des sciences historiques. Rapports (Stockholm, 1960), 32-60 or in Vecoli and Sinke, Ibid. Others argue that labor migration is limited, especially when compared to the movement of capital and commodities, and that it has become much more limited in recent decades. See: Paul Hirst and Graame Thompson, *Globalization in Question*, 2nd Edition (Malden Maine: Polity Press, 1996,1999), 29-30.
[4] Harry Jerome Migration and Business Cycles, with a foreword by Wesley C. Mitchell (New York, National Bureau of Economic Research, inc., 1926).
[5] E.G. Ravenstein, "The Laws of Migration," Journal of the Royal Statistical Society, 1885, 48 (2): 167-235. Ravenstein's work was a study of migration patterns in 19th century England.
[6] Debra L. DeLaet, "The Invisibility of Women in Scholarship on International Migration," the Introduction to: Gregory A. Kelson and Debra L. DeLaet, Gender and Immigration (New York: New York University Press, 1999), 2.
[7] "The proportion of women to be found among the immigrants of a particular nationality reflected, in part, the ability of females from that ethnic background to find employment. Immigrant women were not ornaments," Archdeacon, Becoming American, 136.
[8] In the United States, there are virtually no women in the skilled trades, for example, i.e., plumbers, carpenters, electricians, and few in professions such as engineering, and fewer black women in either.
[9] Indians (rather than Native Americans or Amerindians) is now the commonly accept term for the indigenous people of North America. Russell Thornton, American Indian Holocaust and Survival: A Population History Since 1492 (Norman, Oklahoma; University of Oklahoma Press, 1987.) Thornton has a lengthy discussion of estimates and methodologies of estimating indigenous population, together with many tables and maps dealing with all of the Americas and with various regions.
[10] Alfred W. Crosby, Jr., The Colombian Exchange: Biological and Cultural Consequences of 1492 (Westport, Conn.: Greenwood Press, 1972), Chapter 2, "Conquistador y Pestilencia," 35-63
[11] Daniels, Coming to America, gives a range of views estimating a population decline of 20, 60, or even 90 percent. The higher estimates have been gaining ground over time. Thornton, Ibid. covers population decline for various specific groups.
[12] Peter Linebaugh and Marcus Rediker, The Many-Headed Hydra: Sailors, Slaves, Commoners, and the Hidden History of the Revolutionary Atlantic (Boston: Beacon Press, 2000), 57-60. They state that two-thirds of all who came were indentured, transported or kidnapped.

[13] Bruce Levine et al, Who Built America? Working People and the Nation's Economy, Politics, Culture and Society (New York: Pantheon, 1989), I, 5.
[14] David Cressy, Coming Over: Migration and Communication between England and New England in the Seventeenth Century (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1987, 1989); David W.Galenson, White Sevitude in Colonial America: An Economic Analysis (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1995); Abbot Emerson Smith, *Colonists in Bondage: White Servitude and Convict Labor in America* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1947). For a useful summary see: Russel R. Menard, "Indentured Servitude," Eric Foner and John A. Garraty, eds., The Reader's Companion to American History (Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1991), 542-3.
[15] Levine, Who Built America?, I, 52.
[16] Edmund S. Morgan, American Slavery, American Freedom:The Ordeal of Colonial Virginia (New york: W.W. Norton & Company, 1975).
[17] Philip D. Curtin, The Atlantic Slave Trade: A Census (Madison: University of Wisconsin, 1969), Table 77, page 268. While more than nine million slaves arrived in the Americas from Africa, other millions must have perished in wars of conquest and subjugation, and in transportation. Estimates of the numbers of slaves brought to the Americas have varied from 3 million to 25 million, but Curtin's estimate of more than 9 million or as he sometimes say about 10 million is now standard.
[18] Bobin Blackburn, The Making of New World Slavery: From the Baroque to the Modern, 1492-1800 (London: Verso, 1997), 3.
[19] Daniels, Coming to America, 6.
[20] Eric Williams, Capitalism and Slavery (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1944, 1994), passim, and Blackburn, Ibid., passim. Blackburn argues that capitalism created slavery as much as slavery laid the foundation for capitalism.
[21] Eugene Genovese estimates the workday at 12 hours in Edward D.Genovese, Roll Jordan, Roll: The World the Slaves Made (New York: Vintage Books, 1972, 1974), 60; the estimate of two days work to pay the cost of their keep comes from Robin Blackburn, The Overthrow of Colonial Slavery 176-1848 (New York: Verso, 1988, 2000), 8. Genovese explains that while slaves spent 15 hours at work, three hours of that were usually spent at rest.
[22] Genovese, The World Slaves Made, 60-65. This is not to praise the slave owners for their treatment of the slaves, but rather suggests the poor conditions of other agricultural laborers, artisans and workers in the rest of the world at the hands of landlords and capitalists.
[23] I put "white" in quotation marks here, and would at this point do the same with "black," because of course there were no "whites" in Europe and no "blacks" in Africa. Such racial terminology developed only with the rise of the slave trade, the plantation slave system, and the encounter with the indigenous people of the New World, as Europeans and Africans came to the new world, voluntarily and involuntarily.
[24] Peter H. Wood, Black Majority: Negroes in Colonial South Carolina, From 1670 through the Stono Rebellion (New York: W.W. Norton & Company, 1974, 1975); John W. Blassingame, The Slave Community: Plantation Life in the Antebellum South, New and Enlarged Edition (New York: Oxford University Press, 1972, 1979); Deborah Gray White, Arn't I a Woman? Female Slaves in the Plantation South (New York: W.W. Norton & Company, 1985); Edward D.Genovese, Roll Jordan, Roll: The World the Slaves Made (New York: Vintage Books, 1972, 1974); Peter Kolchin, American Slavery: 1619-1877 (New York: Hill and Wang, 1993) provides an excellent overview of the history of slavery in British North America and the United States.
[25] Herbert Aptheker, American Negro Slave Revolts (New York: Columbia University Press, 1943); Eugene D. Genovese, From Rebellion to Revolution: Afro-American Slave Revolts in the Making of the Modern World (Baton rouge: Louisana State University Press, 1979); Robin Blackburn, The Overthrow of Colonial Slavery: 1776-1848 (London: Verso, 1988, 2000).

[26] Paul Goodman, Of One Blood: Aboitionism and the Origins of Racial Equality (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1998) puts new emphasis on the role of African Americans in the abolitionist movements, many of them former slaves. Though this had been advanced earlier, see Herbert Aptheker, The Negro in the Abolitionist Movement (New York: International Publishers, 1941). The theme of the role of African American resistance was most forcefully advanced by W.E.B. Du Bois in Black Reconstruction in America, 1860-1880 (New York: Atheneum, 1935, 1962, 1969). That idea is now incorporated in the standard histories, such as, Eric Foner, Reconstruction: America's Unfinished Revolution, 1863-1877 (New York: Harper & Row, Publishers, 1988, 1989).
[27] Daniels, Ibid, 114.
[28] Thomas J. Archdeacon, Becoming American: An Ethnic History (New York: The Free Press, 1983), 30; E.J. Hobsbawm, The Age of Revolution: Europe, 1789-1848 (London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson, 1962), 169-170. Hobsbawm give the population growth figures for various states.
[29] E.J. Hobsbawm, The Age of Revolution: Europe, 1789-1848 (London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson, 1962), Chapter 8, "Land," 149-167; Gabriel Kolko, Main Currents in Modern American History (New York: Pantheon, 1976, 1984), "Migration to the United States was an aspect of an international phenomenon which the emergence of European capitalism created." (68).
[30] Rudolph J. Vecoli, "The Italian Diaspora, 1876-1976," in: Robert Cohen, ed., The Cambridge Survey of World Migration (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1995), 114-122.
[31] Lawrence A. Cardoso, Mexican Emigration to the United States, 1897-1931: Socio-Economic Patterns (Tucson: University of Arizona Press, 1980), Chapter 1, "Porfirian Mexico: the Background of Massive Emigration," 1-18.
[32] Because there is no significant African migration to the United States in this period, I do not discuss in this paper the capitalist and imperialist disruption of Africa which may have been the most cataclysmic suffered by any region. See: Thomas Pakenham, The Scramble for Africa: The White Man's conquest of the Dark Continent from 1876 to 1912 (New York: Random House, 1991) and Adam Hochschild, King Leopold's Ghost: The Story of Greed, Terror, and Heroism in Colonial Africa (Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1998, 1999). Hochschild, basing himself on the historical scholarship, argues that the Belgians killed 10 million people in the Congo.
[33] Mike Davis, Late Victorian Holocausts: El Niño Famines and the Making of the Third World (New York: Verso, 2001).
[34] Richard Franklin Bensel, Yankee Leviathan: The Origins of Central State Authority in America, 1859-1877 (New York: Cambridge, 1990, 1995). While Bensel argues that the whole process ended in a "weak state" after 1877, his evidence supports an argument that there was in fact a capitalist state strong enough to both dominate American society, keep labor and farmers in check, and begin an imperialist expansion.
[35] Dick Hoerder, "International Labor Markets and Community Building by Migrant Workers in the Atlantic Economy," in: Rudolph J. Vecoli and Suzanne M Sinke, eds., A Century of European Migrations, 1830-1930 (Chicago: University of Illinois Press, 1991), 79.
[36] The idea that white workers exercise privileges not enjoyed by blacks has been developed by Noel Ignatiev, How the Irish Became White (New York: Routledge, 1995) and David Roediger, The Wages of Whiteness: Race and the Making of the American Working Class (New York: Verso, 1991, 1996). Some of these ideas had been developed much earlier by W.E.B. Du Bois in in his writings in the 1930s. See: David Levering Lewis, W.E.B. Du Bois: The Fight for Equality and the American Century (New York: Henry Holt and Company, 2000), 308-311.
[37] Daniels, Coming to America, 126-145.
[38] Daniels, Coming to America, 148-152.
[39] Harmut Keil, "socialist Immigrants from Germany and the Transfer of Socialist Ideology and Workers' Culture," in: Rudolph J. Vecoli and Suzanne M. Sinke, A Century of European Migrations, 1830-1930 (Urbana: University of Illinois, 1991), 315-338.
[40] Daniels, Coming to America, 188-201.
[41] Daniels, Coming to America, 214-223.

[42] Daniels, Coming to America, 223-232.
[43] Irving Howe, World of Our Fathers (New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, 1976), 154-63; Ronald Sanders, The Lower East side Jews: An Immigrant Generation (Mineola, N.Y.: Dover, 1969, 1987), Chapter 4 "Anarchists, Socialists and Labor Unions."
[44] Howe, World of Our Fathers, 162-163, 287-359.
[45] Ron Takaki, A Different Mirror: A History of Multicultural America (Boston: Little, Brown and Company, 1993), Chapter 10, "Pacific Crossings," gives a general overview of Asian immigration in the 19th century within the broader context of American history.
[46] Ronald Takaki, Strangers from a Diferent Shore: A History of Asian Americans, Updated and Revised Edition. Boston: Little, Brown and Company, 1989, 1998), 21-42.
[47] Levine et al, Who Built America, II, 114.
[48] David Montgomery, The Fall of the House of Labor: The Workplace, the State, and American Labor Activism, 1865-1925 (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1987), 85.
[49] Some 80,000 Japanese immigrants also came to the United States in the early 20th century, mostly to California. While Californians and other Americans also wished to stop Japanese immigration, President Theodore Roosevelt, fearing a possible war with Japan if they were excluded like the Chinese, negotiated the "Gentlemen's Agreement" of 1907-08, whereby Japan refused to give passports to laborers bound for the United States, thus ending Japanese emigration, except for some 20,000 Japanese wives. Daniels, Coming to America, 254-5.
[50] Neil Foley, The White Sourge: Mexicans, Blacks and Poor Whites in Texas Cotton Culture (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1997) 58-63.
[51] Juan Gonzalez, Harvest of Empire, 47.
[52] Lawrence Anthony Cardoso, "Mexican Emigration to the United States, 1900 to 1930: an Analysis of Socio-Economic Causes," (Ph.D. Diss., University of Connecticut, 1974), 90. Only 330,000 legally registered immigrants were admitted, but the author estimates as many as 1.65 million may have entered. While foreign immigrants were not eligible for the draft in World War I, misunderstandings and rumors led thousands of Mexicans to voluntarily return to Mexico. The government and employers, working with the Roman Catholic Church corrected the misunderstanding and stopped the exodus. (86-87)
[53] Cardoso, "Mexican Emigration," 108. The chief cause of emigration was the Cristero Rebellion in Western Mexico, especially in the state of Jalisco.
[54] The great contemporary account of this social movement can be found in Manuel Gamio, Mexican Immigration to the United States: A Study of Human Migration and Adjustment (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1930), 2 vols., based on his 1926-27 interviews with migrants.
[55] Lawrence A. Cardoso, Mexican Emigration to the United States, 189-1931: Socio-Economic Patterns (Tucson: University of Arizona Press, 1980), 22.
[56] Juan Gómez Quiñones, Mexican American Labor, 1790-1990 (Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press, 1994) is the best account.
[57] Joe William Trotter, Jr., ed. The Great Migration in Historical Perspective: New Dimensions of Race, Class and Gender (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1991) and James R. Grossman, Land of Hope: Chicago, Black southerners, and the Great Migration (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1989, 1991).
[58] Gabriel Kolko, Main Currents in Modern American History (New York: Pantheon, 1976, 1984), 69.
[59] The classic study of nativism is John Higham's Strangers in the Land: Patters of American Nativism, 1860-1925 (1955, 1963, 1994).
[60] Levine et al, eds. Who Built America?, II, 173-74; Kolko, Main Currents in Modern American History, 75.
[61] Richard O. Boyer and Herbert M. Morais, Labor's Untold Story (New York: United Electrical Workers, 1955, 1971), 66.
[62] David Montgomery, The Fall of the House of Labor: The Workplace, the State, and American Labor Activism, 1865-1925 (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1987), 89-96.

[63] Lizabeth Cohen, Making A New Deal: Industrial Workers in Chicago, 1919-1939 (New York: Cambridge Univesity Press, 1990, 1992), lays out these arguments
[64] Daniels, Coming to America, 296-302.
[65] Ron Takaki, Ron Takaki, A Different Mirror, 378-85; Daniels, Coming to America, 302-306.
[66] Manuel García y Griego, "The Importation of Mexican Contract Laborers into the United States, 1942-1965," in: David G. Gutíerrez, ed., Between Two Worlds: Mexican Immigrants in the United States (Wilmington, Delaware: Scholarly Resources Inc., 1996), 47
[67] García y Griego, "The Importation of Mexican Contract Laborers," 45-85.
[68] Nathan Glazer originally made this point.
[69] Daniels, Coming to America, 340-344.
[70] We use the old word Indochinese here for the Vietnamese, Kampucheans (Camodians), Hmong, and Laotians. Among those Indochinese, many of the Vietnamese were actually ethnic Chinese, and so identified themselves.
[71] Daniels, Coming to America, 335-337.
[72] "The Asian and Pacific Islander Population in the United States, March 1999," U.S. Census Bureau, issued September 2000, available on line at: http://www.census.gov/prod/2000pubs/p20-529.pdf.
[73] Daniels, Coming to America, 354.
[74] Takaki, Strangers from a Different Shore, 86, 91, 149, and 252.
[75] Juan Gómez-Quiñones, Mexican American Labor, 1790-1990 (Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press, 1994), 76. This big strike of Japanese and Mexican workers took place in Oxnard, California in 1903
[76] Kent Wong, "Building an Asian Pacific Labor Movement," in: Fred Ho et al, Legacy to Liberation: Politics and culture of Revolutionary Asian Pacific America (San Francisco: AK Press, 2000), 89-98.
[77] See the Chinese Staff and Workers Center home page at http://www.cswa.org/www/index.asp.
[78] Korean Immigrant Workers Advocates at http://www.kiwa.org/.
[79] INS, "Immigrants, Fiscal Year 2001," at: http://www.ins.gov/graphics/aboutins/statistics/IMM01yrbk/IMM2001text.pdf, 1.
[80] U.S. Border Patrol, "The National Border Patrol Strategy," at: http://www.ins.usdoj.gov/graphics/lawenfor/bpatrol/strategy.htm#Southwest.
[81] Amnesty International, "Human Rights Concerns in the Border Region with Mexico," 1998 report at: http://www.web.amnesty.org/ai.nsf/index/AMR510031998.
[82] Joel Brinkley, "Vast Trade in Forced Labor Portrayed in C.I.A. Report," *New York Times*, April 2, 2000.
[83] INS, "Immigrants, Fiscal Year 2001," 3-4.
[84] INS, "Immigrants, Fiscal Year 2001," says, "…information on net illegal immigration is not available." (4).
[85] Border Patrol, "Overview," at: http://www.ins.usdoj.gov/graphics/lawenfor/bpatrol/overview.htm.
[86] INS, "Illegal Alien Resident Population," at: http://www.ins.usdoj.gov/graphics/aboutins/statistics/illegalalien/.
[87] U.S. Census Bureau, "The Hispanic Population of the United States," March 2000.
[88] Andrew Sum et al, "Foreign Immigration and its Contributions to Population and Labor Force Growth in Massachusetts and the U.S.: A Recent Assessment of 2000 Census and CPS Survey Findings," Center for Labor Market Studies, Northeastern University, Boston, Mass., December 2001.
[89] "'Operation Tarmac' airport sweep widens," April 24, 2002 Posted: 3:34 PM EDT (1934 GMT) at: http://www.cnn.com/2002/TRAVEL/NEWS/04/24/airports.sweep/?related.
[90] Scott Sunde, "INS arrests 20 illegal Sea-Tac workers," *Seattle Post-Intelligencer*, January 19, 2002.
[91] Erich Lichtblau, "F.B.I. Tells Offices to Count Local Muslims and Mosques," *New York Times*, Jan. 28, 2003.