

h  
n  
d  
r

## Chapter Eight

# RACE AND IMMIGRATION IN THE NINETEENTH CENTURY

*Omar Valerio-Jiménez*

Race and immigration have been inexorably linked in the history of California, especially during its tumultuous nineteenth century. As jurisdiction over California shifted from Spain, to Mexico, and ultimately, to the United States, racial classifications became simpler but more rigid, while immigration policies grew more exclusionary. This trend was partially fueled by California's racial and ethnic diversity, which increased in the nineteenth century due to large-scale immigration. Before the first immigrants arrived in the late eighteenth century, the region had already been one of the world's most linguistically diverse and home to over one hundred distinct indigenous communities. The eighteenth-century colonists entered California not as an immigrant underclass, but as conquerors. Instead of adapting to the established society that they were entering, these immigrants radically altered the indigenous communities in the process of creating a new society.

Spanish colonists used force to impose their ideological and cultural beliefs on California's Indians. Indigenous nations suffered not only a loss of their land, but were also subject to the ravages of Spanish-introduced diseases and the imposition of a government, religious, and labor structure by Spanish missionaries, civilians, and the military. The Spanish viewed Indians as "savages" who lacked "civilization" and would have to discard their Indian culture to become "civilized." This view was manifested in the ways that the Spanish divided people into two categories: *gente de razón* (people of reason) to refer to people who had converted to Catholicism and adopted Spanish culture (including Christianized Indians), and *gente sin razón* (people without reason) to refer to non-converted Indians. Like the territorial conquest of California, the *conquista espiritual* (spiritual conquest) also depended on the use of force by Spanish missionaries, who physically punished mission Indians, and by soldiers, who brought captured Indians to the missions and launched campaigns to subdue indigenous rebellions to colonial rule. The Spanish also viewed Indians as "children" who needed to be instructed not only in religious beliefs, but also in cultural and economic views (Monroy 1990). The missions, therefore, were

centers of religious instruction as well as cultural and labor centers where Indians learned the Spanish language, customs, and ways of working. The missionaries gave instruction on cultivating European crops, tending livestock, and various skilled crafts. In addition to forcing Indians to discard native religions, the missionaries also hoped to transform indigenous sexual practices such as polygamy and divorce (Bouvier 2001). In exchange for providing Indians with Christianity, the colonists reasoned, the Indians should willingly labor for the colonists. When Indians resisted their enforced labor, Spanish soldiers and civilians organized raids for Indian captives. The dearth of women among the first colonists meant that the Indians were also seen as potential sexual partners.

Unfortunately, the process of racial intermixture was often violent and involuntary. In the years following the founding of the mission and presidio at Monterey, missionary Junípero Serra complained that various soldiers had begun sexually abusing Indian women and impeding the conversion efforts (Bouvier 2001). The rape of women of a conquered group had been part of a pattern followed by soldiers in previous conquests in Europe and the Americas, so religious and civilian officials had reason to be concerned. In the context of California, the rape of Indian women symbolized their specific domination by the soldiers and the more general subjugation of the entire native population. Native women were vulnerable to sexual attacks because the Spanish soldiers believed them to be inferior and the spoils of conquest (Castañeda 1993). The actions of the soldiers led to Indian reprisals, escapes from the missions, and resistance to religious conversion. In addition, the sexual attacks spread venereal diseases among the Indians, which in turn led to a decline in the native population (Chávez-García 2004). The soldiers' behavior also discouraged the missionaries, who complained to the military officers and, at times, asked to be transferred away from California. In order to avoid continued outrages, colonial authorities began encouraging soldiers to marry Indian women by offering incentives of land, livestock, and transportation costs. Officials believed that the marriages between Spanish soldiers and indigenous women would promote stable families, strengthen kinship ties, and increase the population of *gente de razón*. The colonial government was more successful in boosting the colonists' numbers with two other experiments. In the late eighteenth century, the government sent convicts and their families to California. Despite the men's criminal backgrounds, officials hoped that married couples would prove more stable. In 1800, officials also sent a group of orphans from Mexico City in another effort to increase the number of colonists (Castañeda 1990). The government's difficulty in attracting colonists demonstrated that California continued to be seen as an unappealing destination, where only impoverished people seeking upward mobility would seek to move.

Many of the supposed "Spanish" colonists who settled in California were in fact racially mixed. Only a few priests and high-ranking military officers were originally from Spain. The majority of the colonists hailed from poor northern provinces such as Baja California, Sonora, and Sinaloa (Chávez-García 2004). The colonists' decision to migrate to California was motivated by a desire to increase their social position by taking advantage of the colonial government's various incentives, especially the grants of land and livestock. By acquiring wealth, some colonists could pay to obtain a *gracias a sacar* (literally, thanks to be taken out) decree that officially changed their birth status to reflect a "white" lineage and *limpieza de sangre* (purity of blood) (Haas 1995). After three centuries of mestizaje (racial intermixture), most of New Spain's population (including the first Californios) had African, Indian, and Spanish ancestry. The process of mestizaje continued in California as the mestizo and mulatto colonists intermarried, while others sought indigenous spouses. Although the Spanish colonial government had developed a complex system of racial categorization, by the eighteenth century officials were hard pressed to enforce these racial categories, especially in Mexico's Far North (Haas 1995). In addition, the assignment of a category was quite subjective, as repeatedly illustrated by baptismal registers in which priests assigned different racial categories to siblings even though their parents remained the same. Throughout Mexico's northern frontier, people transcended racial categories as their class status shifted. The maxim that money whitens held true in California as the nouveaux riches were easily reclassified as *españoles* (Spaniards), the most elite category. On the eve of Mexican Independence in 1821, the *gente de razón* population of California hovered around 3,200 people.

Frustrated by failed efforts to increase the number of colonists in Mexico's northern territories, Spanish officials turned to immigrants as a solution. Royal officials established a colonization program (continued by Mexico after its independence) that offered land and tax exemptions to foreign immigrants who agreed to settle in Texas. While few European immigrants arrived, Anglo Americans flooded into Texas and soon Mexican officials began to worry about their loyalty. Faced with growing uncertainty over Texas, Mexican officials became wary of extending the colonization plan to California. A few Anglo American traders and trappers did make their way to California, but they found that the most desirable land was unavailable as it belonged to the missions. Prior to 1840, only about 400 Americanos had made their way to California. Several of these men, like Abel Stearns and John Forster, married into Californio families, became Catholics, and acculturated to Mexican society. The merchants' kinship ties helped their businesses succeed, and enabled them to acquire large landholdings. In turn, the Californio families with ties to the

English-speaking merchants obtained access to capital and business connections (Monroy 1990).

The availability of land changed with the secularization of the missions between 1834 and 1836. Among the foreigners who arrived after secularization were John Marsh and John Sutter, who played important roles in attracting more foreigners. In addition to being early California boosters, both men shared a fugitive past (Marsh in New Mexico and Sutter in Switzerland) and a desire to remake their lives in the West. Posing as a medical doctor, Marsh grew wealthy by dispensing "medical treatments" in exchange for cattle. He was instrumental in attracting Anglo American migrants through the numerous letters he wrote to eager would-be settlers in the Midwest. Sutter was a Swiss immigrant whose fort in Sacramento became a magnet for Anglo Americans, including "illegal aliens" who moved to California without securing permission from the Mexican government. Sutter assisted overland migrants by providing them with supplies, giving them jobs upon their arrival, and illegally distributing land to the newcomers. During the 1840s, many more foreigners arrived, attracted by the inexpensive land offered by Californio and Anglo American rancheros who had obtained land after secularization (Weber 1982).

The influx of a large number of foreigners placed Californios at odds with Mexican government officials. The national government became increasingly suspicious of the *arrivistes* after 1840 because many entered the state illegally, refused to learn Spanish, and did not acculturate to Mexican society. Even local officials noticed the difference, as did Governor Juan B. Alvarado, who noted, "Would that the foreigners that came to settle in Alta California after 1841 had been of the same quality as those who preceded them!" (Monroy 1990: 163). Along with other Californios, Alvarado had welcomed the first Anglo American and European immigrants who intermarried and acculturated to Mexican society, but disliked the new arrivals who arrived with families, remained apart from Californios, and expressed nativist sentiments. Worried that the flood of foreigners would lead to another separatist revolt like that in Texas, Mexican officials unsuccessfully ordered local officials to expel foreigners who lacked permission to settle and tried to discourage Americans by publishing newspaper notices denying the existence of cheap land.

In contrast to the national government's view, Californios held contradictory views of foreign immigrants who streamed into the Sacramento and San Joaquín valleys. Californios welcomed the immigrants because the newcomers brought much-needed skills and strengthened the economy, but they also feared being outnumbered by immigrants who increasingly refused to acculturate to Mexican society. After years of neglect, Californios had also grown to distrust the national government. They lacked a strong sense of nationalism but felt greater loyalty to their local region. These

conflicting views meant that the Californios felt a closer affinity with the 1,300 foreigners who lived in the state by 1846 than with national government officials. On the eve of the US – Mexican War, Mexico had failed not only to control the flow of foreigners into the state, but also to gain the loyalty of the established Californios. Mexico's immigration policy had been successful in attracting foreign colonists to its Far North, but would prove disastrous in maintaining its control over the region. As David Weber has aptly observed, Mexico's experience in its Far North changed the famous dictum, "to govern is to populate," on its head. By numerically overwhelming Mexican colonists in Texas and California, Anglo Americans had provided a counterexample, suggesting that to "populate is to govern" (Weber 1982). Unfortunately, these new immigrants would establish a government that employed racial classifications more effectively to exclude non-whites from civic participation.

The arrival of a large number of Anglo Americans changed the established racial hierarchy. Unlike Spanish colonists who had adopted a "frontier of inclusion," the newcomers followed a "frontier of exclusion" policy towards Indians that did not integrate within Anglo American society (Hine & Faragher 2000). The newcomers viewed the Indians less as potential workers, trading partners, or spouses, than as obstacles to westward expansion. Anglo Americans believed that California's American Indian population was uncivilized because, among other reasons, they subsisted from hunting and gathering instead of agriculture. Rather than incorporating Indians, Americanos preferred to remove indigenous nations from their lands to make way for the newcomers' settlements. The majority of Anglo Americans also held negative views of Mexicans, who were characterized as lazy, uncouth, and filthy. Typical of these views were those expressed by Richard Henry Dana in *Two Years before the Mast* (1840). Dana, a Harvard graduate who arrived in California by ship, held the Californios in contempt while recognizing the value of their landholdings. Characterizing the Californios as "idle, thriftless people," Dana judged them to be "proud, and extravagant, and very much given to gaming." His account of California was widely read, and shaped the views of westward-moving Americans. Dana's writing helped popularize the view that Mexican men were inept and lazy, while Mexican women were exotic and loose. These negative opinions were further influenced by prevailing racial attitudes in the mid-nineteenth century regarding Mexicans' mixed racial ancestry. Americanos believed Mexicans to be a "mongrel" people due to their mixed African, Indian, and Spanish racial heritage (Horsman 1981).

The large influx of Anglo Americans was part of a larger ongoing process of American westward expansion and would become critical for the second conquest of California. Influenced by the prevailing ideas at mid-century, the newcomers justified the nation's expansion with a strong opinion about

the superiority of American institutions, and a racist belief in the inferiority of the people living in the coveted territory. Their trust in the nation's "manifest destiny" included a conviction that God supported the nation's expansion across the continent and the spread of American culture and institutions. The most fervent supporters of manifest destiny viewed the acquisition of the entire Mexican nation as an ultimate goal. The "all of Mexico" movement encountered stiff opposition from those who believed that the United States could not incorporate so many "mongrel" people. Nativist opponents argued against annexing all of Mexico because they did not want the United States to add more Catholics after the large influx of Irish immigrants at mid-century. The debate also touched on the expansion of slavery, which northerners suspected was the ultimate goal of southern expansionists. Despite disagreements about how much territory to annex, most Americans believed that Mexicans could not take part in democratic institutions due to their innate inferiority. During the war, Congress continued debating how much Mexican territory to acquire. Senator Lewis Cass of Michigan minced few words when he argued, "We do not want the people of Mexico, either as citizens or subjects. All we want is a portion of their territory . . ." (Horsman 1981: 241). Ultimately, a compromise was reached to incorporate Mexico's less densely settled northern territories, including California, where expansionists believed Mexicans would either disappear or eventually identify with American institutions. The war ended with the Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo, which guaranteed Mexicans living in the ceded territories full citizenship rights including the respect of their property, religion, and freedom of assembly. Unfortunately, the discovery of gold at Sutter's Fort within a few months of the treaty's signing dispelled hopes that the Californios would easily exercise these rights.

Economic competition in the mines would provoke racial antagonisms as non-white immigrants arrived in California. The violence and racial antipathy unleashed during the Gold Rush had national implications, according to Kevin Starr, because they reflected the characteristics of "a nation with strong racist and ethnic prejudices in its heart" (Starr & Orsi 2000: 7). The possibility of striking it rich in the gold mines acted as a magnet that pulled numerous migrants from other parts of the United States and immigrants from various regions of the world. During the Gold Rush, over 100,000 people arrived, including immigrants from Chile, China, France, Hawaii, and Mexico. The mostly male migration disrupted the Anglo Americans' conceptions of proper gender roles as men were forced by necessity to perform domestic duties. This moment of gender confusion allowed for some inter-ethnic cooperation, as some Anglo-American men came to rely on French, Chinese, and African-American men to cook, wash, and nurse the sick (Johnson 2000). Many of these

immigrants arrived with mining skills learned in their native country, such as Mexicans and Chileans who employed their skills with placer mining to gain some initial success in the gold mines. The distinct languages, clothing, and religion of the international group of miners that gathered in the state made each group acutely aware of racial and ethnic distinctions. Unfortunately, the ethnic diversity of the diggings proved too explosive for Anglo Americans imbued with mid-century racial ideologies. Resentful that Mexicans and Chileans had staked out some of the best mining claims, Anglo Americans soon outnumbered the Latinos and Asians and began organizing to drive out the immigrants, whom they viewed as "foreigners." According to Sucheng Chan, "ethnic consciousness quickly became transformed first into nativism and then into racism" (Starr & Orsi 2000: 58).

In addition to the physical assaults and intimidation, the Americans also appealed to California's legislature, which passed the Foreign Miners' Tax in 1850. This law required non-citizens to pay \$20 per month for the "privilege" of mining. Although some Mexicans were US citizens, they obtained little protection from local or state officials. The law technically applied to all immigrants, but officials enforced it selectively. The legislature repealed the law in 1851, but by then it had accomplished the goal of driving many French and Latino miners away from the mines. The state passed a second Foreign Miners' Tax in 1852 that imposed a \$3 per month tax, but this was primarily enforced against the Chinese. The long-term significance of the Foreign Miners' Tax was to provide legal sanction for Anglo Americans' nativist violence and to "institutionalize a pattern of race relations" that would plague the state throughout its history (Starr & Orsi 2000):

The population boom in California proved disastrous for the state's indigenous population, and led to the passage of legislation that used race to deny citizenship rights to California's Indians. Diseases, introduced by the arrival of numerous immigrants, led to a precipitous decline in the Indian population, but starvation and violence also had a considerable impact (see the essay in this volume by William Bauer, Jr.). In addition to the violence, Indians were forced to confront legal disadvantages. The state's constitution denied them full citizenship rights, and subsequent laws reinforced their disadvantaged position by prohibiting Indians from serving as witnesses in court, preventing them from attending public schools, and making it illegal for them to obtain firearms. Perhaps the most blatant discriminatory state law at mid-century was one that allowed for Indian children to be indentured by whites. This 1850 law virtually legalized Indian slavery since employers were allowed to hold Indian children in servitude until they turned 18 years of age. The legislature modified the law in 1860 to lengthen the terms of indenture for children and to allow

employers to indenture Indian adults. Indenture laws gave rise to the trafficking in Indian children as Anglo Americans and Mexicans began raiding indigenous villages in order to kidnap children to sell into servitude. The 1850s also witnessed attempts by federal officials to negotiate treaties with Indians that would force them onto reservations. The state eventually created a few reservations, but these were an abysmal failure (Hurtado 1988).

Unlike California's Indians, Mexicans had more legal protections that allowed some to avoid being racialized as "non-white." The citizenship rights guaranteed to Mexicans and their "white" legal status under the state constitution helped Californios avoid some of the discrimination experienced by Indian, African, and Asian residents. Because they spoke a romance language and practiced Christianity, some scholars have argued that Mexicans were culturally closer to Anglo Americans than Asians and Indians (Almaguer 1994). Nevertheless, Mexicans' experience varied because their class status determined whether Anglo Americans would accept them as white. Californios confronted significant obstacles when they attempted to exercise their property rights. In Northern California, Mexicans quickly became a minority population as Anglo Americans flooded into the state during the Gold Rush. The newcomers brought different ideas of land tenure and property divisions than those held by Californios. Under the Spanish and Mexican land systems, the property boundaries were not as precisely demarcated as they were in Anglo American communities. These differences, along with the common practice among Americans of squatting on unused land, created great problems for Mexican landowners. The tension was exacerbated by Anglo Americans' mistaken characterization of Mexicans as "foreigners" within California, and the newcomers' belief that Californio landowners were not properly using their land. Some Americans also believed that the Californios' lands should be made public as a result of the war of conquest.

In the process of verifying Spanish and Mexican land titles before federal commissioners and in US courts, Californios confronted a myriad of technical and spurious challenges, including a new legal system and a different language. Some of the biggest challenges resulted from squatters and land speculators who filed claims on land belonging to Californios that delayed title confirmations, and lengthened the court proceedings – landowners spent 17 years on average securing their titles (Haas 1995). Californios lost land to expensive legal fees, and to unethical lawyers who tricked them into signing legal documents that saddled the owners with additional debts. Afraid of the lengthy appeals, some owners sold their land at bargain prices. Others abandoned portions of their land as a result of vigilante violence. For landowners who managed to secure their titles, taxes became another obstacle because the state's tax laws disproportionately targeted owners of

land over owners of different types of wealth (i.e., gold). Some rancheros managed to keep their property within the family after their daughters married Anglo Americans or European immigrants, who could defend the family's property because they understood the legal system and spoke English. Another challenge confronting Californio landowners came from their lack of capital diversification. When the market in cattle decreased after the Gold Rush many rancheros, who had most of their wealth invested in land and cattle, were forced to sell their land in order to pay loans and taxes (Monroy 1990).

While the Californio elite lost vast landholdings, less privileged Californios faced increasing criminalization and violence. In the aftermath of the US – Mexican War and the Gold Rush, racial tensions remained high throughout the state. This atmosphere fueled an increase in crime in Los Angeles. While every ethnic group was represented among the criminals, journalists helped convince Anglo Americans that impoverished Mexicans were to blame for most crimes. Some writers characterized the disorder as a "race war," and soon vigilantes, like the gang of Anglo Texans known as El Monte boys, began lynching Mexicans suspected of crimes. The racial violence also gave rise to the appearance of several groups of bandits. Some, like Joaquín Murrieta in Northern California, rebelled after enduring vigilante violence. Others, like Juan Flores and Tiburcio Vásquez, rebelled in response to the criminalization and subordination of the Mexican community. These bandits targeted Anglo Americans by stealing their cattle and killing vigilantes who remained unpunished by legal officers. The bandits also targeted Chinese miners, whom Anglo Americans feminized by characterizing them as "defenseless" and the white men as their defenders (Johnson 2000).

As European immigrants arrived in California, they found common cause with Anglo American workers in their opposition to non-white workers. Most European immigrants came from Ireland, Germany, and England, with a smaller number originating in France and Italy. The state's 1870 census enumerated over 116,000 European-born residents, including 54,421 Irish, 29,699 Germans, 19,202 English, 8,063 French, and 4,660 Italians. Perhaps because they shared a common ancestry and culture with northwestern European immigrants, Anglo Americans came to accept Irish, German, and English immigrants more easily and to regard them as "honorary Americans" (Starr & Orsi 2000: 48–9). In California, Anglo Americans came to view these northwestern European immigrants as "white" because of shared experiences and alliances against racially marked "non-whites." Many Anglo Americans arriving in California at mid-nineteenth century agreed with the free labor ideology that valued individualism, competitive markets, expanding capitalism, and, above all, the value of free labor. The goal of free labor advocates was a middle-class lifestyle where

they could be self-employed and economically independent. In California, Anglo Americans sought to prevent the existence of any labor system that threatened free "white" labor (Almaguer 1994). Because African Americans did not become a significant percentage of the labor force during the nineteenth century, white workers were more threatened by Chinese workers who eventually made up 25 percent of the labor force. According to Saxton, European immigrant workers (mostly Irish and Germans) united around the idea that they were not Chinese. Thus, European immigrant workers claimed the privileges of whiteness as they joined white Americans in portraying the Chinese as an indispensable enemy (Saxton 1990).

African Americans in California confronted not only racial tensions but also legislation that upheld white supremacy. White Californians, influenced by free labor ideology, successfully prevented slavery from gaining legal acceptance when the state entered the Union as a free state. Their antipathy extended beyond slavery to free African Americans, as demonstrated by various unsuccessful attempts to pass laws that would have prevented the immigration of free African Americans into the state (Almaguer 1994). Nevertheless, some African Americans arrived as slaves accompanying white southerners during the Gold Rush, while others arrived as free people searching for riches in the same mines. State officials generally ignored slave owners' use of slaves despite California's prohibition of slavery. However, free African Americans noticed the contradiction and organized to assist slaves' efforts to sue for their freedom. African American and Anglo American abolitionists gathered funds to publicize the slaves' plight and to pay for their legal fees. Their strategy worked as several slaves, including Bridget Mason and Archy Lee, successfully sued and obtained their freedom. Mason became a prominent nurse, real-estate investor, and philanthropist while Lee left the state for British Columbia accompanied by hundreds of others, frustrated by the state's attempts to pass anti-immigration laws aimed at African Americans. Other slaves earned enough money in the mines or other endeavors to purchase their freedom and that of their families (Johnson 2000).

California passed several laws meant to keep African Americans subordinate, including denying them the right to vote, serve on juries, testify in court, and marry whites; the state even passed a fugitive slave law to help slave owners retain control of escaped slaves (Lapp 1977). In response to their continual subordination, African Americans organized a series of statewide conventions to press for political and legal rights. The denial of rights affected an increasing number of people as the state's African American population, which was approximately 4,000 in 1860, hovered around one percent throughout the second half of the nineteenth century. African Americans also pressed for access to education and for the desegregation of public schools. While few African Americans became successful

entrepreneurs like Bidy Mason, most labored in the food and service industries because of restrictive hiring practices.

Chinese immigrants also confronted various discriminatory laws targeting their participation in the workplace and civil society. Originally from southern China, the mostly male immigrants were pushed out by war, a bad economy, and political strife. They arrived in such large numbers during the Gold Rush that their population had swelled to 35,000 by 1860. Chinese immigrants began confronting vigilante harassment and legal restrictions soon after arriving in the mines. According to Alexander Saxton, much of the anti-Chinese legislation and violence was modeled after similar actions that white Californians had directed at African Americans (Saxton 1971). Some Chinese immigrants left the diggings to work as cooks, laundrymen, and servants. Although the Foreign Miners' Tax weighed disproportionately on them (they paid over 95 percent of the total \$5 million collected), Chinese laborers remained in the mines after others left even though the gold had become more difficult to extract. Transformed into wage workers for mining companies, they made up half the mining labor force by 1870. Chinese immigrants also began working in railroad construction, taking lower pay for the most dangerous jobs that white laborers shunned (Saxton 1971). They also migrated into urban areas, formed benevolent associations, and established ethnic enclaves called Chinatowns.

Like African Americans and Indians, Chinese immigrants faced restrictive legislation because they were racially marked as "non-whites." State laws prevented them from becoming US citizens, forced them into segregated schools, and barred them from testifying in court against whites. The ruling in the case of *People v. Hall* (1854) officially relegated the state's Chinese population to the same second-class status held by African Americans and Indians. Overturning an earlier murder conviction, the California Supreme Court ruled that Chinese residents could not testify against whites (Starr & Orsi 2000). Their situation worsened during the 1870s when the state faced an economic depression and widespread unemployment. The worsening economy provided the pretext for the Workingmen's Party of California (WPC) to blame Chinese workers for lowering wages. Denis Kearney, an Irish immigrant living in San Francisco, led the WPC and ended many of his speeches with chants of "the Chinese must go!" Not surprisingly, several WPC rallies resulted in riots and arrests. The WPC managed to win numerous local and state elections before imploding in the 1880s. Riots in Los Angeles also targeted Chinese immigrants in the 1870s as white and Latino residents destroyed buildings and killed immigrants living in the city's Chinatown. While the laborers bore the brunt of these attacks, Chinese benevolent associations and merchants chafed under legal restrictions, which they challenged in court. Their lawsuits targeting

anti-Chinese legislation succeeded in overturning their exclusion from public schools (in response the state created segregated Chinese schools) and discriminatory laws against business owners. Nevertheless, exclusionist politicians followed labor unions' earlier agitation by pressing for anti-Chinese legislation, including the federal Chinese Exclusion Act of 1882, which severely restricted immigration from China and prevented the naturalization of Chinese immigrants (Gyory 1998).

Racial exclusionary legislation had the desired effect of severely restricting the immigration of racialized "others," while at the same time welcoming European immigrants and Anglo American migrants to California. Not surprisingly, the vast majority of migrants during the second part of the nineteenth century had European ancestry. Boosters and real-estate developers partially contributed to the state's tremendous growth in the last third of the nineteenth century, while inexpensive transportation and the temperate climate of Southern California lured migrants from other parts of the nation. Urban jobs and rural land pulled European Americans to the state in such large numbers that first- or second-generation immigrants made up over half of the population in 1900. In San Francisco, over 70 percent of the population consisted of first- and second-generation European immigrants. As in the rest of the nation, the state's immigrants hailed mostly from Germany, Ireland, Italy, and Britain; a smaller number came from Norway, Sweden, and Denmark.

California's economy changed the typical settlement patterns that these immigrants followed in other parts of the country. In addition to working as farmers and urban industrial workers, European immigrants found work as sailors, packinghouse workers, winemakers, and merchants. Like other non-white immigrants, European immigrants formed ethnic enclaves where they could continue to speak their native languages and practice their traditional religions. However, unlike Chinese immigrants who were barred from living in certain neighborhoods, European immigrants voluntarily chose to live in ethnic enclaves (Issel & Cherny 1986). At the end of the nineteenth century, the ethnic diversity of the state would continue to increase as Japanese immigrants began arriving. Like others racialized as "non-white," the Japanese would encounter few employment opportunities in a racially stratified labor market. When the Japanese obtained a measure of success as small farmers, the state's white agriculturalists mobilized to push through the next round of racially discriminatory legislation.

Racial categories and immigration in California changed dramatically over the course of the nineteenth century. During this period, the state's racial and ethnic diversity challenged the white - black racial binary through which much of US history is customarily interpreted. The century began with Spain struggling to remain in control of Alta California, offering

numerous incentives to spur immigration, and classifying residents into some 54 *castas* (racial categories). Economic opportunities spurred large-scale immigration over the next 100 years, and increased the racial and ethnic diversity of the state. By the end of the century, California was firmly under United States rule, attempting to stem the flow of "non-white" immigrants, and increasingly relying on a process of racial construction that marked immigrants as "white" or "non-white." Immigration had radically changed the demographics of the state, leaving "white" residents as the overwhelming majority of California's population by the turn of the twentieth century.

#### REFERENCES

- Almaguer, T. 1994. *Racial Fault Lines: The Historical Origins of White Supremacy in California*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Bouvier, V. M. 2001. *Women and the Conquest of California, 1542-1840: Codes of Silence*. Tucson: University of Arizona Press.
- Camarillo, A. 1979. *Chicanos in a Changing Society: From Mexican Pueblos to American Barrios in Santa Barbara and Southern California, 1848-1930*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Castañeda, A. 1990. "Presidarias y Pobladoras: Spanish-Mexican Women in Frontier Monterey, Alta California, 1770-1821." PhD dissertation, Stanford University.
- Castañeda, Antonia I. 1993. "Sexual Violence in the Politics and Policies of Conquest: Amerindian Women and the Spanish Conquest of Alta California." In Adela de la Torre and Beatriz Pesquera, eds., *Building with Our Hands: New Directions in Chicana Studies*. Berkeley: University of California Press, pp. 15-33.
- Chávez-García, M. 2004. *Negotiating Conquest: Gender and Power in California, 1770s to 1880s*. Tucson: University of Arizona Press.
- Gutiérrez, R. A. and Orsi, R. J. 1998. *Contested Eden: California before the Gold Rush*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Gyory, A. 1998. *Closing the Gate: Race, Politics, and the Chinese Exclusion Act*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press.
- Haas, L. 1995. *Conquests and Historical Identities in California, 1769-1936*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Hine, R. V. and Faragher, J. M. 2000. *The American West: A New Interpretive History*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- Horsman, R. 1981. *Race and Manifest Destiny: The Origins of American Racial Anglo-Saxonism*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Hurtado, A. 1988. *Indian Survival on the California Frontier*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- Issel, W. and Cherny, R. 1986. *San Francisco, 1865-1932: Politics, Power, and Urban Development*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Johnson, S. L. 2000. *Roaring Camp: The Social World of the California Gold Rush*. New York: W. W. Norton.

- Lapp, R. 1977. *Blacks in Gold Rush California*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- Monroy, D. 1990. *Thrown Among Strangers: The Making of Mexican Culture in Frontier California*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Pitt, L. 1971. *The Decline of the Californios: A Social History of the Spanish-Speaking Californians, 1846-1890*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Saxton, A. 1971. *The Indispensable Enemy: Labor and the Anti-Chinese Movement in California*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Saxton, A. 1990. *The Rise and Fall of the White Republic: Class Politics and Mass Culture in Nineteenth-Century America*. New York: Verso.
- Starr, K. and Orsi, R. J. 2000. *Rooted in Barbarous Soil: People, Culture, and Community in Gold Rush California*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Weber, D. 1982. *The Mexican Frontier, 1821-1846: The American Southwest under Mexico*. Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press.

#### FURTHER READING

- Deverell, W. 2004. *Whitewashed Adobe: The Rise of Los Angeles and the Remaking of Its Mexican Past*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Gutiérrez, D. G. 1995. *Walls and Mirrors: Mexican Americans, Mexican Immigrants, and the Politics of Ethnicity*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Haney-López, I. F. 2006. *White by Law: The Legal Construction of Race*. New York: New York University Press.
- Hurtado, A. L. 1999. *Intimate Frontiers: Sex, Gender, and Culture in Old California*. Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press.
- Jacobson, M. F. 1999. *Whiteness of a Different Color: European Immigrants and the Alchemy of Race*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Lee, E. 2003. *At America's Gates: Chinese Immigration During the Exclusion Era, 1882-1943*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press.
- McKanna, C. V. 2002. *Race and Homicide in Nineteenth-Century California*. Reno: University of Nevada Press.
- Molina, N. 2006. *Fit to Be Citizens? Public Health and Race in Los Angeles, 1879-1939*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Pitti, Stephen J. 2003. *The Devil in Silicon Valley: Northern California, Race, and Mexican Americans*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Ueda, R., ed. 2006. *A Companion to American Immigration*. Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishing.