

摘 要

美国本土主义运动是美国历史上的一场以排外思想为理论基础，以反对天主教，犹太教，亚洲和拉丁美洲移民为主要任务，以一些兄弟会性质的组织为骨干，以维护美国白人主流文化为主要目标的运动。这场运动断断续续存在多年，至今仍对美国社会有很大影响。本土主义运动的波及范围很广，从社会下层逐渐到上层，并对美国政府政策的制订也产生了一定的影响。本土主义运动与移民问题紧密相连，与美国社会多元文化的存在和发展息息相关。

本文分析了本土主义运动在美国的发展以及对美国移民的影响，并对美国移民的未来进行了展望。首先，文中介绍了美国人反对外来移民的背景。早期的美国移民来自英国，他们有共同的价值标准和价值观。他们认为非英国移民是文化“另类”。其次，本文分析了早期本土主义运动（19世纪到20世纪初）的产生的原因及发展：由于爱尔兰和德国移民数量的增加，反对天主教情绪高涨。之后到了19世纪中期，本土主义者认为白种人是统治阶级，并接受了西欧移民，认为白种人享有至高权利。本土主义者以亚洲和东南欧移民为主要攻击目标。认为其是低劣人种。

爆发于1929年的经济危机过后，美国历史开始了新篇章。本土主义运动的形式也有所变化。二战后犹太避难者成为他们攻击的主要目标。随着亚洲，中美洲，墨西哥移民数量的增加本土主义者最关心的是英语语言的纯洁性和非法移民对美国社会的影响。本土主义者和美国政府都为解决这些问题付出一定的努力。同时，这一部分还分析了本土主义在这一时期反对外来移民在政治，经济及社会方面的原因。

结论部分总结了本文并展望未来。在美国，白人将成为少数。拉美，非洲，亚洲及来自中东的移民将成为大多数。到那时，有色人种将不会接受不平等的待遇或处于美国社会的附属地位。

关键词：本土主义， 移民， 排外， 美国社会

Abstract

American nativism is a movement with exclusionism as its theoretical basis. It is biased mainly against Catholic, Semitist, Asian, and Hispanic immigrants. The mainstay of the movement is some fraternal organizations, and its goal is to safeguard American white mainstream culture. This movement continued on and off for many years and still has great influence on American society. As an important event in American social and political movement, it started at the grass root level and gradually moved to the upper level and has certain influence on the formulation of government policy. The nativist movement is closely linked with the issue of immigration and the existence and development of multiculturalism in American society.

The thesis analyzes development of nativism in the United States and its impact on immigrants and also explores outlook of immigrants in the United States. First, the paper introduces the background of antialien activities. The early immigrants to the United States were English immigrants, who abided by the English norms and values. They regarded non-English as cultural others. Then, the next section analyzes causation and development of the early nativism (from 19th century to 20th century). As the number of immigrants from Ireland and Germany increased in 1830s and 1840s, anti-Catholicism sentiment became violent. By the mid-nineteenth century nativists regarded white race as the ruling class, at the same time, they have accepted western Europeans as one of them who could enjoy special privileges. So, immigrants from Asia and eastern and southern Europe become their main targets. These people were deemed as inferior races.

The Great Depression marked the beginning of modern American history. Antialien activity would never be the same again. After WW II, Jews fleeing from Nazi Holocaust became the target by nativism. The targets of today's nativism were Mexican, Central American and Asian faces. They focused on language and illegal immigrants. Nativists and policy makers have made great efforts to solve these problems. The last section of this part is economic, political and social causation of why nativism opposes immigrants.

The section of conclusion gives a summary of the paper and outlook of nativism. In the future, whites will be a minority population. Latinos, Africans, Asians and Middle Eastern Americans will be the majority. By then, these people of color will not accept inferior treatment and subordinate position of U.S society.

Key words: nativism, immigrants, antialien, American society

Acknowledgements

I am honored to have the opportunity to acknowledge the kind individuals who have helped me during my study for master degree and through the writing of my thesis. I owe my deepest gratitude to my advisor, Professor Zhang Binjiang, who gave me suggestions on the writing of this thesis. I have benefited a lot from his extensive knowledge about American studies.

I am grateful to Professor Yang Dianrong and Professor Zhu Botong for their enlightenment and encouragement during my graduate studies.

I especially want to express my gratitude to my classmate Liu Han and Li Tong, Education Major, who helped me find the books I needed in writing my thesis.

I also wish to extend my gratitude to my family for their emotional and economic support.

致 谢

我在攻读硕士学位以及写毕业论文期间，得到了很多人的帮助，在此我向他们表示深深的谢意。特别感谢我的导师张滨江教授为我的论文提出了许多宝贵的意见。他对美国社会与文化的广博知识使我受益非浅。

我还要感谢杨殿荣教授和朱柏桐教授在我硕士学习过程中给予的启迪与鼓励。

特别感谢我的同学刘涵和教育方向的同学李桐。他们在我资料收集方面给我提供了很多帮助。

此外我还要感谢我的家人在精神与经济上的支持。

CHAPTER 1

Introduction

1.1 Background of the Study

As a nation of immigrants, the United States has also been a nation of nativists. The word nativism means that a preference for those deemed natives; simultaneous and intense opposition to those deemed strangers, foreigners. (The Columbia Electronic Encyclopedia) Nativism, also known as anti-immigrant sentiment has pervaded most of American history. Americans have done the persecuting-passing discriminatory laws against the foreignborn, denying their fundamental rights, and assaulting them with mob violence. Immigrants in the United States had been welcomed in periods of expansion and optimism, but had been blamed in periods of stagnation and cynicism. Americans' attitudes toward immigrants have depended primarily on domestic politics and economics, secondarily on the volume and characteristics of the newcomers. Fear and loathing of foreigners reach such levels when the nations' problems become so uneasy to overcome that some people seek scapegoats. Typically, these periods feature a political or economic crisis, combined with a loss of faith in American institutions and a sense that the national community is gravely fractured. Hence a yearning for social homogeneity that needs an internal enemy to sustain itself: the "alien". Nativists' targets have reflected America's basic divisions: class, race, religion, and to a lesser extent, language and culture.

Nativist movements, and the legislation they made, seek to rid the nation of perceived enemies of the American way of life. Nativism seeks the ritual purification of American society, the separation of those who belong from those who do not. The majority enhances its status as the "real" Americans, those who belong, and rejects those currently deemed threatening to American values.

In 1798, when Alien and Sedition Acts were enacted, the enemy took the form of French ethnicity and ideology, and Americans associated with that ideology. The 1850s saw the vilification of the Irish "savages" who, for the first time, had migrated to the United States in large numbers. The years during and after World War I Americans showed its hatred of the Germans and German Americans. During World War II, the hatred of the Japanese enemy, and of loyal Americans of Japanese ancestry who looked like the enemy, resulted in the forced incarceration of seventy thousand Japanese aliens in domestic internment camps. During the 1950s, fear of the Communist "enemy" was played out in the frequent interrogation of immigrants from Southeastern European Countries, in suspicions regarding their ethnicity, and in the blacklisting of Jews. The targets of today's nativism were Mexican, Central American, and Asian faces. Indeed, the public identification of "illegal aliens" with persons of Mexican ancestry is so strong that many Mexican Americans and other Latino citizens are presumed foreign and illegal. When citizens and aliens look alike, then all are presumed to be alien and foreign and undermining of the national character. This is an old theme in American politics.

The new nativism cannot be understood adequately in isolation from other current social phenomena. The deteriorating treatment of undocumented persons is vitally linked to the deteriorating treatment of persons of color, minorities, and women. One of the most powerful insights into the treatment of persons of color in the United States is Derrick Bell's theory of interest-convergence. Briefly stated, the theory holds that the treatment of African Americans, and by extension other peoples of color, will improve only when it is in the interest of the white majority.

The word nativism reemerged alongside a terrible discourse of anti-immigration hostility in the country which have not been seen, or heard, for several decades. Many Americans have come to blame immigrants for a variety of the country's social ills in recent years; and dramatic restrictions on both the admission of prospective immigrants and the rights of those already here are now at the top of the policy agenda.

1.2 Outline of the Study

My study is divided into four chapters. Chapter 1 introduces the background of study, the outline of the study and the literature review. Chapter 2 begins with the history of nativism, discussing features and forming of nativism before the birth of the American nation. Chapter 3 discusses the growth of antialien crusade, including Protestant crusade and racist nativism. Chapter 4 analyzes the new nativism in America since the beginning of modern American history and also the causation of the new nativism. Patterns of immigration shifted and problems modern nativism focused on were language and illegal immigrants.

1.3 Literature Review

Since immigration problem is a big topic in America, racial and ethnic relations are also worth studying. Joe R. Feagin is Graduate Research Professor in the Department of Sociology at the University of Florida. He is the author of many books and is widely recognized as one of the nation's foremost scholars of racial and ethnic relations in the United States. He received a Pulitzer Prize nomination for his book *Ghetto Revolts* (Macmillan, 1973) He has also published *White Racism: The Basics* (Routledge, 1995) with Herman Vera and *Racial and Ethnic Relations* (Prentice-Hall, 1995) with Clairece Feagin.

Linda S. Bosniak is Associate Professor of Law at the Rutgers School of Law, Camden. She has written extensively on issues concerning immigration policy, the status of aliens, and nationalism.

Raymond Tatalovich is a professor of Political Science at Loyola University, Chicago. He specializes in public policy analysis, particularly moral conflicts, and authored *Nativism Reborn? The Official English Movement and the American States*, a sophisticated and systematic study of the politics behind the current agitation to establish English as the official language of the United States.

Juan F. Perea is Professor of Law at the University of Florida College of Law. He has written extensively on American multilingualism and language policy, nativism, and ethnic identity and American law.

David H. Bennett is professor of history in the Maxwell School at Syracuse University. He is the author of *Demagogues in the Depression: American Radicals and the Union Party, 1932-1936*, and *The Party of Fear: From Nativist Movement to the New Right in American History*. *The Party of Fear* is a study of right-wing politics in modern United States history and treatment of the early nativists.

T. Alexander Aleinikoff is Executive Associate Commissioner for Programs, Immigration and Naturalization Service. He has published a leading textbook on immigration law, and is the author of articles on immigration and refugee law, constitutional law, and race discrimination law.

Gilbert P. Carrasco is Professor of Law at the Villanova University School of Law. He has specialized in civil rights, constitutional law and immigration law.

Kevin Johnson is Professor of Law at the University of California at Davis School of Law. Professor Johnson has published many articles on issues of immigration law and policy, such as *The New Nativism: Something Old, Something New, Something Borrowed, Something Blue*, including significant work on California's Proposition 187. His work has focused on the influence of race on U.S. immigration laws.

In China, few scholars do study on nativism and there is no finished book on nativism.

CHAPTER 2

Antialian Movements Before the Birth of the United States

The foundation for aggressive nativism in North America begins in the expansion of European capitalism. By the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, several European nations, especially the Netherlands, France, and England, had spurred the globalization of capitalism. In the process, they created a type of colonialism with fundamental inequalities between colonizers and the newly colonized.

2.1 Early English Immigration Waves to North America

Beginning in the 1600s, English immigrants began a major colonization of North America, taking over Native American lands in four distinctive waves. The first to come were English Puritans, who settled in New England, Jamestown in 1607 and Plymouth in 1620, and brought dissenting Protestant churches. The urge for greater economic opportunity, together with the desire for religious freedom; impelled these people to leave their home. These English people, the first settlers, gave America the basic foundation of its institutions: their form of government, their common law, their language, their tradition of freedom of religious worship. Some of these concepts have been modified as the nation has grown, but the basic elements remain. (Robert 1964: 30-31)

A second wave, a few Royalists and many indentured servants¹, came to Virginia in the mid-seventeenth century and established a hierarchical colony with Anglican churches. A third wave of English Quakers² came to the Delaware Valley between 1675 and 1725 and established a pluralistic system based on spiritual and social equality and an intense work ethic. The fourth wave came to the Appalachian backcountry from the borderlands of Britain between 1718 and 1775; this group represented English, Scotch, and Scotch-Irish ancestries and was mostly Protestant. While each group had a distinctive type of English or Scottish culture, for the most part they shared a commitment to an Anglo-Protestant culture, central to which were variants of the English language. (David 1989: 13-205, 785-786)

These English immigrants firmly believed that they were the pioneers of this wild land. So the land belongs to them. They are the hosts. The latter immigrants are foreigners.

2.2 A Colonial Heritage: Defining “Savages” and “Foreigners”

The early immigrants abided by same culture and shared the same language. So naturally, the strong commitment to the English norms, values, and ways of operating is the basic concept of nativism. In particular, the famous Puritans built a base for the ethnocentrism and parochialism of the newly emerging U.S. republic. These people developed “a powerful tradition of hating strangers, foreigners, and subversives”, just as Joel Kovel has noted. (Gerry 1994:18) This tradition was shown in the bloody attacks by Puritans on the native population. The Puritan immigrants created the first

colonial settler-society, in which these English settlers would make better use of what they saw as undeveloped “wilderness” than “wild savages” who were the present occupants. English immigrants’ destruction or oppression of highly civilized Native American communities was soon coupled with the importation and oppression of Africans brought to the new immigrant colonies in the slave trade.

Genocide against Native Americans and enslavement of Africans were part of the original foundation of the American nation. Native Americans and Africans were not included during the Revolutionary War that British Americans struggled against British Crown for liberty and democracy, because British Americans viewed them as cultural “others”, as aliens, strangers, and uncivilized savages. In their point of view (British invaders), the anti-other images increasingly became not only cultural differences but also physical and racial characteristics.

From the seventeenth century to the twenty-first century this racialized framework of otherness has shaped Euro-American attempts to exclude or oppress subsequent non-European groups, such as the Chinese and Japanese immigrants brought in for cheap labor in the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, and the Mexican immigrants brought in for cheap labor since the early 1900s. Over four centuries, many non-European groups have been defined by Euro-Americans as sub-human “others,” as non-citizenship without rights or as citizens with only limited rights. Europeans distinguished themselves from the “savages,” and colonized peoples were labeled as wildness, brutishness, cruelty, laziness, and heathenism. “Far from English civilization, the Europeans had to remind themselves constantly what it meant to be civilized—Christian, rational, sexually controlled, and white. And they tried to impute to peoples they called ‘savages’ the instinctual forces they had within themselves.” (Ronald 1990:12) By the 1700s and 1800s well-developed theories of the cultural and racial inferiority of the “uncivilized savages” were common in both England and the new United States.

2.3 The Root of Anti-Catholic Prejudice Before the Birth of the United States

The earliest target of antialien movement was Roman Catholicism. Anti-Catholicism was rampant in England many years before the first colonists settled in America. It took root in the nationalism of a state threatened by the rival imperial ambitions of Catholic Spain and France.

The first white men to settle the Western shores were Spaniards and Roman Catholics, who planted missions in Florida and New Mexico in the sixteenth century. Richard Hakluyt laid great stress on the need to combat the Spaniards for American colonization for Queen Elizabeth I. Actually, the Elizabethan Acts of Supremacy and Uniformity in 1559 had put the kingdom permanently in the Protestant camp, fulfilling the demands of Henry VIII, who insisted that England not be bound to Rome and that the king be the supreme head of the church in England. In the agonizing conflicts that followed the religious breaking up, a series of real or imagined Catholic conspiracies had a devastating impact on the British mind. The Irish Massacre of 1641, the baseless story that it was the papists who had burned London in 1666, and the so-called Popish Plot of Titus Oates in 1678 all aroused hatred of Catholicism. For

many Englishmen, to be a Catholic was to be accomplice to a sinister conspiratorial organization that had declared holy war on Protestant England.

The Glorious Revolution of 1689³ was another ill sign for American Catholics. John Locke, the great apologist and the philosopher of English democracy, considered Catholics dangerous participants in any civil government. Even the most egalitarian colonies, Rhode Island and Pennsylvania, seemed to agree disfranchising and ruling them ineligible for any "office of trust and honor." Rhode Island was founded by Rodger Williams who had demanded freedom of worship for Quakers. But in his private papers, Williams wrote of the "Romish wolf gorging herself with huge bowls of the blood of saints," filled his correspondence with references to the "popish leviathan," and conducted his dispute with the Puritan divines of Massachusetts in the terminology of antipapal rhetoric. (Sister May 1936: 101, 112—113)

By the 1740s, in the outpouring of Protestant fundamentalist religious fervor known as the Great Awakening, there was a deadly threat to America. George Whitfield preached of the "swarms of monks and friars like so many locusts overspreading and plaguing the nation." In a land where wars against France and Spain there had led to new rumors of Catholic conspiracy. It was not difficult to see the papist as an enemy agent. Nativism already was firmly rooted in both the religious and the political conventional wisdom. (John 1963: 43)

In the year before the birth of the United States, social and political custom made a mockery of the declaration that "all men are created equal" especially for white American. Public school primers instructed children to "abhor that arrant Whore of Rome and all her Blasphemies." With the outbreak of the French and Indian War, word spread in some areas of a wicked alliance: Indians, Negroes, and Catholics combining to overthrow the government and give Catholic France and her Indian allies a victory that would bring, in Jonathan Mayhew's words, "slavery, poverty, superstition and wretchedness" in its wake.

But the coming of the Revolution changed some of this hostility. If one of the functions of anti-Catholic activity in colonial days was to unite a disparate people in a lonely land, creating a sense of community for those in search of a new national identity, the conflict with the mother country suddenly made all this irrelevant and counterproductive. The Revolution was a great unifier for "true" Americans. In the end, the real test of loyalty was whether a person supported the new government or the crown, not whether he or she practiced Catholicism or some other religion. Every man and ally was needed, and General George Washington cancelled the Pope Day festivals in 1775 because American Catholics were useful in the revolutionary army and Catholic France was essential as an ally in the field against the British. (Thomas 1969: 41)

By the end of the war, a new spirit of tolerance was felt everywhere. Thomas Jefferson and James Madison made great efforts on behalf of religious liberty in Virginia, offering a different and more hopeful model for state and local constituencies. In 1790, there were thirty-five thousand Roman Catholics, one-half of them in Maryland, among the 3 million citizens of the new United States. The Founding Fathers had been heirs to the Protestant hatred of Rome. But the Founders

had overcome this heritage in forming their more perfect Union. Anti-Catholic activity would not be seen again until a new wave of Catholic immigration began three decades later. (MA Ray 1936: 345—350)

CHAPTER 3

The Growth of Nativist Crusade Against “Aliens”

Anti-immigrant nativism in North America is at least two centuries old. The roots of nativism can be described as follows: One common complaint is that certain “races” are intellectually and culturally inferior and should not be allowed into the country, at least not in substantial numbers. Nativists have often regarded immigrant groups as racial “others” quite different from the Euro-American majority. A second theme views those who have immigrated from racially and culturally inferior groups as problematical in terms of their complete assimilation to the dominant Anglo culture. A third theme, articulated most often in troubled economic times, is that “inferior” immigrants are taking the jobs and disrupting the economic conditions of native-born Americans. A fourth notion, also heard most often in times of fiscal crisis, is that immigrants are creating serious government crises, such as by corrupting the voting system or overloading school and welfare systems.

3.1 The Earliest Antialien Act

From the 1700s Euro-American views of savage outsiders were not only at Americans of color but also at certain new immigrants of European origin. Many English American leaders, as well as many in the English American public, had negative or mixed feelings about new European immigrants who were not Protestants. The new immigrants were often needed to meet the labor needs of U.S. employers, and many native-born Americans profited from the economic impact of immigration. At the same time, many Americans viewed the new immigrants as a major threat to the nation’s Anglo culture and institutions. This anti-immigrant sentiment took the form of law by the late 1700s.

The 1798 Alien Act empowered the American President to deport immigrants considered a threat, and the period of residence for citizenship was raised significantly.

If immigrants could not be excluded, restricted, or discouraged, the next best thing was to assimilate them, in a one-way adaptation pattern, to the dominant Anglo-Protestant culture. From the 1700s to the present, the assimilation of immigrants to the dominant Anglo culture has been a central feature of much nativist thought. Immigrant assimilation has been seen as one-way, as conformity to the Anglo-Protestant culture: “If there is anything in American life which can be described as an overall American culture which serves as a reference point for immigrants and their children, it can best be described, it seems to Americans, as the middle-class cultural patterns of, largely white Protestant, Anglo-Saxon origins.” (Milton 1964: 72-73)

Antialien groups had long used forces or pressures over the immigrants who resided in the United States in insuring their assimilation of whiteness and the Anglo culture. For example, when Benjamin Franklin set up a Pennsylvania school in the

1740s, he was greatly concerned that many non-English immigrants who did not know the English language or customs. (Michael 1972: 66) He had strong prejudices about the new German immigrants to the colonies and feared these uncivilized immigrants would “shortly be so numerous as to Germanize us instead of us Anglifying them.” (Nancy 1983: 125)

3.2 Protestant Crusade (Nativism since 1830s)

Hatred of Catholics and foreigners had been steadily growing in the United States for more than two centuries. By the 1830s and 1840s, negative ethnocentrism took on a distinctive American form that was given the name nativism. (Ray 1938:1-5)

In the first decade of the nineteenth century, nativists developed their anti-foreign perspective further, with increasing emphasis on anti-Catholicism and appealing for white supremacy. As immigration from Ireland and Germany grew sharply since 1830s, many nativists targeted Irish and German Catholic immigrants and their children.

In the early nineteenth century, industrial capitalists faced a shortage of labor. Native-born workers resisted the oppressive conditions of the new industrial enterprises, and capitalists increasingly recruited workers for building transportation projects and manufacturing mills from overseas. By the mid-nineteenth century, Irish and German immigrants were critical to many new industrial enterprises, including textile mills, railroad lines and shops and foundries. The ability of a capitalist system to “expand successfully is a function both of the ability to maintain relative social solidarity at home and the arrangements that can be made to use cheap labor far away.” (Immanuel 1974: 85-86) In this case, major capitalists aggressively sought the new immigrant workers.

3.2.1 Immigrants from Ireland and Germany

English American resistance to Irish immigrants dated from the seventeenth century, but it was the nineteenth-century Catholic immigrants from famine-ridden Ireland who were attacked viciously under the new banners of nativism.

The Irish were the first group of the great waves of immigration to arrive during the nineteenth century. By 1850, after the potato famine, they had replaced England as the chief source of new settlers, making up 44 percent of the foreign-born in the United States. In the century between 1820 and 1920, some four and a quarter million people left Ireland to come to the United States.

The Irish were the first to endure the scorn and discrimination later to be inflicted, to some degree at least, on each successive wave of immigrants by already settled “Americans.” In speech and dress they seemed foreign; they were poor and unskilled; and they were arriving in overwhelming numbers. Their religion was also the target of nativistic organizations. The Irish would do any available jobs. When their earnings were not enough to support their families, their wives and daughters obtained employment as servants. The Erie Canal, linking New York with the Great Lakes in 1825 was largely built by Irish labor. In the three decades from 1830 to 1860, a

network of thirty thousand miles of railroads was laid across the idle part of the country, the Irish again made contribution prominently.

The Irish eased the way for other immigrant groups and speeded their assimilation in several ways. They firmly established the Catholic Churches. The schools they founded offered educational opportunities to children of later immigrants of other tongues. The Irish had their own press, their own fraternal orders and their own organizations. Irish labor leaders fought for the rights of other groups as well as their own.

Between 1830 and 1930, the period of the greatest migration from Europe to the United States, six million people left Germany to the United States, more than any other nation. German immigrants founded and developed industrial enterprises in the fields of lumbering, food-processing, brewing, steel-making, electrical engineering, piano-making, railroading and printing.

A small but significant part of the German immigration consisted of political refugees. Reaction in Germany against the reform ideas of the French Revolution had caused heavy suppression of liberal thought. There was strict censorship of the press, of public meetings and of the schools and universities. Nevertheless, a liberal movement had emerged, nurtured in the universities by young intellectuals. This movement led to unsuccessful revolutions in 1830 and 1848. In addition, some of the German religious groups established Utopian communities in parts of Pennsylvania, Ohio, Indiana, Texas, and Oregon.

German immigration reflected all the chaotic conditions of Central Europe after Napoleon: the population growth, the widespread hunger, the religious dissension and oppression. The Germans included Lutherans, Jews and Catholics, as well as freethinkers. Their talents, training and background greatly enriched the burgeoning nation.

3.2.2 Response to the Newcomers

As immigrants grew sharply in the 1830s and 1840s and became increasingly Roman Catholic, with the arrival of large waves of Irish and German, many Americans began to notice that the increasing pace of immigration seemed to add to disorder and uncertainty. They felt that these newcomers were speaking with an alien tongue, organizing strange clubs, gangs and societies. Most significantly, they were not ready to share the Protestant faith.

The clash between Protestant and Catholic, native and "foreigner," grew rapidly through confrontations both verbal and violent in the decade of the 1830s. In Philadelphia, the Reverend John Breckenridge took on Father John Hughes in a series of rambling evening meetings before audiences. In 1833, after a drunken Irishman had killed a native on a Charlestown street, houses were smashed in the Irish section as troops stood by and watched. The educational conflicts were also serious. Catholics did not get public money for their schools, but with the governor's help, they won an elected school board for New York City that ended nativist control of the public institutions. If Catholic leaders achieved some of their own goals in the New York school controversy, the cause of antialienism was advanced even more as new groups

were projected into an active role.

In focusing on the threat to educational and moral standards, nativists found friends and allies in the temperance crusade. Temperance⁴, like nativism, had grown rapidly in the 1830s. Temperance and nativism made natural moral partners: foreigners were wasting themselves in drink, deluding themselves in choice of schooling, risking their souls by accepting the authority of sinister and manipulative priests who denied them access to the true Bible. The native American was asked to see in the immigrant a vision of dangers confronting himself and his nation. He must try to save America by stopping the tide of immigration and forcing those wretched aliens already here to change the destructive ways that threatened everyone.

Catholics were hated not only because they were “foreign” immigrants but because of Protestant stereotypes of Catholic “popery.” The large number of Catholic immigrants from Ireland and Germany in the mid-nineteenth century brought new targets for the anti-immigrant nativists among Anglo-Protestant Americans. Anglo-Protestant nativist organizations played a major role in attacks particularly on the Irish Americans.

3.2.3 The Early Nativist Organizations in this Period

In 1770s, some special groups that were searching for the characteristics of a pure American Nation to identify who were foreigners appeared, including Massachusetts Society for the Information and Advice of Immigrants, Tammany, the Federalist Washington Benevolent Society, the General Society of Mechanics and Tradesmen, New York Tammany Society, the Democratic Society of Pennsylvania, New York Washington Benevolent Society, and so on. At first, the purpose of these groups was against European immigrants and protecting their own interests. So at that time, the idea of nativism was not accepted widely yet. It was not until 1840s, the creation of the Know Nothing pushed nativism to the historical stage.

The Know-Nothing party was an outgrowth of the strong anti-immigrant and especially anti-Roman Catholic sentiment that started to manifest itself during the 1840s. The sources of the Know Nothing movement and the great appeal for nativism are found in concerns about immigration and historic fears of Catholicism. Members of the Know-Nothing party, when asked about their nativist organizations, were supposed to reply that they knew nothing, hence the name. As its membership and importance grew in the 1850s, the group slowly shed its secret character and took the official name American Party. As a national political entity, it called for restrictions on immigration, the exclusion of the foreign-born from voting or holding public office in the United States. By 1852 the Know-Nothing party was achieving obvious growth. It did very well that year in state and local elections, and with passage of the Kansas-Nebraska Act in 1854 it won additional adherents from the ranks of conservatives who could support neither the proslavery Democrats nor antislavery Republicans. When Congress assembled on Dec. 3, 1855, 43 representatives were avowed members of the Know-Nothing party. That, however, was the peak of Know-Nothing power.

At the American Party convention in Philadelphia the following year, the party

split along sectional lines over the proslavery platform pushed through by Southern delegates. Party presidential candidate Millard Fillmore carried just one state (Maryland) in the 1856 election, and congressional strength dropped to 12 representatives.

Caught in the sectional strife disrupting all national institutions, the American Party fell apart after 1856. Antislavery Know-Nothings joined the Republican Party, while Southern members flocked to the proslavery banner still held aloft by the Democratic Party. By 1859 the American Party's strength was largely confined to the border states. In 1860 remnants of the Know-Nothings joined old-line Whigs to form the Constitutional Union Party and nominated John Bell of Tennessee for president. In the election, many Know Nothings did cast their ballots for Lincoln, many other supported Bell's constitutional Union alternative. At last, Lincoln was president. The Civil War buried remains of Know Nothing Movement.

Although the Know-Nothing party flashed in American history, it did not mean that Nativism was defeated and disappeared. The Know Nothing Movement represented a continuing expression of the nativist tradition in America, a movement of middle-class people dealing with forces that threatened stability in almost every realm of their lives. These Americans responded to nativism's appeal because it offered a way out of so many dilemmas: how to protect their America from the disorder and urban strife accompanying the great migration, how to find community in a land undergoing widespread economic and social upheaval. It was an American response—no matter how ugly and unfair the implications of its program for millions of Catholics and immigrants—to the questions troubling so many: how to realize the American dream with all its costs, how to survive in difficult times of a nation in turmoil. However, the movement was declined at last by the coming of the Civil War. The war unified North and South. When it was over, the older anti-Catholic anti-immigrant impulse was arrested; too many Catholic boys and immigrant sons had fought and died for the cause of union; the ethnic and religious hostilities of the past were tempered by the war fires. However, nativism did not disappear. A larger group of people who hold the idea of Racism sprang out. The concept of American nation changed from Anglo-Saxon American to European American.

3.3 The Rise of Racist Nativism

By the mid-nineteenth century anti-Catholicism was not the only Anglo-American thought and action in regard to immigrants but racist perspective joined this group. Initially, the racial supremacy perspective took the form of accenting the superiority of those Americans whose ancestors came from the dominant "race" of northern Europe. This perspective regarded that the so-called Anglo-Saxon race made up the core of the U.S. population and had made great achievements. This idea was common in England and the United States in the early nineteenth century. Other north European Protestants often joined together with British Americans to celebrate a "superior Anglo-Saxon race." By the 1840s and the 1850s, Anglo-Saxonism could be found everywhere of the new nation. Sometimes it targeted white immigrants; in other cases, it targeted people of color.

In the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, the “white race” emerged as a constructed social group for the first time in history. They, the early English invaders and their descendants, saw themselves as culturally and physically different from Native and African Americans. Moreover, by the early 1800s the importance of Southern cotton plantations for the U.S. economy had brought a growing demand for Native American land and for African and African American slaves. Slavery was being abolished in the North, and the number of free black men and women was growing. In this period, the Anglo-Protestant ruling class developed the ideology of a superior “white race” as one way of providing racial privileges for poorer European Americans and keeping the latter from joining with black Americans in worker organization. By the mid-nineteenth century, not only later English immigrants but also immigrants from Scotland and Scandinavia, Ireland, and Germany had come to accept a place in this socially constructed “white race,” whose special racial privileges included the rights of personal liberty, travel, and voting. (Theodore 1994: 21, 184)

After the Civil War, the dominant economic and political leaders were still entirely from north European or descendants. These people became a racialized nativism. They were influenced by English and U.S. historians who argued for the superiority of the Anglo-Saxon background. They adopted a social Darwinist⁵ viewpoint and convinced that they were the “survival of the fittest” nations in the world who were the most civilized. Popular U.S. writers like Josiah Strong, whose book *Our country* sold thousands of copies in the last years of the nineteenth century, stated racial myths of Anglo-Saxon superiority in attacks on non-British immigrants. The United States was destined to be the seat of an “Anglo-Saxon race”. This survival of the racially fittest dictated the ultimate superiority of the “Anglo-Saxon race” throughout the world. (Lewis 1972) Vigorous Anglo-Saxonism was initially developed in noble circles and was centered on the superiority of English traditions and culture. Gradually, however, it came to target in a negative way the new immigrants from southern and eastern Europe and also the immigrants from Asia. Racist thinkers like Strong saw these immigrants not only as culturally strangers but also as racially inferior.

3.3.1 Asians Exclusion

The need for low wage labor to construct the transcontinental railroad spurred Chinese immigration to the United States in the 1800s. Anti-Chinese sentiment flourished in response, a fact reflected in the judicial opinions of the era. For example, in broadly interpreting a statute prohibiting a Chinese person from testifying “in favor of, or against a white man,” the California Supreme Court observed in 1854 that Chinese immigrants were

a distinct people, living in our community, recognizing no laws of this State except through necessity, bringing with them their prejudices and national feuds, in which they indulge in open violation of law; whose mendacity is proverbial; a race of people who nature has marked as inferior, and who are incapable of progress or intellectual development beyond a certain point, as their history has

shown; differing in language, opinions, color, and physical conformation; between whom and ourselves nature has placed an impassable difference. (*People v. Hall*)

The hostility toward the Chinese grew to even greater heights when the economy turned sour. Anti-Chinese sentiment was at its worst in California where many demanded legislation to force the Chinese out of the state. At the 1878 California constitutional convention, for example, proponents of Chinese exclusion expressed alarm about the “Oriental invasion.” In response to pressures from Californians, the United States Congress passed a series of laws known as the “Chinese Exclusion Acts” designed to halt further immigration from China and to encourage the deportation of Chinese persons already here. Each law was increasingly severe. One went so far as to subject a Chinese immigrant unlawfully in the country to imprisonment at hard labor without a trial by jury. Another required that a Chinese person establish lawful presence in this nation through “at least one credible white witness.” (Juan 1997:168)

As one might expect, the Chinese exclusion laws and related legislation were challenged as violating the Constitution. In rejecting such a challenge to one of the laws, the U.S. Supreme Court said the following about Chinese immigrants:

They were generally industrious and frugal. Not being accompanied by families, except in rare instances, their expenses were small; and they were content with the simplest fare, such as would not suffice for our laborers or artisans. The competition between them and our people was for this reason altogether in their favor, and the consequent irritation, proportionately deep and bitter, was followed, in many cases, by open conflicts, to the great disturbance of the public peace.

The differences of race added greatly to the difficulties of the situation... They remained strangers in the land, residing apart by themselves, and adhering to the customs and usages of their own country. It seemed impossible for them to assimilate with our people or to make any change in their habits or modes of living. As they grew in numbers each year the people of the coast saw...great danger that ... our country would be overrun by them unless prompt action was taken to restrict their immigration. ⁶

This and other judicial opinions of the era emphasized that Chinese immigrants were racially different, foreign, and in effect, un-American. Deeply negative images of the Chinese, exacerbated by the difference of race, obviously influenced the legislatures that enacted the exclusion laws as well as the courts that upheld them. Chinese immigrants found it impossible to assimilate. This resulted in not small part form resistance to their assimilation by dominant American society. Neither the courts nor the body politic accepted the Chinese as members of the national community. As noncitizen outsiders, the Chinese had little chance to influence the political process.

The Chinese exclusion acts were not the last of the efforts to exclude unwanted immigrants from Asia. Amendments to immigration laws in place near the turn of the last century sought to limit migration from nations in Asia in addition to China (as

well as to exclude anyone with Asian blood). In that spirit, a number of Western states passed laws, which came to be known as the “alien land” laws, that limited the rights of aliens ineligible to naturalize to own agricultural lands. Although these laws did not specifically target Japanese noncitizens, the laws unquestionably were directed at them, since they were ineligible for naturalization under federal laws at the time.

The enactment of the alien land laws was influenced by racism and nativism. The campaign culminating in the passage of a law in 1920 by California voters “depicted the Japanese as degenerate mongrels and the voters were urged to save ‘California—the White Man’s Paradise’ from the ‘yellow peril.’...Opponents of the initiative measure were labeled ‘Japalovers.’”(Juan 1997:169) Despite this racist backdrop, the Supreme Court rejected constitutional challenges to the laws.

Even those who attacked the alien land laws appealed to nativist and racist themes that dominated the times, illustrating how deeply entrenched these views were. For example, an attorney challenging the Washington law argued to the Supreme Court that

it cannot be said that the subjects of Russia and Turkey are attached to or respect the American Government or its institutions; or that the admission to citizenship of the Zulu, the Kaffir, the cannibals of the Congo and the tribes of Ashantee and Dahomey, contribute to the success and preservation of our government and civilization.... Japan stands among the foremost nations today, not only in which make her one of the great recognized powers. Her nationals, resident in America, are notably law-abiding and industrious, and actuated by civic pride which well might be emulated by American citizens. Many of them have been residents of the State for years; have made it their permanent home. (Terrace v. Thompson 1923)

Note the emphasis on difference in terms of the race, in addition to the political views, of foreign citizens other than the Japanese. Note also the attempt to establish how the Japanese embraced “American” values and thus could not be classified as “un-American.”

Like the Chinese exclusion acts, the alien land laws were influenced by many factors, including a desire to eliminate “competition by alien Japanese in farming.” Still, pure and simple racism sentiment worsened the nativist reaction. Disenfranchised and demonized, the Japanese, similar to the Chinese, were in no position to defend themselves in the hostile political climate.

There is one difference in the anti-Japanese outburst during this time from previous ones that is worth noting—a difference that served as a bell-weather for the future. Political leaders at the time who advocated restriction of Japanese immigration claimed that the tenor of the debate had improved and that the laws were not motivated by race. For example, California Governor William D. Stephens proudly emphasized that, “although the Japanese caused economic and social problems for the state, it is with great pride that I am able to state that the people of California have borne this situation and seen its developing menace with a patience and self-restraint beyond all praise.” California is proud to proclaim to the Nation that despite this

social situation her people have been guilty of excesses and no indignities upon the Japanese within our borders. No outrage, no violence, no insult, and no ignominy have been offered to the Japanese people within California.⁸

3.3.2 Nativist Oppose Immigrants from Eastern and Southern Europe

With the expanding of U.S. economy, immigration flows for U.S. capitalists needed a large number of labors. In addition, native-born workers worry less about labor competition from immigrants in such periods. The federal government generally encouraged immigration, particularly from Europe. The industrial employers and land companies set agents to Europe and Asia to recruit labor. Between 1881 and 1920, the majority of the twenty-one million immigrants emigrated from southern and eastern Europe. (Douglas 1977: 146-147) In spite of the fact that U.S. business interests had played a crucial role in generating much of this migration, many Americans at all class levels were becoming opposed to these new immigrants, an opposition that intensified during and after World War I. For most U.S. nativists, immigrants from southern and eastern Europe did not represent the "superior races." Madison Grant, an influential ideologue of racism, argued that the "Nordic race" was being destroyed by the millions of immigrants from southern and eastern Europe, the "inferior races." (John 1963:156) In Grant's view, the Nordic race, seen as the original white race in North America, was intellectually, culturally, and politically superior to all others. In the early 1900s, many Americans of northern European descendant described themselves as "white men," in other words; they were totally different from the southern and eastern Europeans in racial term. The native-born Euro-Americans were afraid that if the inferior white races would mongrelize the Nordic race, the true white race would be destroyed.

Popular writers, scholars, and members of Congress spread the alarm. They warned of the disaster that would come from allowing inferior racial stocks from Europe into the United States. Journalist Kenneth L. Roberts wrote of the dangers of the immigrants: "Races can not be crossbred without mongrelization, any more than breeds of dogs can be crossbred without mongrelization. The American nation was founded and developed by the Nordic race, but if a few more million members of the Alpine, Mediterranean, and Semitic races are poured among us, the result must inevitably be a hybrid race of people as worthless and futile as the good-for-nothing mongrels of Central America and southeastern Europe." (Kenneth 1972: 312) The "Alpine, Mediterranean, and Semitic races" generally covered countries of heavy emigration other than those of northern Europe; Italians and European Jews were seen as examples. At the heart of this racist attack was a great fear that the immigrants would damage the U.S. economic and political systems. One writer warned in a 1913 magazine article that "unless Americans are careful, they will take over." (Rita& Susan 1993:123)

Nativists saw the Italian immigrants as inferior and degraded. They alleged that southern Europeans were an inferior stock that lived immoral lives centered in liquor. Like poor immigrants before and after them, the Italians were blamed for destroying the moral fabric of the nation and for accelerating the costs of government,

particularly in relation to crime and poverty. For many reasons, Jewish immigrants from Eastern Europe were also major targets by the early 1900s. Jews were seen as immoral business competitors. They were accused of taking the jobs of "Americans". By the early 1900s, riots against Jewish American workers brought into factories. Moreover, by 1920s a revived Ku Klux Klan launched violence activity against both Jewish and Catholic immigrants and their children.

In the nativistic attacks on the southern and eastern European immigrants, we can generalize the themes of nativism. First, the races that are intellectually and culturally inferior should not be allowed into the country, at least not in substantial numbers. Nativists have often regarded immigrant groups as racial others quite different from the Euro-American majority. Second, the complete assimilation of immigrants from racially and culturally inferior groups to the dominant Anglo culture is also a serious problem. Third, the inferior immigrants are taking jobs and disrupting the economic conditions of native-born Americans. Fourth, immigrants are creating serious government crises, such as by corrupting the voting system or overloading school and welfare systems. Immigrants were not only accused of being incapable of assimilation to the Anglo culture, but were blamed for problems of unemployment and for increasing social crises, such as poverty, disease, and crime.

3.4 The Nativistic Organizations and Anti-Immigrant Activities

At the turn of the twentieth century, large-scale immigration from southern and eastern Europe and the modest immigration from Asia became the target of much anti-immigration action. In the late nineteenth century, the American Protective Association (APA) and a revived Ku Klux Klan were working aggressively against immigration of the southern and eastern European and Asian immigrants.

3.4.1 The American Protective Association

In the early 1890s, the stock market crash and the wrenching depression that immediately followed further stimulated mounting anti-Catholic, antialien activity. The American Protective Association, created by Henry Bowers, founded in an environment of mounting fear of Catholic influence. This organization spreading across the Midwest with new councils in Wisconsin, Missouri, Illinois, Kansas, Ohio, and Michigan, had become a movement of seventy thousand members. The APA accused Catholics of causing the crash by "running" on the banks. It pointed to Catholic immigrants as "job stealers" of positions "desperately needed by real Americans."

The targets of APA were not only Catholics from southeastern Europe but also Jews. One nativist reported, "The Jews have been brought in to wage war with Rome against America and Americans." (Desmond&Michael 1932: 98-99) The APA expanded to more than one-half million members. Between 1893 and 1895, it grew in New York, Pennsylvania, Massachusetts, Connecticut, and Rhode Island, in California, Washington, and Oregon and was penetrating parts of the South. APA had become a mass movement.

Like its famous predecessor in the 1850s, the American Protective Association

was a star that flared briefly, creating excitement for its followers and anxiety for its adversaries, only to flicker and die suddenly. But APA had little real political success even in the short term. After the turn of the century, the end of the depression and the quick victory of the Spanish-American war created a new surge of national confidence, perhaps a new sense of community in a country now enjoying prosperity. If McKinley's assassination by an anarchist in 1902 brought a brief shiver of fear of foreign radical conspirators, the ensuing presidency of Theodore Roosevelt featured a remarkable leader who effectively celebrated American power, pride and destiny. The Progressive Era has come. It was an age of optimistic activism, an age of belief in the ability of an alert and rational citizenry to make a better tomorrow by reshaping institutions. So even as the new immigration reached its peak in the years before 1910, the "patriotic societies" found relatively few followers. Only in Georgia was there another sign of nativist renewal. The former leader of southern Populism, Tom Watson, became increasingly fixated on the threat of "the Roman Catholic hierarchy, the deadliest menace to the liberties and civilization." In 1911, he organized the Guardians of Liberty, a miniature of neo-APA group. However, it has little influence at that time, for the economy of America was booming, reform was in the air, the press and the politicians seemed to favor immigration. The setting for the displacement or projection of middle and working class fears on the "alien" menace seemed only a thing of recent memory.

3.4.2 The Palmer Raid

The Great War, 1914--1918, stimulated nativism. When the United States declared war on Germany, anti-Catholicism quickly declined. This time, the New World paradise was threatened by a country, Germany. German-Americans were now seen as a threat to the nation. Their sin was not their religion but their nationality. Theodore Roosevelt, not only beat the drums for war but assailed German-Americans. After the war, the nation faced a difficult adjustment to a peacetime society. Population shifts stimulated by the war had brought large numbers of blacks from southern farms to northern cities where factory jobs were available for all. The socialist activities and movements appeared in America under the influence of European socialism. Founding of Soviet Union threatened America. Theodore Roosevelt exclaimed "Russian exiles of the Bolshevist" and "Germanized Socialists" would "lead our people into ...subjugation to German autocracy. "Reds" and "Huns" were regarded as the main enemies. (Mercer 1917: 21—22 ; Archibald 1969)

At this time, A. Mitchell Palmer, who was schooled in the antialien tradition became an important person in American history. Palmer, as head of the Department of Justice in March 1919, responsive to the nativist passion, and he cared about threat from " Red Scare." On November 7th, the second anniversary of the Russian Revolution, agents of the Department of Justice raided meeting place of Russian workers in twelve cities. In New York, the Russian People's House was invaded, many were beaten, and 200 people inside were taken to jail. Some were members of the Union of Russian workers, some were radicals, some were not. Palmer was widely praised in the press and saluted by the American Legion. Palmer Raids has been

known as anti-socialism history, but few people noticed that Palmer not only against Socialist but all the antialiens who threatened “real” Americans. Palmer Raids was only one stage of the old nativism—based on alien people and an alien religion—inevitably would wane. But before that happened, there would be on last dramatic outbreak of the old fervor. In the 1920s, the setting was right for traditional nativism’s last stand. The vehicle was fraternal organization, a secret society, and a movement reminiscent in many ways of the “patriotic” orders of the 1850s and 1890s. But it owed its name and its liturgy to a very different heritage. It was the Ku Klux Klan.

3.4.3 The Emergence of the KKK

Antialien movements in earlier years had emerged in times of economic instability and political disarray. Nativism’s last stand in the 1920s flourished in the boom years of a decade marked by a conservative consensus. The modern Ku Klux Klan, unlike the Red Scare of 1919 or the APA in the 1890s, grew without a setting of runaway inflation and labor strife of panic and recession. Like a throwback to the 1830s, the Klan represented fear and hatred in an age of equality and opportunity. (David 1988: 199)

The modern Klan was founded in 1915 in Atlanta, Georgia. It never prospered until the golden years, and it did not survive the decade. Its creator was William J. Simmon, a fraternal organizer, a former circuit-riding minister, a veteran of the Spanish-American War. Simons was a native of Alabama. His father, a doctor and mill owner had been an officer in the post-Civil War Ku Klux Klan, who advocated to repress black freedman and restore “order” and native white supremacy in the South of Reconstruction. Simons was an effective stump speaker and was known as an ambitious, experienced local organizer. He long had dreamed of inventing his own fraternity, modeled on Ku Klux Klan. On October 15, 1915, the film “the Birth of A Nation” opened in Georgia. Griffith’s film was a sensation, and its romantic, sympathetic vision of the old hooded fraternity served as an immediate organization tool for the new movement. Simmons advertised for members wishing to join “The World’s Greatest Secret, Social, Patriotic, Fraternal, Beneficiary Order.” He had a measure of success.

Simmons was calling “the hordes of aliens who flock to the ballot box to outnumber native-born people” and arguing that the “foreign element is trying to get control of the government of the United States.” The two were what the traditional nativism appealed for. So the two helped turn the Ku Klux Klan into a traditional nativist crusade. They assailed Jews and Orientals as well as blacks but soon focused particularly on the evils of Catholicism and the inextricable ties between the church and the “foreigners.”

From the Klan papers and magazines, books and articles it could be regarded as successor of its nativist progenitors, the Know Nothings and the APA. One spokesman, Reverend E. H. Laughner in *The Kall of the Klan in Kentucky*, explained that “the KKK is not a lodge or a society or a political party.” It is rather a mass movement, “ a crusade of American people who are beginning to realize that they have neglected

their public and religious duty to stand up for Americanism.” This meant remembering that America was discovered by Norsemen, colonized by Puritans, that the United States was “purely Anglo-Saxon and Nordic.” It was essential to “preserve our racial purity, he insisted, to avoid “mongrelization.” It was imperative to maintain separation of church and state because “the forces of Protestantism” were protectors of the “doctrine of Americanism.” The Roman Catholic Church, appealing to the polyglot peoples who threatened the good and pure society, must be blocked in its drive to dominate and destroy the great nation. (David, 1988: 209-214)

However, the Klan did prosper at least a decade. When the 1920s ended with the coming of the Great Depression which marked the beginning of modern American history, to be followed immediately by World War II, forces were at work which permanently reshaped the nature of antialienism in the multiethnic, multiracial, multireligious society. After 1930, many political, economic, and social arrangements would be transformed throughout the land. The antialien activity of the 1930s and after would appear in new ways and laid out the appeal of the new face.

CHAPTER 4 The New Nativism in America

The Great Crash of 1929 marked the end of an era. The Great Depression which immediately followed marked the beginning of modern American history. After 1930, many political, economic, and social arrangements would be transformed throughout the land. Antialien activity in the United States would never be the same again. Large-scale immigration had been arrested for almost a decade since the imposition of the national origins quotas. Without the influx of millions of newcomers, with their strange languages and attendant social problems, the source of much nativist hostility was removed.

4.1 Nativism from the 1930s to the 1960s

Changes in economic conditions in the United States have often affected the surges of anti-immigrant thought and movements. The racist 1924 immigration law significantly reduced the numbers of immigrants, including Jewish immigrants in countries where genocide against the Jews was becoming public policy. Franklin Roosevelt's administration, particularly his State Department, did much less than it could have to allow Jews to flee the Nazi Holocaust. At first, the State Department adopted callous immigration restrictions to reduce the flow of refugees fleeing Hitler's reign of terror, and then in mid-1940 it put an end to most immigration from central Europe. More than 400,000 slots within U.S. immigration quotas for refugees from countries under Nazi control were left unused. (Milton 1976)

The United States Immigration Act of 1924, also known as the National Origins Act or the Johnson-Reed Act, limited the number of immigrants who could be admitted from any country to 2% of the number of person from that country who were already living in the United States in 1890 according to the census of 1890. It superseded the 1921 Emergency Quota Act. The law was aimed at further restricting the Southern and Eastern Europeans who had begun to enter the country in large numbers beginning in the 1890s, as well as East Asians and Asian Indians, who were prohibited from immigrating entirely. It set no limits on immigration from Latin America.

It passed with strong congressional support (only 6 dissenting votes in the Senate). Some of its strongest supporters were influenced by Madison Grant and his 1916 book, *The Passing of the Great Race*. Grant was a eugenicist and advocate of the racial hygiene theory. His data, which is now considered by the vast majority of scientists to be flawed, purported to show the superiority of the founding Northern European races.

As an example of its effect, in the ten years following 1900 about 200,000 Italians immigrated every year. With the imposition of the 1924 quota, only 4,000 per year were allowed. At the same time, the annual quota for Germany was over 57,000. 86% of the 165,000 permitted entries were from the British Isles, France, Germany, and other Northern European countries.

The quotas remained in place with minor alterations until the Immigration and Nationality

Act of 1965.

Source: http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/1924_immigration_act

Moreover, with immigration limited by these special restrictions and the older nativistic immigration laws the primary targets of nativist groups were now the immigrants already in the United States, together with their children. The number of openly anti-Semitic organizations was increasing dramatically, from only one in the early 1930s to over a hundred just a few years later. Many of these were large-scale enterprises that sponsored large anti-Jewish rallies and distributed millions of anti-Jewish pamphlets and newspapers. Some famous ones were the German-American Bund, the Silver Shirts, and the Christian Front. By 1941, hatred of Jewish immigrants and their children was growing in the United States, even as the nation went to war against Nazi Germany. Radical organizations like the KKK created new outlets for white Americans desiring to attack Catholic and Jewish Americans, who were often immigrants of their children, and thereby preserve, as they said, the "Anglo-Saxon race." (Donald 1941)

The end of World War II did not reduce the outburst of nativism. Opposition to immigration continued after World War II, when various members of Congress and various northern European organizations even opposed legislation permitting displaced persons, such as European Jews, Japanese and Catholics, to migrate in significant numbers to the United States.

Though this sort of denial may seem incredible today, it is not atypical. To the contrary, such denial may be the norm in any period of nativism. Nativists often deny that they are nativists and point to past nativist epochs as "true" or "real" examples of nativism. Similar themes, including the claim that Proposition 187 is not nativist, racist, or anti-immigrant, can be seen in the immigration debate in the 1990s.

The anti-Japanese sentiment of this era, fanned by the hostility toward Japan during World War II, facilitated one of the most notorious examples of racism in U.S. history. In the infamous case of *Korematsu v. United States*, the Supreme Court upheld the decision to place Japanese persons, citizens and alien alike, in internment camps. The Court's statements about the Japanese in one internment case is:

There is support for the view that social, economic, and political conditions which have prevailed since the close of the last century, when the Japanese began to come to this outcry in substantial numbers, have intensified their solidarity and have in large measure prevented their assimilation as an integral part of the white population. In addition, large numbers of children of Japanese parentage are set to Japanese language schools outside the regular hours of public schools in the locality. Some of these schools are generally believed to be sources of nationalistic propaganda, cultivation allegiance to Japan. Considerable numbers ...of American-born children of Japanese parentage have been sent to Japan for all or a part of their education.

As was the case for the Chinese in the 1800s, we see concern expressed with the inability of people of color who immigrated to the United States to assimilate and

become less un-American and less foreign. This is true even though many of the Japanese interned were not immigrants at all but citizens born in the U.S. What the Court failed to acknowledge was that the failure of Japanese Americans, including citizens such as Fred Korematsu, to fully assimilate resulted from racially discriminatory laws that made that impossible, such as the law denying Japanese immigrants the ability to naturalize and become members of the U.S. political community. (Juan 1995: 571, 582—587)

Social tensions, most notable war with Japan, inevitably influenced the internment decision. Similarly, World War I contributed to antipathy toward German immigrants. However, the impact of race is reflected in the decision to intern the Japanese but not the Germans. This disparate treatment highlights the difference that race makes in nativist responses to the immigrants of the day.

In addition to the work of these racist activists, anti-Semitism continued. Attacks on Jewish Americans, their property, and their synagogues have been common since 1945. In the United States anti-Semitic violence directed at Jewish Americans happened frequently. For example, in the half decade between 1979 and 1984 nearly 3,700 anti-Jewish incidents were reported. These numbers had increased by 1991, when a record number of 1897 incidents were recorded. (Lenni Brenner 1986: 205-209) Among the most serious manifestations of the old nativism are these attacks on the property and persons of Jewish immigrants and their descendants.

4.2 Modern Nativism from the 1980s to 1990s

Nativism seeks the ritual purification of American society. The years during and after World War I yielded intense hatred of the Germans and German Americans. During World War II, the hatred of the Japanese enemy intensified. During the 1950s, fear of the Communist was played out in the frequent interrogation of immigrants from Southeastern European Countries, in suspicions regarding their ethnicity and in the blacklisting of Jews.

The targets of today's nativism were Mexican, Central American and Asian faces. In the 1950s census, America was 89% white and 10% black. Now Latinos account for around 12% of the population. They will overtake blacks to become the largest minority group. The bulk of the "new Americans" will be Latinos and Asians, although there are also newcomers among the "white and black" groups. Indeed, the public identification of "illegal aliens" with persons of Mexican ancestry is so strong that many Mexican Americans and other Latino citizens are presumed foreign and illegal. Undocumented persons and increasingly the broader class of noncitizens are the new enemy, the new objects of legislative war.

The following scenes showed us a vivid picture of the new nativism. In 1997, white students attacked the home of Asian Indian immigrants on Staten Island. They broke windows, smeared the house with paint, and left a statement on the drive "Indians go home. Leave or die." In 1992, across the country in Houston white skinheads beat and killed a Vietnamese teenager. The Vietnamese boy, according to one of the murderers, cried out: "God forgive me for coming to this country." (Deborah 1992: A1) We can see that contemporary nativism has great

difference from the past. Although the past and present nativism means simultaneous and intense opposition to those deemed strangers, foreigners. The main targets of past nativist were Catholics and Judaism immigrants. But today, the main targets are colored people, especially immigrants from Asia and Latin America.

Mexicans often characterized as hardworking and performing labor that many Americans will not. On the other hand, they serve as convenient scapegoats when the U.S. economy turns for the worse. Woody Guthrie captured the essence of this ambivalence:

Some of us are illegal and some are not wanted,
Our work contract's out and we have to move on;
Six hundred miles to that Mexican border,
They chase us like outlaws, like rustlers, like thieves.
(Juan 1997: 171)

The contrasting views are reflected in the changing government attitudes toward enforcing the immigration laws with respect to undocumented Mexicans in the twentieth century. The U.S. Supreme Court has focused considerable attention on cases touching upon illegal Mexican immigration. Individual justices have observed that immigration from Mexico is virtually uncontrollable and that the nation is powerless to stop the tide of illegal aliens—and dangerous drugs—that daily and freely crosses the 2,000 mile southern boundary.

By focusing exclusively on the noncitizen's immigration status, the “good alien/bad alien” distinction fails to consider the other salient characteristics of immigrant population, such as race, culture(including language), and class, which often are considered to be linked to a certain immigration status. Undocumented immigrants include a relatively large percentage of Mexicans, though perhaps not as great as popularly thought. The dominant image of a bad alien is often undocumented Mexican or some other person of color, perhaps a Haitian or a Chinese person travelling by sea, from a developing nation. Analyzing the impact of these variables on the Court's reasoning is difficult because, unlike the decisions of the late 1800s, or even those earlier in the twentieth century, xenophobic statements generally are absent from the decisions, a qualitative departure from past nativist eras. The same is true for the law and policymaking process.

4.3 Shifting Patterns of immigration : Problems the Modern Nativism Focused on: Language and Illegal Immigrants

Between 1970 and 1990, the U.S. population grew by a fifth, while the Asian American and Latino population grew at 385 percent and 141 percent respectively. In this period, about nine million new Americans were added from countries in Asia and Latin America. Asian Americans and Latinos now make 3 percent and 9 percent of the total population, with much of the growth coming from immigration. (U.S. Bureau of the Census)

The modern nativism mostly focused on two problems: language and illegal

immigrants.

These Asian and Latino immigrants are viewed as a “problem” by native-born Americans. By the end of the 20th century, the number of non-English speakers in the United States is expected to reach forty million. Some ethnic schools were allowed bilingual teaching, which means that English teaching was not guaranteed in ethnic schools. Many believed that the lack of a common language will lead to the fragmentation of society and balkanization. And it greatly violated American traditional culture. So the new nativist groups formed, such as U.S. English and lobbying groups, and English First, organized to promote an English Only agenda. (Jean 1997:119)

4.3.1 U.S. English and other English Advocating Organizations

The beginning of the Official English movement, which holds that multilingualism erodes the English language and fragments society to the harm of their national heritage, is marked by a 1982 proposal by the late Sen. S. I. Hayakawa to make English the official language of the United States. In 1987, the effort was renewed. Six bills were introduced into the U.S. Senate and House to amend the Constitution and make English the official language. Although none of the bills passed, the issue remained a live one. At the state level efforts declaring English the official language of the United States have been more successful. In November 1986, California passed Proposition 63 by a 3—1 margin, making English the state’s official language and requiring that steps be taken to meet that end. Consequently, the California Constitution now requires the legislature to “preserve and enhance the use of English.” California was the first to encode this requirement into its constitution.

California’s momentum was also inspired broad action around the country at state level. New groups formed. U.S. English was founded in 1983 by Dr. John Tanton. This organization developed so fast in the whole country, soon grew to a membership of 620,000 nationwide. It tries to make English the official language of the U.S. government through a constitutional amendment, as well as to aid state level campaigns that same end. Its other goals include “action to end policies which require government agencies to conduct their official business in multiple languages; enforcement of English language and civics requirements for naturalization; English proficiency as a national priority; expanded opportunities to learn English quickly in schools and in the workplace.”(Juan 1997: 79—83) U.S. English does not support English-only workplaces, perhaps because the organization realizes that many small and medium-sized businesses would oppose such a rule.

In 1986, Tanton wrote an inflammatory memo for a study group called WITAN, made up of members of U.S. English, FAIR, and like-minded organizations. He derived the name WITAN from the Old English word witenagemot, meaning council of wise men to advise the king. The memo asks a series of questions addressing the consequences of immigration in California, including the following:

Will the present majority peaceably hand over its political power to a group that is simply more fertile?

Will Latin American migrants bring with them the tradition of the *mordida*, the lack of involvement in public affairs, etc.? What in fact are the characteristics of Latin American culture, versus that of the United States?

Ethnicity is a more acceptable term than race. It should also be noted that 50% of all Hispanic surname people on the census forms designate themselves as White. So perhaps we should speak of Hispanic Whites and non-Hispanic Whites, to further diffuse the issue. Is Anglo a better term than White? An important problem has been put forward: Language is very important here.

What are the differences in educability between Hispanics and Asiatics?

Since the majority of the retirees will be Non-Hispanic Whites, but the workers will be minorities, will the latter be willing to pay for the care of the former? They will also have to provide the direct care: How will they get along, especially through a language barrier?

(John Tanton. WITAM IV Memo. 1986.)

Opponents of U.S. English claimed the memo revealed the true motives of the English Only movement. The real motivation for too many of the movement's leaders is racism, plain and simple. The leaders of U.S. English have grossly misrepresented their real purpose.

U.S. English responded that a majority of its leaders, as well as many of its members were minority group immigrants. How could its policies be racist? In addition, the organization maintained that its support of English only is anti-racist in that it would be discriminatory to print government and official documents in Spanish and English, and not in any of the other 150 languages spoken in the United States. ("U.S. English Slams Bustamante Proposan for Government Operations in Spanish," U.S. Newswire, Oct. 17, 1991.) Despite the controversy, scandal, and resignations, U.S. English successfully mounted winning campaigns in the 1988 elections in Florida, Colorado, and Arizona where voters, by small margins, made English the official language in their respective states. Funding for U.S. English comes from membership dues and grants. In 1993, U.S. English reported more than \$6,000,000 in contributions, with almost \$4,000,000 of that spent on program services.

English First, a spin-off group of U.S. English, declares itself a lobbying organization and actively engages in working for legislative reform. It was founded in 1986 and currently claims about 100,000 members. The organization, whose logo is the Statue of Liberty, has three basic goals: "make English America's official language; give every child the chance to learn English; and eliminate costly and ineffective multilingual programs." (English First) The organization justifies its harsh views by quoting immigrants who embrace English and believe that their own language should be used only at home. The organization president, Lawrence Pratt, is a most versatile conservative. In addition, to directing English First, he serves as the head of two other lobbying groups, Gun Owners of America and Committee to Protect the Family. A document issued by the Council in 1986 declared, "Hispanics in America today represent a very dangerous, subversive force that is bent on taking over our nation's political institutions for the purpose of imposing Spanish as the

official language of the United States. English First has taken a leadership role in English Only efforts in Georgia and Pennsylvania.

4.3.2 Proposition 187 and Illegal Immigrants Problem

On November 8, 1994, the voters of California overwhelmingly passed Proposition 187, which was, in the words of its supporters, to "Save Our State" by preventing "illegal aliens in the State of California." As with many trends that begin in California, the anti-immigrant sentiment expressed in Proposition 187 rolled across the nation, as other states, some congressional representatives, and presidential candidates expressed the need to deny health care, education, and other publicly funded benefits to immigrants.

As California's anti-immigrant discourse flowed across the nation, the anti-illegal alien focus of Proposition 187 broadened considerably to people who might be suspected of being "immigrant," "foreign looking," "un-American," or different. By eliminating or reducing these groups, immigration reform would, in theory, "do something" about the source of the "problems" facing U.S. citizens, problems in the economy, education system, health care, and even the relations of local governments with the federal government. To the proponents of immigration reform, illegal immigrants are not the only problem; immigration in general is a threat to the "nation" that is conceived of as a singular, predominantly Euro-American, English-speaking culture. The "new" immigrants are transnationalists, or people who maintain social linkages back in the home country; they are not bound by national borders and their multiple identities are situated in communities in different nations and in communities that cross nation.

Proponents of immigration reform, therefore, often widen their issues than just illegal immigration. For example, after the passage of Proposition 187, the proposition's backers announced that their agenda was actually much broader and included affirmative action, bilingual education and the promotion of English as the official language.

The question of who is an "American" and anti-immigrant discourse become entangled in revealing ways. For instance, on October 18, 1994, California State Senator Craven, a Republican from Oceanside, was quoted as saying "that the California state legislature should explore requiring all people of Hispanic descent to carry and identification card that would be used to verify legal residence." (Maria 1994: A1.) By targeting "all Hispanics," citizens, legal residents, and undocumented immigrants, California Senator Craven defines all Hispanics as belonging to a suspect class. After all, California's ethnic diversity includes many other ethnic groups, including undocumented Canadians and Europeans who overstay their visas. Perhaps the answer has to do with the assumptions about social evolution and progress implicit in immigration discourse.

Representative Gallegly was an early proponent of this policy. In October 1991, he introduced legislation into Congress to amend the U.S. Constitution to deny citizenship to a child born in the United States if neither of the parents are citizens and if the child's mother is not at least a legal resident. His argument is that even though

this is a nation of immigrants, we must reduce immigration-both legal and undocumented:

We must recognize, however, that the United States is also a nation of finite resources and opportunities which must be available to and shared by all its citizens. Today, in many parts of this country our cities and towns are being overrun with immigrants, both legal and undocumented, who pose major economic and law enforcement problems for local governments and place an added burden on their already strained budgets.

(Elton 1991)

Although Gallegly's legislation focuses on the children of undocumented immigrants, his statement clearly makes little differentiation between legal and illegal immigrants. He views immigrants generally as a problem, as outsiders, regardless of immigration status. Thus, his attempts to stop conferring citizenship on the children of undocumented immigrants appears as but one part of a broader agenda to rid the country of all outsiders, that is, immigrants and their U.S.-born children.

4.3.3 The influence of this policy on immigrants.

Finally, the U.S. Congress is considering legislation that would reduce the number of legal immigrants from 800,000 to about 535,000 per year. This reduction would be accomplished by eliminating several preference categories for family reunification, including the preferences for foreign adult children and parents of U.S. citizens and legal residents, and for adult brothers and sisters of U.S. citizens. The aim of eliminating these preferences is to stop the network migration of extended family members, while allowing nuclear families to continue to reunite in the United States. Eliminating these preferences would shut the door on an estimated 2.4 million foreigners, mostly Mexicans and Filipinos, waiting in queues to enter the United States on the basis of family ties.

In sum, the nativist revolt against undocumented immigrants that began in California quickly reached national proportions, targeting all immigrants. The policy recommendations can be seen everywhere. Should some of these proposals come to pass—especially such dramatic changes as a constitutional amendment to deny citizenship to children born in the United States, and distinctions between citizens by birth and those naturalized—then this round of nativism will have ushered in some of the most profound changes in how the United States perceives itself as a community, as a people, and as a nation. Traditional definitions of who deserves to be an American and receive the benefits of the social contract are being challenged and redefined in unprecedented ways.

4.4 Causes of New Nativism

Anti-immigrant sentiment reveals several common conditions. These include: (1) economic uncertainty and job security among nation's population, (2) social, ethnic and cultural disparities between new arrivals and the native majority, and (3) a large and sustained immigrant inflow. Since 1980, immigrants from Mexico, Central

America and Asia, reached about 10 percent of the nation's population. In some of the larger metropolitan centers, as much as a third of the population are immigrants of these and their descendants.

4.4.1 The Economic Causes

The economic situation of the United States in the mid-1990s can be described as uncertain. Although the sharp economic downturn in the first years of the decade has been reversed, the situation is not in good condition.

First, average earnings continue to be low, although unemployment rates have fallen below 6 percent. Second, income has become more concentrated, with the most affluent part of the population absorbing a larger share of total income. Immigration has been regarded as one of the main causes for both phenomena. To the extent that immigrants contribute to the downward pressure on unskilled worker wages, this effect is concentrated in areas with a large immigrants presence. Hispanics, who typically form these large amount of these workers, absorb a substantial share of reduced earnings. Non-Hispanic immigrants, especially Asians and Europeans, who have education and skill levels compete with the native population. Most upper-and middle-class Americans understand that they benefit from low wages paid to immigrants. In their absence, these households would have to pay more for child care, meals in restaurants, clothing, and fresh vegetables from California or Florida. Senior citizens also gain from young immigrants because the elderly population depends on a large labor pool to finance the Medicare and Social Security trust funds. For the elderly, wage disparities attributable to immigration are not an issue.

Competition for jobs was a rallying cry of anti-immigrant groups during earlier periods, but is a less emotional issue for most Americans today. Although some believe that foreign-born workers as a group are replacing the native-born workers, there is no empirical data to demonstrate such an effect. Yet the fear of job loss or displacement continues to haunt many, perhaps a majority of American workers. Although most Americans are willing to accept the truth that immigrants not only take jobs but also create employment, job uncertainty and wage stagnation is causing the public to seek a simplistic explanation for these conditions.

Anxiety about low wage jobs is partially muted because in periods of relatively low employment there is little competition for such jobs. Nonetheless some blacks, such as Representative Major Owens, have concerns. In 1990, Owens warned that increasing the level of legal immigration was another step in the creation of a permanent underclass. Owens did not persuade others that blacks would be hurt, and the bill he argued against passed Congress by a comfortable majority. In addition to blacks, a few other groups, including associations representing engineers, complained at the time that the presence of foreign-born professionals reduced their employment opportunities. This concern remained neglected until the 1990s, when lay-offs in defense industries and cutbacks in federally sponsored research curtailed job opportunities for those professionals. Until recently, few skilled, white-collar workers grasped that a new threat to job security emerged: some of their own jobs are being exported to countries with lower wages. Many native-born engineers and

programmers are not competing for jobs primarily with foreign-born engineers in the United States but increasingly with professionals in other nations functioning as subcontractors to American corporations.

A comparatively new immigration-linked fear is the use of public services by immigrants, particularly illegal aliens. This issue was not proposed when nativism peaked in previous eras because the government sector was still not concerned about that. Publicly funded social services were not widely available until the 1930s. Although complaints about "paupers" arriving as immigrants emerged two centuries ago, the current outcry can be traced to California's fiscal crisis of the early 1990s. The cost of education and welfare was rising in the state at a time when the economy was stagnating. Proposition 187 passed in part because of public anxiety about the size of the alien population but also because rising social service costs were attributed to these aliens.

The vast majority of American workers are not impacted directly, or even indirectly by new immigrants. Therefore, fear that their jobs are threatened by aliens is not frequently expressed by native-born workers. A more reasonable explanation why economic concerns fan anti-immigrant sentiment is the frustration of many workers who feel that their earnings are stagnant and their job insecurity is rising. Unable to identify a specific cause, immigrants can be seen as a convenient target for some to vent their anger. Although the sponsor of the 1995 Immigration Act, Congressman Lamar Smith of Texas, asserts that minority workers may be hurt by alien jobholders, minority job issues are not the underpinning for the anti-immigrant upsurge. Economic conditions were more severe and unemployment rates among blacks and whites substantially higher in both the early 1980s and early 1990s than in the mid-1990s, yet the level of nativism observed now failed to materialize. Although economic concerns can strengthen anti-immigrant sentiment, we need to search elsewhere for the root causes of the nativist resurgence.

4.4.2 Social Discontent

In the more politically correct environment of the 1990s, few would admit that the ethnicity or appearance of new immigrants is the basis of their negative views regarding much of the foreign-born population. Until very recently, anti-alien sentiment based on race or ethnicity would not be exposed in public. In contrast to the 1920s, when racial inferiority was a belief widely acknowledged by the media, today's environment is not adapted to traditional nativism.

The increased visibility of new immigrants, the sight of veiled women in suburban supermarkets, the proliferation of mosques in large cities, the prevalent sound of Spanish in the streets, and the proliferation of small businesses with Korean, Indian, Arabic, and other ethnic advertising have aroused middle-class resentment in the 1990s.

Language is one of the irritants to nativists. The growth of Spanish has now reached level that the nation is close to being a two-language society, causing added uneasiness among those who believe the English language should have exclusive domain. The role of language today cannot be ignored. Although new immigrants

speaking several kinds of distinct languages, only Spanish is regarded as a potential threat to the dominance of English. The proliferation of Spanish in the media, popular culture and advertising are an indication that the business community has recognized the emerging bilingual society. In the early 1990s several shocks strengthened the fear of ethnic division. The Los Angeles riots were the first of these events. Commentators analyzed the root cause of the disturbances were the conflicts between Afro-Americans and newly arrived Hispanics. (Edward 1992: A29&Joe 1992: C1) All expressed the fear that more immigrants could worsen interethnic strife in Southern California. The bombing of the New York City Trade Center by Islamic aliens was the first demonstration in decades of how immigration from volatile nations could result in domestic terrorism. The Oklahoma City bombing⁹, a product of indigenous violence, fanned fears of international terrorism.

4.4.3 Nativism on The Political Arena

Every cause or movement that gets strong public support quickly finds expression in the political arena. When legislators perceive public discontent on issues such as immigration, there is a rush to sponsor bills aimed at responding to the concerns of their constituents.

The 1992 presidential campaign focused on economic issues, particularly the deep recession, and essentially ignored immigration. In the early stages of the political campaign, Pat Buchanan made an anti-immigration stance a focal point of his platform. However, his "America First" position was not a serious challenge to the Republican political establishment. The party saw no political advantage from what was acknowledged to be a divisive issue.

The 1996 presidential race promises to be different. Pat Buchanan again sought the Republican nomination. In the early months of the 1996 campaign, he assured his audience that if elected, all immigration would be halted for five years. As public sentiment has become more nativist, Buchanan's view is likely to find a more receptive audience than in the early campaign.

Senator Dole, the leading candidate of his party, stated that "ethnic separatism" is a threat to American unity. This belief was the basis for his call to have English declared their national language. His comments were a signal that immigration among the mainstream politicians is not as much an economic concern as a social issue. The beliefs held by these candidates are not to suggest that the Republican Party is dominated by anti-immigrant elements. Newt Gingrich is not anxious to tackle the legal immigration issues, nor is the House Majority Leader, Dick Armey. President George Bush also takes a dim view of immigration as a political issue.

The attitude of the President has always been crucial in setting the course of the immigration debate. Therefore, President Clinton's initial positive response to the report of nonpartisan U.S. Commission on Immigration Reform provides an indication of the national direction. The report issued in the summer of 1995 recommended that the number of legal admissions should be curtailed by about a third. Another recommendation was that employers seeking the admission of workers based on their needed skills pay a substantial fee for the privilege. Both proposals strike one

as surprisingly political for a nonpartisan group. The Commission findings and recommendations, as those of the numerous earlier commissions on immigration formed to advise Congress, appear to follow public sentiment. The commission had the opportunity to follow public sentiment at a series of public hearings across the nation and their findings may have been influenced by these hearings. The White House has not taken a formal position of the immigration bills being considered by the House and Senate.

At the Southern border, although the Commission has built more barriers and measures, they are doomed to failure. Sharp increases in border patrols and surveillance, including the use of military personnel and equipment and severe measures against those who cross illegally and against employers who hire these workers would be essential steps to halt illegal immigrants. One has the impression that the Commission and others wish to reduce public concerns not by effective measures to reduce the illegal flow, but by the easier path of reducing legal entry level.

Conclusion

In recent year, popular magazines have run major stories asking “ What will America be like when whites are no longer the majority?” However, one can ask what the predominance of whites has to do with the future of the nation, unless one has racist proclivities? As with earlier anti-immigrant perspectives, the views of nativists today include a worry about immigrant’s physical and cultural characteristics. Earlier in the century it was the southern and eastern European immigrants who were seen as racially and culturally inferior. Today, it is the Latino and Asian immigrants. Some anti-immigrant advocates, “the American nation has always had a specific ethnic core. And that core has been white.”

Nativism has waxed and waned over the course of U.S. history, but it remains an important perspective that many native-born Americans use to construct and interpret hard economic times. Certain essential components of nativism remain more or less constant: the accent on the racial or cultural inferiority of immigrants, the problematizing of assimilation of immigrants, the idea that immigrants are a serious threat to the U.S. economy, and the notion that immigrants are responsible for government crises. Some may argue that current nativism is motivated primarily by illegal immigration. If illegal entry were constrained, the concern would presumably be resolved. One has to agree that there is a fundamental non-economic difference between legal and illegal entry. One group enters the nation at the invitation of society; the other violates its sovereignty. But I think that the response to illegal immigrants is just an excuse. It is not as much the legal status of aliens but rather their ethnic, cultural and religious diversity that is the origin of most anti-immigrant sentiment.

There is a strong consensus in Congress that illegal immigration should be curtailed. No doubt additional legislation will emerge to discourage illegal entry, although the chances are dim of substantially slowing this flow with legislative action. In part, this is because Americans are unwilling to recognize that promoting such trade-generating measures encourages illegal immigration. For example, thousands of trucks cross the borders everyday. More commercial air and sea traffic increases the difficulty of controlling entry from nations outside the Western Hemisphere. It is clear that in case of a national emergency or an economic depression could measures be taken by both conservatives and liberals.

A majority of Americans are not as anti-immigrant and exclusionist as many national leaders, especially leaders of nativist organization, although immigrant myths and fictions are frequently created in the speeches of prominent politicians, the writings, or the journalistic commentaries in the mass media. In particular, anti-immigrant advocates and nativist leaders often suggest that native-born Americans are strongly opposes to immigration and want it to be curtailed sharply or ended. Indeed, how strongly Americans feel about limiting immigration depends on how it is presented to them. In some national surveys three-quarters of those polled favor limiting immigration. However, this does not mean all favor major cutbacks in the number of immigrants. In a 1994 National Opinion Research Center poll 34

percent of respondents thought immigration should be decreased a lot. Another 28 percent felt it should be decreased only a little, while one third felt immigration should actually be increased or stay about the same. It is clear that a majority of those Americans polled did not wish to see major changes in immigration flows. (National Opinion Research Center, *1994 General Social Survey*.) There is no evidence that the majority of Americans favor significant cutbacks in immigration or that those native-born Americans who see the most new immigrants, those on the West Coast or in New York, are the most opposed to continuing immigration.

Today, nativists face a major demographic problem. The dominance of people of color is coming to the United States whether white and other nativistic Americans like it or not. Even if some immigration restrictions are imposed, current demographic trends are likely to persist, and the United States will have a population where the majority is composed of people color sometime in the middle of the twenty-first century. Around 2050—2060 the majority of Americans will be of African, Asian, Latin American, Middle Eastern, or Native American ancestry. Moreover, long before that date more than half of all young Americans will be people of color, and large cities in several states will have populations that are mostly people color. (Joe 1995) By the year 2010, it is estimated, whites will be the minority in the largest state in the union, California. Latinos, Africans, Asians, and Middle Eastern Americans will be the majority there. By approximately these dates European Americans will, as in the 1700s, be a minority population. As a result, there will be major social and political changes. Over the next several decades these changes in demographic composition will force actions to be taken against the racist aspects of the nativistic ideologies. People of color will not tolerate their inferiorization in racial and cultural terms. In addition, those Americans with political and economic power, mostly white Americans today, will have to cease the now common discriminatory practices targeting people of color in most parts of U.S. society. These people of color will refuse to accept inferior treatment and subordinate positions in the institutions of U.S. society.

The European Americans, who are themselves all descendants of immigrants, should realize the meaning of the Statue of Liberty. They might well remember the inscription by Jewish American Poet Emma Lazarus:

Give me your tired, your poor,
Your huddled masses, yearning to breathe free,
The wretched refuse of your teeming shore,
Send these, the homeless, tempest-tost to me,
I lift my lamp beside the golden door.”

Notes:

- 1 They are the most important source of labor in the colonies in the 17th century and for a large part of the 18th century. They sold their labor for a period of four to seven years in exchange for passage to America. The contract entitled the indentured servant to food, clothing, shelter, and medical attention. At the end of his term of service he was provided with 50 acres of land, funds, and a rifle.
- 2 A religious group from England. The Quakers were among the first abolitionists in American history, attacking the slave trade and slavery in the late 18th century. They made distinguished contributions in the fields of Indian relations, penal reform, temperance and education. During the two World Wars they contributed much in relief and good will work in the United States and abroad. In 1965 there were over 127,000 Quakers in the United States.
- 3 In English history, the events of 1688—89 that resulted in the deposition of James II and the accession of William III and Mary II to the English throne. It also called the Bloodless Revolution. The Declaration of Rights and the Bill of Rights (1689) redefined the relationship between monarch and subjects and barred any future Catholic succession to the throne.
- 4 Prohibition in the United States was a measure designed to reduce drinking by eliminating the businesses that manufactured, distributed, and sold alcoholic beverages. The leaders of the prohibition movement were alarmed at the drinking behavior of Americans, and they were concerned that there was a culture of drink among some sectors of the population that, with continuing immigration from Europe, was spreading.
- 5 It is a descriptive term given to a kind of social theory that draws an association between Darwin's theory of evolution by natural selection, and the sociological relations of humanity.
- 6 The Chinese Exclusion Case, 130 U.S. 581, 595, 1889. “ stating that restriction of immigration from China was essential to the peace of the community on the Pacific Coast, and possibly to the preservation of our civilization there”.
- 7 The Alien Land Law of 1913 (also known as the Webb-Heney Bill) provided that: "Aliens not eligible for citizenship and corporations in which the majority of the stock was owned by ineligible aliens had to comply with the land ownership provisions of any treaty existing between the countries involved.
- 8 Gov. William D. Stephens, of California, Presents the Original Question to Secretary of State Bainbridge Colby, Washington, D.C., in United States House of Representatives, Hearings before the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization on Japanese Immigration, 66th Cong. 71, 1921.
- 9 At 9:02 AM local time on Wednesday, April 19, 1995, in the street in front of the Murrah building, a rented Ryder truck containing about 5,000 lb (2,300 kg) of explosive material exploded. The truck bomb was composed of ammonium nitrate, an agricultural fertilizer, and nitromethane, a highly volatile motor-racing fuel - a mixture also known as ANFO. Timothy McVeigh, a Gulf war veteran, was arrested by an Oklahoma Highway Patrolman within an hour of the explosion after being pulled over for not having a license plate.

Bibliography

- Archibald B. Roosevelt.. *Theodore Roosevelt on Race Riots, Reds, Crime*. N.Y.: Probe Publishers.1969.
- David, Fischer, *Albion's Seed: Four British Folkways in America*. New York: Oxford University P. 1989.
- David H. Bennett, *The Party of Fear: From Nativist Movements To The New Right in American History*. New York: the University of North Carolina Press. 1988.
- Deborah Sontag, *Across the U.S.*, "Immigrants Find the Land of Resentment," New York Times, December 11, 1992.
- Desmond, *A.P.A. Movement*; Michael Williams. *Shadow of the Pope*. New York: McGrawHill, 1932.
- Donald S. Strong, *Organized Anti-Semitism in America*. Washington, D.C.: American Council on Public Affairs.1941
- Douglas F. Dowd, *The Twisted Dream*. Cambridge, Mass.: Winthrop.1977.
- Elton Gallegly, "Gallegly Seeks to End Automatic Citizenship for Illegal Alien Children," press release of October 22, 1991, from the Office of Congressman Elton Gallegly, Washington, D.C., 1991
- Edward N. Luttwak, "The Riots: Underclass vs. Immigrants," *New York Times*, May 15, 1992, and Joe Kotkin "America on Hold, Can We Learn to Rebuild the Nation?" *Washington Post*, May 31,1992.
- Gerry, O'Sullivan, "Mythmaking in the Promised Land; An Interview with Joel Kovel," *Humanist*. September 1994: 18.
- Immanuel, Wallerstein, *The Modern World-System*. New York: Academic Press. 1974.
- Lewis H. Carlson& George A. Colburn, *In Their Place*. New York: John Wiley, 1972.
- Jean Stefancic. "Funding the Nativist Agenda" *Immigrants Out! The New Nativism and the Anti-Immigrant Impulse in the United States*. New York and London: New York University P., 1997.
- Joe R. Feagin, Hernan Vera, and Barbara A. Zsembik, "Multiculturalism: A Democratic Basis for American Society," in *Primis*. New York: McGraw-Hill,

- 1995.
- John Higham, *Strangers in the Land*. New York: Atheneum.1963.
- John Tanton. *WITAM IV Memo*, "copies of the memo can be obtained from People for the American Way", 202. Oct. 10, 1986..
- John Tracy ,Ellis, *Perspectives in American Catholicism*. Baltimore: Helicon Press. 1963.
- Juan F. Perea. *Immigrants Out!: The New Nativism and the Anti-Immigrant Impulse in the United States*. New York and London: New York University P., 1997.
- Juan F. Perea, "Ethnicity and the Constitution: Beyond the Black and White Binary Constitution," *William and Mary Law Review*. 1995
- Kenneth L. Roberts, *Why Europe Leaves Home*, excerpted in "Kenneth L. Roberts and the Threat of Mongrelization in America, 1922," in *In Their Place*, ed. Lewis H. Carlson and George A. Colburn. New York: John Wiley. 1972.
- Lenni Brenner, *Jews in America Today*, Secaucus, N.J.: Lyle Stuart, 1986.
- Maria C. Hunt, "Craven Says All Hispanics Should Carry I.D. Cards," *SanDiego Union-Tribune*. 18 October 1994.
- MA Ray, *American Opinion of Roman Catholicism*. NewYork: Columbia University Press. 1936.
- Mercer Green Johnston. *Patriotism and Radicalism*. Boston: Sherman.1917
- Michael, Kammen, *People of Paradox*. New York: Knopf. 1972.
- Milton M. Gordon, *Assimilation in American Life*. New York: Oxford University Press.1964.
- Milton Meltzer, *Never to Forget: The Jews of the Holocaust*. New York: Harper and Row. 1976
- Nancy F. Conklin& Margaret A. Lourie, *A Host of Tongues*. New York: Free Press. 1983.
- Ray Allen Billington. *The Protestant Crusade 1800-1860: A Study of the Origins of American Nativism*. New York: the Macmillan Company.1938.
- Rita J. Simon and Susan H. Alexander, *The Ambivalent Welcome: Print Media, Public Opinion, and Immigration*. Westport, Conn.: Praeger, 1993. p.123

Robert F. Kennedy. *A Nation of Immigrants*. New York: Haper&Row Publisher, Inc.. 1964.

Ronald Takaki. *Iron Cages*. New York: Oxford University P. 1990.

Sister May Augustina Ray. *American Opinion of Roman Catholicism in the Eighteenth Century*. New York: Columbia University P. 1936.

Theodore W. Allen, *The Invention of the White Race*. New York: Verso, 1994.

Thomas T. McAvoy. *A History of the Catholic Church in the United States*. Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press.1969.

U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1970 Census of Population: Detailed Characteristics—United States Summary. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1973, p. 591; U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1990 Census of Population and Housing: Summary Population and Housing Characteristics-United States. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Governmetn Pringting Office, 1992. P. 59.

Internet Source:

---. *People vs. Hall*. History of California Courts. 1854.

http://www.cschs.org/02_history/02_e03.html

Terrace vs. Thompson et al. "Statement of Counsel for Appellants" 263. U.S. 197. Nov. 12, 1923.

<http://caselaw.lp.findlaw.com/cgi-bin/getcase.pl?court=us&vol=263&invol=197>

---. "Does America Need an Official English" *English First*. 1986.

<http://www.englishfirst.com/>

--. "The Columbia Electronic Encyclopedia", 6th ed.

<http://www.cc.coloumbia.edu/cu/cup/>