Culture, Ethnicity, and Place in a Changing America

A Perspective

JOHN W. FRAZIER, NORAH F. HENRY, AND EUGENE L. TETTEY-FIO

PERSISTENCE AND CHANGE IN AMERICAN HUMAN GEOGRAPHY

Culture, and the human geography it produces, persist over a long time period. However, culture changes slowly, as do the visible landscape it produces, and the ethnic meanings imbued by the group that shapes it. That many examples of persistent and new cultural landscapes exist in the U.S. is not surprising, given the major technological, demographic, and economic changes in American society since World War II (WWII). America emerged from WWII as one of two superpowers, developed and embraced technology that took Americans to the moon, created an electronics revolution that greatly modified the ways that Americans work and live, and built a globally unique interstate highway system, new housing stock, millions of additional automobiles, and otherwise increased its production to meet the challenge of nearly doubling its population between 1950 and 2000. The Post-WWII baby boom and massive immigration fueled population growth and modified American society in important ways, creating different needs and growing aspirations. A larger African-American middle class also emerged during this Post-war period. Leadership in a growing global economy enabled unprecedented economic growth that supported these changes.

This book tells the story of the changing faces of the U.S. since WWII and the roles that various groups have played in altering the cultural landscapes and racial geographies of America. Aimed at the broadly-inclusive cadre of *students of American culture and culture change*, this work examines some of the more important cultural, racial, and ethnic changes of the 1940s through the first decades of the 21st Century. Both events and concepts illuminate the changes in America resulting from international migration-pattern changes, U.S. internal migration and mobility patterns, social, racial and ethnic implications of the changes, and the role that technology plays in our ability to comprehend the depths of the cultural changes. Our goal is not to reveal all depths and dimensions of U.S. culture, for that would be impossible. However, by presenting and illustrating contemporary, cogent examples of race, ethnicity, and culture in 21st Century America, we provide a unique foray into multiple ethnicities, cultures, and landscapes from varied perspectives to illustrate the growth, ethnic and racial mix, and changes that have occurred over the past 75+ years. We begin with an overview of trends to provide background and perspective, and follow with conceptual dimensions and technological advances that provide both an intriguing, and occasionally disturbing, view of "progress" and how it has affected different groups.

We begin by explaining the components of race, ethnicity, and culture that express the issues contained in the chapters of this book. We then look at the influence of both international and domestic groups who shifted locations to create the fabric of American society as we know it today. The groups, the shifts, and the resulting events and patterns provide the altered social and cultural landscapes that describe contemporary America.

CULTURE AND ETHNICITY

Culture refers to an entire way of life of a group of people. A culture maintains values, beliefs, practices, and behaviors that help define and differentiate one group from others. These traits are learned, or exchanged within and between groups, and are passed from one generation to the next. Many traits are common among cultural groups, but cultural identification entails a unique set of individual elements and processes that together create a unique cultural identity. Biological and ideological characteristics, social institutions, and technology are typically used to identify a specific cultural group. Wilbur Zelinsky, in discussing the American culture and its landscapes, observes that certain characteristics, while not uniquely American, are uniquely American in their combination. He also suggests that American culture is linked to northern Europe, especially Great Britain. This implies the importance of the English language, representative government, a focus on the individual, and the preponderance of the Judeo-Christian outlook among its members. However, it involves much more (Zelinsky, 2001).

Cultural groups may also have an affinity for a particular environment, which can influence cultural identity. Because the host environment provides a variety of opportunities for indigenous resources and physical features, it may contribute to cultural identity. An example of the attachment of environmental features to culture identification is the term "mountain people," which implies more than living at high elevation. Such descriptions are meant to help identify cultural groups by location and the influence of environment on the group. Mountain people, for example, live in rough and isolated terrain that keeps them at relatively low levels of economic development and separated from other societal groups, which leads to distinctive qualities. The Hmong people are an example of a culture defined, in part, as a "mountain people" of South Asia. They supported the U.S. during the Vietnam War, suffered genocide afterwards, and were admitted later into the U.S. as refugees. Perhaps one of the best known perspectives on environmental influence on cultural development is the "Turner hypothesis," which credited the environmental conditions of the North American frontier as a significant force that shaped the "rugged individualism" trait of the American culture (Hofstadter and Lipset, 1968).

Beyond environmental influences, a culture may have a sense of synergy with environment, feeling inextricably linked with nature. This also can be a defining element of that particular cultural group. In such cases, the culture self-identifies using aspects of nature and place. For example, indigenous populations often have a very different association with their environments than those cultures in advanced industrial societies. Examples within the U.S. include American Indian, Eskimo, and native Hawaiian cultures. Their historic relationships with their environments contribute to their cultural identifications and, therefore, help distinguish their cultural traits

Culture, then, can be understood to be a set of values, beliefs, technology, and institutions that bring meaning to and preserves a group's existence. Cultural continuity is provided by a common language and cultural history. Both function as powerful sources for strengthening individual ties to the group. Particular social institutions, such as schools and social organizations, reinforce and maintain culture. The cultural system contains individual elements that combine to form a unique set of interrelationships, dynamic in nature, always open and adaptive to new information, ideas, and technology. It also seeks stability and sometimes power relationships through continuity.

Ideology refers to the comprehensive beliefs of a culture. Cultures encompass strong beliefs, often involving deities or a particular political ideology, or both. This is why a shared sense of the divine is often a component of cultural identity. Cultural ideology and associated emotions sometimes result in malicious actions toward other groups, including open conflict directed at the destruction of the enemy culture and/or its cultural symbols. Ideology also results in expressions within the culture, such as memorializing a special place or sacred space associated with some event or person important to the host culture. When two cultures value the same land or place, cultural conflict typically ensues due to competition over the depth of beliefs and sentiment toward the place.

Technology refers to the tools available to a society to make its living, to communicate and to exchange with others, to create and to maintain its advantages, and to transform its surroundings. As with other traits, technological devices, and expertise vary by culture, as does the vision of technology's role in the future of the society and the globe. In America, a constant increase in technology has created a historical framework for discussing

progress and development of the nation. By the mid-1850s, canals and railroad systems were both established in the U.S. Their creation attracted numerous ethnic immigrants to work in their development. These technologies allowed for the rapid development of the American Midwest, the stunning transformation of Chicago from trading outpost to the rail center of the nation and one of the leading industrial cities in America. By the 1860s the Trans-continental Railroad connected the east and west coasts and stimulated even greater growth by century's end. The creation of the automobile industry with its assembly line revolutionized American industry and transportation systems. Air travel followed on the heels of the auto and by WWII America was an air power. Post-WWII saw a rapid development of commercial aviation and the space race that placed a human on the moon in 1969. A person born in the late 1890s literally observed the transformation of American travel. In the early 1900s some workers operated with horse-drawn wagons, such as in the delivery of ice to homes and businesses. In that same lifespan, a human traveled to the moon and safely returned. The electronics revolution during the same lifetime changed the ways that Americans traveled, worked, and played. It also provided global military advantage. It is little won-der, then, that American culture is perceived as different from others on the basis of technology in combination with other distinctive traits.

It should be clear by the discussion thus far that culture also has transforming powers. The group imposes boundaries between its areas and that of others, gives meaning and sentiment to place and objects, and transforms the land by imprinting its cultural presence. While the dominant culture may control the geographic space of a nation, any culture group can, and typically does, leave its cultural imprint on the land it occupies. Culture groups create spaces and places of their own to celebrate and perpetuate their culture. The transformed visible, material culture pattern on the earth's surface is called a **cultural landscape**. It, therefore, is the material expression of the occupying culture, an affirmation of what is valued by that culture. It represents a set of ideas about life — family, the social group and social relations, relations with nature, and the value given to objects that embody its beliefs — present in every culture. The landscape contains cultural markers symbolizing what is important, those deeply embedded values, and what is unique about the group. This is true of American culture. However, changes in human enterprise are constant and evolving cultural landscapes represent not only the inseparable elements of history and historical geography, as visibly apparent expressions of human occupation of various places, but also contemporary expressions that result from recent immigrant settlements. As we will see later in this text, cultural landscapes, one of geography's central concepts, take on many forms, but one of the most dominant examples among American immigrant ethnic groups is the clustering of ethnic businesses that serve commercial and cultural functions.

Ethnicity involves a group-constructed identity using one or more of its cultural attributes. Ethnic identity connects group members through a shared sense of what is unique and, therefore, distinguishes "us" from "them." Common attributes contribute to characteristics that may also make groups distinct from other groups, influencing how others within the larger society see them ("they-ness") (Ringer and Lawless, 1989). Shared traits can involve, for example, language, cultural history, cultural traditions, and religion. There also is a shared sense of aspirations and sometimes vulnerability among those in an ethnic group. National origin may be important but is not synony-mous with ethnicity. Ethnicity is a social construct that defines the "we-ness" of group membership and often in-volves connection to place. Immigrants, by definition residents of a new land, often find it necessary to reaffirm their ethnic identity, which involves preserving cultural value and distinctiveness and preserving ties to a homeland.

Ethnicity, however, is not the equivalent of race. However, racism certainly can cause a shared sense of vulnerability and, therefore, contribute to ethnic identity. This is particularly true when struggle is a part of the group's cultural history, as in the cases of African Americans and the the Jewish faith. Religious customs and cultural celebrations are two ways that ethnic affinity is strengthened. For example, American Jews and American Jewish followers celebrate cultural and religious holidays, which strengthen their ethnicity. It is also important to note that "racial" differences within a community, within the context of different skin color, need not preclude a common ethnic identity. Puerto Ricans are a good example. Black and White Puerto Ricans are included in this ethnic group.

Ethnicity also has been defined within the context of ethnic polarization as a "strategic construction" of cultural boundaries, a process driven by economic and political differences and concerns (Ballard, 2002). As such,

ethnicity can be a deliberate process of amplifying cultural distinctiveness and "moral solidarity" to protect community interests. This, of course, is not limited to minority ethnic groups. The majority, or host culture, closes ranks to sustain its power base, whereas the minority ethnic group seeks refuge because it feels threatened. Both tend to organize geographic space in ways meaningful to their group. Sometimes, when both groups seek the same spaces, this results in contested space. A simple example involves suburbanization in the 20th Century. African Americans sought a place in the suburbs but were rebuffed by the White majority. Despite this, African Americans created their own cultural landscapes and carved out living spaces in suburbia as "places of their own" (Wiese, 2004).

This notion of physically and economically defending one's ethnic group from discriminatory actions of the host culture is but one dimension of ethnicity. Even among European groups, who have been permitted to assimilate into the broader American culture and economic system without experiencing long-term exclusion, there is a need for belonging, or for ethnic affinity. This is why "Irish-only" enclaves still exist in the Catskills, various ethnic celebrations (German, Italian, etc.) remain popular, and some ethnic groups, such as Greek Americans, retain a sense of ethnicity decades after assimilating into the American culture. Affinity takes on many forms and can even lead to claims for financial assistance by contemporary Whites, first-generation immigrants, as demonstrated by Susan Hardwick and Derek Miller (2011). Important dimensions of culture include prejudice and privilege, which can lead to cultural and ethnic conflict.

SOCIAL INSTITUTIONS AND CULTURE

Social institutions are vehicles that support common cultural goals and objectives. Because ethnicity is a part of culture, they also support the existence of ethnicity, including minority ethnic groups within the dominant American culture. They can influence all aspects of an individual's life from birth to death. They permeate marriage and family, govern financial transactions, guide worship where it exists, and often structure burial ceremonies. They are in the market place and they take on many forms, social, political, and economic, but share the same purpose of supporting and perpetuating the health and strength of the culture they are designed to serve.

Educational institutions, for example, are dedicated to teaching particular knowledge and skills that support cultural interests. Governments and legal institutions create and administer the affairs of culture, including the governing body of law and its interpretation, and the military. Social institutions have great power. Subsequent chapters of this book will have much to say about American institutions because they have shaped American immigration policy, including the numbers and sources of migrants from time to time, the rights of American subcultures in many different ways, and have contributed directly to the settlement patterns of suburbia. Institutions also serve economic functions (market institutions), such as in lending money for home mortgages and real estate agencies that present available properties to interested buyers. Both of these institutions played major roles in shaping the racial distribution of urban Americans (discussed in detail in later chapters). Yet another important institution that plays a dominant role in shaping attitudes and behaviors is the media. Media are influential in a number of ways. Media has long shaped perceptions of minority groups, which at times involves positive reports of the impact of hard-working immigrants and in other instances portray them as the evil and undermining source of contemporary problems. Chapter 3 will illustrate these observations for members of all four of the major Diasporas in the U.S. Finally, social institutions also can be ethnic organizations that seek to support their group in many ways. The Chinese Benevolent Association is an example. It has provided guidance and support to sustain many Chinese immigrants in America and has served as an umbrella organization for their other ethnic institutions as well.

In summary, social institutions appear in many contexts, supporting members of a group, perpetuating culture and ethnicity and at other times attacking them and justifying discriminatory actions to restrict or eliminate them. These are the mechanisms of social structure that, although they change from time to time, are the permanent

means of governing and supporting a single culture, sometimes at the expense of the other. This leads to a consideration of what constitutes the uniqueness of the Anglo-American culture and how elements of culture transform our thinking and behaviors, and shape our organization of geographic space and landscapes.

ANGLO-AMERICAN CULTURE

The U.S. continues to change as a nation, yet maintains its central beliefs that guide its behaviors as a culture. This supports the notion that, although the U.S. is a relatively young nation, it definitely has cultural qualities that some social scientists believe constitute an "American culture." Recall the tendency of European-based cultures to see western democracy's individual freedom as a "universal value." This Enlightenment-based concept projected social evolution in a rational manner wherein democracy and personal freedom would be globally achievable (Gray, 2000 and Ballard, 2002). In this vision, individual freedom is a personal right that supersedes group value and association. Personal freedom is the path to a more perfect society. This, of course, ignores the "non-universal" visions of cultures that stress group welfare over individual freedom. The concept also assumes that western democracies have evolved a set of superior cultures. This justifies their political hegemony and messianic desire to "share" ("convert") their superior values with others (Ballard, 2002). As such, the Euro-American approach uses the importance of individual freedom to act superior and to argue that their cultural virtues should be emulated as universals, applicable for all others to follow.

During the post-1950 period the U.S. maintained a set of unique cultural motifs (themes) that created many societal and landscape changes. When discussing American culture, Zelinsky is clear that American cultural history is tied to that of northern Europe, especially the British. An overall set of American cultural traits evolved under these ties with Great Britain and resulted in an Anglo-dominated U.S. cultural system with a distinctly American flavor. Zelinsky explains American cultural characteristics as "the basic values and axioms that define aspiration and direction" and as an "ethos — that powerful mood of this and all other distinctive cultures..." (Zelinsky, 1973, 39-40). These American culture traits include "a reverence for individualism," a high valuation placed on "mobility and change," "a mechanistic world vision" that values "growth and bigness," which also explains America's reverence for technology and its cures, and a "messianic perfectionism" with a drive to share their culture with others. Related to the last trait, Zelinsky states:

> "... the notion that the U.S. is not just another nation, but one with a special mission — to realize the dream of human self-perfection and, in messianic fashion, to share its gospel and achievement with the remainder of the world. This moral expansiveness (some would call it 'moral imperialism') exists over and beyond the usual flexing of economic or military muscle..." (Zelinsky, 1973, 61).

He elaborates the expressions of each of the motifs as American cultural landscapes. Of the several examples provided by Zelinsky, the strongest trait attributed to Americans is the "intense, almost anarchistic individualism" that permeates American society and is expressed in American landscapes. This is America's most dominant value and drives institutional decisions as well as individual behaviors. Having many dimensions, it has transformed American landscapes in diverse and important ways:

> "... The fanatical worship of extreme individualism, indeed an almost anarchistic privatism, affects so many phases of our existence so deeply that no one can interpret either the geography or the history of the nation without coming to grips with it ... a critical force ... in shaping the cultural landscape" (Zelinsky, 1973, 41–42).

Among the numerous patterns attributable to American individualism is American political fragmentation, the notoriously inefficient and costly legal and administrative maintenance of small geographic territories

(towns, villages, etc.). These jurisdictions, maintained within larger regional contexts, with duplication of services (e.g., police and fire departments), represent enormously unnecessary costs to local taxpayers. Zelinsky argues that this landscape example of American individualism results in "tens of thousands" of local expensive governments that, despite increasing costs and financial problems, persevere because of Americans' needs for autonomy and individualism. He argues that America's "haphazard morphology" of metropolitan regions with their "lack of aesthetic or functional association" with adjacent entities constitutes an additional landscape expression of American individualism. Furthermore, the uniquely American drive for personal autonomy has been "symbolized by the metal-and-plastic bubble around each American," the automobile, which gives uniqueness to another form of human cultural geography, the American transportation and commuting system, where non-auto modes struggle for survival and the auto culture thrives despite increasing costs and periodic fuel shortages. The automobile culture also serves the American drive for secluded living in an ever expanding metropolitan region, whose outer suburbs emphasize the maximum spaciousness and separation that money can buy. Of course, individualism can influence many behaviors that lead to both positive and negative outcomes.

As we explain below, during all of the Post-1950 changes, the American cultural-political economy guided the organization of space and the creation of American landscapes based on cultural motifs. Meanwhile, a growing number of recently-arrived immigrant cultures, as well as the subcultures already occupying the nation, made their cultural marks in various places. The growing volume of immigrants in recent decades, along with their ability to settle in exclusively White American locations, has made contrasting cultural landscapes more visible and cultural conflict more apparent. Several geographic concepts and social science theories to be presented in subsequent chapters relate to these geographic settlement structures, social and economic assimilations, and cultural landscapes.

In the remainder of this chapter, we concentrate on the fundamental socio-cultural changes that result from immigrant source-region shifts and domestic shifts in population structure, race, and ethnicity. The power of institutional policies has been a key to Post-WWII population characteristics and to landscape changes. The next section presents a synopsis of U.S. immigration and settlement that constructed America of the 21st Century. We then summarize the race-culture-ethnicity linkages to the U.S. urban-economic structure.

IMMIGRATION TRENDS: INCREASING DIVERSITY BY THE NUMBERS

America has been changing from a predominantly White, Non-Hispanic nation to a more multicultural and multiracial society. Using the broad racial/ethnic categories of the U.S. Census, this shift is quite obvious between 1940 and 2009. In 1940, nearly 90 percent of Americans were Non-Hispanic White. In the year 2000, a half-century later, that proportion had dropped to seventy-five percent. Before 2050, Whites are likely to be a slim majority of about 50 percent (Frazier, Margai, and Tettey-Fio, 2003). This racial/ethnic diversification is due to a number of factors, especially immigration and birth rate differences between Non-Hispanic Whites and Hispanics.

The major racial/ethnic categories and their changes in the share of the total U.S. population between 1940 and 2010-2014 are reported in Table 1.1. These data indicate that the African-American population changed little in proportion to the total U.S. population between 1940 and 2010–2014, especially relative to the other two growing minority groups. The Black proportion of the total population did not change between 1940 and 1970 and increased only 2.8 percent over the next four decades, 1970 to 2010–2014. However, the total Black population increased from just under 13 million in 1940 to more than 39 million by 2010–2014. Latinos, on the other hand, accounted for slightly more than 1 percent of the total U.S. population in 1940 and increased to 4.5 percent by 1970, and from 12.5 percent of the total in 2000 to 19.9 percent by 2010–2014. Thus, while the Black population experienced very moderate percentage gains over the 70 years reported in Table 1.1, the Hispanic percentage of the total increased from 1.4 percent in 1940 to 16.9 percent in 2010–2014 and has remained America's largest minority group since 2000.

The Asian population was relatively miniscule in 1940, when approximately a quarter of a million Asians resided in America, less than 1 percent of the total American population. The Asian total had increased to about

1.5 million by 1970 but still accounted for less than 1 percent of the U.S. total. However, although a relatively small percentage of the total in 2000, at 3.7 percent, Asians realized a large percentage increase between 1970 and 2000, and therefore were one of America's fastest growing minorities on a percentage basis. By 2010-2014, the Asian population totaled slightly more than 13 million, and accounted for 5.2 percent of the total U.S. population.

Table 1.1
Major Racial/Ethnic Group Changes in Percentages of the Total U.S. Population,
1940, 1970, 2000 and 2010–2014

Group/Year	1940	1970	2000 SF1	2010–2014 5-Year Estimates	Margin of error for 2010–2014 5-Year Estimates (+/-)
One Race, White, non	116,353,000 (88.5%)	169,653,000 (83.4%)	211,460,000 (75.1%)	231,850,000 (73.8%)	*51.2*
One Race, Black	12,866,000 (9.8%)	22,539,000 (9.8%)	34,650,000 (12.3%)	39,565,000 (12.6%)	*23.0*
Hispanic	1,861,000 (1.4%)	9,073,000 (4.5%)	35,308,000 (12.5%)	53,070,000 (16.9%)	*1.5*
Asian/Pacific Islander	255,000 (<1%)	1,526,000 (<1%)	10,641,000 (3.7%)	16,246,000 (5.2%)	*25.2*
Totals	131,669,000 (100%)	203,210,000 (100%)	281,421,000 (100%)	340,731,000 (100%)	

While the numbers in Table 1.1 indicate the substantial increase in diversity in the American population, they do not express the cultural diversity within each group that contributes to an increasingly multicultural society. Table 1.2 clarifies this within-group diversity by reporting the national origin for each unique foreign-born population in the U.S. with a minimum of a half-million people in 2000. A number of observations are possible from the table:

1. Fourteen different source nations are represented, indicating the diversity of foreign-born in the U.S. in 2000. These 14 foreign-born groups together account for only about 61 percent of the 31,107,889 total foreign-born population in 2000, suggesting an even greater diversity if all source nations had been listed in the table. By 2010–2014, the proportion reached approximately 65 percent.

2. Mexico stands out as the chief source nation of the U.S. foreign-born. It alone provided approximately 30 percent of the total foreign-born population in 2000, and 28 percent in the 2010–2014 period.

3. The sources of the next four largest foreign-born American populations in 2000 were Asian, and all Asians together accounted for nearly five million foreign-born, or about 12 percent of the U.S. total. By 2010–2014, although the rankings of nations changed, the same four nations remained important and accounted for a combined total of more than 7.5 million of the American foreign-born, or 18 percent.

4. Of the 14 largest sources, six are in Latin America and the Caribbean and five are in Asia. The same is true when using the 2010–2014 estimates. This illustrates the shift in U.S. immigration policy since

1952 and especially since 1965, when immigrant sources shifted from Europe to Latin America and Asia.

5. Among notable changes in the rankings of these 14 nations is the higher rank of India, moving up to number three and passing the Philippines. Also, El Salvador moved from ninth in the ranking in 2000 to sixth by 2014.

Many of these groups have shaped new landscapes and places of their own so that they are reminded of their cultures and homelands.

Table 1.2
Source Nations of U.S. Foreign Born, 2000 and 2010–2014,
with a Minimum Population 500,000

Source Nation by Rank, 2000	Rank 2000	Foreign-Born Population, 2000	Foreign-Born Population 2010–2014 5-year Estimates	Margin of Error for 2010-2014 5-Year Estimates	Rank 2000	Rank 2010–2014 5-Year Estimates
U.S. Total		31,107,889	41,056,445	*+/-102,782*		
Mexico	1	9,177,487	11,636,547	*+/-53,025*	1	1
China	2	1,518,652	2,338,405	*+/-12,355*	2	2
Philippines	3	1,369,070	1,865,271	*+/-12,285*	3	4
India	4	1,022,552	1,988,733	*+/-16,296*	4	3
Vietnam	5	988,174	1,273,982	*+/-11,525*	5	5
Cuba	6	872,716	1,128,324	*+/-9,454*	6	7
Korea	7	864,125	1,082,307	*+/-9,866*	7	8
Canada	8	820,771	812,073	*+/-7,919*	8	10
El Salvador	9	817,336	1,255,177	*+/-13,436*	9	6
Germany	10	706,704	595,502	*+/-4,337*	10	14
Dominican Republic	11	687,677	942,123	*+/-9,331*	11	9
United Kingdom	12	677,751	683,726	*+/-6,342*	12	12
Jamaica	13	553,827	697,215	*+/-8,654*	13	11
Colombia	14	509,872	680,215	*+/-9,326*	14	13

CHANGING U.S. IMMIGRATION LAW

Immigration Policy between Two World Wars

As mentioned earlier, social institutions may take the form of legal and political actors charged to protect the host culture, as in the case of the 1882 Chinese Exclusion Act that attempted to eliminate Chinese immigration into the U.S. By the beginning of the 20th Century, American labor's dissatisfaction had turned toward the Japanese immigrants who were perceived as flooding the U.S. labor market and unfairly displacing honest Anglo workers. This perception was particularly acute in California and resulted in the Gentlemen's Agreement in 1907 between the leaders of Japan and the U.S., wherein Japan promised to limit Japanese emigration and avoided an

international incident. By the 1920s, already involved in a period of isolationism, the U.S. had become generally suspicious of involvements with foreign nations, especially in terms of formal agreements in trade and military treaties. Many Americans believed that the U.S. could set the standard for global democracy and peace by its independent example. Isolation did not mean the U.S. would cease its economic and territorial expansion policies, but it would refrain from unnecessary foreign entanglements with European nations. Of particular relevance to the evolution of American culture in this period were the actions by the U.S. Congress related to new immigration policies. The entry of three waves of European immigrants between 1820 and 1920 totaled about 50 million in less than a century. The first two waves attracted cultures from northern and western Europe: Irish, English, German, and Scandinavian populations. The third European wave differed sharply from the previous two in that it attracted eastern European and Italian immigrants who spoke different languages and had very different customs and cultural features than the earlier northern and western European groups, many of whom had assimilated into the Anglo-American culture by the 1920s. Various actions by the Congress illustrated their desire to protect Anglo-America from being diluted by those who were culturally dissimilar.

In 1917, for example, Congress passed a law to impose literacy testing as a means to slow unwanted immigration. After nearly another million immigrants entered the country in 1920, Congress passed the 1921 Emergency Immigration Act as an immediate stop-gap action that established the quota system, an annual limit of 350,000 and a three percent national limit based on foreign nations share of the U.S. population in 1910. Given the dominance of western and northern European nations during the previous century, this law, by design, provided immigrants from those regions a significant advantage. Congress continued to debate the immigration issue during the early 1920s and, in 1924, passed an even more restrictive act that President Coolidge signed into law. The 1924 Immigration Act had the clear intention of restricting eastern and southern Europeans immediately, and ending the entry of all Asians (especially the Japanese), who were ineligible for U.S. citizenship. The law continued the favorable status of northern and western Europeans. It set the national limit at 2 percent of the 1890 U.S. Census, which further strengthened the position of the Irish, English and other Europeans that had dominated the first two waves of immigration. By 1927, an annual cap of 150,000 was instituted. For a period, exceptions were made for the Americas and resulted in Canada and Mexico providing large numbers of immigrants in the 1920s. However, the pattern of immigration remained the same in the 1930s, although annual numbers dropped significantly due to the Depression; Western hemisphere nations of Great Britain, Germany, and Mexico provided the most immigrants. The large influx of Mexicans during the 1920s led to the U.S. Census Bureau's initial effort to count those of the "Mexican race" by 1930. Congressional action soon restricted the influx of immigrant Mexican workers. Immigration laws had the goal of keeping the U.S. as a White nation, favoring northern and western European immigrants.

Immigration Policies Since 1952

American immigration policies changed dramatically after WWII beginning with the 1952 U.S. Immigration and Nationality Act (amended as the McCarran-Walter Act). America emerged as a superpower after WWII and contributed substantially to the rebuilding of Europe and Japan. The American economy expanded and labor shortages in key fields led to a different attitude toward immigration. The impact of communism also was influential; the "Red Scare" associated with the McCarthy Era not only frightened many Americans, it increased their awareness and sympathy for foreigners who had fallen victim to the spread of communism. The new policy established in 1952 recognized both of these forces and also took a more tolerant attitude about admitting the close relatives of existing American citizens. Thus, while maintaining the quota system, the new law established a new preference system for skilled workers (preferred occupations based on employment shortages), and for immediate family members (e.g., unmarried children, siblings, and parents of American citizens), and an emergency entry provision for those fleeing immediate danger related to political crises. The latter led to the admission of refugees, including hundreds of thousands of Latin American and Asian refugees.

Undoubtedly the most dramatic change in immigration law, since the establishment of the quota system, however, occurred with the passage of the 1965 Immigration and Nationality Act (Hart-Celler Act), which abolished

the quota. By this time, America had entered the Civil Rights Era and was involved in a war in Vietnam. A more liberal element of Congress (including Ted Kennedy, Claiborne Pell, and Philip Hart) argued that the proposed changes associated with this Act would not significantly alter the cost or magnitude of immigration. Of course, history has proven them wrong. The unanticipated impacts of this law were extremely significant. The new law abolished the quota system and replaced it with numerical limits and a multiple category preference system. Under its terms, it mattered less where you were from, and more who you were in terms of skills, family relationships, and refugee status. The new limits were hemispheric as opposed to nationality-based: 170,000 from the Eastern Hemisphere (to compensate for previous biases) and 120,000 from the Western Hemisphere. All non-refugee immigrants theoretically had an equal chance of admission either in the occupational or family preferences categories, specifically under family reunification or in preferred professionally-based occupations in six categories. Most importantly, however, the new law also created exemptions for immediate relatives (spouses, offspring, and parents) from the numerical limits established by this legislation. This caused the number of annual immigrants to increase dramatically, an unanticipated impact of the Hart-Celler Act, especially in the numbers of immigrants from Latin America and Asian countries. The impact has increased cultural and ethnic diversity in the U.S.

There have been other immigration acts passed since 1965 that permit temporary or permanent status to certain immigrant applicants. Not all of these laws are examined here. However, there are many ways for foreign nationals to secure lawful permanent residents status, popularly called the "green card," in America. Among the possibilities are employment, family member, lottery, adoption, business investment, and refugee/political asylum. Decisions related to status are based on the preference system mentioned previously. Among the modifications in the law are those that address unforeseen bias outcomes. For example, due to the impact of the family reunification clause in the existing law, a "lottery" system was created under a new law passed in 1990. This was to address the fact that the reunification clause favored particular underdeveloped nations, while excluding others. The 1990 U.S. Immigration Act addressed this problem by the addition of 55,000 immigrants drawn by "lottery" from those nations who had been excluded.

The labor market in the U.S. also continues to influence immigration law. There are two general types of visas (permission to enter the country) issued by the U.S. government: immigrant and non-immigrant visas. An immigrant visa recognizes the immigrant's intention to live and work in the country permanently. The non-immigrant visa is for a temporary visitor to work, study, receive training, and engage in other short-term activities. The 1990 Act and subsequent immigration legislation modified existing law and also increased the number of immigrant visas in the occupational/employment category. Also, in recognizing the market needs for high-tech skills and managerial personnel, the new law encouraged non-immigrant visas. This category has L-1 and H-1B visas to promote non-immigrant entry. The L-1 visa supports the establishment of multinational corporation investment through the creation of branch operations with skilled employees. Once non-immigrants hold the L-1 visa, they are eligible to apply for permanent residency after one year of successful operation of the new business. In the same vein, high-tech corporations have lobbied Congress to increase the number of annual H-1B visas for non-permanent immigrants for various skilled and educated foreigners. Congress has responded by raising those limits, which in 2003 reached 195,000 visas. Just as L-1 visa holders are eligible for permanent residency, so too are the holders of H-1B visas during their six-year approved work status.

All of these changes have contributed to the continued growth in the number of annual legal immigrants entering the U.S. and to a diversification of U.S. population, as well as to an increasing number securing permanent status. Much of this growth is tied to skilled migrants, especially those from China and India. Beyond these changes in the laws regulating legal immigration, America has experienced a tremendous influx of millions of illegal immigrants in recent decades. Various efforts to better control the international border have been undertaken but none have had a lasting impact on this problem. Legal and illegal immigration have led to major changes in the spatial distribution, settlement, and cultural landscape patterns of the U.S.

POST-WWII ECONOMIC EXPANSION

Post-WWII U.S. economic expansion coincided with the baby boom generated by returning soldiers and new family formation. Federal legislation that supported the housing boom and rapid expansion of suburbia contributed to that economic expansion. Other legislation, such as the 1956 National Interstate and Defense Highway Act, the largest public works project in American history, greatly facilitated the emerging new geography of suburbanization by creation of interchanges that connected old inner city employment centers with the new housing subdivisions, retailing, industrial parks, and office centers that emerged. During the same post-war period, an immigrant influx, generated by the changes in national immigration policy, began and reached record proportions by the end of the 20th Century. Millions of immigrants also facilitated this economic expansion and contributed to a rapidly increasing affluent middle-class population. The complexity of these forces in a short timeframe reshaped American immigrant history and created profound and new geographic patterns across the North American continent.

As baby boomers moved through the life cycle (toddlers, K–12 schools, college graduates, professionals, retired), their consumerism increased and has been felt in successive decades since the 1950s. First, the demand for baby products and children's merchandise coincided with a simultaneous housing boom supported by government programs. A growing population of young people contributed to the expansion of the market economy and changed the nature of education, including the expansion of the university. As this population has aged, their growing affluence as adults has continued economic prosperity that has lasted with periodic financial crises that began with the 1973 Oil Embargo and continued with the banking and credit crises of the early 21st Century. Woven into these occurrences was the rising tide of immigrants, including a large number that entered under the employment preferences that began with the 1952 INA and were enhanced by various legislative actions thereafter, especially the 1965 Hart-Celler Act.

Many of the early immigrants (1950s–1970s) were professionals with financial capital, or high earnings that placed them in the affluent classes. Unlike earlier immigrants, many of the Post-WWII foreign-born ethnics from Asia, Africa, and Latin America moved directly to the suburbs and became part of the consumer class. During this period, middle-class households vacated large urban centers; suburban growth pushed farther into formerly rural areas; metropolitan areas expanded for many miles from the once "central cities" of America. In fact, over time, the suburbs took on different functions and aged. In the process, suburban communities that were once thought of as "dormitories," places to sleep while one worked in the big cities, evolved and became more independent and competitive with the big cities they surrounded (Hartshorn and Muller, 1986). The older suburbs evolved into "inner suburbs" that contrasted with the newer "outer suburbs."

Of course, refugees, illegal immigrants, and some entries through family reunification, did not represent the affluence of the "new" professional immigrant class and settled in poorer sections of metropolitan America and in rural environments. These settlements contributed to an increasingly complex American human geography.

As a result of the economic expansion and other trends, American consumerism increased dramatically after WWII and reached a new plateau by the end of the 20th Century. Consumption in this period evolved from meeting individual and household needs to satisfying the increasing wants that exceeded needs. Children, teenagers, parents, grandparents, and retirees contributed to increased consumer spending that evolved into the major engine of growth and stability in the American economy, until the bubble burst loudly at the beginning of the 21st Century, causing an American debt crisis that contributed to a collapse in consumer spending. Along the way, however, boomers were credited with creating the "Dream Economy" of the U.S., characterized as overconsumption that provided experience and satisfaction through the purchase of unneeded goods and services. Knox describes this as a process that entailed emulation of the "lifestyles of the rich and famous," which inspired the consumption of "luxury goods and symbols" that became a "consumption binge" supported by a credit binge and reached unprecedented levels (Knox, 2011).

In the same time period, the Civil Rights Era and the affirmative action stipulations of the Civil Rights Law led to an expansion of the African-American middle and wealthy classes that also joined in consumerism. Of course, many Blacks remained in poverty and the removal of affirmative action advantages and other opportunities

that contributed to the real Black socio-economic gains of the 1970s (Clark, 1979), which faded in later decades, as Black poverty increased and remained consistently higher than that of American Whites.

Although one can identify positive forces in the Post-WWII period that have lasted to the present, some less positive changes occurred during this period also as America repositioned itself in global affairs, and experienced great domestic and global economic, social and political challenges.

CHALLENGES AND CHANGES IN THE POST-WWII PERIOD

America engaged in a war in Vietnam, experienced an energy crisis, and suffered through double-digit inflation and severe economic recession, which contributed to a more conservative mood in Washington, D.C. by the 1980s. For many people of color, economic and social disparities with Whites were magnified between large inner cities and their surrounding communities. The human geography of the U.S. was modified and reflected some of these major changes. Perhaps the biggest of the geographic changes was the rapid consumption of rural lands, their transformation into thousands of new small communities independent of their nearby large cities, and the relocation of much of the White middle class and economic activities to emerging suburbs. While suburbanization had begun prior to WWII, it intensified in the post-war era and made America a commuting nation dependent on the automobile and foreign oil. While undeniable gains were made by African Americans, suburbanization also increased racial segregation and literally pushed the worlds of Blacks and Whites farther apart. Other regional movements created new American landscapes and racial/ethnic disparities. Post-war America witnessed the remainder of the Great Migration until 1970, which brought millions of additional African Americans to northern and western cities and, when the economy changed, left millions jobless. Racial strife increased. One of the more obvious results of these culturally-based geographic patterns in American cities has been the unequal distribution of resources that created and concentrated poverty and caused the deterioration of neighborhoods and living conditions. This was true in the early industrial cities, where immigrants were segregated into high-risk ethnic neighborhoods, such as the tenements of New York City or the housing adjacent to the Chicago rail yards and garbage dumps that killed many children. Inner cities since 1950 are no different. Poverty and the risks of infant mortality remain high, despite the national economy being second to none in the world. Poverty begets crime and the drug cultures, which add to the ills of poor living environments, especially those containing American minorities.

This period of racial separation and increasing class distinctions occurred simultaneously with major restructuring of the American economy due to globalization. This created new challenges due to the massive losses in manufacturing and the employment base it supported. The service economy expanded and became two-tiered, characterized by the high-paying technical employment and low-paying service sector jobs that largely supported the lifestyles of the upper-middle class in the use of restaurants, hotel, and other services.

In stark contrast to the newer outer, wealthy suburbs, large, old "inner cities" of metropolitan areas disproportionately contain areas of poor housing, persistent unemployment, low wages, and a declining tax base. American ghettos persist as landscapes of fear and despair that encompass horrendous conditions, despite a half-century of national growth and prosperity. Typically invisible to middle-America, these conditions became more apparent when Hurricane Katrina struck New Orleans in 2005. Hundreds of thousands of residents evacuated, but the very poor, predominantly Black inner-city residents who lacked resources and access to transportation were left behind to experience one of America's most devastating natural disasters and its aftermath. The conditions and racial distribution of New Orleans is typical of many other American cities, including Detroit, Milwaukee, Chicago, Cleveland, Buffalo, Rochester, and others that experienced ghetto formation generations ago. America's outer suburbs are the antithesis of such conditions, and represent the relatively new, prosperous and spreading American landscapes that reflected wealth.

Spatial patterns of racial and ethnic distributions have become increasingly complex in recent decades due to the rapid influx of immigrants and other forces. As a result, the ubiquitous ethnic enclave economy has become but one of multiple geographic expressions of ethnic settlement structures in the U.S. The same is true of assimilation, which once had a singular explanation but now revolves around multiple factors creating multiple outcomes. When explaining enclaves and other geographic forms of settlement, social scientist perspectives are

wide ranging, each with its supporters and critics. The perspectives range from emphasis on group unity to the importance of social and financial capital, and from the specialized functions of place and space to explanations associated with neoliberalism and the influence of the "new" economy in shaping contemporary human behaviors and the characteristics of modern landscapes.

Zhou and Cho, for example, emphasized the non-economic influences of ethnic entrepreneurship, especially the link between the social environment created by entrepreneurship and the improved mobility and adaptive behaviors of the ethnic Chinese and Korean economies in Los Angeles (2010). Other research perspectives include concepts such as transnationalism, the tendency to be influenced by more than a single culture due to residence in multiple global locations. Transnational migrants are used to explain the transfer of cultural experiences and behaviors from one country to the other and often become expressed as geographic landscapes. An example is the case of Asian-Indian immigrants in the U.S. Chacko (2007) illustrated the impact of these Asian-Indian immigrants resettling in Indian communities wherein their new landscapes include gated communities that are an adaptation of American housing development. At the same time, recent Asian-Indian immigrants in Queens, New York, have created an ethnic economy and visible commercial landscapes, while also creating new housescapes that are reminiscent of Indian culture. Their American housescapes in Queens typically involve the use of new architectural facades, stainless steel railings, enclosed front yards, decorative animals and concrete in place of grass. These are associated with cultural preferences and habits associated with India.

Yet other perspectives are philosophical in nature, focusing on the roles of macro processes believed to shape human behaviors and result in emerging and changing landscapes. Knox (2011), for example, relies on contemporary interpretations of neoliberalism (the free-market doctrine) that replaced egalitarian liberalism (emphasis on Keynesian economic policy and the welfare state). Concepts such as consumerism, which suggest the process of massive consumption for wants rather than needs, are employed to explain the creation of the "Dream Economy." A growing number of upper-middle class consumers in the 1980s and 1990s typified a consumer binge and an increasingly competitive environment. This new type of consumer was typical of an ever increasing materialistic society of individuals and groups seeking distinction through material purchases. A "cultural industry" was designed to serve the new consumerism and supplied positive emotional immigrant experiences brought about by products and services that support ethnic distinctiveness, express self-image, and reflect cultural value. Generally described as a process of "aestheticization of consumption," it provided the motivation to consume in particular ways. This means that the design and consumption of products (certain goods) contribute to group identities because they contain (or have injected) specific meanings that "provide a positive emotional experience" (Knox, 2011, 29). In this sense, the material world shapes the perception of an individual, defines the person and associates her/him with a group and place identity. Thus, the materialism of the new economy reinforces cultural beliefs, differentiates people and places, and may shape distinctive landscapes at urban, neighborhood, and housescape scales. Knox notes "the significance of the new economy" in such processes:

> "Houses, neighborhoods, interior designs, clothes, gadgets, food — everything — is now freighted with meaning, a consequence of the aestheticization of everyday life . . . emphasis is on appearance; the symbolic properties of urban settings and material possessions . . . assume unprecedented importance" (57).

Thus, those of different perspectives and philosophical persuasions interpret the processes and causes of landscape formation and geographic patterns quite differently. Geographic studies have applied all of the perspectives briefly described above, some of which are expressed in other chapters of this volume. The next two chapters provide theoretical and philosophical structures for landscape changes in the U.S.