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Richard Walker

California's Collision of Race and Class

California is a frontieristian laboratory of modern hopes and failures. It has provided fertile ground for fast-track capitalist development and experiments in liberal democratic, while at the same time allowing for the mingling of many diverse peoples. But the state has also displayed the antinomies of economic crisis, class hatred, racism, and political reaction. California has repeatedly set the agenda for the United States as a whole, for better or worse, and has set the tone again in the 1990s for a paradox of immigrant hashing and black-white racial antagonism. Today's Californians face the profound task of integrating a plethora of non-European peoples into what is still overwhelmingly a white man's republic, and their success or failure will mark this nation's history well into the next century. As such, the prospects are dimmed by inauspicious circumstances of economic restructuring, class division, political recidivism, and recrudescence racism and classism. If Californians fail at this task, the desperately needed renewal of class and race relations, politics and government, work and economy will be put off yet again, and the United States will remain a stagnating, increasingly monstrous presence on the world's stage.

We, the People: Race and Class Reconstruction

California has been a state of immigrants since the Spanish conquest in the late eighteenth century. It has never known a decade when the number of newly arriving people did not exceed the number of those born within the state. Since the exodus of the indigenous people, the vast majority of Californians have been of European origin. Nevertheless, Asian and Mexicans have been a constant presence, and people of African origin finally arrived in large numbers in the 1940s for wartime work. Race in California and the West has never been a simple black-and-white issue.

California became whiter in the mid-twentieth century, thanks to the exclusionary immigration quotas of 1924 and the increased breakup of the European world system. The global turn to economic globalization, capitalistic penetration of the Third World, and loosening of immigration restrictions in 1965 have returned California to something nearer its appearance in the last century. But the
geography of new arrivals has tilted sharply away from Europe and the eastern United States and toward the Pacific Basin, in line with the shift of the center of gravity of world capitalism away from the Atlantic. In the last two decades, California (especially Los Angeles) displaced New York as the chief receiving area for immigrants (35 percent of immigrants to the United States arrived in California in the 1980s versus 14 percent in New York). Some 400,000 migrants per year poured in during the lax decade (versus 388,000 births), and the state’s population surged past 30 million by 1990, up 12 million from the previous twenty years. Fewer than 50 percent of current inhabitants were born in-state.

This influx has transformed the face of California. Nowhere will the biblical growth in the next century. Latinos rose sharply in number during the 1960s (by 78 percent), Asians more precipitously (by 121 percent). By 1990, whites had fallen to roughly 57 percent of the population, while Latinos jumped to 25 percent and Asians nearly 10 percent (Africans holding at about 7 percent and indigenous people at 1 percent). The number of foreign-born residents went up to 80 percent. An economic earthquake moved two and a half million Filipinos, a quarter million Salvadorans, Vietnamese, Koreans, and Chinese and over one hundred thousand Guatemalans, Hawaiians, Britons, and Iranians. The central cities have undergone the most drastic recomposition. In 1970, Los Angeles was 75 percent white, by 1990 it was only 38 percent white. San Francisco went from 75 to 43 percent white in the same period.

Racial recomposition of California went hand-in-hand with class recomposition. The working class of the 1990s is composed overwhelmingly of Latinos (mostly Mexican, Salvadoran, and Nicaraguan) and East and Southeast Asians (mostly Filipinos, Vietnamese, and Chinese), who serve in disproportionate numbers as manual workers. Overall, 79 percent of men of Mexican origin were in blue-collar jobs in 1980 versus 55 percent of Anglo men in such jobs. Because of labor market segmentation, immigrants are largely confined to specific occupational niches. Mexicans dominate Southern California manufacturing; Salvadorans stock the furniture industry and gardening crews; Guatemalans and Salvadoran women are the principal group of domestics; Chinese and Thai women fill the garment sweatshops north and south; Little Vietnam supplies the electronics belt of Orange County; Silicon Valley electronics feed off men and women of many origins: Chinese, Central Americans, and Filipinos labor in the restaurants and tourist hotels of San Francisco; and agribusiness in the interior valleys makes hay on the backs of Mexicans, both mestizos and Mestizos.

Contrary to popular images of borders of unskilled peasants jumping border fences, today’s immigrants include a healthy measure of the highly skilled who are competitive for technical, professional, and managerial jobs, as well as many well-capitalized business owners and entrepreneurs. The numbers of the skilled are particularly large among East Asians, South Asians, and Middle Easterners. Fields such as medicine, engineering, and computing have become immigrant niches for Indians, Chinese, Filipinos, and Indians. Few visible are the many Canadians and Europeans in electronics, banking, and teaching. These favored immigrants usually arrive already trained, with considerable acclimation to English and American commercialism, and they have perpetuated the petit bourgeois layers of California society. California has always received an extraordinary bounty from its skilled and well-capitalized migrants and, unlike the rest of the United States, has seldom felt the full impact of mass migrations of the rural poor.

California has always depended on long-distance migration to feed its growth. In fact, the percentage of foreign-born residents is considerably higher in a century ago, 39 percent in 1960 and 25 percent in 1990. The 1970 wave of migration was no larger, of longer duration, than the great post–World War II influx and fits closely to a pattern of 15–25 year "long swings" of migration going back a century. The imposing logistics of coping with millions of new people are daunting, to be sure, and require money, ideas, and commitment to rebuilding the state on a new human foundation. But it has been done before. Schools, houses, and infrastructure were built in ample number for the baby boomers of the postwar era of immigration (including the Walkers family). So what has changed? Race, politics, and the economy, to which we now turn.
the United States (twice the size of second-place Chicago), while the Bay Area doubled its employment and Silicon Valley (Santa Clara county) became the dens- est manufacturing area in the country. 49

California took over as the principal engine of U.S. economic growth and its high-tech sectors were trumpeted as the model for a nation losing its knack in manufacturing. On one side was electronics, where Silicon Valley was hailed as the world center of the new computer-information age and emblem of American innovation and entrepreneurship at its best. On the other side was mighty aerospace, the American trump card for beating back the Soviets and economic de- fense, as defense spending shot up to $800 billion. California's share of prime contracts peaked at 23 percent. A new generation of "smart war machines" was ushered in, and Orange County robots became the biggest economic choice on earth, while the Bay Area received huge contracts for satellites, guidance systems, and Star Wars lasers.50

Then there was finance capital: at the beginning of the 1980s California was home to the world's largest bank (Bank of America) and credit card company (VISA), the country's biggest Savings and Loans (led by imperious Charles Keating), and the nerve center of the junk bond market (predicted once by Michael Milken). New branches of foreign banks sprang up like mushrooms and loans were easy to come by. As regulations fell, fast-buck operators shuffled a deck of dubious assets, backed by the wizardry of Wall Street. Inflated by free-sell finance, constraints ballooned 41 percent to $40 billion in 1984, seven times the previous peak in 1973.51 Escapes piled upon excess, and the California economy became white hot.

Economic growth through the 1970s and 1980s was fed by the influx of almost 5 million new people from around the world. Not only were California jobs plentiful, they paid well—better than the jobs in the rest of the United States and at a rate of time higher than in Mexico or China. During the recent boom, incomes were one-sixth above the nation-wide average.52 California's wage and income advan- tage has not disappeared despite the arrival of millions of new workers, however. California has enjoyed a virtuous circle of investment, employment and spending in a highly diversified economy, and its skilled labor and ample capital have sust-ained a high rate of innovation that keeps California products in demand far and wide.53

The crisis of 1990-94 slammed the high-flying California economy harder than anything since the Great Depression. The state was forced into collective dozing in the wake of a decade of overconsumption of factories, workers, securities, real estate, and executive fat. Wealth shrink, thanks chiefly to real est- ate valuations dropping 25-39 percent. After leading the country in new business formation, California's failure rate soared, with 28 percent of the nation's bank- ruptcies in 1991-92. Construction came grinding to a halt almost everywhere in the state, with housing starts hitting the lowest point since World War II. Southern California was the worst hit. The post-cold war military cutbacks

cost the state some 258,000 of 100,000 jobs in defense. Greater Los Angeles ac- counted for over a quarter of all job losses in the country in 1991-93, losing one-quarter to one-third of its manufacturing workforce.54 The south lost financial skat in paper empires tank without a trace; Milken, Keating, and other con-men went to jail; bank lending stagnated; venture capital plummeted; and Japanese investments dried up ($3 billion per year in 1986 to $16 billion in 1994). Then Great Los Angeles watched helplessly as a revised Bank of America bought out Security Pacific Bank.55 The Bay Area was less devastated but still lost 120,000 jobs from 1990 to 1995.

Workers bore the brunt of the catastrophe. Gross job loss amounted to almost 1.5 million (10 percent) from 1990 to 1992. 900,000 is wholesale and retail trade, 500,000 in manufacturing, 150,000 in construction, 70,000 in agriculture. Net job growth was negative from 1991 through 1993, with unemployment rising toward 10 percent by 1993 and remaining at 9 percent in 1995—50 points higher than the national average. Not surprisingly, immigrants stopped coming. Im- migration plunged after 1990, out-migration increased, and net migration hit a new low in 1992-93 as the recession bottomed out. Thai did not stop immigrants from taking the blame for "glutting" labor markets, even though hoiyas of locals and migrants alike were the real culprits, and unemployment rates rose equally for all racial and ethnic groups.56

California sits on the cusp of an epochal change in the geography of capitalism in which its place is no longer secure. It has been the dominant economic unit before, and survived through a combination of new technologies, political initiatives, and cultural change. This time, one cannot be sure. As in the business cycle is reentering some of the boots into the Golden State, with strengths in electronics, entertainment, and exports to East Asia. But long-run industrial leadership may be passing irreversibly across the Pacific. No region or nation is ever immune to the inevitable downsizing of accumulation and shifts in the for- umes of power.57 The economic integrants—for the bourgeoisie as well as the working class—adds to the uncertainties and conflicts of social reconfiguration and racial change.

A Nation Divided: The Growing Class Schism

Even as the economy was roaring ahead, a yawning chasm between the classes was opening up that marked the United States as the most divided of all wealthy countries. California led the pack along with the rest of the sunbelt states. Those who owned capital did spectacularly well. California's jet stream of fast- track entrepreneurs and upper-middle families more than doubled in the 1980s to over 340,000 millionaires (one in ten people), and its richest families—Heeze, Pack-
ards, Waltons, Gettys, Haases, Bedfords—disproportionately filled the top ranks of America’s haute bourgeoisie.\(^7\) Michael Milken earned the highest personal salary in history, while the 13-year-old mayor of Los Angeles made $100 million.\(^8\) The professional and managerial class prospered. Average income for the top quintile rose by 15 percent to $107,000, and the Bay Area, spiritual center of the yuppie lifestyle, remained the richest metropolitan area in the country and the most expensive to live in.

Meanwhile, the working class descended. Total income of the middle 20 percent remained flat throughout the decade (and declined by 10 percent in the costly Bay Area). For the lower 40 percent the bottom fell out.\(^9\) Wages stagnated in full-time jobs, while leisure and part-time work increased. Working people kept their income up by sending more family members out to work, holding two or three jobs, and working more overtime.\(^10\) Chronically high unemployment averaged 7.5 percent over the twenty-year period beginning in the 1970s. A growing gap opened up between total state income and total wages (including salaried professionals) - a crude measure of total surplus value—which expanded from $155 billion in 1930 billion over the decade. This helps explain where all the millionaires came from.

While wages for all workers ebbed, some fared worse across the board. Latinos earned 70 percent of what white workers earned, on average. The per capita income of Latinos was 45 percent of whites because Latinos tend to have larger families. Blacks and Asians did somewhat better, but not much, with per capita incomes 61 percent and 72 percent that of whites, respectively. Unemployment rates have been consistently higher for minorities than they are for whites. Immigrant labor has provided the upper classes of California with a new middle class of economic surplus. The excess profits gained by hiring Latino wage-workers, for example, instead of better-paid white workers was about $55 billion in 1990. All the same, the widening class schism also shows up within every race or nationality—European, African, Asian, or Latino—modifying a simple race-class alignment.\(^11\)

Throughout the mass-spirited 1980s, new battles were added to the armies of the poor. The poverty rate stood at 12.5 percent in 1990, even before the recession set in 18.2 percent. This rate puts California into the top ten poor states (just behind Arkansas) in this most impoverished of rich nations. South Central Los Angeles has a higher poverty rate now than at the time of the Watts Rebellion, and outside the coastal-urban belt higher unemployment, lower income, and dependence on social services are perennial features. Saddled of all is California’s astronomical rate of poverty among children—over 25 percent (55 percent for children under the age of six).\(^12\)

In short, at the same time that the racial composition of California has changed so dramatically and the economy has gone into free fall, class contradictions have sharpened. Working-class comfort and security have declined in tandem with a massive erosion of the middle class of work, poverty, job competition, housing, and health care in rude. All this would be true regardless of the numbers of immigrants and their racial and ethnic composition, because the erosion of working-class incomes and welfare has been taking place throughout the country and, indeed, the world. But Governor Pete Wilson and the Right have used immigration as a scapegoat for the sorry state of the working class. Are they worried, perhaps, that because the working-class and nonwhite peoples now overlap to such a great degree, the combination of class and race resentments could put fire in their bellies? Better to divide the white- and the dark-skinned, the newly arrived and the long resident, than to face their united protest against an economic miracle gone sour.
They, the Criminals. The Political Attack on the Poor and the Aids

Face with economic restructuring and social repressiveness, the people of California have found a new agenda for their suffering. The Hispanic community of Los Angeles, the new face of the Los Angeles Police Department, has been the focal point of these changes. The city's police force has been made up of Hispanic officers since 1972. This is the year the late Mayor Tom Bradley, a Democratic leader, was elected mayor of Los Angeles. Bradley had been active in civil rights issues during his tenure as mayor. The police force has since been predominantly Hispanic, with a large percentage of the population, "singer white" are the largest group. However, the new agenda for the police force has been to crack down on illegal immigration. This has led to the displacement of many Hispanic families from their homes. The police force has been praised for its efforts in this area, but there is growing opposition to the use of police forces to enforce immigration laws. The frustration of residents and the police force has led to a situation where the police are seen as the enforcers of the new agenda. The result is a growing divide between the police force and the community it serves.

In 1994, the Los Angeles Police Department was accused of racial profiling. The department was forced to change its tactics, but the division between the police force and the community remained. The police force has continued to be seen as the enforcers of the new agenda, and this has led to a decrease in the trust of the community in the police force. The result is a situation where the police force is seen as the enforcers of the new agenda, and this has led to a decrease in the trust of the community in the police force.
The Great Depression began in 1929, decimating the economy and leading to widespread unemployment and poverty. This economic downturn had a profound impact on the United States, leading to social and political turmoil.

The Hoover Herbert 1932 Rep sition grants to the Electors of the respective States, but the Electors shall not be held to any other contingency, and the Electors of the State of California, shall have the privilege of voting for the President and Vice President of the United States, at the polls, on the first Monday after the first Monday in November next.
Johns here to which they are returning. This binationalism is utterly obscure to most whites, as espoused by Wilson's remembrance to President Emerson Zeidt in "fust out of California's business" for expressing concern over Proposition 187. 

Affirmative action has been a target of conservative agitation in California for many years. In 1978 Alan Ruck took the president-writing case against the University of California at Davis medical school for "reverse discrimination" against white males. Reagan took up the countercase when he entered the White House, putting the Civil Rights Commission in the hands of Clarence Thomas and his ilk. But affirmative action had, meanwhile, become deeply institutionalized in this state, from local government contracting to University of California admissions policies. Revson and the rightward trajectory of Governor Pete Wilson opened the doors for a renewed campaign against it. This trajectory re- spawned to the fears of job competition among the professional and educated strata of the labor force in much the same way that immigration-bashing spoke for the unemployed ethnic worker, including African Americans. But once again political ideology and opportunism had the upper hand. Based on the heels of Proposition 187 came a proposal for a new ballot measure in 1994, cleverly titled the California Civil Rights Initiative (CCR) by two academics with links to Reed Irvine and Howard D'Amour's well-known Accuracy in Academia campaign against political correctness in the classroom. Wilson selected on polls showing CCR to be a winner and hoped that taking an affirmative action would prop him up to the presidency. Wilson's backers on the Board of Regents, Ward Connerly (a historian whose success was leveraged by state contracts set aside for minority businesses), led the charge to remove affirmative action from the university system, over the protests of the president of the University and the chancellor of all of its campuses, in a naturally skewed decision in mid-1995.

Us and Them: The Politics of Race and Reaction

California has often embodied the best of the American juggermout. It has been a place where millions of enterprising people have been able to work for a good pay, exploit the abundance of nature, buy a little property, exercise their imagination, take their laws, and maybe even make the long hop into the ranks of the bourgeoisie. Acquisitive opportunism, political openness, and equality were available by comparison with most of the world and with most of capitalist America. Yet California's American identity was announced out in the mid-nineteenth century at the height of the formation of the racial ideology of what Alexander Saxton and David Roedinger have called "the White Republic." So California was not only the "one successful resolution of 1848" for the cosmopolitan mix of petit bourgeois arguments, but equally the triumph of Anglo-Saxon Manifest Destiny on the slopes of the Pacific.7 For the next century, white Americans dominated the body politic. But after World War II the sun began setting on their golden century, as citizenry, law, and ideology underwent epochal shifts due to migration, civil rights struggle, and the disruption of racial triumphalism. Of late, we see California's racemongers conjuring up the ghost of the White Republic in hopes of recovering a lost sense of unity among the privileged and unvilified among the pre-immigration populace. But will this perform its magic this time round, in a period not of economic and racial triumphalism but of sustained threat to the old order? 

In California's blood-stained racial history, the list of horrors unleashed in the name of commercial compact and the civilizing mission of the white race is long. The native peoples were murdered and enslaved, the Californios dispossessed of their property, African American denied the rights of citizenship, the Chinese lynched and driven into ghettos, the Japanese denied land as their enterprise proved threatening, Mexicans deported on mass when labor surpluses appeared in the Great Depression, and Japanese Americans thrown into concentration camps in the Second World War. This is the tragic face of a land in which fortune smiled on to many, one hidden so well that most whites have lost the memory of their own selectivity as the children of America's Israel.8

California has an equally ignoble history of incendiary racial ideology to inspire and justify its practices. One has only to read Richard Henry Dana on the Californios or John Muir on the Basque sheepherders or John Muir, William Randolph Hearst, and Michael DeYoung on the Yellow Peril at the turn of the century. By the 1920s, Lewis, tramson of Stanford, co-developer of the IQ test, was calling Mexicans "unschooled," and practical eugenicists were sterilizing more "defective" in mental hospitals and prisons in California than anywhere else in the United States.9 In the 1960s and 1970s, William Shockley of semiconductor fame and Arthur Jensen of UC Berkeley were the foremost exponents of African genetic inferiority. Today, biologists Paul Ehrlich of Stanford and Garrett Hardin of UC Santa Barbara provide scientific cover for FAIR, peddling fear of immigration by the "test-breeding races" of the Third World.

Despite the panorama of racism, however, the record is not of a piece. The White Republic of Euro-Americans was constituted from the encounter with subjugated peoples, but in California and the West it was forged in the crucible of a multiple encounter that included Latinos and Asians, as well as Native Americans and Africans. The right to fear at California's petit bourgeois bourgeoisie depended heavily on appearance and place of origin, with different races having radically different points of entry into the class structure.10 White supremacist, unbekled with its full fury against the Indians, was moderated in other cases by ambiguity and conflict: the resistance and partial legitimacy of the California elite, who were...
but it has been led, funded, and imagined by the powerful, and the evidence of their backing and benefit is overwhelming.6 Despite the right-wing chorus of racist diatribes, the majority of white people in California have welcomed in-migrants as fellow workers, neighbors, and members of the commonwealth. It has been political opportunism and mass disenfranchisement, more than popular sentiment from below, that has caused Proposition 187 into a winner and thwarts affirmative action programs.

Conclusion

Every epoch is a mortal thing that eventually sickness. It may give way to rebirths of the social order or to perpetual senility—even to barbarity and calamity. California's extraordinary record of expansion left the state with a massive set of strains on its economy, government, and social cohesion. The hasty termination of the social experimentation and political revolt of the 1960s, however, left Californians unable to see their way clear to recover the war industries; integrate racially; reconstruct rotting cities; reconfigure corporations; salvage public education; or spend public monies for recovery, employment, and universal health care. The failure of imagination rests partly on bourgeois ideological reflexes, but behind such a failure lies a political impasse: horn of the right-wing hold on the public agenda. If we are not to mourn the passing of the late, great Golden State, there must be change at the top caused by energy and anger from below.

Can the forces of social reclamation rise again? Promising challenges to the white establishment are now coming from the many hypochronous Americans of post-Anglo California: for example, Mexican Americans are struggling over re-directing in Los Angeles County, Chinese Americans for the first time hold a majority on Monterey Park's city council, and the state's first Filipino American public official has been elected in Daly City. Proposition 187's threat to the foreign-born has indeed helped send tens of thousands to seek citizenship in the last year; ironically, Petie Wilson may have written off precisely these potential voters in order to win the 1994 elections. When Wilson's presidential campaign petered out, it brunt large that California's anti-immigrant and anti-affirmative action vision would not spread. Aspirant minority lawmakers are being politicized by racist attacks, as demonstrated by the formation of the well-heeded Coalition for Immigrant and Refugee Rights. Significantly, tens of thousands of Latino high-schoolers with little political experience cast votes against 187, and their march of over 100,000 may be the largest demonstration ever held in Los Angeles. Fortunately for California, the racial divide here remains a complex entanglement, not simply a Grand Canyon of black-white incomprehension and mistrust. Nonetheless, the immigrant and antiracist awakening of the 1980s has long way to go if it is to overcome the political legacy and economic nonsense of the Anglo-bourgeoisie.
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