

Ethnicity and Urban Ethnic Places in American Cities: Fading Away or Resilient?

Youngmin Lee*

북미도시의 민족성과 민족집단장소 이론의 지리학적 함의: 동화론 비판을 중심으로

이 영 민*

Abstract : Viewed from the framework of world system, international migration is connected sometimes to unequal power relations by prejudice and discrimination in destination areas, or to equal power relations by intentional effort for harmonious multiculturalism. According to the existing ethnic relation theory, assimilationism, it is natural that ethnicity is fading away as the foreign immigrants of different ethnic background have long lived in a destination area, and thus the relative urban ethnic places are weakened and finally disappeared. Through the various examples particularly on the United States, however, ethnicity would not be easily fading-away but be sustained for long time. Also, the characteristics of ethnicity or ethnic place are sometimes revented or reconstructed as the various situation of multiculturalism is affected by postmodernism. Whether it is the thing made by ethnic segregation or by ethnic congregation, ethnicity and ethnic place are evidently a kind of affluent resources of culture and economy in the destination areas.

Key Words : ethnicity, ethnic places, assimilation, spatial congregation, spatial segregation

요약 : 세계체제론적 관점에서 본다면, 국제인구이동은 선택적 인구이동이라고 할 수 있으며, 이는 국가간 격차의 심화로 이어진다. 또한 문화적으로 보았을 때, 이는 목적지에서의 민족집단별 경쟁과 갈등, 혹은 조화와 같은 복잡한 현상들을 유발한다. 기존의 동화론에 의하면, 민족성은 이주집단이 새로운 정착지에서 오랜기간 동안 생활하다보면 자연스럽게 그 성격이 약화되고, 이에 따라 민족집단의 공간적 격리 현상도 점차 사라지게 되는 것으로 간주된다. 그러나 현재 다민족으로 구성된 국가들에서의 다양한 사례를 보게 되면, 그러한 동화가 매우 더디게 진행되거나 혹은 정반대로 민족성과 민족집단장소가 오히려 강화되는 모습을 확인할 수 있다. 민족성과 민족집단장소의 재발견 혹은 재구성은 현대사회의 다문화주의 및 포스트모더니즘 이념과 밀접한 관련이 있다. 민족성과 민족집단장소는 다민족 국가나 도시에 있어서 문화와 경제를 풍요롭게 하는데 큰 역할을 할 수 있는 귀중한 자산인 것이다.

주요어 : 민족성, 민족집단장소, 동화론, 응집, 공간격리, 공간응집

1. Introduction : International Migration toward Ethnicity

Migration is broadly defined as the physical movement of an individual or group of people from one place to another. The geographical movement of

human beings is of great consequence in that it affects the population growth and structure which subsequently give rise to socio-cultural and economic changes in both the origin and destination areas. Migration acts as an agent of change of social relations in the place of destination, and thus migrants

* Assistant Professor, Department of Social Studies Education, Ewha Womans University, Seoul, Korea.

themselves are required to adjust to the new social structure.

In the general sense, this framework of migration process can be applied to global level and international migration. That is, push and pull factors, according to structural-historical approaches, do not incidentally happen in the separated places of origin and destination, but are rather mutually interconnected under the world system order (Cheng and Bonacich, 1984). From Wallerstein's (1979) framework of historical social science, the last several centuries witnessed an on-going evolution of capitalist world economy as a single entity. Along with economic growth of mercantilism, many regions of subsistence economy had been colonized by European nation states, and in the meantime, the underdeveloped or peripheral areas had been so devastated as to uproot people from traditional economic pursuits.

The expansion of imperialistic colonialism encompassed the whole world by about 1900, geographically delineating into core and periphery zones. While capital was persistently concentrated in the core zones in its highest forms such as banking, the professions, mercantile activity, and skilled manufacturing, surplus potential laborers continued to be created in the periphery by the breakdown of subsistence economy and the rapid increase of absolute population. The capital in the core was sometimes channeled into the periphery which was exploited by extensive cultivation of agricultural products controlled by colonial capitalists. In this process, some of the periphery areas became changed to semi-periphery to which capital became to some degree accumulated. Large amount of cheap, reliable labor forces was definitely needed and introduced in the capital-invested periphery from other peripheries in the forms of slavery, serfdom, indentured labor, and debt peonage (Hugill, 1988; Taylor, 1988). The colonial capitalists' operation of the plantation system was profoundly responsible for the recomposition of colonial population and ethnic cultural pluralism, especially in the Americas.

Could this international migration within the framework of world system be connected to unequal power relations by prejudice and discrimination in destination areas, or to equal power relations by intentional effort for harmonious multiculturalism? This question is very debatable as the related phenomena differently display according to region by region. Furthermore, globalization in this century causes more people to make international migration, which makes the situation of multicultural regions more complicated. This thesis aims to theoretically compare two contrary propositions in regard to ethnicity and ethnic places caused by international migration. Based on the conceptualization of ethnicity and ethnic neighborhood, the ethnic relations of multicultural society and region is socially and spatially estimated with some examples of modern America.

2. Concepts of Ethnicity and Culture of Racism

Ethnicity can be broadly defined as a kind of culture with which a number of people perceive themselves to be in some way united because of their sharing either a common background, present or future position, or a combination of these (Cashmore and Troyna, 1990, 2). Deriving from the Greek "ethnos" which means heathen nations or peoples not converted to Christianity, "ethnic" currently refers to a group of people who share a common experience and origin. Hence, it is a matter of course that all humans belong to an ethnic group or another. But more significant in the study of ethnic relations is the conceptualization of "minority" group. Minority group status does not necessarily have to do with the population distribution among various ethnic groups, but it has more fundamentally to do with unequal power distribution between ethnic groups. The unequal interethnic power relations have been strongly associated with the racist's belief

in some ethnic members' belonging to inferior groups with undesirable cultural attributes. Institutionalization of the racist culture up to the mid-twentieth century allowed some groups to exploit and discriminate others designated as minority, irrespective of numerical amount of population.

As a process of self-conscious definition to tell a group apart from others, ethnicity tends to be intensified when people migrated to new place where they have to be relegated into minority status and subordinated to unequal treatment and discrimination. Racialization and ethnicization of new immigrants by the host society often prompt the consciousness of ethnic affiliation inside a group to be re-generated and solidified. Ethnicity is produced and evolved by the dialectic conjunction of the internal process of self-identification based on shared cultural heritage and historical experiences, and the external forces of categorization by racism or ethnocentrism. That is, ethnic groups identify their nature and boundary by themselves, and at the same time their identities are categorized by the outsiders. Regarding ethnicity formulated by the external process of social categorization (Jenkins, 1994), more attention should be paid to the power and authority relations in the process. The external force, racism, refers to the assumption that social differences of people directly derived from biologically given differentiation by discrete races and thus their cultures are inherently different (Jackson, 1987).

The racist thought probably has its origin in the notion of a polygenist theory before the nineteenth century. Following this notion, humans were descended from different origin, and physically and culturally fixed and unchanging (Langness, 1990, 8). So, it was possible to assume that the physical and cultural capacity of human beings would be fundamentally different by races or ethnic groups. In addition to the polygenesis notion, nineteenth-century evolutionism was likely to contribute in part to the rationalization of the racist thought. This unilinear evolutionism stands on the belief in the monogene-

sis wherein mankind was regarded as homogeneous in nature and thus its culture could be changeable or perfectable (Applebaum, 1987, 6-36). Although rooted in the assumption of the intellectual equality or "the psychic unity of mankind" (Langness, 1990, 31), the unilinear evolutionism insisted that each race or ethnic group was in different stages of cultural evolution which was culminated by Occidental civilization. By putting the European culture on the top of the evolution sequence, it may have provided an academic legitimacy for scientific racisms supported by social Darwinism and eugenic notions of white racial fitness¹⁾ (Rich, 1987, 97).

Furthermore, this white superiority discourse was likely incorporated into assimilationism, which assumes that all ethnic minorities are supposed to be incorporated into the mainstream culture symbolized as the Anglo-Saxon/Christianity/middle class American culture. As a matter of fact, however, non-white groups from non-European regions were not granted the privilege to enter the assimilation process, because they were classified as unassimilable. Firmly grounded in ethnocentrism, the norm of assimilation into such Anglo-Saxonism acknowledged and pushed non-Anglo-Saxon Europeans to become Americanized as quickly as possible, whereas non-white immigrants, especially Asians, were completely blocked from being Americanized and remained as 'aliens ineligible for citizenship' until 1940s²⁾ (Sharon Lee, 1989). They were treated as being too different or too inferior to adapt to so-called American culture. Those who were classified as unassimilable were exploited and unequally treated under the justification of racism, which was, according to the structuralist argument, initially developed and propagated by capitalist employers.

In sum, race or ethnicity themselves should not be simply viewed as a given and immutable category. Instead, it should be seen as a product of racism originated from the Eurocentric world-view which was socially constructed and manifested in the progress of global expansion of imperialism (Jackson,

1987). In this context, racialization or ethnicization is the more appropriate word in explaining ethnic relations and power relations of domination and subordination around the turn of the twentieth century.

3. Ethnicity Fading-away: Assimilationism

In association with an immigrant group's transformation of its status into a permanent resident group and its establishment of an identification in a new land, the process of adaptation to the changing social environment has been one of the most important subjects in the study of urban ethnic relations. The wide variety of adaptive strategies among ethnic groups have enabled various kinds of symbolic metaphors to be presented: "melting-pot", "mosaic", "salad bowl", "rainbow", "symphony", "kaleidoscope", etc. (Fuchs, 1990, 276). None of them by themselves, however, are likely to speak squarely to the complexity of ethnic dynamics in the United States. These various metaphors can be accommodated into two principal theories of ethnic relations which seem competing but also complementary: assimilationism and ethnic pluralism.

Heavily influenced by the concepts of the nineteenth-century evolutionism and the view of the French sociologist, Emile Durkheim, of society as an ordered system, assimilationism holds that ethnic groups in the United States are supposed to evolve toward assimilation into modern society, and consequently through the process ethnicity is destined to vanish. That is, the underlying assumption is that a migrating group tends to quite orderly accommodate to the culture of the host group, while its ethnic identity is weakened more and more. Therefore, it can be defined as a homogenizing process of boundary reduction in a multi-ethnic society whereby "the biological, cultural, social, and psychological fusion of distinct groups creates a new ethnically undifferentiated society" (Barth and Noel, 1972, 336).

Robert Park (1950), who initiated the classical assimilation theory and the entailing Chicago school of urban ecology, maintains that a society will be increasingly unified in the process of a progressive and irreversible assimilation sequence. The sequence, called "race relations cycle", takes the form of "contacts" with other peoples, "competition" with them for jobs, "accommodation" to one another, and ultimate "assimilation". In his view, modern society, characterized by multi-ethnic cities, inexorably attracts tradition-oriented people and converts them from their custom-bond ways of life into civic-minded citizens of a new Occidental socio-economic order. The order, in turn, makes them change from collective, family-based cultural characteristics to individualistic secondary human relations which are necessarily entailed in order to struggle for scarce material in a modern society (Lyman, 1994, 43-44). In Park's view, ethnicity is simply a traditional form of identification that was formed in a pre-urban setting. Therefore, as individuals who were once confined to what is called a *gemeinschaft* community become members of the urban *gesellschaft* society, they begin to contact with persons of different culture and thus the traditional distinctive ethnicity must be eventually lost in the course of assimilation.

The aim of assimilation should be to transform the immigrants to become an integral part of the Americanized community. Americanization was believed by some to be achieved by a "melting-pot" process in which all groups' cultures including the dominant host group are amalgamated into a new one. In reality, however, immigrant minority groups had little influence on the making of so-called Americanized culture. Although Frederick Jackson Turner, one of the early adherents of melting-pot philosophy, declared that "in the crucible of the frontier the immigrants were Americanized, liberated and fused into a mixed race" (as quoted in Postiglione, 1983, 17), some selected groups were totally excluded from taking part in the

Americanization movement in the frontier as well as the other urban settings. The melting-pot theory has been more a romantic vision than a reality throughout the history of the United States.

Instead, the Anglo-conformity model, connected with the contemporary racism substantiated on the basis of nineteenth century evolutionism, had become prevalent through out the nineteenth and early twentieth century. The idea stemmed from the evolutionary belief that the Aryan and Nordic races of Northwestern Europe were the most highly evolved superior ones, and consequently their culture, having been partially modified on the American soil, might well be a norm for other inferior groups to seek. It was commonly believed that the superior culture justifiably prevailed over the others. At the same time, the inferior cultural groups' continuous inflow posed a serious threat to the structure of American society (Postiglione, 1983, 14-16). For the immigrants, to survive in the new land meant nothing less than to discard their heritage and to take on the dominant Anglo-Saxon culture. According to the view of the assimilationist, Milton Gordon, the hegemonic white Anglo-Saxon Protestant (WASP) middle class culture formed the reference culture against which immigrants were expected to measure their progress.

In this paradigm of assimilation, individual attainment through "human capital", such as motivations, values, relevant job skill, and language, are stressed because those are regarded as prerequisite for the progress to the melting-pot or Anglo-conformity culture, which is blind to ethnic diversity. That is, the individual cultivation of "human capital" facilitates the socio-economic attainment and also leads to the progressive weakening and ultimate disappearance of the primordial bond of ethnicity (Morawska, 1990, 189).

As stated above, the classic assimilation theory toward melting-pot or Anglo-conformity culture is too simplistic to be capable of accounting for the more complicated processes of the immigrants' and

their descendants' adaptation. First of all, the process of assimilation and Americanization had been an explanatory framework only for white European immigrants. As far as assimilation is concerned, although the degree of the particular contributions to the making of the Americanized culture is different even among the European groups, non-white immigrants of blacks and Asians, or American Indians, however, were not granted a clear place in the Americanization process at least until the mid-twentieth century.

Second, the one-way and irreversible process of assimilation sequence should be re-considered. Whereas some groups follow the exact route of the assimilation process and thus become like the dominant groups, others often jump stages, are retarded, or proceed in the opposite direction. The explanation to why the rapidity of assimilation is different by ethnic groups and why certain groups have been structurally excluded from the normal passage of assimilation has been ignored by the assimilationists. In the real world, ethnicity, which is anticipated by the proponents of assimilationism to disappear with the progress of time, still persists even in generation to generation in many cases. Hence, assimilation does not necessarily make ethnic people abandon the ethnic identity or affiliation (Fugita and O'Brien, 1991). Even though some individuals are socially assimilated into the mainstream, more often than not, they still keep considerable residues of ethnic culture by continuously participating in the ethnic associations and social networks.

4. Ethnicity Resilient: Primordialism and Structuralism

As a society constituted by immigrants, the United States has long embraced assimilationism as the unofficial national doctrine, but ethnic cultural diversity continues to stand out partly due to on-going influx of immigrants. In many cases, some groups

have been highly resistant to Americanization and thus ethnic identity has persisted over even the third or fourth generation. Despite the creed of assimilation, it is recognized that American society is obviously composed of many ethnic sub-societies, and to the ethnic minority members, their own distinct sub-culture itself has constantly played as the strategic resources in adapting to the new world full of competition. In other words, the new-coming minorities tends to start a new life on the basis of their own ethnic community which helps them to prepare for competency in the wider mainstream society. In this context, many minorities seek to maintain their cultural identity, and at the same time they try to participate in the various mainstream institutions. Especially, urban centers have been the magnetic field which attracts a large variety of differentiated people and unified them in some cases or separates them in other cases. Why and how have some ethnic groups' identities been rather tenacious or evolving into new forms rather than fading away over time? It is necessary to investigate the structural factors that drive ethnic identity to be newly generated or resurgent.

The most simple but hardly verifiable approach to explain the retention of ethnicity is the primordialists' view that ethnic groups are intuitively bounded by shared ancestry and culture. Members are enabled to have a perception of community, and thereby satisfy the human essential need for "belonging" (Geertz, 1963). According to the anthropologist, Clifford Geertz (1963, 109), ethnicity is defined as a primordial attachment that is an ineffable "givens" stemming from being born in to a particular social patterns. He also contends that the general strength and the types of such primordial bonds differ from person to person, from society to society, and from time to time, but the attachments seem to flow more from a sense of natural affinity than from social interaction. In his definition, ethnicity is the conception naturally or biologically defined rather than socially defined. That is, primordial attach-

ments is a kind of superorganic or given entity outside of individuals, and an entity created prior to their interactions (Eller and Coughlan, 1993). Sometimes the ethnicity of primordial bond often remains so 'unmeltable' as to strongly affect several generations down. Nevertheless, the primordialist's framework, which takes it for granted that once established, ethnicity is made fixed as a permanent feature of any society, would not be able to explain that attributes of ethnicity often may be prescribed and changed by dint of social decisions. Externally-located processes of social categorization based on power and authority relations (Jenkins, 1994) as well as internal process of group identification originating in the primordial bond must simultaneously work on the production or re-emergence of ethnic identity.

The other approach to explain ethnicity resilience is that ethnic ties are sustained and re-produced by rational interests. In other words, ethnic groups are conceived as interest groups, and to them ethnicity functions as an instrumental or situational means for mobilizing power. It contrasts sharply to primordialism wherein ethnicity is regarded as an end in itself or making its own dynamic. When socio-economic competition for resources becomes intense in the immigrants' destination, the ethnic groups attempt to organize and consolidate the ethnic identity in order to cope with the outer competitive environment. The collective action is not only taken by the host group toward the new minority groups to secure the scarce resources, but also the subordinate ethnic group actively mobilize its people to effectively adjust to the harsh environment of unequal power distribution and the ensuing structural discrimination.

A typical explanatory framework for this confrontational ethnic relationship is "split labor market theory" (Bonacich, 1972; Peck, 1989). This theory asserts that the occupations of modern society are divided into primary and secondary labor market sectors, and the ethnic characteristics of workers function as major determining influences in their

admission to each sector. More specifically, power-holding groups take the most desirable occupations, whereas powerless immigrant minorities are confined into less prestigious and low-paid secondary labor market jobs. But what determines the characteristics of workers? Are those characteristics intrinsically given or social prescribed? Regarding the underlying reason of labor market separatedness, Sociologist Edna Bonacich(1972) argues that over the last century the white majority working class have turned to prejudice and discrimination to protect their own privileges because they feared the possibility of job displacement and wage lowering by the immigrant laborers the capitalists introduced to maximize profits by curtailing labor costs. Accordingly, their efforts to restrict the access of minority laborers to many high class jobs resulted in the so-called "split labor market".

The split labor market is generally sub-divided into smaller segmentations by ethnic lines(Schreuder, 1990) effected by information flow in ethnic social network and the consequent chain migration. The ethnicization by the multiple dimensions of ethnic segmentation apparently reduces contacts between ethnic groups and brings about an intensification of ethnic organizations inside an ethnic group. Mutual inter-ethnic rejection results in in-group solidarity which provides members of the immigrant group with moral support and sometimes economic and political power. According to Hechter(1974), when immigrant newcomers are forced into the peripheral minority under unequal treatment which blocks them entering into the assimilation process, an "internal colonialism" is created by social or spatial segregation, and then, the newcomers tend to turn on the process of ethnic self-consciousness and identity consolidation. In short, ethnicity is situationally recreated through the mobilization process. Moreover, based on the same context of instrumental ethnicity, it is proposed that ethnicity is often used as a commodified resource in itself to be incorporated into the mainstream economy(D.O. Lee,

1990), or considered as a political resource to resist to the oppression imposed by the dominant group(Hechter, 1982).

From this perspective, ethnicity is an emergent phenomenon, not a given fact of social life beyond the realm of human agency. It is seen as an explicit response to a specific social context rather than as an inherent characteristic of any social grouping.

The character and strength of ethnicity varies place by place because specific historical conditions or contingencies impinges on how it emerges, and grows. That is, ethnic identity is constantly remolded through intra- and interethnic relationships dominated by the structural conditions of the host society. Ethnic groups in modern settings The recreation process of identity takes place irrespective of majority or minority groups. A noticeable research on the ethnicity mobilization by power-holding groups was done by sociologist Richard Alba(1990). He argues that various European ethnic groups are being currently blended into one large white ethnic group through the making of new integrated identity. In addition to the processes of acculturation and intermarriage, he maintains, self-defining processes of ethnicization are responsible for the invention of an acquired sense of belonging which are greatly influenced by confrontation with the non-white immigrant group. continue to recreate themselves, and thus ethnicity is continuously being reinvented in response to changing realities both within the group and the host society(Conzen et.al., 1992). Therefore, ethnicity should be understood and examined in the process of contextuality in a place as a historically contingent phenomenon. In the invention of ethnicity, however, human beings are not likely to be passive recipients merely affected by the constraints of particular historical contexts, but rather active agents making or selecting among various strategies for adaptation.

The on-going supply of foreign immigrants and the retention or even strengthening of ethnic identity among ethnic groups have made the United States a

society of ethnic pluralism. Presently multiculturalism has become the preferred term for such a condition. Multiculturalism probably became prevalent in general public after Canadian government proclaimed it as an official policy in 1971 and in the United States, a "multicultural" curriculum was first proposed for the New York schools in 1990 (Gleason, 1992, 48). In the Canadian policy, all groups are encouraged to maintain their distinctive cultural heritages and all group members are recognized as having equal rights (Kobayashi, 1993). In reality, however, multiculturalism remains an ideal. That is, two forms of multiculturalism could be differentiated based on how power is distributed: equalitarian pluralism and unequalitarian pluralism. In the society of equalitarian pluralism, ethnic groups are allowed to retain their cultural distinctiveness and equally participate in a common political and economic system. In a society of unequal pluralism, ethnic groups have unequal political and economic power distributed, and are socially or spatially segregated. The question of the maintenance or celebration of distinctive ethnic cultural heritages become secondary. Presumably, equalitarian ethnic multiculturalism on the way toward Americanization has become the societal objective of the United States.

5. Ethnicity and Ethnic Neighborhood

New immigrants in the opening decades of this century, regardless of being from South and East Europe or from Asia, had generally settled down in the neighborhoods of their own as soon as arriving. The production and the continued existence of such ethnic residential segregation were partly due to their voluntary desire to keep their cultural orientations, partly to the authority of the host population possessing power, but mostly due to the interplay of both factors. In more recent cases of the post-1965 huge influx of immigration, similar situations have occurred. It is apparent that the ethnic neighbor-

hood, no matter what causal factors have influenced on its formation, has functioned as a social structure which encourages the constituents to foster a sense of attachment to the ethnicity and the place.

Neighborhood can be defined as a district within an urban area wherein an identifiable subculture is built up to which the majority of its residents conform and thus set them apart from the rest of the city (Johnston et al., 1994, 409-10). Apart from its boundedness by a sense of place, neighborhood is almost the same as the concept of community, which is based on the residents' common ties and social interaction in a shared subculture which fulfill some common purpose or share some common interest between members (Davies, 1993, 3-7). The concept of community does not necessarily require spatial clustering of members because the more essential things to bind the people together are thought to be the shared attitudes and behaviors—"community without propinquity". But the placelessness of community, as Godfrey mentions (1988, 24-26), should not be overemphasized. In many cases, social ethnic groups constitute their identity on the basis of locality and further spatial patterns reciprocally affect social practices. Therefore, the significance of neighborhood or community of place should be recognized in the study of ethnic relations.

From the aspect of assimilationism, ethnic neighborhood is merely regarded as a spatial reflection of social differentiation, which tends to temporarily exist and eventually disappear under the goal of assimilation. This assimilationistic view on ethnic spatial segregation concludes that although the poor immigrants first gather in their ethnic neighborhood to take advantage of the social ethnic network facilitating cheap housing, nearby work places, and psychic comfort, the degree of residential segregation, as time goes by, would constantly decrease with the progressive residential mobility out of the segregated neighborhood accompanied by the members' improvement in their socio-economic position. That is, socio-economic attainment is one of the most

important dimensions of immigrant assimilation, and in the process of assimilation into a society that would be blind to ethnicity, the transitory ethnic spatial segregation would become progressively weakened and disappeared. Accordingly, residential segregation shows the degree to which immigrant groups are integrated with the mainstream society. This view of ethnic neighborhood as the reflection of social difference seems to have its root in Robert Park's contention that social distance could be transformed into spatial distance. He defined social distance as a degree of intimacy that a group people are willing to establish with others, and further proposed that the higher is the degree of social distance between two groups, the more physically separated are the two groups. Spatial segregation is simply the product of social relations between groups.

Although it is the general trend that spatial segregation diminishes with the ethnic minorities' cultivation of human capital and the resultant socio-economic upward movement, certain ethnic groups remain persistently stable, or change relatively slow, or even somewhat increase the extent of segregation. That is, contrary to the explanation of assimilationism, ethnicity does not usually disappear, but in many cases, it becomes resilient with the progress of time. Presumably, it demonstrates that other factors beyond individual "human capital" exert significant influence on the lives of ethnic group members. The resilience of ethnicity seems caused by the interplay of various factors such as cultural properties and socio-economic status of ethnic group members, the role of historical events, and also the segregated place itself of the ethnic group.

As geographer Morgan(1984) indicates, however, spatial structure or segregated place also inversely plays an influential role on reinforcing and evolving the social structure itself like the growth of community consciousness and class formation by lessening the possibility of interaction and the potential conflict with the other groups outside the neighborhood boundary. That is, ethnic spatial segregation con-

tribute to the reproduction of ethnic groups by creating contexts for preservation of a particular way of life and bases for action in the wider society. A neighborhood, created by social residential segregation, tends to interrupt the social interaction between social groups. Furthermore, institutionally complete set of activities and services in an ethnic neighborhood, or what is called "institutional completeness"(Driedger and Church, 1974), assists in the maintenance of the ethnic subculture through enhancing the primordial ties of shared attitudes and behaviors. Institutional completeness also assists in developing a sense of place with the encouragement of an ethnicity-evolving or ethnicity-redefining process. Institutional completeness also enables the members to take advantage of pragmatic interests through securing economic opportunities within the ethnic boundary. Anyhow, residential segregation area, bounded by spatial propinquity and structured by institutional completeness, is perceived as an identifiable unit by both inhabitants and outsiders, even if neighborhood identities, boundaries, and even designations may be variously perceived among people and over time(Godfrey, 1988, 24-26).

6. Conclusion : Ethnic Place, Segregated or Congregated?

With regard to the causes of spatial segregation, long-standing debates have been made around the dichotomy: voluntary congregation by choice and forced segregation by discrimination. Some groups like Jews have such a high proclivity toward internal ethnic cohesiveness to preserve their distinctive cultural and religious heritage that their spatial segregation remains quite stable. Residential clustering could facilitate the development of self-help ethnic social network to support themselves and thus consolidate ethnic cultural identity.

In relation to voluntary ethnic neighborhood, eth-

nic social networks, which were extensively formed between families and friends within an ethnic community, play an essential role of offering jobs and housing to new-coming compatriots. The process of ethnic social networking gives rise to the proliferation and consolidation of voluntary ethnic institutions, which in return serve as the internal structural conditions for the development of socially and/or spatially segregated ethnic communities. Such institutions as immigrant churches, ethnic schools, ethnic newspapers, and various fraternal, mutual aid associations, help the residents anchor their neighborhoods, so that those institutions function as the central points for the socialization of the ethnic residents. That is, those institutions enable them to acquire the knowledge which is used to negotiate the world outside the ethnic neighborhood and at the same time provide them with shared values and life experiences which subsequently help them to obtain ethnic solidarity and political consciousness. As such, the place does not exist simply as a physical container for social activity, reciprocally contributes to the construction of social structure.

In many more cases, however, the spatial segregation of an ethnic group is primarily attributed to discrimination by majority group. Non-white ethnic minority groups, particularly before World War II, were perceived as unassimilable to the mainstream culture and were prevented from competing equally in labor market of the mainstream economy. Public racialism and discriminatory policy by state or local government coercively confined ethnic minority group members to an isolated area or ghetto (Anderson, 1991). Also the discriminatory economic environment of a split labor market partly accounts for the genesis and sustenance of spatial segregation as an ethnic economic enclave. According to this structural approach as mentioned earlier, an ethnic group members who are inaccessible to the mainstream primary labor market gather into economic niches where the majority members are reluctant to occupy. This economic segregation,

generally before and partly after World War II, was closely associated with the spatial segregation. In case of Asian ethnic groups, small businesses of certain trades and services have moved into economic niches which have subsequently solidified the segmented labor market where family members or fellow ethnics have been mainly employed.

Although generated by external exclusionary forces, the ethnic neighborhood further contributes to the members' cultivation of human capital essential for adjusting to the new social environment. That is, the neighborhood enclave can function as a nest where the members are provided with social capital of their own, and as a springboard which helps them to jump to the outer mainstream society with the cultivated human capital, but without losing ethnic identity. As such, residential segregation is not always the case of economic hardship and blocked mobility. While valid only for selected immigrant groups, ethnic neighborhood especially as economic enclave might provide economic opportunities for co-ethnic members, at least during initial settlement. It could play the roles as place of work as well as place of residence.

Based on the criteria of choice or constraint and permanence or impermanence, three kinds of ethnic spatial segregation can be separated: "colony", "enclave", and "ghetto". Enclave and ghetto have longevity of existence in common, but are differentiated by the criteria of voluntary congregation and external constraints respectively. By contrast, colony refers to a temporary existing port-of-entry for an immigrant ethnic group, which provides the members with a base for cultural assimilation and spatial dispersion. For the most part, however, ethnic spatial segregation is formulated and maintained by the reciprocal influences of external forces of discrimination and internal forces of voluntary ethnic cohesion. It is virtually impossible to separate clearly the forementioned three kinds of spatial segregation because various factors are compounded in the origin and evolution of spatial segregation.

Note

- 1) For the restrictionists' anxiety about the damaging effects of continuous incompatible immigrants on the cultural unity of the United States and the established American heritage, and their accommodation of the science of eugenics and Neo-Lamarckian ideas to appeal to the public for the restriction of the unselective immigration, see David Ward's (1987) excellent book on *European immigration, Poverty, Ethnicity, and the American City, 1840-1925*, 142-147.
- 2) The Chinese Exclusion Act, the only legal discrimination that the naturalization of immigrants had been prohibited based on racial background, was repealed in 1943. Along with the revocation, all other Asian immigrants also came to be eligible for citizenship. For more details, see Sharon M. Lee, 1989, Asian Immigration and American Race-Relations: from Exclusion to Acceptance? *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, 12(3), 368-90.

References

- Alba, Richard D., 1990, *Ethnic Identity: The Transformation of White America*, New Haven and London: Yale University Press.
- Anderson, Kay J., 1991, *Vancouver's Chinatown: Racial Discourse in Canada, 1875-1980*. McGill-Queen's University Press.
- Barth, Ernest A. T. and Donald L. Noel, 1972, Conceptual frameworks for the analysis of race relations, *Social Forces*, 50: 33-49.
- Bonacich, Edna, 1972, A theory of ethnic antagonism: the split labor market, *American Sociological Review*, 37: 547-559.
- Cashmore, Ellis and Barry Troyna, 1990, *Introduction to Race Relations*, London: The Falmer Press.
- Cheng, Lucy and E. Bonacich (eds.), 1984, *Labor Migration under Capitalism: Asian Workers in the United States before World War II*, University of California Press.
- Conzen, Kathleen N., D. A. Gerber, E. Morawska, G. E. Pozzetta, and R. J. Vecoli, 1992, The invention of ethnicity: A perspective from the U.S.A., *Journal of American Ethnic History*, 12(1): 3-41.
- Davies, Wayne K. D. and D. T. Herbert, 1993, *Communities within Cities: An Urban Social Geography*, London: Belhaven Press.
- Driedger, Leo and Glenn Church, 1974, Residential segregation and institutional completeness: a comparison of ethnic minorities, *Review of Canadian Sociology and Anthropology*, 11: 30-52.
- Eller, Jack D. and R. M. Chouglan, 1993, The poverty of primordialism: the demystification of ethnic attachments, *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, 16(2): 183-201.
- Fuchs, Lawrence H., 1990, *The American Kaleidoscope: Race, Ethnicity, and the Civil Culture*, The Wesleyan University Press.
- Fugita, S. and D. J. O'Brien, 1991, *Japanese American Ethnicity: The Persistence of Community*, Seattle: University of Washington Press.
- Geertz, Clifford, 1963, The integrative revolution: primordial sentiments and civil politics in the New States, In *Old Societies and New States*, ed. by Clifford Geertz, Glencoe, Illinois: The Free Press, 105-157.
- Gleason, Philep, 1992, *Speaking of Diversity: Language and Ethnicity in Twentieth Century America*, Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Godfrey, Brian J., 1988, *Neighborhoods in Transition: The Making of San Francisco's Ethnic and Nonconformist Communities*, University of California Publications in Geography, vol.27, Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Hechter, Michael, 1982, A theory of ethnic collective action, *International Migration Review*, 16: 412-34.
- Hechter, Michael, 1974, The political economy of ethnic change, *American Journal of Sociology*, 79: 1151-78.
- Hugill, Peter J., 1988, Structural changes in the core regions of the world-economy, 1830-1945, *Journal of Historical Geography*, 14(2): 111-27.

- Jackson, Peter, 1989, *Maps of Meaning: An Introduction to Cultural Geography*, London: Unwin Hyman.
- Jackson, Peter, 1987, *Race and Racism: Essays in Social Geography*, London: Allen & Unwin.
- Jackson, Peter and S. J. Smith(eds.), 1981, *Social Interaction and Ethnic Segregation*, London: Academic Press.
- Jenkins, Richard, 1994, Rethinking ethnicity: identity, categorization and power, *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, 17(2): 197-223.
- Johnston, R. J., D. Gregroy, and D. M. Smith, (eds.) 1994, *The Dictionary of Human Geography*(3rd ed.), Blackwell.
- Kobayashi, Audrey, 1993, Mutculturalism: Representing a Canadian institution, in *Place, Culture, Representation*, ed. by J.S. Duncan, and D. Ley, London: Routledge.
- Langness, L. L., 1990, *The Study of Culture*, Novato, California: Chandler & Sharp Publishers, Inc.
- Lee, Dong Ok, 1990, Commodification of ethnicity: the sociospatial reproduction of immigrant entrepreneurs, *Urban Affairs Quarterly*, 28(2): 258-75.
- Lee, Sharon M., 1989, Asian immigration and american race-realtions: from exclusion to acceptance? *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, 12(3): 368-90.
- Lyman, Stanford M., 1994, *Color, Culture, Civilization: Race and Minority Issues in American Society*, Urbana and Chicago: University of Illinois Press.
- Morawska, Ewa, 1990, The sociology and historiography of immigration, in *Immigration Reconsidered: History, Sociology, and Politics*, ed. by Virginia Yans- McLaughlin. New York: Oxford University Press, 187-238.
- Morgan, B.S., 1984, Social geography, spatial structure and social structure, *Geojournal*, 9: 301-10.
- Park, Robert E., 1950, *Race and Culture*, Glencoe, Illinois: Free Press.
- Peck, Jamie A., 1989, Reconceptualizing the local labor market: space, segmentation and the state, *Progress in Human Geography*, 13: 42-61.
- Postiglione, G. A., 1983, *Ethnicity and American Social Theory: Toward Critical Pluralism*, Lanham: University Press of America.
- Rich, Paul, 1987, The politics of 'race relations' in Britain and the West, in *Race and Racism: Essays in Social Geography*, ed. by Peter Jackson. London: Allen & Unwin, 95-118.
- Schreuder, Yda, 1990, The impact of labor segmentation on the ethnic division of labor and the immigrant residential community: Polish leather workers in Wilmington, Delaware, in the Early Twentieth Century, *Journal of Historical Geography*, 16: 402-24.
- Taylor, Peter J., 1988, World-systems analysis and regional geography, *Professional Geographer*, 40(3): 259-65.
- Wallerstein, I., 1979, *The Capitalist World-Economy*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

(Received November 8, 2001)